"Cosmopolitans" and "Locals" in Contemporary Community Politics

Daniel J. Elazar
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

Douglas St. Angelo
Florida State University, Tallahassee

Recommended Citation

POLITICAL SCIENCE

"Cosmopolitans" and "Locals" in Contemporary Community Politics

DANIEL J. ELAZAR and DOUGLAS ST. ANGELO
*University of Minnesota, Minneapolis and Florida State
University, Tallahassee*

Numerous products of recent social science research have revealed the reemergence of what seems to be a traditional pattern in American history, the lack of class consciousness in the political behavior of most Americans (Banfield 1961, Coleman 1957, Rogoff 1951: 406-420, Rogoff 1953: 347-357, Warner, et al., 1949).[1] While this lack of class consciousness by no means precludes the more subtle influences of socio-economic class on matters political, it does limit the usefulness of the accepted class divisions developed by sociologists and anthropologists in the 1930's and 1940's in understanding the patterns of community politics (Lynd 1937, Parsons 1953: 92-128, Warner 1949). American society is one in which the great majority of its members identify themselves or are identified with the middle class (Parsons 1953: 92-128, Rogoff 1951: 406-420, Riesman 1953, Warner, et al. 1949, Whyte 1953). Furthermore, those who are identified with the upper and lower classes generally play limited political roles, either by choice or because they are excluded from much of the framework of community political life (Baltzell 1957:172-85, Corey 1945: 1-20, Hyman 1957: 426-442, Lynd 1937, Rogoff 1953: 347-357, Straetz 1958). Indeed the very breadth of the middle class — a consequence of the widespread popular identification with middle class status and the behavior patterns which accompany it — limits its potential internal homogeneity, further weakening the accepted categorization of socio-economic class as a tool for political analysis.

Some of the limitations of class analysis in political research at the community level have been recognized by a number of contemporary social theorists, who have substituted the "cosmopolitan" — "local" distinction as an analytical tool.

The cosmopolitan-local division was first introduced into American social theory by Carle Zimmerman (1938) in his studies of rural communities, primarily in Minnesota. Zimmerman, in turn, freely adapted the concept from the classic works of Ferdinand Toennies, who talked about *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* as the two fundamental forms of community organization in the European society he knew. Zimmerman spoke of whole communities as being "cosmopolitan" or "local", much as Toennies thought of communities as either being organized on traditional (i.e. "folk") lines or as products of post-traditional (i.e. "modern") society.

Robert K. Merton (1957) was apparently the first to

use the cosmopolitan-local concept to distinguish between individual influentials in the local community, in his study of "Patterns of Influence: Local and Cosmopolitan Influentials." In that study he applied a non-class oriented typology to study the influence of mass communications on patterns of interpersonal influence in "Rovere," a city of 11,000 on the Eastern seaboard. There, in an attempt to identify types of people regarded as variously influential by their fellows," Merton first attempted to use the more traditional analysis and was forced to seek other tools:

"Where [our] first classification had dealt with phases in the cycle of personal influence, the second was in terms of influentials' *orientation* toward local and larger social structures . . . and the ways in which [their] influence was exercised. With the emergence of the concepts of local and cosmopolitan influentials, a number of new uniformities at once came to light . . . Such seemingly diverse matters as geographic mobility, participation in new works of personal relations and in voluntary organizations, the translation of influence-potentials into influence-operations, patterns of communications behavior — all these were found to be expressions of these major orientations toward the local comunity: orientations ranging from virtually exclusive concern with the local area to central concern with the great world outside."

The concept was further refined when Alvin W. Gouldner (1958) applied it in a similar manner in his study of academicians' latent social roles. In that study he found that two types of individual cosmopolitans, "outsiders" and "empire builders," and four types of locals (the dedicated, the true bureaucrat, the home-guard, and the elders) could be distinguished in terms of three variables: their commitment to professional skills and values, their loyalty to the organization, and their reference group orientations. Gouldner also found marked differences between cosmopolitans and locals in terms of their influence, participation in the "community," their acceptance of organizational values, and their informal relations with their colleagues.

The authors' research in the field of community politics in a number of Western, Midwestern, and Southern communities has lead them to posit the usefulness of the cosmopolitan-local distinction, with some modification, as extremely valuable in analysing patterns of community conflict and cleavage.[2] Rather than consider the concept

---

[1] Citations of standard sources are listed by author's name in the body of the text and more fully in the bibliography at the end of the article.

[2] The ideas presented in this paper are based on conclusions drawn from studies of federal-local relations in Dubois County, Indiana; Benton, Arkansas; and Lafayette, Georgia; referenda cases in Nashville and Davidson County, Tennessee and Blue Island, Illinois; and community political surveys in East Moline,

as applying exclusively to whole communities on one hand or single individuals on the other, it is suggested that the cosmopolitan-local distinction may be applied to relatively large population aggregates within the local community to indicate basic divisions in attitude and behavior that are delineated in terms of their respective reference groups. Furthermore, the concept can be of use in distinguishing differences in community outlook among those who are rooted in the interpersonal networks of their local community as well as to distinguish, as Merton and Gouldner do, between those who are so rooted and those who are not. When so applied, the cosmopolitan-local distinction can be a valuable tool for the identification of attitudes and values within a community, particularly as they affect community-wide political issues either based on existing community cleavages or which provoke new community conflicts (a classification which includes almost all overt attempts at gaining community-wide-consent to public support for economic development or social and institutional change.)[3]

Simply defined, a "cosmopolitan" within the local community is one who is extensively involved in the economic, social, and political life of the community as a whole on a day-to-day basis. "Involvement" in this sense means identification as well as activity. While the prototype cosmopolitan is likely to be reasonably active in community life, the cosmopolitan group will include otherwise passive members of the community whose primary identification is still with the community as a whole and who react to issues through the framework of community-wide identification. One might expect entrepreneurs, professionals of various types, downtown businessmen, college professors, promotors of economic development, and upwardly mobile people generally to be cosmopolitans, since they and their families tend to participate in community-wide endeavors and to utilize a wide variety of community services and facilities.

On the other hand, a "local" within the local community is one whose day-to-day involvement in the economic, social, and political life of the community is quite constricted. Generally speaking, the primary social ties of the local are to his neighborhood, rather than to the com-

munity as a whole. While he almost invariably works outside of his neighborhood, his primary identification is not job-centered but is focused on home, block, and church (or sometimes on his children's school with its "Little League" baseball team.) His ties with the wider community are secondary, indirect, and made evident only on infrequent occasions (in certain types of elections, during the high school basketball season, or when a community-wide political issue appears to threaten him.) Furthermore, the local is not normally socially mobile and consequently is not propelled to change his neighborhood orientation. One might expect factory works, farmers, neighborhood businessmen, elementary school teachers, and the like to be locals.

At the other end of the social scale, certain members of the upper class who have long since "arrived" and are now concerned only with life in their immediate social set are also locals in terms of their community involvement. While it is apparent that members of the upper middle class are more likely to be cosmopolitans and members of the lower middle class, more likely to be locals, the distinction cuts across even subclass lines such as these as the existence of upper class locals and working class cosmopolitans (often in the labor movement) indicates.

In sum, the difference between cosmopolitans and locals within any community rests on fundamental differences in attitudes, outlook, and values rooted in the level and intensity of different individuals' day-to-day involvement with the community as a whole and with its component neighborhoods. These differences, because they are both universal and deep-rooted, have an important bearing on the course of political decision-making in every community and in the larger world of which the community is a part.

Cosmopolitans and Locals and Economic Self-Interest: One area in which the division between cosmopolitans and locals is most apparent is in the realm of their respective economic interests, which, in turn, affect the character of public support for community development and public welfare programs. Economic self interest is apparent in both groups in equal measure. The differences between cosmopolitans and locals lie in their varying perceptions of what their economic self interest is. This often means that the cosmopolitans will be interested in promoting community growth and development while the locals are more concerned with the impact development projects normally have on the individual household in the form of increased taxes and assessments or on the neighborhood affected by "development." In the Davidson County (Nashville) metropolitan government referendum, defeated at the polls in June 1958 (since resubmitted and passed in 1962,) the great majority of the cosmopolitans voted for city-county consolidation as a stimulus to community growth. The locals, on the other hand, opposed the plan largely out of the fear that it would lead to increased property taxes and decreased neighborhood representation on the local governing bodies. (Elazar 1959:69-76, Case Study 1961).

A similar pattern of support and opposition appeared in Dubois County, Indiana when the locals in the community opposed the improvement of a small airport on the grounds that they would be required to pay for the work through taxation without any perceived benefits for themselves. The cosmopolitans in the community, most of whom do not directly utilize the services of the airport, supported the improvement on the grounds that it would aid the community's attempt to attract industry (St. Angelo 1960.)

Indeed, the community cleavage that results from the cosmopolitan-local division has important practical consequences for community development efforts. Data from many studies can be interpreted as indicating that cosmopolitans and locals react differently to proposals for innovation and change. By and large, locals have tended to support the initiation and maintenance of social welfare programs, which appear to bring them the most direct benefits for the least cost, and to oppose community development programs whose benefits are considerably less direct and thus much less apparent. Even further, community development programs often mean immediate inconveniences — a property tax increase, dislocation of homes and farms, alteration of established patterns of political access, and the like — while not offering a socially non-mobile population sufficient return, by their lights, even in the long run. Cosmopolitans, on the other hand, generally gain little direct benefit from social welfare programs but do stand to benefit considerably (or feel that they do) from community development. Their opposition and support are given accordingly. They tend to see a connection between community development and personal benefits, and are sufficiently socially mobile (in outlook if not in fact) to expect community improvements to be of personal value. Consequently, they are to some extent willing to accept immediate inconvenience (such as residential displacement and higher taxation) for supposed long-range benefits and are more willing to give up the presently familiar for a future promise. Furthermore, community development projects are generally associated with values high on the cosmopolitans' scale of values, such as "growth" and "progress" and "improvement," so that it becomes a matter of morality, as well as social conformity, for individual cosmopolitans to support them. Because community development programs are so often associated with the "good" in the minds of their proponents, their opponents are often labeled as "bad" (or, worse, "anti-progressive"). As a consequence, the role of self-interest in determining the positions of both groups is often overlooked, as is the recognition that the differences between the cosmopolitans and the locals are honest ones.

These perceptions of economic self interest cannot be adequately explained in terms of class lines. A school bond issue referendum in Illinois School District #130 (Blue Island, Robbins, and vicinity) passed in 1958 with the overwhelming support of the extremely low income Negroes in the village of Robbins who might have been expected to oppose passage if class had been

the determining factor. However, the Negroes, though poor, were upwardly mobile in outlook. A cosmopolitan perception of their economic self interest led them to equate increased educational opportunity for their children with future economic advancement. This far offset the expected nominal increase in their property taxes.[4]

The Robbins case is indicative of the effects that expectations of social mobility have in overriding class categorizations. Cosmopolitans, no matter what their immediate positions in the class system, are concerned with following an upward pattern of social mobility. Those in the process of reaching out for normally cosmopolitan managerial, proprietarial, and professional status (e.g. students "on the way up") and even those whose hopes for social mobility may be more limited should be included among the cosmopolitans, though traditional class oriented analysis might place them in any one of several classes. The Negroes of Robbins, almost by virtue of their settlement in a suburban community (even a segregated one) were highly conscious of and concerned with upward mobility, even limited mobility, for their children if not for themselves and they voted accordingly. In sum, those who are upwardly mobile or expect to join the ranks of the upwardly mobile can be identified with the cosmopolitans. In contrast the locals normally include those who stand outside of the patterns of upward mobility who have little or no expectation of changing their social status.[5]

The foregoing analysis is not meant to imply that cosmopolitans are automatically for "progress" at the community level or that locals are deeply committed to the status quo. A review of community studies over the past several decades indicates that the objective positions of the two groups tend to fluctuate in relation to the economic cycle. There is considerable evidence that in the Thirties, at least on the local level, some cosmopolitans who today advocate community development programs were then opposed to similar programs being administered as federal supported public works while the majority of the locals strongly supported the same programs. The real distinction between the groups does not lie in the objective programs which they tend to support or oppose but in the reasons underlying their respective positions. The locals' support for public works projects during the depression was not the result of a more extensive community involvement, but was rooted in their immediately personal need for employment opportunities. Once these needs were satisfied in one way or another and community development programs came to mean increased local taxation the position of the locals and the cosmopolitans was reversed (Lynd 1937, Straetz 1958).

In the same way when the limited mobility aims of the

[4] Unpublished notes and newspaper clippings from *Blue Island Sun Standard* in St. Angelo's files. Robbins is an all Negro (99%) suburb of Chicago.

[5] Though it is possible to identify occupational categories which fit into cosmopolitan or local patterns in a given period, the change in occupational status over time severely limits the utility of occupational categories alone. (Hyman 1957:426–442, Bendix and Lipset 1952:494–504, Gordon and Lipset 1957:491–500, Rogoff 1951:406–420, West 1957:465–480.)

locals are met, as in the case of providing a certain level of school facilities the locals tend to lose interest in further expansion of facilities. In similar cases the cosmopolitans are not necessarily satisfied with these limited aims and particularly when aroused by civic "reform" groups which are virtually by definition, cosmopolitan, continue to press for further "improvements." This can readily be seen in the present declining support for school bond issues in communities around the nation. In most localities, during the first decade after World War II, when the immediate need for school facilities in all parts of the community was clearly great, school bond referenda tended to pass time after time with solid margins. With the general satisfaction of the minimum school needs in most communities and with the accompanying considerable rise in property taxes, more bond issue referenda are failing to receive the voters' approval. The needs have changed from providing minima to improving facilities or building in new neighborhoods. In either case, the locals tend to lose interest in supporting further tax increases for the schools. In the first case they see no further need for their own children. In the second, they lose sight of the needs of others outside of their own neighborhoods.

Cosmopolitans and Locals and Community Leadership: A second area in which the cosmopolitan-local division affects community politics lies in the realm of community leadership. In any community conflict the cosmopolitans are able to draw upon those individuals commonly accepted as "community leaders." By virtue of their own cosmopolitan identifications, a majority of those community leaders are available to furnish varying degrees of support for cosmopolitan-endorsed issues. In doing so, they simply fill their normal roles as cosmopolitan community leaders. It is this group, which generally excludes leaders of the locals, which is considered the community's power elite by those who claim that such "power elites" exist in American communities (Hunter 1953, Lynd 1937, Mills 1957).

A few of the people accepted as "community leaders" and members of the "power elite" until the "chips are down" are actually not cosmopolitans at all but upper class locals who by reasons of their wealth and social position have come to be influential in the community's affairs (Corey 1945:1-20, Dahl 1961). The very nature of their social position removes them so far from the ability to consider the community as a whole (in the way of the cosmopolitans, who base their judgments, whether right or wrong, on such an ecumenical foundation) as to render their particular class interests as parochial in orientation as the particular neighborhood interests of the lower class locals. Those upper class community leaders opposed to metropolitan government for Davidson County fell into this category. Community growth was not desirable in their eyes because of the potential threat it held for their own well established economic and social positions (Elazar 1959:69-76, Case Study 1961). The same holds true in the Dubois County Airport development case. Here some wealthy locals, whose wealth was not dependent on local community growth, opposed the proj-

ect as a needless expenditure of tax funds (St. Angelo 1960).

When situations arise where the locals are in conflict with the cosmopolitans, they find themselves in need of reproducing the leadership which is usually provided in the community by the cosmopolitan leaders now arrayed against them. In the absence of this "normal" leadership, they often ally themselves with the upper class locals who become available — though usually hidden — backers of "local" interests. In addition, cadres from among those normally considered to be secondary level leaders come forward to assume the positions vacated by the cosmopolitan leaders of the cosmopolitans. It is true that these cadres are often cosmopolitans themselves who find it in their interest to provide such leadership. These "permanent" leaders of the locals fall into the following categories.

(1) Persons with local backgrounds taking on the characteristics of cosmopolitans who have followings among the locals. (Neighborhood influentials exemplify this type)

(2) Locals who have become cosmopolitans on the basis of their leadership in primarily localistic groups, but who can only maintain their status among the cosmopolitans by continuing to be leaders of the same groups. (Labor union leaders and some politicians exemplify this type.)

(3) Persons whose outlook is cosmopolitan but who are not accepted by the cosmopolitan community and therefore become virtually implacable leaders of local constituencies often out of frustration.

(4) Individual upperclass locals, situated fully within the cosmopolitan constellation who use the locals to gain support on specific issues. Their contacts with the locals are generally made through intermediaries.

Very often those who fit into the first two categories are themselves conflict ridden because of their ties to both local and cosmopolitan groups.

The American political system as it functions in the local community and on the state and national levels is geared to re-enforce both cosmopolitan and local political leaders, so long as they maintain bases in their local communities. This re-enforcement comes through a system of countervailing power which serves to create something of long-term, overall equilibrium between the cosmopolitan and local elements. One way in which this equilibrium is managed in the political arena is through a corresponding cosmopolitan-local division among the politicians. While virtually all politicians above the precinct level are extensively involved in the community they serve by the very nature of their roles as political brokers, their basic sources of popular strength reflect the cosmopolitan-local division of their communities. Some of the politicians serve the cosmopolitan elements and some serve the locals though this cleavage is not as sharp in reality as it appears to be in print. Since politicians must reflect the primary interests of their constituents, at least publicly on fundamental issues, to retain their power, they provide representation for both elements

within the political system, despite the fact that even the politicians serving cosmopolitan constituencies are likely to have built-in localistic tendencies and the politicians serving the locals are likely to have personal cosmopolitan inclinations.[6]

The existence of these alternate sources of leadership which can replace the so-called "power elite" and beat the "power structure" on many issues, confirms what is becoming increasingly apparent: that the picture presented of a ruling elite that "controls" most cities is generally inaccurate in the last analysis. Instead American city politics can be said to be based on the "concurrent majority" principle, whereby the concurring majorities of a variety of groups and interests (and individuals), both cosmopolitan and local, are necessary to make community-wide political decisions (Banfield 1961, Coleman 1957, Dahl 1961, "Rockford, Illinois" 1960, Riesman 1953). The very existence of the cosmopolitan-local division may serve to reenforce the necessity for the development of such concurrent majorities in order to govern.

An Exemplary Community Conflict Situation: Closer examination of the situation in Nashville and Davidson County, Tennessee illustrates the respective roles of cosmopolitans and locals in a community conflict situation. The cosmopolitan groups were virtually unanimous in their support of the proposed metropolitan government, since they were deeply involved in the entire metropolitan area which served as their basic community. In their eyes, the suburban areas and neighborhoods with which they maintained attachments, were simply sub-divisions of the basic metropolitan community. Their business and professional interests were either located in downtown Nashville, the center of the metropolitan area, or scattered over industrial and commercial sites located in all parts of the county. Their friends resided in neighborhoods in different parts of the metropolitan area. Their community and cultural interests were of a nature which caused them to draw upon the entire resources of the area.

Opposition to the plan was centered among the locals of all classes in the Nashville metropolitan community. Unconcerned with the growth potentials for the Nashville area as a whole, they were concerned with the level of their personal property taxes under a government which would expand its services on what would be almost a county-wide basis. Unlike their city-oriented opponents the suburban dwelling locals considered themselves to be "country people" primarily interested in their immediate neighbors and neighborhoods which were their basic communities. They were identified only secondarily with

[6] Because the politicians serve as exceptionally sensitive indicators of their constituents' reference group predilections, an observer can usually identify the cosmopolitan and local elements in a specific community with considerable accuracy by observing the public identifications of the local politicians, relating the identification of each politician to the voting returns of the community and to those of his electoral district, and correlating the returns with the relevant census data to expose neighborhood socio-economic differences. This makes it possible to use the cosmopolitan-local division as an analytical tool in community studies without conducting extensive survey research.

greater Nashville. In their occupations they tended to identify with their immediate co-workers. For social and cultural associations they drew primarily upon their neighbors, their neighborhood churches and schools, and commercial entertainment facilities such as bowling alleys and roller skating rinks requiring only limited community resources. Even their police protection was organized on a private, neighborhood basis paid for by each individual householder.

The overwhelming majority of the recognized community leaders were cosmopolitans. They supported the proposed metropolitan charter. They were opposed by a combination of community leaders which included only a small group of big businessmen and upper class locals who had resisted any change in the status quo which had so well served their self interest. At the same time, politicians whose political positions; for the various reasons, listed above, were based on the localistic neighborhoods were interested in defeating a single area-wide government that might have eliminated their positions or curtailed their powers. These politicians were active in defeating the plan. Other people whose interests were with the local elements, and who depended upon local support for their influence in the general community, were useful in providing a means of contact between the cosmopolitan and upper class local leadership of the opposition and the mass of the local voters.

The relatively few electoral district deviations from this pattern of support tend to bear out the contentions of this paper. The one localistic neighborhood that did support the proposed charter did so because of the confidence its residents had in a highly cosmopolitan school principal who commanded great trust from his "constituency" which he had developed through his services to them over a period of several decades in the community and who was an ardent supporter of metropolitan government. His influence successfully overcame the initially negative reaction of that community toward any change in a status quo which they had learned to manage tolerably well.

In other localistic neighborhoods this link between the cosmopolitans and the local residents was not present, leaving the field open to the activities of the opposition leadership, which needed only to reinforce fears already present in the minds of their constituents. The proponents of the charter operating under an understandable misconception of their fellow citizens' localistic outlook were unable to effectively communicate their position. This lack of communication made possible an uncontradicted flow of rumors that played on legitimate fears of the locally oriented members of the community leading to the defeat of the charter (Elazar 1959:69-76, Case Study 1961).

Community Cleavage: Some Exemplary Cases: The cosmopolitan-local division is not confined to special cases of community conflict only but extends to all "constitutional" issues that involve basic changes in the structure of power and politics in the local community. It is also apparent in the less noticeable but continuing patterns of community cleavage which exist in virtually every com-

munity political system. Our studies have indicated that the concept is useful in clarifying the substance of political behavior in a variety of ways, a few of which may be mentioned here as suggestive of the possibilities for its use.

In Rockford, Illinois, city elective offices are traditionally filled through the competition of two special local parties. Since neither party is formally associated with either the Republicans or the Democrats, both have been free to attract supporters otherwise located on both sides of the national political fence on the basis of local concerns. In practice, the two parties have tended to divide along cosmopolitan-local lines. Between 1957, and 1962 the then designated All-Rockford Party (its name must be changed every two years to avoid becoming a legal political party and hence being required to hold a primary election under State law) generally attracted both Republican and Democratic cosmopolitans who were concerned with community-wide issues and interested in promoting community "development" and "reform" in much the same manner as outlined earlier in these pages. They were led by the normal cosmopolitan leadership in the community who are indeed powerholders of some significance and, campaigning on a "civic improvement" platform, became the leading party in the city's governing bodies. Their opposition, the then named People's Coalition Party (its name is subject to the same necessity for periodic changing) generally attracted the Democratic and Republican locals, most of whom are very conservative in matters of community-wide activity but are extremely interested in perserving their generally attractive neighborhoods and in keeping taxes down. They were led by the community's "secondary" leadership, men who would not be considered part of the local business-industrial elite, whose power stems almost exclusively from their influence among the locals.

While there are tendencies to division along occupational lines in the bases of support for both parties, the overwhelmingly middle class character of the Rockford community makes it well-nigh impossible for a class-based cleavage to develop even where an opportunity like this is available. This was put to what amounted to an almost empirical test. A local labor leader became the leader of the People's Coalition Party. His own orientation was to attempt to promote the ideology of class conflict among his constituents in order to stimulate their political interest and encourage them to political activity. In less than a decade he managed to force the majority of the cosmopolitans in his party into the opposition party or into retirement and to convert his party from the majority to the minority party in the city. Since his departure, his party has begun to regroup and, by abandoning the class conflict approach, has begun to make some inroads against their opposition.

During the past decade, Rock Island, Illinois has been in the throes of a struggle to adopt and maintain a nonpartisan, city manager-at large council form of government. A group of cosmopolitans in the city including leading businessmen, the League of Women Voters, and academics from Augustana University were responsible for the promotion and adoption of the council-manager plan in the first place. They were opposed by the local politicians who appealed to the neighborhood interests of the locals. The cosmopolitans (normally a majority of the city's population because of special local conditions within the Quad Cities metropolitan area) have, to date, been successful in securing and holding onto the manager-council government. Opposition to the council-manager plan comes almost exclusively from the locals, who feel they have lost access to the city government, and from their natural leadership, the professional politicians who are cosmopolitans with local constituencies, who have indeed lost much of their influence. Despite repeated threats against the plan, the strong cosmopolitan element in the city has warded off all efforts to revise or replace it. In the process, they also came to dominate the city government, to the virtual exclusion of representatives from the "local" element in the community until 1961 when, tired of "reform," the voters returned some of the older politicians to office.

In the general election of November 1960, the voters of Peoria, Illinois approved a referendum restoring ward based elections for their city council. This action was the latest in some seven years of cosmopolitan-local conflict over the form of municipal government in Peoria. In this case the locals, known in Peoria as the people in the "valley" succeeded in restoring what seems to be a universal "local" desideratum in the United States, ward-based elections (i.e. formal recognition of neighborhood orientations in the local political process). The cosmopolitan-dominated city council, however, retaliated by drawing the new ward boundaries in such a manner as to almost completely eliminate the possibility for the locals to elect more than two aldermen under their own scheme. In Peoria, questions of constitutional change have become the basis for cosmopolitan-local conflict and are consequently far from being resolved.

The cosmopolitan-local cleavage in Peoria is a fixture on the local scene and has been for at least two generations. The conflict over council-manager government is only the most recent manifestation of what has become the city's most fundamental cleavage. As in Rockford and Rock Island, there is some distinction between the "bluff" and the "valley" based on occupation and income lines but the existence of a large middle class element among the locals precludes the class division from being considered the dominant one. While the origins of the cleavage lie in the historic patterns of ethnic settlement in the city, its present manifestations are almost entirely along the lines of the cosmopolitan-local division.

The three examples described so briefly above reflect three ways in which the cosmopolitan-local division manifests itself in the contemporary community. While, as a concept, it can no more be used to explain every case of local political conflict and cleavage than the traditional concepts of socio-economic class, its utility and versatility should make it an important tool in the arsenal of social research.

Summary: The identification of the majority of Americans with the middle class has severely limited the value of traditional concepts of socio-economic class divisions in society. The reference group division between cosmopolitans and locals, provides a more generally applicable framework for investigating local politics. Cosmopolitans are those whose economic, social, and cultural interests extend throughout the local community (and usually beyond it). Locals' interests are generally restricted to their neighborhood, centering around block, school, and church. The political interests of both groups follow the respective patterns of their other interests. The resulting conflict of interests leads to community cleavage and political conflict.

Economic self-interest motivates both groups about equally but their perception of what is in their self-interest differs radically. Today, cosmopolitans tend to identify with the promotion of community "growth" and tend to be highly mobile. Locals are more concerned with possible increases in taxation (at least locally) and are generally not mobile. Cosmopolitans are able to view programs in terms of their community-wide benefits since they identify the benefits accruing from such programs as personally significant while both lower class and upper class locals are generally unable to view such programs as valuable beyond their immediate impact upon them personally.

The "normal" leadership of the local community is in the hands of cosmopolitans. This has given rise to the various "elite" theories of community "power structures". Leadership for the locals is furnished in most cases by cosmopolitans whose positions rest on a local base or former locals who have become cosmopolitan in outlook but are not accepted by the other cosmopolitans. In the context of the concurrent majorities needed for decision-making in local politics, endorsement of a "cosmopolitan" position by the cosmopolitan leadership will not carry the locals along but it is likely to lead to a revolt of the locals under their own leadership and often to the defeat of the cosmopolitans. The cosmopolitan leadership can win the locals over only when they can bridge the deep gap of outlook and understanding that separates the two groups.

While the cosmopolitan-local division is useful in explaining a wide variety of community conflict situations, it is particularly relevant in dealing with questions of constitutional change and continuing political cleavages. A multitude of examples illustrating the use of this conceptual tool are available to even the novice in political research and its use can open up new vistas in the understanding of political conflict in the local community.

LITERATURE CITED

BALTZELL, E. DIGBY. 1957. Elite and Upper Class Indexes in Metropolitan America in *Class, Status, and Power*. Bendix and Lipset, eds. Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press.

BANFIELD, EDWARD. 1961. *Political Influence*. Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press.

BENDIX, REINHARD AND LIPSET, SEYMOUR M. 1952. Social Mobility and Occupational Career Patterns. *American Journal of Sociology* 57:494-504.

COLEMAN, JAMES. 1957. *Community Conflict*. Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press.

COREY, LEWIS. 1945. The Middle Class. *The Antioch Review*. Spring:1-20.

DAHL, ROBERT A. 1961. *Who Governs*. New Haven, Yale University Press.

DENNY, REUEL, GLAZER, NATHAN, AND RIESMAN, DAVID. 1953. *The Lonely Crowd*. New Haven, Yale University Press.

ELAZAR, DANIEL J. 1960. Metro and the Voters. *Planning 1959*. American Society of Planning Officials, Chicago.

ELAZAR, DANIEL J. 1961. *A Case Study of Failure in Attempted Metropolitan Integration: Nashville and Davidson County, Tennessee*. National Opinion Research Center, Chicago.

ELAZAR, DANIEL J. 1960. *Rockford, Illinois*. Paper presented at the Midwest Conference of Political Scientists.

GORDON, JOAN AND LIPSET, SEYMOUR M. 1957. Mobility and Trade Union Membership in *Class, Status, and Power*. Bendix and Lipset, eds. Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press.

GOULDNER, ALVIN W. 1958. Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 2,3,4.

HACKER, ANDREW. 1958. *Politics and the Corporation*. The Fund for the Republic.

HUNTER, FLOYD. 1953. *Community Power Structure*. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press.

HYMAN, HERBERT H. 1957. The Value Systems of Different Classes in *Class, Status, and Power*. Bendix and Lipset, eds. Glencoe, The Free Press.

LYND, ROBERT S. AND HELEN M. 1937. *Middletown in Transition*. New York, Harcourt, Brace and Co.

MERTON, ROBERT K. 1957. *Social Theory and Social Structure*, 2nd ed. Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press.

MILLS, C. WRIGHT. 1957. *The Power Elite*. New York.

PARSONS, TALCOTT. 1957. A Revised Analytical Approach to the Theory of Social Stratification in *Class, Status, and Power*. Bendix and Lipset, eds. Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press.

ROGOFF, NATALIE. 1951. Recent Trends in Urban Occupational Mobility in *Reader in Urban Sociology*. Hatt and Reiss, eds. Glencoe, The Free Press.

ROGOFF, NATALIE. 1953. Social Stratification in France and in the United States. *American Journal of Sociology* 59:347-357.

ST. ANGELO, DOUGLAS. 1960. *Local Impact Upon Federal Programs*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago.

STRAETZ, RALPH A. 1958. *PR Politics in Cincinnati*. New York, New York University Press.

WARNER, LLOYD, et al. 1949. *Democracy in Jonesville*. New York, Harper and Bros.

WEST, PATRICIA S. 1957. Social Mobility Among College Graduates in *Class, Status, and Power*. Bendix and Lipset, eds. Glencoe, Ill., The Free Press.

WHYTE, WILLIAM H., JR. 1953. How the New Suburbia Socializes. *Fortune* 47.

ZIMMERMAN, CARLE. 1938. *The Changing Community*. New York, Harper and Bros.

SOCIOLOGY

The Modern Celebrity as a Unique Form of Stratification

RONALD ALTHOUSE

Moorhead State College, Moorhead

Social strata are horizontal layers of persons occupying positions with approximately equal access to social values of communities. Every society provides a unique arrangement of social strata with respect to one another. The modern mass society is no exception. Social positions of high rank resting on notoriety — the modern celebrity — are a foundation for prominence in a manner found nowhere else.

The Celebrity as a New Dimension of Stratification: The majority of social stratification studies during the last decade fixed attention upon the small town and local urban community. The studies by Warner (1949), Hollingshead (1949), Centers (1949), the contributors to the volume by Lipset and Bendix (1953), and the recent study by Vidich and Bensmen (1958) are representative investigations. Only a few attempts like those of Mills (1956) and Baltzell (1958) have been concerned with the formation of strata within the framework of a national society. One result of this inattention to national strata has been to obscure the social ranking accorded the modern celebrity. Mills (1956) stands almost alone among social scientists in considering the location of the celebrity in the mass society, while some comparable observations about the prominence of the celebrated person have come from authors and journalists like Cleveland Amory (1961).

The professional celebrity approaches the pure case of an engineered public image supported by a manufactured reputation. Whatever the celebrity does or plans to do has news value. Nothing, perhaps, is a greater testimony to the emergence of such national recognition than the appearance of the *Celebrity Register* (1961). This is a listing of personalities constantly before the public eye. It is not an index of persons whose high social rank is located in achievement or in ascribed status. The critical governing test for inclusion is notoriety.

Although the *Celebrity Register* appeared for the first time in 1960, several partially successful listings of celebrated personalities had preceded it. As early as the

1920's gossip columnists made their appearance, reporting to their audiences through large syndicated newspapers. Distinctions were drawn between "Cafe Society" and members of the old metropolitan upper classes. As the distinction became a focus for new status claims, a few columnists (the most notable being Maury Paul and Frank Crowninshield) enacted the role of special social arbiter, providing lists of acquaintances or potential acquaintances. With increasing clamor for shares in the new arena of prominence, the clubs and cafes became a forum for the distribution of new social honors. Ever since, the idea that Cafe Society is a way of life founded on publicity has served as a basic reference point.

The local reference to metropolitan areas was dropped with the crystallization of channels for gaining and sustaining national notoriety. Contributing to this organiza- is a vast network of amateur shows, booking agencies, talent scouts, night-club circuits, sports arenas, public relations agencies and studio build-ups. In parallel with these developments is the apparatus of the large scale corporations which serve in the creation of favorable consumption images for their products, their primary officers, and the organization itself. In 1953, when a list of the "New 400" was produced by one columnist, it contained not only "professional" celebrities, but members of the older metropolitan upper classes and notable leaders of business, government, science and education. (Cassini, 1953).

The *Celebrity Register* claims in its introduction that it is not an index of prominence through ascription or an index of prominence through achievement, so that the book represents not "Society" at all but "Celebrity". The compendium denotes the celebration of accomplishment in the sense of popular, or highly publicized, temporary success. Whatever their origin or occupation, the well-known man or woman — the name "name" — is likely to be included.

A Sample of Modern Celebrities: The present report is part of a larger study concerned with the emergence of new social strata (Althouse, 1961). It involves persons located only in the Boston and Philadelphia metropolitan areas. The samples were taken from the *Celebrity*