## **Editor's Preface**

W. David Watts

Jacksonville State University

Volume 13 of the Clinical Sociology Review represents a number of important changes in the life of the journal. First, the transition in publishers from Michigan State University Press, via the University of North Texas Press, to Kendall Hunt is complete. Contrary to rumor, the Clinical Sociology Review is alive and well. Additional copies of Volume 13 can be obtained from Kendall Hunt. Copies of back issues can be ordered from The Clinical Sociology Review, Department of Sociology, Jacksonville State University, Jacksonville, AL. 36265. Back issues are \$16.50 for individuals, plus \$3.00 postage and \$25.50 for institutions, plus \$3.00 postage.

Second, readers of the journal owe a debt of gratitude for the superhuman service that Susan Brown Eve, past editor of the **Review** has given. She took over the journal in 1992 and has done an outstanding job.

Third, this issue is a joint effort by the authors and Associate Editor, Hugh McCain, who is Professor of Sociology at Jacksonville State University. When Hugh agreed to serve as an Assistant Editor last year, he was not aware of the full range of responsibilities that were associated with the publication of the **Review**. He is now and has earned the promotion to Associate Editor. Special thanks are also due to Gail Childs and Sandra Walker for the generous giving of their time and skills for preparation of this issue for press.

The authors' contributions, like other issues of the **Review**, provide a high quality mixture of application of sociological theory and method to all levels of practice. These articles, which stand on their own merits, represent a further development of the practice of the discipline. While all the articles are worthy, I want to draw your attention to two in par-

X

ticular. The first article, by David J. Kallen, President of the Sociological Practice Association, adds to our insight about the history of both sociology and its less favored partner, clinical sociology. Kallen tells us that the adoption of a clinical approach was rejected in favor of what Mills has called abstract empiricism and grand theory. The second article, by Clarence C. Schultz, in the Practice Notes Section, tells us in metaphor of the consequences of the choices that the discipline has made. Like the secret garden of fiction, Schultz, like Kallen and all our authors, would have us reopen that garden and tend it. Volume 13 of the Clinical Sociology Review contributes to that tradition.

W. David Watts Editor