

from the editors

in this issue

The world **does** seem to be divided into lumpers and splitters—those determined to find common features shared by things normally considered disparate, and those who take delight in drawing distinctions between things ordinarily grouped together. Some theorists are inclined to lump informal logic and critical thinking together; others think they should be split apart. For purposes of strict theoretical fidelity, we need to get the lumps and the splits right, and if informal logic and critical thinking belong in two separate fields, then so be it. But for purposes of intellectual nourishment and cross-fertilization, we think it best to place the two of them in the same forum, without worrying too much about theoretical purity. Certainly that is the editorial policy of this journal, regardless of its current name.

All of this is both to make a general point, and to introduce the articles gathered by serendipity into this issue—three by title on critical thinking, and the fourth by content at home in critical thinking.

Mark Weinstein offers a wide theoretical perspective in which to situate critical thinking. He is after *The Big Picture*. Tziporah Kasachkoff gives a critique of some standard analyses, plus her recommended revisions, of a couple of concepts situated centrally in the field: explaining and justifying. Her aim is to Correct the Conceptual Map. Karen Warren questions some assumptions of critical thinking from a feminist perspective. Her objective is to Correct the Conceptual Focus. And Arthur Millman takes the widespread contention that attitudes are essential to critical thinking and tries to give it more substance than it has sometimes received. His project is to Fill in the Details.

The Reply in this issue by Roderick Girle is his response to Seale Doss's critique of formal logic in his article, "Three Steps Toward a Theory of Informal Logic," in Vol. VII, Nos. 2&3 (Spring and Fall 1985), 127-135.

a plea

We were recently at a conference of journal editors, where we learned (surprise! surprise!) that no journal has enough subscribers. But we **really** do not have enough subscribers! Perhaps due to our former dilatoriness—now a thing of the past, as faithful subscribers know—this journal reaches only a tiny fraction of its potential audience. Will you do what you can to help by encouraging colleagues and other friends to subscribe?

don't throw away your *informal logic* mailing envelope yet!

Since **informal logic** has been getting caught up, more than one Volume has been appearing during the calendar year and in consequence more than one bill has been issued to subscribers paying by the single Volume. In the circumstances it is natural for some confusion to arise about just what your subscription payments have covered. On your mailing label, in the upper righthand corner, there is a capital letter followed by a slash, followed by a number. The letter to the left of the slash is a code for internal administrative purposes, and need not concern you. **The number to the right of the slash is for your information as a subscriber. That number is the number of the latest volume for which your subscription is paid up, according to our records.** Thus the code "P/10", "S/10" or "I/10" means that you are paid up to the end of Volume X (the volume of which this issue is the first number). If the number following the slash is "09" then you owe for Volume X. If the number following the slash is "11" or "12", then you are paid up not only for Volume X, but also for Volume XI or Volume XII, respectively. It is time to send a payment to continue your subscription when you have received the third issue of the Volume whose number corresponds to that number on your mailing label. If you already threw away your envelope and you are unsure of where your subscription stands, please write to the Managing Editor and he will gladly inform you. □