
This book is to be hailed for many reasons. It deserves at least these three cheers: (1) It is an exemplary version of multinational cooperation in social research; (2) it brings the techniques of survey research to bear upon "opinion-making elites" in a comparative context; (3) it is a good book. Something more than a "pep talk" is needed to justify three cheers in a professional journal, so I shall expatiate and illustrate my enthusiasm for the readers of POQ.

On the first cheer, the book is a product of multinational cooperation that is multidisciplinary as well. At first it sounds merely like a bilateral gambit by Columbia's Bureau of Applied Social Research, so anybody with a taste for Lazarsfeld's type of "imperialism" is engaged: "There are four Yugoslav contributors, four American contributors, and one contribution by a Yugoslav-American." Very tidy!

Ah well, one says, everybody who has been awake since Tito knows that Yugoslavia is not really a Communist country. But those who did not yawn and go back to sleep must have wondered how one would go about doing joint research with the Yugoslavs and other Communist non-communist social scientists—which includes Hungarians, Rumanians, Poles, Czechs, Bulgarians, possibly even Russians. (I certainly wondered, and worked, on this during my month in Yugoslavia in 1969.)

The book not only solves this bilateral quiz, but goes beyond it to become multinational and multi-disciplinary. The multinational facet is accounted for by acknowledgements to Pierre Bourdieu of Paris and Joseph La Palombara ("Spaghetti Joe") of Yale. Even more important multinationaly, for those who know and love Yugoslavia, is the cooperation sustained between the principal research organizations at Belgrade and Zagreb. The multidisciplinary facet is covered by acknowledgments to both the International Sociological Association and the International Political Science Association.

It is especially encouraging that beyond the "generous grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York," there was "organizational and financial support" from Zagreb and that Belgrade "raised a considerable proportion of the funds needed." In these days of the declining dollar and rising multinationalism, the first cheer must go mainly to the Yugoslav-American Bogdan Denitch!

The second cheer goes to the policy-science conception of the book. Harold Lasswell enjoined us, years ago, to study "the composition and vocabulary of the ruling few." Most of us took the easy way of looking at these facets separately: composition became elite studies; vocabulary became content analysis. It appeared that never the twain should meet. Yet, here is a book that does, happily, mark the twain by defining its central issue as "how politically relevant public opinion is mobilized and formed in modern polities in divergent societies." The editors announce this as the first in "a series of national studies of opinion-making elites around the world." If the series maintains the policy-science perspective and research quality of
its first volume, this will indeed be cause for good cheer.

For this is a good book and richly merits our third cheer. The quality is remarkably consistent considering the numbers and variety of individuals and institutions involved. The two final "theoretical" chapters are relatively weak, particularly the skimpy (and needlessly polemical) sketch of a "monist model" of modern society by George Fischer, but this has little bearing on the substantive contents of the book and can be skipped without loss. Somewhat more relevant is Rudi Supek's final chapter on "statist" and "self-managing" models of socialism, an effort (not wholly successful) to codify Yugoslav experience.

The meat and potatoes are in the nine data chapters. Denitch writes two on elite interviewing and leadership mobility. Cohen presents the social background data for 1918-1948. Lukic relates opinion formation to social structure. Popovic shows the interaction between social mobility and political activity (including an especially valuable section on three-generation mobility). Kadushin and Abrams write two chapters on the social structure of informal leadership and the relative impact of formal-informal influences on opinion. Zvonarević interprets the relationship between opinion-makers and public opinion (in which the mass media are assigned a quite limited role). Barton presents a magistral analysis of "determinants of leadership attitudes in a socialist society."

Barton's chapter will be the most valuable for POQ readers who are not particularly concerned with Yugoslavia. He articulates the considerations underlying the application of survey method to elite studies and explains the ingenious schema by which the basic positional sample (200-300 in each of six institutional sectors planned, but not uniformly achieved) was made to interact, by sociometric questions, with reputational leaders, opinion leaders, discussion partners. Barton then inventories the 19 "orienting propositions" of the study and shows their interaction in a complex flow diagram that repays careful study (p. 227). What follows is a concise and lucid review of the principal findings. Barton's chapter alone is worth the price of admission.

There are defects in the book, of course. There is no index and no bibliography. In part, this may be due to publisher's economy (the book is offset not typeset); in part, it reflects the peculiar parochialism of the Columbia Bureau, which pays little attention to any work but its own. I can immodestly suggest that this study could have learned something from my own decade-long survey research on the European elites, along very similar lines, published in 1968 as Euratlantica: Changing Perspectives of the European Elites. It would have been enlightening as well to compare this study's findings with Milovan Djilas' The New Class and other less controversial work on elite sociology in socialist society.

These faults of omission do not, however, lessen the value of what is included. The book is indispensable for students of Yugoslavia, of socialist society, of elites, of public opinion, of survey research. It should be widely read in academic courses, in the opinion industries, and in several sectors of government. Among readers of POQ it is likely to become a book-of-the-year.
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