EDITOR'S COMMENT

In 1976, Catania wrote an editorial on the process of book reviewing for the *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*. In that editorial, he commented that the purpose of JEAB reviews was to occasion discussion of major issues in the analysis of behavior, or of potential relations between the analysis of behavior and other research orientations. In 1981, Wasserman contributed a review of *Cognitive Processes in Animal Behavior*, edited by Hulse, Fowler, and Honig (1978). Wasserman's review occasioned the following comment by Malone. In view of the current interest in cognitive interpretations of behavior, and in the interest of providing further discussion of alternative approaches within the pages of this Journal, I decided to publish it, and invited Wasserman to use Malone's comment as an occasion for further reflection on the issues involved. He has done so, and his own comment, which follows Malone's, is the result.

The appearance of these two pieces should

not be taken as a signal that JEAB is initiating a series of comments and rebuttals. Instead, these pieces should be construed as continuations of the discussion of major issues within the analysis of behavior initially triggered by the Hulse et al. (1978) book. I hope that they will contribute to serious consideration of alternative approaches to the study of behavior.

John A. Nevin
Editor

REFERENCES

- Catania, A. C. Editorial: On attending at the "having" of reviews. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 1976, 26, 317-320.
- Hulse, S. H., Fowler, H., and Honig, W. K. *Cognitive processes in animal behavior*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1978.
- Wasserman, E. A. Comparative psychology returns: A review of Hulse, Fowler, and Honig's *Cognitive processes in animal behavior*. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 1981, 35, 243-257.