

## Editorial

The *Review* has a unique history and stature in our field. Its first issue was published 101 years ago, and it has for decades been the preeminent theoretical journal for all of scientific psychology. Starting with James McKeen Cattell and J. Mark Baldwin, 13 individuals have served as Editor or Coeditor of the *Review* over its first 100 years. As the new Editor, I feel a strong sense of obligation to those individuals, to other pivotal figures in our history who played a role in founding the *Review*—among them Alfred Binet, John Dewey, William James, Hugo Munsterberg, Carl Stumpf, and J. B. Watson—and to the current community of psychologists.

The basic editorial policies and standards of the *Review* have remained intact for many years. I plan to reaffirm these policies and standards, and for good reason. They have met the test of time, especially during the last several decades when a proliferation of new journals, many with a theoretical slant, have created a growing competition for theoretical articles of the “psych review” type. That the *Review* has retained its status as psychology’s theoretical flagship journal is a tribute to its history, its standards, and the efforts of its recent Editors, Associate Editors, and Editorial Boards.

Probably the most difficult challenge the *Review* now faces is to retain its historical status as the primary outlet for important theoretical advances across *all* of scientific psychology. On the one hand, the *Review* needs to reflect the realities of where significant theoretical developments are and are not taking place: Advances in the various subfields of psychology do not occur at a uniform rate over time. On the other hand, over the long term, the *Review* needs to be balanced. There is a constant risk, especially in this era of increased specialization, that the *Review* will become too narrow, reflecting developments in some fields but not others. A related risk is that a typical issue of the journal will come to consist of a small number of very long articles—the majority written for specialists in a certain few domains and all but intractable for readers a step or two removed from those domains. I was struck when reading the special Centennial Issue of the *Review* (April 1994) that the eight classic *Psychological Review* articles reprinted in that issue averaged only a little over seven journal pages, about one third the length of the average *Review* article in recent years.

I am committed to having the journal continue to speak for all of scientific psychology. A necessary first step is to make sure that any area that might have been underrepresented in the journal’s pages is adequately represented on the Editorial Board. In an attempt to achieve that goal, I have drawn heavily on the suggestions of the Associate Editors, Linda Smith and Daniel Wegner, and on the advice of other trusted colleagues who work in areas outside of my own. Other steps include encouraging authors to write more efficiently and in a way that makes the importance of their contribution understandable to a broader audience.

Under the stewardship of my predecessor, Walter Kintsch, the *Review* has retained its stature in our discipline. When we refer to an author’s “psych review” paper, that label has an aura: It conveys a set of high expectations as to the rigor and importance of that work. My term as Editor will end with the year 2000. Among the goals I have for this unique journal, none is more fundamental than that “psych review paper” retains its special meaning as the 21st century begins.—Robert A. Bjork, Editor