

Editorial

History begins here. In the future, this journal might be remembered as a brave act of will, or as a superfluous project, or as a bad investment, or the opposite of these scenarios. But none of the negative possibilities or positive prospects are good reasons today to stop doing what is necessary: to create new paths of communication for those interested in the phenomenon of reasoning and argumentation, both at a theoretical and a practical level.

In September 2009, *Cogency* opens its doors to the international academic world in the hope of contributing to the study of reasoning and argumentation by means of a new space for discussion across related fields, such as logic, informal logic, psychology of reasoning, artificial intelligence, communication studies, rhetoric, argumentation theory, discourse analysis, linguistics, law, education, among others fields and disciplines.

Cogency is a journal of the Centre for the Study of Argumentation and Reasoning (CEAR) at the Faculty of Psychology, Diego Portales University, Chile. At CEAR, we are convinced that by opening up this space opportunities are provided to the theoretical and empirical study of argumentation and reasoning with a technical and social interest.

To address these challenges, this journal emerges with a clear multidisciplinary vocation and, for this reason, we kindly invite the academic community to support this project by submitting articles and book reviews that combine innovative proposals and revisions of all topics implied in the ecology of argumentation and reasoning.

Some of these general aims are already reflected in this inaugural volume, where some of the key dimensions in the study of reasoning and argumentation are investigated by the following authors (in alphabetical order): partially from a logical point of view, First Margaret Cuonzo pro-

poses a way to resolve paradoxes, namely: to analyse the implicit intuition that motivates accepting the parts of the paradox; from the point of view of argumentation theory, particularly the pragma-dialectical perspective, Frans H. van Eemeren and Bart Garssen shed light on the fallacies of composition and division by outlining their parameters; from an informal logic perspective, Trudy Govier reveals how to deal with the gap between logical opposition and social opposition; also from an informal logic point of view, Ralph H. Johnson thoroughly discusses the project of informal logic itself, by showing its strengths and weaknesses; to accept rhetoric as action-oriented discourse is the proposal that Christian Kock offers as an angle from which to understand the problem of constant conflict of value concepts in audiences and arguers; using Ducrot's semantic-argumentative perspective, Carolina Tosi investigates the linguistic strategies social sciences secondary textbooks in Argentina use to direct the reader.

From now on into the future, the team will work to be remembered as having a good cooperative project in hand and for investing its money wisely.

CRISTIÁN SANTIBÁÑEZ YÁÑEZ, Director
Amsterdam, September 2009