Mike Zeiler. Never a better or more reliable bunch.

Bill Cumming died early that year, and he was remembered in my second issue. That issue also carried Dick Herrnstein's seminal article, "On the Law of Effect."

Quick, how many supplementary monographs did JEAB publish? The answer is five; the last one was published during my term as Editor (but invited by an Editor before me). Unless I missed something, there has not been a monograph supplement since 1970! In the issues that bore my name as Editor there were just over 250 research articles published, plus

a number of book reviews, technical articles, and notes. I wondered if there was one of the research articles I could identify as my favorite. I scanned the issues, and there was one. I'll not name it though, because I don't need a pack of new enemies!

As I look back to those years, I think I can say that I had fun. From my perspective today, I would do it again *then*, but never now.

*Department of Psychology
University of Maine-Orono
Orono, Maine 04473*

Victor G. Laties (Editor, 1973–1976)

DOUBLE DUTY

John Boren visited Bernie Weiss and me in Rochester in early 1966. He mentioned that he was looking for nominees to stand for editor to succeed Nate Azrin. Bernie suggested me. The notion struck me as faintly ridiculous. I had come out of a nonoperant background and, although I had been on the JEAB editorial board for about three years by then, had all too frequently been reminded of my own incompetence by the arrival of the other reviewer's comments along with the editor's letter to the author. During a visit to Washington in March, I had dinner with John and he said he wanted to nominate me. The job started to sound less forbidding, the way he described it. A week later there was a letter from John, formally asking me to stand. After a restless night I wrote him suggesting several others that he should approach, but concluding with "if these do not prove to be possible alternatives, then I will be happy to serve as a backstop." But I was lucky; the SEAB Board of Directors wisely chose Charlie Catania. Then Charlie turned around and suggested that I share the job with him; he, as Editor, would actually edit the journal while I served as Executive Editor, taking care of the business and financial aspects. That offer was accepted with delight and I have been involved with such matters ever since.

In the spring of 1972, after six years as Executive Editor under Charlie and then Stan Pliskoff, I felt more comfortable with the idea of editing JEAB when the possibility arose again. The SEAB meeting was in Boston this time. After my election, I walked down to Newbury Street. There on the sale rack in my favorite store was a blazer in my size—and it was green, JEAB green. I bought it and wore it (with grey slacks) when visiting Stan Pliskoff that summer to find out how he had organized his editorial responsibilities. He never noticed.

During his last year, Stan Pliskoff had used me as a half-time Associate Editor as well as Executive Editor and I got to know and appreciate the work done by his full-timers. I kept on as many as possible and thus started my own term with as strong a group of Associate Editors as has ever been put together. Serving all four years were Larry Byrd, Don Hake, Tony Nevin, and Mike Zeiler, plus Charlie Catania as both Review Editor and part-time Associate Editor. Lew Gollub worked for half the first year and Ed Fantino for the first two years, both leaving in order to take sabbaticals abroad; and Stan Pliskoff, by then well rested from his own term, worked as Associate Editor for 1976. Since all but

Victor G. Laties, 1978.

Hake had started with Pliskoff, the change of direction from Orono to Rochester was made with ease.

My term started with a torrent of manuscripts. August can be a busy time; a few months without classes means that many papers get submitted in late summer. During August 1972, 30 articles and 4 technical notes arrived. Manuscript submissions had been high during the preceding few years but this was downright scary. Reliable data exist on submissions only since 1962 and the actual numbers for that year through 1986 are as follows (with my years in *italics*): 99, 103, 105, 140, 135, 138, 178, 200, 192, 241, 186, *245*, *196*, *206*, 222, 196, 158, 169, 149, 154, 129, 140, 153, 122, and 120. The years 1968 through 1977 represent the production of papers during the glory years of basic behavioral science. Those of us who edited the journal during these middle years can now brag about how tough it was in them thar days. Charlie Catania presided over the upswing with the jump from 138 to 178 to 200 occurring during his term. Then Stan Pliskoff averaged 206 manuscripts per year and I surpassed him, averaging 217. Mike Zeiler caught the tail of the bulge but Tony Nevin and Phil Himeline have been hard put to keep busy. (There is some slight error in attributing these totals to particular editors at the beginnings and ends of terms, because each editor picks up the responsibilities of the job about four months before the name on the masthead is changed.)

My term was extended one year because Mike Zeiler, my successor, had a sabbatical year in England lined up. At the time, I wrote a letter to Herb Terrace, who was President

of SEAB and chaired the nominating committee that was looking for candidates to replace me, saying, "I find this job very enjoyable and could easily be persuaded to go on forever, even though I am convinced that the Journal would be much better off having the editorship move every several years." How wrong I was about going on forever. While there officially was no Executive Editor during my tenure as Editor, I had continued to perform the duties of that post. The last six months of my fourth year found me tiring rapidly from this double duty. Charlie Catania once told me that when he served as the action editor on a manuscript, he dealt with it the night after he received the second review, reading the manuscript and the reviews, making his decision, composing his letter to the author, all before sleeping that night. I didn't always meet that high standard (come to think of it, did he?) but rarely slipped by more than a few days until that fourth year, when I sometimes found myself with a second decision to face before the first one had been made. I also used to try to deal expeditiously with the manuscripts accepted by the Associate Editors. Final processing consists mainly of deciding the sequence of papers for the issue (I put up front the one or two I liked the best, then grouped them by subject matter as far as possible), reading each manuscript with an eye to catching errors or improving clarity, occa-

V. G. Laties, A. C. Catania, and J. J. Boren, 1974.

sionally reworking a passage if there was an obvious problem, and generally making sure that I would be happy with the paper. As 1976 dragged on, more and more frequently a second manuscript or even a third or fourth would come in before I had sent the first to the Managing Editor, Garth Hopkins, for final copy editing and marking for the typesetter. I still have the yellow sheets on which I used to keep track of the stages each paper went through during its final days with me. They now tell me that it took, for my four November issues, means of 4.7, 5.3, 4.2, and then, in 1976, 10.7 days for them to get through final processing. The editorial term was extended to four years in 1979. If the manuscript flow ever increases again, I would recommend it be cut back to three.

Like many of those who have edited JEAB, I've had the dismaying experience of having a paper received with less than enthusiasm by my favorite journal. The first paper that Bernie Weiss and I submitted to Charlie Ferster described a study of a drug on Sidman avoidance. Still under the strong influence of a traditional psychology graduate program, we used a $2 \times 2 \times 3$ factorial design embedded in a Latin square, with R-S, S-S, and dose as the three variables, all this done with two rats that varied slightly in sensitivity to the drug. The results were muddled, to say the least, and we had some difficulty describing them clearly. But we thought we had a publishable contribution and sent it to JEAB. One reviewer agreed with us and recommended publication

without change. The other wrote a two-page, single-spaced commentary that praised some aspects of the work but carefully pointed out all the many ways we had gone wrong. The review was a beautiful example of how an incisive critique could be couched in gentle language, with no trace of the superciliousness that occasionally mars a review; it was like a letter from a friend assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the work. Charlie Ferster didn't accept or reject the paper. Instead, he wrote the enormously flattering words: "You fellows are in the same league; make your own decision."

The long review had started on a page provided by the journal and Charlie had cut out the reviewer's name. But he had done a sloppy job, leaving the tops of some letters. It was easy to check the Board of Editors and find that only one member had a five-letter name starting with *B*: Boren. We knew and admired John and, after a second reading of his review, concluded that there was no way short of starting over that we could rescue the experiment. We tossed the paper into a drawer and never published it. The critique itself taught me something about reviewing and helped me develop my own voice when, a few years later, both Bernie and I were appointed to the board by the next Editor, John Boren.

*Environmental Health Sciences Center
University of Rochester School of
Medicine and Dentistry
Rochester, New York 14642*

Michael D. Zeiler (Editor, 1977–1979)

TWO SIDES OF BEHAVIOR

My inheritance of the editorial mantle followed years as an Associate Editor for Stan Pliskoff and Vic Laties, a history that gave me first-hand exposure to editorial professionalism. It also followed a sabbatical year spent in London. As Editor-elect, I took part in discussions which developed my awareness of some readers' uneasiness about contemporary

developments. As far as I could fathom, their objections stemmed from confusion over the nature and purpose of the Journal.

Readers of JEAB know its debt to the seminal work of B. F. Skinner. By the time I became Editor, this tradition had led to either ambiguity or crisis, depending on individual perception. Skinner's monumental influence