Editor's Introduction: A Reflective Miscellany

Lawrence T. Nichols

Published online: 16 February 2011
© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2011

In this issue we present a wide ranging set of papers that offer thoughtful reflections on a mix of historical and contemporary concerns. Some also include insightful empirical analysis, but the overall emphasis is on the meaning and significance of events.

Matteo Bortolini begins with an examination of “the Bellah Affair” of the early 1970s, a controversy that centered on qualifications for membership in the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton University. As he demonstrates, a “reputational struggle” played out in high-profile mass media, based largely on leaks of confidential documents, including evaluations of Robert Bellah’s scholarly work. In the process, the reputation of sociology itself, as a field of scientific inquiry aspiring to parity with the natural sciences, was called into question.

Brian Conway contributes an analysis of the relationship between the Catholic Church and sociology in Ireland, using a comparative institutional perspective. He traces three historical stages in the career of Catholic sociology in Ireland, and compares developments there with events elsewhere in Europe and in the United States. Many readers, even those with a strong interest in the history of sociology, may be unaware that during the middle decades of the twentieth century there was also a significant “Catholic sociology” movement within the United States, complete with its own sociological journal. Though it seems strange now, I still recall seeing copies of this journal on the library shelves at St. Louis University during my studies there. It is interesting to speculate whether the near future will see other religiously imbued forms of sociology, perhaps especially an Islamic variant, and also whether some concept of spirituality may find its way back into sociological thought and writing.

Robert Prus focuses on Emile Durkheim and the significance of his 1903 *Moral Education*, a work that is not well known among the majority of sociologists in the United States. Approaching this work from the perspective of symbolic interaction-

L. T. Nichols (✉)
Division of Sociology and Anthropology, West Virginia University, Morgantown,
WV 26506-6326, USA
e-mail: Larry.Nichols@mail.wvu.edu.

ism and pragmatism, Prus is interested in understanding its significance both within Durkheim's own intellectual development and for the contemporary discipline of sociology. He argues that *Moral Education* points toward the "more thoroughly humanist sociology" that Durkheim would create in the decade that followed, including his famous *Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*.

David LoConto considers the career of an important founding figure of U.S. sociology, Charles A. Ellwood, who is generally remembered as among the most influential early social psychologists in the field. LoConto's focus is on Ellwood's struggle against the rise of a scientific and value free sociology that came to prominence in the 1920s, a struggle that anticipated much more recent, and still ongoing, debates within the discipline. Drawing on Ellwood's correspondence with social scientists of the day, LoConto shows how Ellwood championed "peace, understanding and sympathy as the basis for the adjustment of all inter-human relations," while struggling against a profound sense of despair.

Steven P. Dandaneau and Elizabeth A. East offer reflections via a wide-ranging interview with an influential contemporary sociologist, Maurice R. Stein, who is probably best known for his 1964 book, *The Eclipse of Community*. As they listen to this "sociological elder," readers will gain a rich perspective on aspects of twentieth century sociology and its academic organization, along with glimpses of Stein's relations with such figures as Alvin Gouldner and Robert K. Merton. Some may also find inspiration in the personal example of Stein who, in his ninth decade, has continued to teach at the Harvard Institute for Learning in Retirement.

The issue concludes with a highly reflective paper by Richard M. Hessler, D. J. Donnell-Watson and John F. Galliher on conflicts between sociological research and the constraints of Institutional Review Boards—a topic that may well trigger emotionally charged memories for many readers. Drawing on their own experience, the authors critically examine IRB rhetoric about protecting human subjects, and call into question the tendency of many boards to exceed official guidelines for a variety of self-protective reasons. They conclude with a call for reform and greater freedom for researchers.