

UNIVERSITY OF BEOGRAD
INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY CENTRE
FOR SOCIAL SCIENCES

UNIVERSITE DE BEOGRAD
CENTRE UNIVERSITAIRE INTERNATIONAL
DES SCIENCES SOCIALES

**SOCIALISM
IN YUGOSLAV THEORY AND
PRACTICE**

**LE SOCIALISME
DANS LA THEORIE ET LA PRATIQUE
YUGOSLAVES**

— COLLECTION OF CONFERENCES —

— RECUEIL DES CONFERENCES —

4

BEOGRAD
1972.

BEOGRAD
1972.

Yazarın Adı
Yayıncı

Kitapın Adı
Yayıncı



INTRODUCTION

S'est le quatrième livre que le Centre universitaire international des sciences sociales de l'Université de Belgrade fait paraître à l'intention de l'opinion scientifique et autre de l'étranger. Tout comme le précédent, ce livre constitue un recueil des conférences tenues au cours de la session d'automne 1971 la treizième depuis l'existence du Centre, Aussi a-t-on donné ainsi une suite à la pratique qui veut que chaque session soit suivie d'un livre comprenant toutes les conférences présentées à cette session, livre qui n'est pas destiné seulement aux participants du séminaire, mais aussi à un cercle plus large de personnes intéressées. Cette pratique a été introduite il y a trois ans. Le Centre universitaire international s'efforcera de faire paraître ce recueil aussitôt après chaque session. Ceci est justifié notamment par ce que les thèmes et les conférenciers se succèdent dans le cadre du thème général du Séminaire — LE SOCIALISME DANS LA THEORIE ET LA PRATIQUE YUGOSLAVES. De cette façon, les sessions traitent toujours des questions et problèmes les plus actuels dans le système yougoslave et dans la théorie et la pratique de l'édification de la société socialiste en Yougoslavie. Cette procédure permet aussi de prendre connaissance des diverses façons d'approcher ces thèmes d'actualité. Il ne fait pas de doute, ayant en vue tout ce qui précède, que le présent ouvrage servira utilement à tous ceux qui souhaitent connaître de plus près et de façon compétente les problèmes de la théorie et de la pratique yougoslaves dans l'édification du socialisme.

Ce quatrième livre contient douze conférences, tenues au cours de la XIIIe session du Centre, en septembre 1971. Il y a eu six conférences du domaine des sciences politiques et du droit (Les changements dans la structure du fédéralisme et la question nationale en Yougoslavie — Jovan Djordjević; The Present Juncture of the Development of Self-Management in Yugoslavia — Najdan Pešić; Relations Between Nationalities in the Yugoslav Socio-Political System — Aleksandar Fira; La Société socialiste autogérée et son droit adéquat — Borislav Blagojević; Political Organizations in Yugoslavia — Branko Pribičević; Yugoslavia's Nonalignment Policy and Problems of European Security and Cooperation — Ljubivoje Aćimović), cinq conférences des sciences économiques (Le système économique et la planification en Yougoslavie dans l'étape actuelle du développement — Dušan Čobeljić; Economic Position of Yugoslav Enterprise and its Function in Yugoslav Economy — Stevan Kukoleča; Development of New Socio-Economic Relations in Education and Science in Yugoslavia — Branislav Šoškić; Current Problems of Yu-

Yugoslav Economic System: Self-Government, Market and Socialism — Branko Horvat; Les relations économiques de la Yougoslavie avec l'étranger — Žarko Mrkušić), ainsi qu'une conférence du domaine de la sociologie et de la philosophie (Social Disproportions and Contradictions in Yugoslav Society and the Social Position of the Individual — Mihailo Popović).

Ce Séminaire, comme on le savait peut-être, est organisé chaque automne par le Centre des sciences sociales de l'Université de Belgrade à l'intention de jeunes chercheurs universitaires et autres travailleurs scientifiques, ainsi qu'à l'intention de tous ceux qui s'intéressent aux problèmes du socialisme dans le contexte de la théorie et de la pratique yougoslaves. Le programme présenté dans le cadre de ce thème général a pour but d'informer les auditeurs du système socio-économique et politique de la Yougoslavie, de la pensée scientifique yougoslave dans le domaine des sciences sociales, ainsi que de permettre aux auditeurs de s'informer sur place de la pratique du développement de la société socialiste yougoslave. Outre les conférences et les discussions, données et animées par d'éminents professeurs d'université et de représentants de la vie scientifique, le Centre organise également des panel-discussions, consacrées aux problèmes de l'heure, ainsi que des visites dans les organisations économiques et autres institutions (organes d'Etat, facultés, instituts scientifiques, etc.), qui donnent lieu à des réunions et des conversations avec les représentants des organes de l'autogestion et d'autres travailleurs et exerts.

Belgrade, août 1972

*Le président du Conseil du Centre;
Prof. Dr BRANISLAV ŠOŠKIC
Le Directeur du Centre,
Prof. Dr PAVLE NIKOLIC*

CONFERENCES

EMAR - EASDALE
EMEK ARASTIRMALARI
VAKFI KITALIIGJ
2 0 1 5

COMPARISONS

THE
NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION
125 WEST 47TH STREET
NEW YORK 10019

Dr Jovan DJORDJEVIC

Professeur à la Faculté de droit de l'Université de Beograd

LES CHANGEMENTS DANS LA STRUCTURE DU FEDERALISME ET LA QUESTION NATIONALE EN YOUGOSLAVIE

INTRODUCTION

Au cours des deux dernières années on avançait sérieusement, de divers côtés, la question de la révision du "système politique", alors que, selon la règle, on recherchait des positions politiques sur la modification du mécanisme institutionnel du pouvoir, tel qu'il a été établi pendant deux décennies et exprimé dans la Constitution de la Yougoslavie, de 1963.

Les tendances qui revendiquaient ces changements, devant être exprimés dans la modification de la Constitution, remportèrent une victoire partielle déjà en 1967, pour gagner encore plus de terrain un an plus tard, en 1968. La série d'amendements était amorcée. Les premiers amendements modifiaient la position du Conseil des nationalités afin de faire ressentir davantage l'influence des républiques en matière d'adoption des lois et de la prise des décisions politiques par la fédération. L'année suivante, guidé d'intentions identiques et dans le même esprit, le Conseil des nationalités est transformé en chambre politique de base et il endosse la fonction de la première chambre dans les Etats fédéraux, fonction qui fut détenue jusqu'à lors par le Conseil fédéral de l'Assemblée. En outre, les amendements de 1968 modifient dans une mesure considérable, et même radicalement, le rapport de la Constitution fédérale vis-à-vis des autonomies provinciales qui deviennent des catégories constitutionnelles particulières et se voient accorder le statut de quasi-république.

Les modifications constitutionnelles qui ont fait récemment l'objet d'un débat public national et qui ont été adoptées et proclamées sous formes d'Amendements vers la fin du mois de juin 1971, ne sont pas seulement plus amples mais dépassent, par leur importance et leur portée, les "amendements" dans le sens le plus large du terme. Ces modifications pénètrent directement en profondeur dans la structure de la fédération et dans ses fonctions, dans la position des républiques et des provinces autonomes, et aussi dans la structure de l'organisation suprême du pouvoir exécutif de la fédération. La dernière phase de la préparation des amendements constitutionnels couvre également les

changements dans les rapports socio-économiques, c'est-à-dire dans la question de la position et de la structure des "organisations du travail associé", de la circulation des moyens sociaux et de la répartition du revenu. Ces changements ont une portée énorme dans le domaine du fédéralisme, de sa structure et surtout de son rapport avec les relations entre les nations dans la présente communauté politique.

I. APERÇU HISTORIQUE

A. *La Question nationale et le Fédéralisme (1918—1963)*

1. Les nations et les nationalités qui constituent l'actuelle République socialiste fédérative de Yougoslavie vivaient de 1918 à 1941 dans le cadre d'un Etat qui n'était pas seulement uni mais aussi unitariste pour devenir graduellement fortement centralisé. L'unitarisme ne s'exprime pas seulement dans son aspect étatico-juridique, mais aussi dans son aspect national car on proclama expressément, après 1929, l'existence d'une "nation yougoslave unique". Dans un tel état de choses non seulement que la question nationale n'avait pas été résolue, mais qui plus est, on créa des conditions propres à une mécompréhension entre certaines nations et nationalités, voire à des conflits entre celles-ci. Au cours de la révolution on a tenté de résoudre la question nationale et de créer des relations nouvelles, démocratiques et égalitaires, entre les nations et les nationalités. Ces tentatives se résument très éloquemment dans le slogan bien connu — fraternité et l'unité. Aux termes des décisions arrêtées en 1943 par le Conseil anti-fasciste de libération nationale de Yougoslavie — AVNOJ — ce slogan recevait son expression étatico-juridique dans la forme de la Yougoslavie fédérative démocratique. Ces décisions consignent les fondements et les principes durables de la nouvelle communauté, tels que: a) confirmation de l'individualité nationale et droits souverains des nations yougoslaves; b) volonté librement consentie et égalité des nations et de leurs formulations étatico-juridiques (devenues républiques plus tard), comme expression du droit à l'auto-détermination, y compris le droit à l'unification et à la secession; fédération en tant que condition et garantie de ces principes et des autres objectifs fondamentaux de la révolution, exprimés dans le projet de création de la société socialiste.

2. Toutefois, les formes et même la structure du fédéralisme subirent des changements depuis la première Constitution après la guerre (1946) jusqu'à la Constitution présente, adoptée en 1963, y compris là les amendements de 1967 et de 1968 qui touchent aux questions du fédéralisme. Aux termes de la première Constitution, la Yougoslavie se constitue, dans une mesure considérable, comme une communauté fédérative centralisée qui a non seulement adopté en principe les *principes de l'AVNOJ* — Conseil anti-fasciste de libération nationale de la Yougoslavie — mais était, dans le même temps, consciente de la nécessité de résoudre la question nationale. Il est caractéristique que dans cette constitution et dans les constitutions des républiques, adoptées en 1947, les républiques sont définies comme formations étatiques souveraines

des nations et nationalités qui y vivent. Or, les fonctions économiques et politiques de base et le centre de décision et du pouvoir se trouvaient dans la structure politique fédérale, dans le pouvoir fédéral en premier lieu, qui était l'organe exécutif du Parti communiste, c'est-à-dire de ses organismes dirigeants.

Cette forme de fédéralisme n'était imposée par personne. Elle a été non seulement l'expression de l'acceptation de l'unique "modèle" existant et valable à l'époque du système fédératif dans une société qui se meut vers le socialisme (modèle soviétique de la Constitution de 1936), mais correspondait aussi à la théorie politique en vigueur de l'Etat et des nécessités objectives et subjectives de constituer un système de pouvoir homogène et même monolithique. Ce système était, au fond, la conséquence des conditions objectives dans lesquelles la Yougoslavie, arriérée et dévastée par la guerre, a dû assumer et assumerait des fonctions grosses de responsabilités pour assurer le passage à la construction d'un système nouveau, d'un système pour l'essentiel socialiste.

3. La question nationale n'était pas à l'époque (dans la période du „centralisme" et du „monolithisme") sous-estimée, et n'était pas considérée, dans les milieux responsables, comme résolue. Or, elle revêtait, relativement parlant, un rôle secondaire par rapport aux tâches historiques de la période transitoire dans les conditions concrètes, nationales et internationales, de l'époque. D'autant plus que l'égalité et l'individualité de l'être des nations particulières n'était ni contestée et encore moins menacée, et que toutes les nations avaient pris sur elles toute une suite de fonctions de gestion de l'Etat, par l'intermédiaire de leurs cadres et en leurs langues maternelles. La nécessité de défendre l'indépendance et la voie propre vers le socialisme, fortement accentuée par les événements de 1948, de même que l'orientation prise dans le sens de l'autogestion initiée des 1950, ont eu pour effet l'insistance sur la priorité de l'unité et des fonctions socio-économiques et des formes des réalités nouvelles sur les territoires nationaux.

A ce propos, il est intéressant de relever que dans les lois constitutionnelles des républiques, datant de 1953, les républiques s'étaient définies comme "Etats du peuple travailleur". Cela ne modifiait pas leur subjectivité nationale, mais reflétait un état dans développement et la conception des rapports, conditionnés par les événements, les besoins, et même par les limites de la période critique, de 1948 à 1954, quand l'unité n'était pas seulement la condition du socialisme mais celle de l'existence de tout un chacun.

4. L'introduction de l'autogestion dans pratiquement toutes les sphères de la création matérielle et spirituelle, la démocratisation de la vie politique, l'esprit critique en essor, de plus en plus d'auto-critique dans les rangs mêmes des communistes, ont fait que lors de la préparation et de la rédaction de la Constitution de la Yougoslavie, de 1963, la question nationale apparaisse comme un des problèmes politiques et constitutionnels fondamentaux. La Constitution de 1963 témoignait non seulement d'un aspect démocratique et plus décentralisé du fédéralisme en Yougoslavie, mais aussi de son aspect national. Les républiques y

étaient définies comme des acteurs indépendants et pour une bonne part des acteurs d'influence tant »per se« que de la fédération. On ne l'avait pas fait uniquement pour des raisons de décentralisation ultérieure et de développement de l'autogestion, mais on a voulu confirmer les subjectivités de plus en plus réelles et les rôles relativement nouveaux des nations, voire des républiques et des provinces dans la structure et le fonctionnement de la fédération. Or, cette Constitution, bien que relativement novatrice dans son concept de fédération, était demeurée inconséquente et même empreinte de compromis quant à la question des moyens et des fonctions des républiques, et aussi des provinces autonomes. L'acte d'introduction de plus de conséquence et d'autonomie dans la structure du fédéralisme étaient les amendements constitutionnels fédéraux de 1967 et de 1968.

5. Il en découle que le fédéralisme yougoslave représente un *processus* et pas une formule achevée et parfaite. Il a subi des transformations et en ce sens on peut parler de son évolution, ou plutôt d'une mutation que d'une »découverte« ou d'une »innovation radicale« dans chaque phase des changements (ce que les apologistes des changements tiennent souvent à mettre en évidence).

B. Actualisation des changements dans le fédéralisme (1970—1971)

1. L'actualisation et le raidissement des questions attenantes aux modifications du fédéralisme dans la période écoulée ont subi l'influence de multiples forces, différentes, tendances et processus. Tout ceci n'a pas été assez souligné et compris dans les délibérations menées jusqu'à présent. Généralement parlant, de multiples facteurs s'engagent en faveur et provoquent des changements: depuis les tenants des intérêts matériels et économiques des groupes, par l'intermédiaire du rôle et de la situation dans le parti et de la relève des générations, jusqu'aux différences dans le degré de sécurité, dans les motivations psychologiques collectives et les manifestations émotives des nations et nationalités particulières. Tout ceci doit être noté et expliqué dans une discussion tolérante et responsable, car il n'y a pas de modifications organisationnelles et constitutionnelles, les mieux trouvées, qui puissent résoudre les questions matérielles, et encore moins psychologiques, émotives et morales, dont est tissée la problématique d'une société aussi compacte, tout en étant diverse, aussi simple et en fait complexe et compliquée, telle que la Yougoslavie multinationale et multiéthnique: elle édifie parallèlement le socialisme et son indépendance en s'appuyant, pour l'essentiel, sur ses propres forces et en empruntant ses propres voies, pour l'essentiel, démocratiques ce qui la rend encore plus exceptionnelle et sa »vie« plus compliquée.

2. De l'aspect des fondements sociologico-politiques de ces processus, il s'avère nécessaire de souligner deux états ou deux faits historiques prédominants.

Théoriquement, le socialisme est appelé à résoudre, ou plus exactement à dépasser la question nationale, mais le socialisme qui a atteint sa maturité et le socialisme qui est devenu système prédominant

dans le monde. Le socialisme en tant qu'idée et encore moins en tant que réalité ne peut être une force d'influence et d'attraction, et notamment dans une communauté multinationale, si dans la théorie et dans la pratique il n'a pas d'attitude concrète et positive à l'égard des nations et des relations nationales. L'état des relations nationales dans le monde et en Yougoslavie exprime une légalité générale et nouvelle qui est qualifiée d'habitude de phénomène d'universalisation et d'accomplissement des nations. Il ne peut être question ni du socialisme ni de la démocratie si la question nationale est négligée et si les nations sont freinées dans leur réalisation vitale et originelle. Les nations sont encore en Yougoslavie, compte tenu du degré de leur développement social et d'industrialisation, la forme générale de constitution de la société. Or, cette légalité de leur réalisation nationale n'est pas unilatérale et ne signifie pas un retour en arrière de la société contemporaine, et encore moins du socialisme, dans l'Etat national-territorial ou dans le nationalisme comme le pensent et le veulent certains pseudo-réformateurs qui sont des chauvins nationaux — ou sociaux. D'ailleurs, cela ne saurait être possible, car le monde a déjà emprunté la voie des liaisons et des intégrations économiques profondes, et mêmes politiques.

Par conséquent, par rapport à la question nationale, cette légalité est aussi dialectique car elle reflète la nécessité de la manifestation d'une nation dans une société dans laquelle se posent, en même temps, les problèmes de son dépassement. Et en ceci réside l'une des «crises» générales de la société contemporaine, qui, dans un certain sens, a apparue objectivement en Yougoslavie aussi, bien que dans des conditions plus favorables que dans ceux des systèmes politiques où le concept d'empire ou d'intégrationnisme national l'emporte encore.

3. Directement parlant, l'essence de la nouvelle mutation — et non de l'interruption — dans le système socio-politique de la Yougoslavie, et surtout dans le domaine du fédéralisme, consiste dans une conception nouvelle, et radicalement différente, de la nation et par là même de la structure fédérative. La question nationale assume aujourd'hui des dimensions qu'elle n'avait pas antérieurement car on découvre sa profondeur sociologico-éthnique et culturelle. Or, elle est posée et résolue en harmonie avec l'intégration de la réalité nationale dans le processus de transformation du monde et d'établissement d'entité et de systèmes socio-économiques, technologiques, culturels et par là même politiques — nouveaux, plus productifs et plus unissants.

Il en découle nettement que tout concept moderne du fédéralisme doit se libérer tant de la sous-estimation des nations, c'est-à-dire de leur égalisation avec le nationalisme, que de leur surestimation et isolation, c'est-à-dire du renouvellement des structures nationales-territoriales étatiques dépassées. L'essence du problème même des nations en Yougoslavie réside dans leur confirmation démocratique et socialiste, et de ce fait dans leur dépassement. Se réaliser ne veut pas dire se replier sur soi-même et s'y plaire. Les petits ne deviennent pas grand à force de se contempler en permanence dans leur propre miroir.

4. Tout ceci n'est pas seulement une hypothèse de la théorie moderne de la nation et du développement de la société moderne, mais aussi une tendance de la société qui ne peut plus progresser dans les anciens cadres du césarisme, de l'étatisme et de l'empire. Pour la Yougoslavie, ceci est encore plus important, car aucune solution progresse de quelle question sociale et politique que ce soit, et par là même de la question nationale, ne peut être séparée du second état, de la seconde crise qu'aborde objectivement notre société. Tout comme dans les autres pays socialistes, en Yougoslavie aussi il existe une contradiction potentielle entre ce que Marx appelle l'âme politique et sociale de la révolution socialiste; entre la politique du pouvoir aliénée et l'auto-organisation et l'autogestion du peuple travailleur. En Yougoslavie, on n'a pas seulement inauguré des voies à prendre mais on a mis au point les premières formes institutionnelles du dénouement graduel de cette contradiction, à partir d'une nouvelle intégration démocratique et socialiste, c'est-à-dire autogestionnaire, de la société et de la transformation de l'autogestion en principes nouveaux de la souveraineté de l'homme, du peuple travailleur, et par là même des nations.

5. Ces processus jettent une nouvelle lumière sur certains postulats fondamentaux de l'Etat politique, énoncée par Marx et Lénine, postulats que l'on ne saurait oublier chaque fois quand on a tendance à égaliser l'Etat, la nation et la classe. La révolution socialiste, disait Marx, ne consiste pas à faire passer la machine bureaucratique et militaire des mains des uns à celles des autres; la destruction de cette machine est »la condition préalable de toute révolution véritablement populaire«. Ce à quoi Lénine ajoute la pensée suivante: »La révolution populaire est celle dans laquelle les masses des peuples, sa majorité, les classes sociales inférieures opprimées et exploitées, se sont redressées dans leur profondeur d'une façon indépendante et ont imprimé sur l'ensemble du mouvement révolutionnaire le cachet de leurs revendications et de leurs aspirations à mettre sur pieds, dans une forme originale, une société nouvelle à la place de l'ancienne que l'on abolit«.

Le sens de ces messages est clair, et notamment lors de toute »restructuration« du système politique dans le socialisme. La nouvelle forme du fédéralisme, en confirmant le rôle et l'influence des sujets nationaux, ne pourra apporter rien de nouveau si elle ne représente pas une forme originale de transformation et non seulement de l'ancien fédéralisme socio-juridique et politico-territorial, et aussi si elle ne devient pas un acte d'établissement d'un système socio-politique qui assure l'autogestion plus profonde et plus réelle des travailleurs.

La pensée théorique progressiste en Yougoslavie a contribué de sorte que ces deux processus trouvent leur expression dans des changements qui exigent que la fédération s'exprime de plus en plus comme une communauté socialiste libre des communautés socialistes et nationales, dans lesquelles les travailleurs et les hommes progressistes pensent, ouvrent et créent un nouveau moyen démocratique, socialiste et marxiste, plus authentique, dans l'esprit de la solidarité et

de la réalisation de l'humanisme. Cette pensée n'était pas partagée par tous, de même qu'elle n'a pas eu sur les modifications contemporaines de la Constitution l'influence que l'on pouvait espérer. Il s'est confirmé cette fois encore que les systèmes sociaux progressistes ne font pas naître automatiquement des idées progressistes et des solutions audacieuses. Aussi longtemps que le pouvoir politique et la politique auront le dessus, la société ne pourra, ni dans la sphère des idées, se libérer du conservatisme et de la situation dans laquelle, pour reprendre les paroles de Marx, »le mort saisit le vivant.«.

II. PROBLEMATIQUE SOCIOLOGICO-POLITIQUE: NATION ET COMMUNAUTE SOCIALISTE MULTINATIONALE

A. La question nationale et les processus sociaux contemporains

1. Dans le sens historique général, les nations se sont créées au cours des XVII, XVIII et XIX s. en Europe en premier lieu, et de nos jours elles sont en voie de formation sur d'autres continents. Elles sont le produit historique de la société moderne, sous laquelle nous sous-entendons la société industrielle, dans le cadre de laquelle se répand en même temps comme forme de communication fondamentale un langage plus ou moins commun, sous l'influence du commerce et plus tard de la formation des villes et du marché commun.

La nation est le moyen global de l'existence de cette société moderne et le cadre de la réalisation de son dynamisme socio-économique et culturel vis-à-vis de soi et par rapport aux autres nations, aux autres peuples et sujets internationaux. La nation n'est pas seulement en transition de la société traditionnelle vers la société contemporaine »post-industrielle« ou »ultramoderne«, elle est aussi le substrat socio-culturel de cette société et porte en elle ses contradictions de classe, idéologiques et autres, des »vestiges du passé« et des germes qui préparent une nouvelle société, c'est-à-dire un moyen moderne et de plus en plus nécessaire de l'existence des hommes. Par conséquent, la nation est un des maillons importants dans l'existence historique et dans la constitution sociale et la modification.¹

¹ Sous nation on sous-entend: »La nation est, par conséquent, non seulement »le produit de l'histoire«, et une communauté historiquement constituée, elle est aussi la forme prédominante et presque globale de l'existence de la société contemporaine.

Elle porte en soi son origine historique qui caractérise sa formation comme résultat de l'intégration et de la désintégration qui s'étaient opérées entre les peuples et des parties des peuples qui vivaient longtemps dans une société traditionnelle. L'existence de l'unité relative politico-économique, linguistique et culturelle, exprimée par la conscience de soi, c'est-à-dire dans une identification collective particulière, revêt une importance essentielle pour la nation«.

(Dr. J. Đorđević, *O samoupravnom i odgovornom društvu* (De la société autogestionnaire et responsable), Službeni list SFRJ, Beograd, 1971.

2. Dans l'époque moderne, la question nationale reçoit quatre aspects fondamentaux, c'est-à-dire qu'elle prend attitude à l'égard de quatre processus historiques nouveaux. Ces processus sont:

a) la décolonisation qui est accompagnée, qui doit assurer la formation et la cristallisation des nations nouvelles non seulement en Afrique, mais en Asie et en Amérique aussi;

b) la création de communautés fédératives multinationales, et surtout dans le processus de la création de bases nouvelles pour une société socialiste. Or, la question fondamentale de ces communautés n'est pas uniquement le rapport entre les parties et l'entité mais aussi la conception et la création des dimensions nouvelles du fédéralisme tant dans le sens horizontal que dans le sens vertical;

c) l'amorce de la question sociale et politique interne, culturelle et ethnique, qui est partie intégrante de la question nationale globale, même dans les nations qui se sont formées ou qui sont comprises comme étant les plus homogènes, les plus unies et centralisées (France, etc.);

d) la formation ou la création de la société post-industrielle ou, en général, des formes supérieures d'intégration économique-politiques, ce qui met en évidence l'étroitesse et l'aspect dépassé de l'ancien concept de nation et de cadres nationaux pour l'agissement et les résultats positifs des forces économique-technologiques, scientifiques, humaines de l'époque moderne.

Dans aucun domaine de la société contemporaine, dans aucune structure unique ou complexe la question nationale ne pourra être posée et saisie, si elle n'est pas posée dans l'unité de ces aspects, si l'on ne connaît pas et l'on n'étudie pas tous les processus dans lesquels elle se manifeste de nos jours et dans lesquels on la résout, d'une façon ou d'une autre, ou on doit la résoudre.

B. *Nouvelles dimensions de la question nationale*

1. La question nationale est aujourd'hui *nouvelle*; elle revêt des *dimensions nouvelles* et doit être résolue conformément à l'intégration de la réalité nationale dans le processus de la transformation du monde et l'établissement de nouveaux «systèmes» sociaux et politiques plus productifs et plus unis et unissants. Elle ne consiste pas uniquement, et primordialement, dans la reconnaissance d'une nation existante ou formée, ou dans le changement de l'arrangement constitutionnel existant ou l'établissement d'un nouveau arrangement constitutionnel qui devrait assurer tel ou tel degré d'autonomie pour les «parties». Tout ceci exige la modification et la transformation en profondeur des structures politiques et sociales existantes, et aussi la pénétration en profondeur dans la morphologie des communautés nationales et de l'ensemble de la communautés des hommes.

La défaite de l'Allemagne dans la Seconde guerre mondiale, le rapport entre l'URSS et la Chine, les résistances de par le monde aux formes nouvelles et anciennes d'hégémonie et d'impérialisme, ainsi que

l'universalisation générale du phénomène national, sont une preuve suffisante que l'on a dépassé tous les concepts de règlement du problème national et politique par la voie de la création d'empires énormes, de super-puissances, de blocs et de sphères de domination.

2. La victoire de ces tendances dépend du règlement du processus double et contradictoire de l'universalisation de la nation et de l'intégration politique et économique des régions, des continents et du monde entier. Dans ce moment historique, il importe de souligner que le dénouement de cette contradiction ne consiste pas à sous-estimer les nations qui s'égalisent avec le nationalisme et à croire tout simplement que les rapports socio-économiques globaux, c'est-à-dire les changements de propriété et les changements politiques de classe assurent automatiquement le dépassement de la nation. Au contraire, le problème national doit être résolu pour que la nation puisse être dépassée. Dépasser ne veut pas dire rejeter et nier, mais circonscrire dans le cadre des synthèses historiques nouvelles et qualitativement supérieures.

La question nationale n'est pas résolue par annexion, par arrangements politico-juridiques globaux, et encore moins par les expansions territoriales. Le temps des expansions et (objectivement) révolu. Les nations sont le moyen global de l'existence de la société qui intègre en elle certains éléments historiques qui lui sont propres. La nation ne pourra être dépassée par le fait d'être incluse dans une communauté sociale plus large qui dépasse ses bases; ni si elle se crispe en soi sur cette même base, laquelle même qu'elle fut «vraie» ne l'est plus, car elle n'est pas la *même*.

Le dépassement de la nation représente et exige l'approfondissement de son existence, de son contenu, de sorte que les communautés nouvelles, fédératives et confédératives, vu qu'elles se manifestent comme besoin social nouveau qui accompagne la conscience des hommes, soient en mesure de l'englober ainsi tous ses peuples, ses groupes ethniques (nationalités) et autres groupes qui la composent et s'ils la composent. Ainsi nous aboutissons à une nouvelle conclusion théorique et pratique.

3. La question nationale a, certes, des dimensions nouvelles, mais elle est posée et résolue, également, conformément à l'intégration de la réalité nationale dans le processus des changements dans le monde et d'établissement d'entités et de «systèmes» socio-économiques, technologiques, culturels et de ce fait politiques — nouveaux, plus productifs et plus unis et unissants. Elle ne consiste pas uniquement à «reconnaître» ou à confirmer les nations existantes ou les nations qui sont en voie de création, ou à changer les arrangements constitutionnels existants qui leur assureraient un plus haut degré d'autonomie. Or, ce processus de confirmation et de modification du phénomène national ne pourra se réaliser sans transformations plus profondes des structures sociales et politiques et sans pénétrer réellement dans la morphologie des communautés nationales et de l'ensemble de la société humaine en création.

Le problème de la réalisation des nations ne réside pas aujourd'hui dans leur sous-estimation, c'est-à-dire dans leur égalisation avec le nationalisme, de même qu'il ne réside pas dans leur isolement, voire dans la résurrection des structures nationales-territoriales étatiques. L'essence du problème actuel de la nation en général, et en Yougoslavie en particulier, réside dans sa nouvelle confirmation socialiste et démocratique, et par là même dans la création de conditions propices à son dépassement.

4. L'orientation nouvelle dans la façon de comprendre la nation (et de là les formes nouvelles du fédéralisme en Yougoslavie) doit reposer sur le principe selon lequel: *se réaliser ne veut pas dire se replier sur soi-même, mais veut dire se dépasser*. La confirmation et le dépassement des nations et nationalités yougoslaves pourront se réaliser si elles sont englobées, comme individualités conscientes, par l'effort de tous, dans le processus de synthèses et de modifications historiques nouvelles et qualitativement supérieures. En outre, le temps des expansions en largeur est, au fond, révolu. La nation ne pourra se réaliser, ni se dépasser, par le fait d'inclusion dans une communauté étatique plus large qui déborde ses bases ou par la tendance d'imposer une telle communauté. Il ne peut être question de réalisation et de dépassement de la nation même dans les »meilleures« formes d'empire ou d'expansion, ni dans les »meilleurs« régime d'unitarisme et d'uniformisme.

Ce substrat sociologico-politique et l'aspect international de la question nationale doit être clair et nettement défini pour comprendre et mettre en oeuvre le concept actuel et le projet futur du fédéralisme yougoslave, et pour enfin saisir l'essence et la portée des modifications constitutionnelles dans la structure du fédéralisme yougoslave. Le socialisme, et en particulier le socialisme d'autogestion, est de par son idéologie et son rôle historique appelé à devenir le promoteur de ces connaissances et alternatives nouvelles.

5. Toutes les nations doivent se réexaminer et se définir pour mettre en évidence leurs structures, réelles et dissimulées, ethniques, culturelles et nationales. Ceci, dans le même temps, signale l'aspect dépassé des systèmes sociaux mécaniques, et surtout des systèmes centralistes de force ou bureaucratique-centralistes. Ce réexamen sociologique, historique, culturel et psychologique simultané s'avère également indispensable dans toutes les fédérations existantes.

Les anciennes ou nouvelles fédérations territoriales-politiques asymétriques ou généralement nationalistes cherchent une nouvelle définition de leur base sociologique et par là même de la naissance d'un nouveau fédéralisme en profondeur. Aucune des fédérations existantes n'a examiné tous ces rapports, et n'a créé en toute matière des solutions qui lui permettent de se moderniser plus rapidement et plus efficacement, et de se préparer pour la nouvelle société post-industrielle dont elles sont des images en petit ou devraient historiquement l'être. Ceci vaut aussi pour le fédéralisme yougoslave.

Or, la Yougoslavie a, à cet effet, un avantage qui réside non seulement dans l'autonomie provinciale mais aussi dans l'autogestion. L'autogestion générale et régionale sur la même base donne le cadre

et offre un instrument qui peut assurer la participation véritable des groupes qui ont leur individualité ethnique et culturelle et dont les éléments historiquement créés ne peuvent qu'approfondir et enrichir la relativité même des nations dans leur existence ou leur dépassement. Etre en possession des voies ne veut pas toujours dire que celles-ci sont mises en valeur.

C. La question nationale et les républiques socialistes fédératives

1. La Fédération yougoslave a été créée, après l'URSS, en raison du pluralisme national et ethnique existant sur son territoire.² En l'occurrence, elle est le deuxième pays socialiste qui a été dès le début et est restée une communauté multinationale. Déjà par sa base, voire par sa conception rationnelle des conditions de l'existence et des intérêts de toutes les nations et nationalités dans la région historiquement constituée et complexe de la Yougoslavie, la communauté s'imposait pendant plus d'un siècle comme une nécessité et comme un projet de l'avenir. Cependant, les groupes au pouvoir, en raison de leur sous-développement des préjugés historiques et politiques et des idéologies «intégrationnistes» en bonne partie nationales et nationalistes, n'étaient pas en état de définir et de donner vie à une communauté potentiellement nécessaire. Ainsi, dès la période après la première guerre mondiale, et notamment depuis que le Parti communiste assume la représentation des intérêts généraux et particuliers des nations yougoslaves, le projet de communauté est conditionné inévitablement par le concept du socialisme, c'est-à-dire par les changements dans les rapports de classe et les rapports politiques sur la base de la modernisation parallèle de la société et du socialisme.

Ce concept de communauté était inévitablement une fédération dans ses prémisses classiques et logiques, des prémisses mêmes qui, à l'image des classiques de la fédération soviétique, comportaient des idées d'intégration sociale plus rapide qui résoudrait pour ainsi dire automatiquement le problème national. Cette conception de la communauté multinationale a été édiflée au cours de la révolution et confirmée moralement et politiquement dans les slogans bien connus sur la *fraternité et l'unité* (des peuples yougoslaves et des groupes ethniques).

2. En dépit de tous les malentendus et conflits provoqués par l'ennemi de classe et l'ennemi du dehors, ce slogan possédait une force matérielle, étant accepté et soutenu par des millions de citoyens actifs et de patriotes qui ont pris part à la guerre de libération et à la révolution socialiste. Ce concept recevait aussi son expression

² Voir: J. Đorđević, *Demokratija i socijalizam* (Démocratie et socialisme), Beograd 1961; *O samoupravnom i odgovornom društvu* (De la société autogestionnaire et responsable), 1970; *Federalizam, nacija, socijalizam*, (Fédéralisme, nation, socialisme), 1971 (les trois ouvrages sont en serbe)

juridique, avec la prédominance de la conception de l'inévitabilité de la centralisation politique et étatique, dans les premières constitutions (de 1946 et de 1963) proclamées après la guerre, c'est-à-dire dans le courant du processus de constitution de la république fédérative de Yougoslavie. La constitution de 1963 a été la première à initier, sans l'achever, le processus de constitution d'une communauté fédérative en tant que superstructure non seulement de la classe ouvrière unique mais aussi des nations unifiées, avec options subjectives, personnifiées dans leurs républiques respectives.

A présent, on peut signaler que ce concept de fédéralisme représentait, lui aussi, un certain compromis entre le processus de subjectivisation nationale et du centralisme étatique, voire même de l'unitarisme. Or, objectivement parlant, la fédération yougoslave se créait comme une communauté unique, se formait selon la volonté des nations et nationalités yougoslaves conformément au principe proclamé d'autodétermination, y compris le droit à l'unification dans le cadre d'un Etat commun et le droit à la secession, c'est-à-dire à la formation d'Etats nationaux indépendants.

Cette deuxième issue n'a jamais entrée en ligne de considération pas parce que le promoteur de cette unification était le Parti communiste, comme avant-garde de la classe ouvrière et de tous les peuples et nationalités yougoslaves, mais aussi en raison des évaluations rationnelles et réalistes des intérêts individuels de tous les peuples et en raison de la situation internationale présente. Dans cet ordre d'idées, on pourrait dire que la fédération yougoslave correspondait au type classique d'unification des sujets individuels tels qu'ils sont connus dans le processus de création des Etats Unis d'Amérique, de la Suisse et aussi de l'URSS.

C'est une fédération qui est la communauté de sujets nationaux et ethniques autonomes, qui, dans un Etat socialiste fédératif unique, trouvent la condition et la garantie de leur individualité nationale, de leur survie et de leur développement national et social ultérieur.

3. Dès l'introduction de l'autogestion, la Yougoslavie aborda, parmi les premiers pays au monde, le processus de critique et d'auto-critique de la bureaucratie et des structures politiques et étatiques centralisées lesquelles, dans la pensée et dans la pratique, représentaient et pouvaient représenter des forces aliénantes, et même des »abstractions« par rapports aux forces élémentaires et vitales dans la société que sont: les organisations autogestionnaires, et par là même les nations et nationalités en tant que formes historiquement constituées de l'existence et du développement ultérieur des entités hétérogènes, sur la plan national, et complexes.

Cette orientation, et tout particulièrement les conceptions et les tendances dans la compréhension et le règlement de la question nationale dans le monde ont fait de sorte que le problème national apparaisse, ces quelques dernières années, dans un aspect relativement nouveau. On a ouvert ainsi une »crise« objective, grevée presque inévitablement de multiples souches subjectivistes, d'erreurs, et même de conflits et de manifestations nationalistes. En laissant de côté certains malen-

tendus non justifiés et certains blocages maléfiques que cela a produit dans la vie socio-politique et idéale de la Yougoslavie (non sans conséquences, mais toutefois sans danger réel pour l'intégrité du pays et l'unité des peuples), aujourd'hui il devient possible de dégager, à l'aide d'une analyse critique et scientifique et de la connaissance de toutes les dimensions de la question nationale, la relation inévitable entre la question nationale et le système politique.

4. Dans le monde, et en Yougoslavie (qui a accompli plus nettement et plus favorablement les premières et les phases politiques dans la solution de la question nationale dans une région de pluralisme ethnique, liée par le sort commun et politiquement) on voit se manifester des processus nouveaux, subordonnés à une nouvelle légalité historique. Cette légalité est fondamentalement dialectique car elle exprime la nécessité de la réalisation d'une nation dans une société dans laquelle on pose en même temps les problèmes du dépassement de cette même nation.

Ce double mouvement qui sépare, entrecroise, oppose et unifie l'universalisation du phénomène national et son dépassement inévitable, fait naître une des plus importantes »crises« presque générales du monde contemporain. La nécessité de comprendre cette »crise« comme un processus objectif, et de découvrir les issues véritables, c'est le problème fondamental du système politique contemporain en Yougoslavie et en même temps la base pour le règlement rationnel et réel des modifications constitutionnelles dans le domaine de la structure fédérative.

Pour ce faire, il convient de souligner immédiatement que même dans des milieux nationaux moins uniques et moins complexes, du type fédératif, le problème national ne peut être cerner et encore moins résolu de la façon ancienne. La »façon ancienne« est celle à laquelle on eut recours au 19ème siècle, et selon laquelle l'accomplissement, la réalisation d'une nation correspondait exclusivement à la création d'Etats nationaux-territoriaux. Dans le monde entier, et même dans les régions où des êtres nationaux sont en voie de se former (en Afrique, en Asie, et même en Amérique latine) le problème national est inséparablement lié aux transformations socio-politiques et culturelles.

D. Les caractéristiques de la structure multinationale et le fédéralisme en Yougoslavie

1. Pour pouvoir résoudre la question nationale et en même temps la nouvelle forme du développement du fédéralisme en Yougoslavie, il s'avère nécessaire de saisir l'importance de la différenciation dans le degré de développement, le degré de réalisation et d'autres circonstances qui déterminent l'être et la subjectivité nationale des nations et nationalités yougoslaves. Jusqu'à présent nous envisageons la question nationale comme étant un équivalent des relations entre les nations et non comme une connaissance mutuelle des nations et comme une né-

7
1
R
A
1

cessité de reconnaître et de respecter leurs particularités. La communauté multinationale et multiethnique en Yougoslavie n'est pas une question de pluralisme mécanique et étatico-juridique. Elle est le problème d'un pluralisme sociologique et socio-psychologique et d'un complexe différencié. Ceci exige, pour sa part, plus de connaissances, plus de tolérance à l'égard des intransigeances, de la compétition mercantile et du soutien de l'hégémonisme important, de l'unitarisme dépassée, du nationalisme provincial et du chauvinisme aveuglant. La conscience de tout ceci pourrait expliquer certaines revendications et aussi certaines solutions qui pourraient contribuer à l'établissement de rapports plus nets, plus ouverts, plus coopérants, multilatéraux et humains, socialistes et marxistes entre les hommes et les groupements sociaux et par là même entre les nations et les nationalités.

La question nationale change, tout comme le fédéralisme. Aussi se conditionnent-ils mutuellement. Politiquement, ce rapport se traduit dans le slogan notoire sur la fraternité et l'unité, et constitutionnellement dans l'existence d'une communauté qui a la forme de la communauté socialiste fédérative. Ce slogan pourrait changer, pourrait disparaître ce qui donnerait d'autres dimensions à la question nationale et inciterait à la recherche de solutions nouvelles, si le concept de fédération comme communauté des communautés, évoquée par Montesquieu, changeait ou était remplacé par un mécanisme étatico-juridique et formel-contractuel.

De ce fait, la forme du fédéralisme était et demeure la question socio-politique capitale et ne pourrait être traitée de simple arrangement constitutionnel et de compromis des groupes au pouvoir. Cela vaut surtout pour les nations qui s'étendent en dehors des frontières d'une république. Leur lutte pour dépasser le nationalisme faiblirait dans la mesure ou faiblirait leur intérêt pour le statut et les droits démocratiques de leur compatriotes en tant qu'hommes et citoyens.

2. Nous sommes souvent enclins à être particuliers et originaux. Quand nous échouons (car ce n'est pas chose facile), nous nous abandonnons aux interventions du hasard qui comportent certains éléments de retour en arrière, à l'ancien dans nos notions, nos instruments, nos pensées et nos formes de sociabilité et de la politique. C'est ce qui se passe, dans un certain sens, aujourd'hui aussi dans le domaine du système politique lequel, selon certaines opinions, devrait se constituer en partant de l'Etat politique, territorial-national, qui est dans une phase de dépassement objectif presque partout dans le monde, et qui fait naître, inévitablement, la bureaucratie, la domination et la lutte pour le pouvoir. Cependant, la communauté fédérative de peuples et nationalités égaux en droits et de travailleurs et de citoyens libres correspond aujourd'hui, plus que dans le passé à un concept de démocratie socialiste et autogestionnaire. Ce concept ne part pas de la conception selon laquelle l'Etat se socialise graduellement et que la structure organisationnelle est mise sur pied parallèlement, c'est-à-dire à la base de la société qui est constituée des rapports entre les hommes qui, pour leur part, se libèrent du centralisme bureaucratique, de l'unitarisme étatique, du »gleichschaltung« nationaliste, et, c'est le plus important, du rapport de salariat et de domination d'un

groupe de personne sur la majorité, sur les masses de travailleurs et les citoyens.

Dans de telles conditions, un fédéralisme communautaire, ouvert et fonctionnel, autrement dit le fédéralisme autogestionnaire devient ce qui est original dans la théorie et la bio-alternative de l'Etat politique avec ses possibilités d'aliéner le pouvoir et l'homme au profit des centres de pouvoir, d'oppression, même quand ils sont véritablement nationaux et pas bureaucratique-totalitaires. C'est l'alternative dont parlèrent nombre de grands penseurs et philosophes depuis la Renaissance jusqu'à Marx et Lénine, comme d'un choix entre le césarisme et l'autocratie, et l'organisation libre des peuples et des hommes à partir des bases de la libération du travail et par la même du socialisme plus réel.

Ce serait aussi la caractéristique fondamentale d'une fédération qui est quelque chose d'outré qu'une nouvelle répartition des fonctions et un remplacement du centralisme étatique fédéral antérieur par un nouveau polycentrisme étatique des républiques et des provinces autonomes, qui peuvent contribuer au règlement et au dépassement des contradictions et pas à leur morcellement ou à leur localisation.

III. LES FONCTIONS DE LA FEDERATION ET LA POSITION DES REPUBLIQUES DANS LA COMMUNAUTE FEDERATIVE

A. Deux significations des termes fonctions et fédération

1. Quand on discute du problème des dites fonctions de la fédération, il convient de distinguer: a) les fonctions d'Etat, c'est-à-dire les fonctions de régulation et administratives et les fonctions *sociales*, c'est-à-dire les fonctions objectives, idéelles et d'orientation; b) la fédération dans sa signification (la Yougoslavie) et dans sa signification *d'organisation fédérale* comme «appareil» fédéral (notion large et restreinte de la fédération); c) les fonctions des droits et obligations comme ensemble de responsabilités et d'autorisations, et aussi des compétences comme forme et instrument d'exercice des fonctions qui s'opère, selon la règle, par l'intermédiaire des organes et des institutions.

Ce sont là des concepts selon lesquels était constituée jusqu'à présent la Yougoslavie comme communauté d'Etat fédérative et dont, la définition nouvelle traduit ses modifications, y compris les dernières modifications contenues dans les amendements constitutionnels de 1971.

Dans sa signification sociologico-politique, la fédération yougoslave (la Yougoslavie) est une communauté et en tant que telle elle englobe les peuples et les nationalités, les travailleurs et les citoyens, et ceci dans leur vie et leur création générales, communes et particulières. Cette communauté (et tant que telle) revêt des fonctions existentielles, sociales, politiques et idéales, fonctions qui sont définies avec plus ou moins de succès dans la Constitution de la Yougoslavie (chapitre I des

Principes généraux), et qui se résument à l'obligation librement exprimée de tous les partenaires intérieurs de soutenir et d'édifier, de développer et de perfectionner le socialisme, ou encore plus, elle se résume à une »communauté libre de producteurs et hommes libres«. Tout un chacun y est engagé, tant la fédération que les républiques (provinces, communes), tant les peuples et les nationalités que les citoyens, tant les organes d'Etat que les organisations socio-politiques et autres organisations et institutions. Ce sont des fonctions qui sont l'expression de la *communauté*, dans sa signification de *Gemeinschaft*, *Communauté*, et par la même des intérêts de tout un chacun.

Ces fonctions de la fédération, selon la règle, ne sont pas toutes formulées dans la Constitution car elles s'expriment le plus souvent à travers les actions et les relations conscientes et spontanées des travailleurs et des nations et d'autres groupes. Or, et avant tout, elles découlent du substrat sociologico-politique et de la forme politique (autogestionnaire — d'après les aspirations) contemporaine du fédéralisme. Elles sont la base constitutionnelle et politico-idéelle pour la régulation dimensionnée des »fonctions« et la réalisation de celles-ci sous forme des »droits et obligations« et des compétences de tous les sujets de l'organisation socio-politique du pays, et surtout de la fédération et des républiques. Cette conception est exprimée dans la Constitution de 1963.³

2. Les changements actuels dans la fédération concernent avant tout une définition nouvelle et la détermination des dimensions nouvelles de ces fonctions par la détermination des droits et des obligations de la fédération (dans le sens plus restreint) et par la précision des compétences, c'est-à-dire des affaires et des autorisations de l'appareil fédéral du pouvoir et de la gestion (de l'assemblée aux organes de l'administration). Ces »fonctions« non plus ne peuvent obéir strictement aux normes et ne peuvent être statiques et ne peuvent, pour cette raison, être énumérées; cette méthode des anciennes fédérations, est dépassée dans les méthodes contemporaines, ce qui ne veut pas dire que les compétences puissent être fluides et à double sens (au contraire: elles doivent être déterminées aussi exactement et clairement que possible). Les Amendements de 1971 ont pour objectif d'accomplir tout ceci.

Dans une communauté fédérative multinationale et socialiste, la fédération en tant structure du pouvoir (la fédération dans son sens plus restreint ou organique) ne s'identifie pas avec cette communauté, mais elle a dans elle et pour elle sa place, son rôle et sa responsabilité. Elle ne l'a pas par soi et pour soi, car la fédération est, dans un sens plus restreint, la création et l'émanation de la fédération prise dans un sens plus large, c'est-à-dire de ses sujets nationaux et d'autres sujets socio-politiques, avec l'homme à la base, dans leurs intérêts et expressions généraux, communs et particuliers. La fédération n'est pas,

³ Elle a été acceptée aussi dans les Amendements de 1971 (Amendements XXVII et XXVIII notamment).

elle ne peut en effet exister si elle demeure une simple »suprastructure« des structures des républiques, sauf si cette »suprastructure« n'est comprise comme une »station-service« commune des républiques (et des provinces), et alors elle cesse d'être la structure qui est son propre système, et pas une simple somme de parties.

Tout ceci s'intègre dans la conception de la Constitution de 1963, conception qui a été appréciée dans la théorie et les ouvrages scientifiques étrangers comme étant jusqu'à ce jour le concept démocratique et marxiste le plus conséquent du fédéralisme — bien que dans toutes les dispositions de la Constitution (et surtout en ce qui concerne la détermination des compétences de la fédération — des organes fédéraux), et notamment dans la pratique, il n'est pas toujours appliqué de façon adéquate et conséquente.

3. Par conséquent, la fédération en tant qu'»organisation fédérale«⁴ est dans chaque fédération, et surtout dans une fédération multinationale: a) le représentant de la communauté fédérative (Etat fédéral) en tant que sujet international et de la souveraineté des peuples et des citoyens vis-à-vis du monde extérieur et complexe; b) le garant et la force organisationnelle de la protection et de la sauvegarde de l'intégrité territoriale et étatique du pays; c) le tenant des autorisations et des moyens qui doivent assurer l'unité de base du système socio-économique et l'unité du domaine économique (l'unité du marché est sous-entendue) et le fonctionnement et l'action de toutes les forces et processus qui permettent la modernisation et l'intégration objective et subjective des besoins et des volontés des hommes et du pays; d) le garant de l'égalité des nations, des nationalités et des citoyens; e) le protecteur des libertés et droits civiques fondamentaux. Ce sont là des fonctions minimales de la communauté et c'est à cause d'elles que l'on forme une suprastructure politique fédérale à laquelle on confère des »affaires« présentant un intérêt général, sans être limitée par un autre pouvoir, mais sous l'influence et le contrôle de l'opinion de toute la société, y compris les républiques et d'autres »structures« qui forment d'ailleurs cette communauté.

Ce concept de fédération et cette conception de ses fonctions sont des caractéristiques durables du *fédéralisme yougoslave*; Les Amendements de 1971 mettent tout ceci au point (malgré certains tâtonnements au début de leur application).

B. Les intérêts »généraux« et »communs«

Des fonctions stables et dans un certain sens durables de la fédération dans son ensemble découle de système d'organes déterminé, les compétences, les autorisations et les moyens de ces organes. Ces compétences, autorisations et moyens appartiennent à la fédération dans un sens plus étroit, afin que les fonctions mentionnées ci-haut puissent

⁴ Dans la signification anglo-américaine: The fédérale Government, ou en français: l'Etat fédéral.

être exercées de la façon la plus efficace et la plus responsable. Ces fonctions sont fédérales. D'après leur caractère elles traduisent, sont l'expression des *intérêts communs* élevés au rang des *intérêts généraux* («la volonté de tous devenant la volonté générale» dans le sens Rousseauste).

La notion «intérêt général» est inséparable de l'essence et des fonctions déterminées de la fédération. L'intérêt général des fonctions déterminées doit, dans une société moins hétérogène et «intéressée», s'égaliser avec les intérêts communs. L'essence de la première notion réside en ce que dans un cas concret elle devient «loi» même quand elle ne comprend pas ou ne satisfait pas à tous les intérêts particuliers, car ceci, selon la règle, n'est pas possible; sa suprématie ne pourrait dépendre de la volonté individuelle, déterminée sur cette base, de chaque république et autre.⁵

Les fonctions présentant un intérêt général doivent être fixées d'une façon plus durable (dans la Constitution), si bien qu'elles ne peuvent être définies, contestées et dépendre des intérêts, individuels ou particuliers, ou de quelque chose d'autre — ce qui ne veut pas dire qu'elles ne peuvent pas, selon une procédure constitutionnelle établie, et dans une certaine mesure par l'interprétation de l'Assemblée fédérale et de la Cour constitutionnelle de Yougoslavie, être changées, ou que l'on ne pourrait ouvertement et avec responsabilité critiquer les *modalités et l'ampleur de leur exercice*. Cette attitude est à la fois un argument durable et une condition pour l'existence d'une communauté en tant que fédération et d'une fédération en tant que communauté. Le développement du fédéralisme yougoslave enregistre une réduction de ces fonctions (elles touchent aux domaines de la défense nationale, des affaires étrangères et de l'unité du marché).

La notion: fonction présentant un intérêt général est insuffisante pour exprimer toute la complexité des autres fonctions au sein de la fédération, que nous appellerons fonctions communes. Il s'agit des fonctions communes des républiques et des organismes et constitutions autogestionnaires, et aussi de certains autres acteurs de la vie sociale et politique en Yougoslavie. Selon la Constitution de 1963 et en vertu des amendements constitutionnels, elles sont exercées «en commun», c'est-à-dire par la voie de l'entente de tous les partenaires.

C. Les droits et les obligations de la fédération

1. La théorie et la Constitution yougoslaves distinguent, bien que pas toujours conséquemment et avec précision (ce qui n'est pas objectivement toujours possible) trois catégories fondamentales au travers

⁵ Cette conception s'est dégagée, dans une certaine mesure, des discussions menées à la première conf. de la Ligue des communistes de Yougoslavie, et elle a été la base du rejet du veto comme instrument de votation (le droit de veto a été introduit) mais aux termes des Amendements de 1971 en forme d'unanimité des républiques pour l'adoption de certaines décisions de la fédération ou pour donner le consentement nécessaire aux fins que ces décisions reçoivent la force d'une loi.

desquelles s'exprime la position, la substance et l'ampleur du pouvoir des communautés socio-politiques — de la fédération à la commune. Ces catégories sont parfois confondues ou prises comme synonyme, et ceci le plus souvent sous terme des fonctions. Les fonctions sont en même temps l'expression active de la position et du rôle d'une communauté socio-politique. Dans les fonctions s'expriment et se confirment le concept et le projet d'une communauté, et surtout de la fédération en tant que communauté (par exemple: »la fédération assure la totalité territoriale et la souveraineté du pays«. Les »droits et les devoirs« sont la façon globale d'exprimer les fonctions et sont plus déterminés. Les »droits et devoirs« sont rattachés à une organisation concrète du pouvoir qui personnifie la communauté socio-politique — fédération, république, etc. Quand on dit: les droits et devoirs de la fédération on pense, selon la règle, que l'on concrétise et l'on détermine ainsi les responsabilités de la fédération dans un sens plus étroit, voire du mécanisme fédéral du pouvoir et du gouvernement. Dans le langage courant, cette catégorie, qui s'est déjà manifestée dans la Constitution de 1963, est appelée aussi — fonction.

La »compétence« est une catégorie juridique encore plus précise et plus concrète. Elle sous-entend à la fois le domaine, les autorisations, la forme de l'exercice des droits et des devoirs d'un organe déterminé; et enfin le caractère et la détermination de l'organe auquel on confie tout ceci moyennant une responsabilité déterminée.

2. Ces catégories n'ont pas essentiellement, et primordialement, une certaine importance pour la théorie. Elles sont d'un intérêt particulier pour la formulation constitutionnelle plus précise de la position et du rôle des communautés socio-politiques particulières, et de la fédération notamment. La Constitution de 1963 s'est servie de ces catégories. Les fonctions ont reçu de l'importance non seulement dans le chapitre des »*Principes fondamentaux*«, mais aussi dans de nombreuses autres dispositions. En outre, la Constitution elle-même est une des fonctions fondamentales de la fédération car elle la constitue à la fois comme communauté et comme organisation fédérale du pouvoir et du gouvernement. Les droits et les devoirs sont traités à partir de l'alinéa 4, de l'article 96 du Titre V — »Des communautés socio-politiques.« Les droits et les devoirs de la fédération ne s'épuisent pas dans ce contexte précis, car ils sont élaborés dans presque tous les titres de la Constitution.

Quand on étudie de plus près le rapport entre le sous-titre sur la fédération, voire l'ensemble des dispositions constitutionnelles sur la fédération et ses droits et devoirs, en relation avec le Titre VIII consacré aux »Compétences des organes de la fédération«, on peut relever une certaine discordance à propos de certaines questions. Bien que l'on ait indiqué dans la théorie et dans la science du droit constitutionnel que la compétence doit être interpréter et appliquer conformément aux droits et devoirs, dans la pratique les dispositions sur la compétence étaient comprises comme étant primaires et non secondaires. Ceci a conduit (mais d'une façon décisive comme certain l'affirment à tort) à un élargissement des compétences de la fédération, et surtout dans

le domaine de la législation et des relations matérielles et économiques. Quant aux lois, elles allaient encore plus loin des formulations relativement vastes et indéterminées sur les compétences de la fédération, telles qu'elles figurent dans le Titre VIII.

Dans les amendements de 1971 (projet de l'Amendement XXIX notamment) on abandonne le terme compétence de la fédération, et pour l'ensemble et le champ de ses activités et pouvoirs on utilise l'expression constitutionnelle «droits et devoirs». Ainsi on fixe — principe posé et admis dans la théorie du droit constitutionnel — que les droits et les devoirs sont la base, le cadre et l'indication des formes pour la détermination des compétences des organes, en générale, et par là même des organes de la fédération.

Les droits et les devoirs de la fédération couvrent tout d'abord les droits et les devoirs qui ont, comme nous l'avons déjà montré, un intérêt général pour la Yougoslavie dans son ensemble, et seulement conditionnellement ceux qui sont d'un intérêt commun pour les républiques et la fédération, ou sont seulement d'un intérêt commun pour les républiques, en assumant toutefois qu'ils soient fondamentalement la fonction et la compétence des républiques dans la signification plus large du terme. Une telle conception nous facilite la définition, aussi précise que possible, des droits et des devoirs de la fédération, l'accomplissement des changements prévus dans la fédération et les républiques, et aussi la création d'un fondement solide pour la détermination encore plus précise des compétences des organes fédéraux.

Ceci dit, il convient de souligner plus particulièrement que ces droits et devoirs de la fédération n'excluent pas mais, au contraire, supposent l'engagement, la responsabilité et par la même la compétence de la république au sein de la fédération. Ceci ressort déjà explicitement de l'article 113 de la Constitution, où l'on souligne que presque tous les droits et devoirs fondamentaux de la fédération sont réalisés et assurés par les peuples et les citoyens, et cela veut dire par les nationalités, et plus particulièrement les républiques et les provinces (c'est-à-dire les communes) qui sont, dans une mesure considérable, les participants dans la décision et l'exécution de cette fonction. Ce principe constitutionnel est concrétisé et élaboré dans les Amendements constitutionnels de 1971, si bien qu'il s'est transformé en un principe sur la «responsabilité des républiques pour le fonctionnement de la fédération» ce qui est, pour sa part, l'une des innovations essentielles dans la présente structure du fédéralisme.

3. Les droits et les devoirs présentant un intérêt général pour la Yougoslavie, qui doivent être assurés par la fédération et pour lesquels la fédération est au fond responsable et qui constituent son essence, sont les suivants:

- 1) assurer la souveraineté, la totalité territoriale et la sécurité extérieure de la Yougoslavie;
- 2) assurer la défense du pays et de ses obligations internationales;
- 3) assurer les relations internationales;

4) protéger et développer les bases du système politique socialiste, démocratique, et autogestionnaire et des droits souverains des républiques;

5) assurer l'égalité intégrale des peuples et nationalités;

6) protéger et constituer l'unité du marché, et assurer la circulation libre des biens et tous les autres produits du travail, de même qu'établir et assurer l'unité du système financier et l'adaptation globale du développement économique (planification);

7) assurer la position socio-économique unique du travail et des travailleurs dans des relations socialistes, de même que l'égalité des libertés et droits élémentaires de l'homme;

8) assurer l'application de la Constitution et de la constitutionnalité et la légalité qui en découle;

9) assurer le système et l'ordre constitutionnel (sécurité constitutionnelle ou d'Etat), de même que l'unité du système législatif.

Ces droits et devoirs sont déterminés et assurés par la Constitution, et, conformément à celle-ci, par la politique, les lois et d'autres actes, mesures et moyens des organes d'Etat fédéraux et des organisations, y compris la participation et la coopération correspondante des républiques, des provinces, des communes, de même que des citoyens et de leurs organisations.

A la différence de la Constitution présente, et dans le cadre de ses principes, on pourrait prendre en considération ces deux postulats sur les droits et les devoirs.

Les droits et les devoirs qui appartiennent aux communautés socio-politiques, exception faite de ceux qui sont déterminés par la Constitution pour la fédération, sont assurés par les républiques, les provinces autonomes et les communes, conformément aux constitutions des républiques, aux lois constitutionnelles des provinces (et aux statuts des communes).

45 Dans le domaine de l'éducation, de l'enseignement, de la santé, de la culture et d'autres questions présentant un intérêt commun, les républiques peuvent librement former des institutions communes ou régler ces questions par voie de concertation. Dans ces domaines, également, la fédération peut prendre des initiatives et acquérir des droits et devoirs déterminés, à partir des initiatives et des accords des républiques.

4. Conformément aux prémisses politiques et à l'opinion publique du pays quant à la nécessité de délimiter la »politique de l'Etat (fédération et république), c'est-à-dire d'assurer constitutionnellement l'autogestion, il s'avère nécessaire de souligner trois principes constitutionnels relativement nouveaux. Ces trois principes non écrits découlent de l'esprit et de l'exposé de motifs officiels des récents amendements apportés à la Constitution de la Yougoslavie. Ce sont:

1) Les lois fédérales et d'autres mesures de la fédération ne peuvent pas limiter les droits autogestionnaires des communes et leurs moyens autonomes qui sont déterminés et assurés par les constitutions des républiques;

2) Ce n'est que dans la Constitution et sur la base de celle-ci que l'on peut adopter des principes touchant aux organisations de travail et à leurs associations, leurs unifications et aux autres formes d'intégration. La loi ne peut pas limiter l'autogestion, l'autonomie et la liberté des activités d'affaires, et la procédure économique selon laquelle seront répartis les moyens réalisés par le travail. Les concertations autogestionnaires et les normes autonomes sont des actes des organisations autogestionnaires et de leurs droits et devoirs protégés par la constitution;

3) La loi ne peut pas limiter ou donner d'autres interprétations des droits autogestionnaires et des autres libertés et droits constitutionnels de l'homme et du citoyen.

5. Et enfin, quelques mots sur quelques questions ouvertes dans le contexte de la forme fédérative de la Yougoslavie. La fédération, fixée et limitée par ses droits et devoirs, ne peut exister et exercer ses tâches et ses fonctions si elle n'a pas ses propres moyens matériels et fonctionnels. Elle doit avoir ses revenus et doit les fixer par l'entremise du budget et des lois.

Elle doit avoir aussi des autorisations et des moyens pour assurer l'application des lois et de la politique dans les domaines pour lesquels elle est responsable. Ceci est particulièrement important dans le système de la dite voie unique, c'est-à-dire dans la situation dans laquelle — à l'exception de la défiance et des affaires étrangères — les lois et la politique fédérales sont mises en oeuvre par les républiques et les provinces. Dans une fédération qui repose sur la primauté de l'Etat républicain et sur le fédéralisme contractuel, cette procédure d'exécution est une contradiction particulière et elle comporte le danger de dissonances dans le fonctionnement.

Enfin — et ceci est particulièrement important de souligner à l'heure actuelle en raison de malentendus et d'attitudes contraires dans de nombreux milieux — le fait que les droits et les devoirs de la fédération doivent être déterminés avec précision et délimités nettement ne veut pas dire qu'elle s'entoure de la muraille de Chine pour se séparer de la société et par là même des républiques. Au contraire, dans la réalité il existe un rapport de délimitation, sujet à des changements permanents et inévitables, et aussi un rapport de coopération, de complémentarité, de croisement, de compromis et de conflits entre ces communautés socio-politiques. C'est sur cette base que se déchifrent les relations entre la vie et les organismes variables, et aussi les fonctions de la fédération reçoivent ainsi leur contenu intégral, contenu qui change et ses modalités d'exécution aussi.

Le «fédéralisme constitutionnel» pur est formel et statique s'il n'est pas animé par la pensée théorique résultant de la connaissance et des expériences.

D. *La position et l'importance de la république dans la République socialiste fédérative de Yougoslavie*

1. Chaque fonction dans la fédération signifie une relation déterminée. Par conséquent, la base et le revers de la fonction de la fédération est la république. La république n'est pas seulement une communauté per se, une communauté et un état national et socialiste; elle est aussi la partie constituante et la force élémentaire de la fédération qui est dans ce sens, »la République des républiques« (Montesquieu). Sans les républiques la Yougoslavie ne peut exister; elle est leur création commune. Or, sans la Yougoslavie, elles, non plus, ne sont pas ce qu'elles sont aujourd'hui. Comme telle, la république est une communauté autonome dans lesquelles se constitue la vie de ses peuples (nations et nationalités), et des citoyens aussi. Elle doit, toujours plus et de plus en plus nettement, prendre cette position dans la structure de la communauté yougoslave. Dans le même temps, elle est aussi une partie (facteur) de la communauté plus large, et pas seulement en ce sens qu'elle s'intègre dans un système constitutionnel et légal unique, qui comprend les garanties de la fédération dans un sens plus restreint, mais parce que se développent, sont assurés et se construisent, en son sein, des rapports qui sont caractéristiques pour l'existence et le projet de la communauté socialiste, démocratique et autogestionnaire (la R.S.F. de Yougoslavie) comme une entité.

Par conséquent, dans le domaine des fonctions historiques et sociologiques et des fonctions prescrites *présentant un intérêt général* il existe une influence réciproque, une complémentarité et un croisement des relations »fédération — républiques«. Seules des responsabilités nettes (accompagnées des droits et des moyens) des structures fédérales et républicaines doivent empêcher que ces relations, complexes et potentiellement contradictoires ne se compliquent et n'aboutissent à une lutte pour le pouvoir ou à la passivité des fonctions fédérales, et pas seulement de celles-ci.

2. Dans l'exercice même des fonctions présentant un intérêt général la fédération n'a pas seulement des droits et des attitudes déterminées à l'égard des républiques dans le sens organique (dans le sens de l'appareil républicain), et pas seulement à l'égard des républiques en tant que communautés. Ces fonctions sont prévues en même temps par rapport à d'autres activités et organisations constituées et libres, telles que sont notamment celles qui apparaissent dans le domaine de l'autogestion dans toute les sphères de la société, et ceci sans égard si ces activités et organisations se situent sur le territoire de la république. La centralisation encore existante et l'aspect inachevé du système économique, et notamment des intégrations autogestionnaires, ont pour conséquence que le problème des fonctions de la fédération dans ce sens est compris comme une question de la position et des droits de la république comme telle, et le plus souvent de la république comme Etat, voire comme un appareil du pouvoir.

Ce n'est pas parce qu'elle vit dans une communauté unique (fédérative), mais avant tout parce qu'elle est engagée à se moderniser et

à s'intégrer des intégrations économiques, techniques et autres, objectivement conditionnées, que la république ne peut pas se fermer sur elle-même et proclamer la mission d'auto-suffisance, même pas dans l'exercice de sa fonction de communauté nationale et dans l'accomplissement de l'individualité nationale des hommes qui y vivent.

En partant de ces prémisses, qui sont aujourd'hui des faits et que l'on ne peut perdre de vue, le problème des fonctions de la fédération et en général des relations entre la fédération et les républiques, ouvre des possibilités nouvelles, possibilités qui distinguent ce que nous appelons spécificité ou «caractère autogestionnaire» du fédéralisme en Yougoslavie.

3. Une telle attitude politique à l'égard des républiques et leur statut constitutionnel pareil constituent la base des récents changements constitutionnels et la caractéristique essentielle du «nouveau fédéralisme». Les raisons ne doivent pas en être cherchées dans le renouvellement de la doctrine sur les *State's rights* mais dans la structure autogestionnaire et multinationale de la société yougoslave, ou plus exactement dans la solution démocratique et moderne de la question sociale (de classe) et nationale (éthnique).

IV. DES FORMES PARTICULIERES DU FEDERALISME EN YOUGOSLAVIE

A. Le fédéralisme coopératif et le fédéralisme contractuel

1. Tout fédéralisme réel, comme expression des structures pluralistes diverses, est polyvalent. Le fédéralisme yougoslave l'est aujourd'hui plus qu'auparavant, non seulement dans sa perspective mais aussi dans le sens institutionnel (et notamment en vertu des Amendements de 1971).

A côté du fédéralisme classique il existe aussi un fédéralisme «nouveau». Le fédéralisme classique se traduit par la dualité du pouvoir, c'est-à-dire dans la division en pouvoir commun, central et local et dans les relations qui existe entre eux. Le nouveau fédéralisme est, pour l'essentiel, social et volontaire.

Parmi les formes du «nouveau fédéralisme» il convient de mettre en évidence, en premier lieu, le dit «*fédéralisme coopératif*» qui comprend les fonctions, les activités et les actions présentant un intérêt commun pour les républiques prises comme communautés, voire pour les peuples, les travailleurs et les citoyens qui y vivent, et la procédure de leur règlement *convenu*.

2. L'aspect fondamental du fédéralisme coopératif est la *collaboration inter-républicaine* et le règlement bilatéral et en commun de toutes les affaires, qui ne sont pas seulement d'un intérêt commun, mais sont parfois identiques dans toutes ou dans certaines des républiques (et rapports entre les institutions des républiques, mais aussi au sein d'une république, et ceci dans toutes les sphères de la vie économique, scientifique et culturelle. Cette collaboration peut recevoir des formes institutionnelles ou s'effectuer *ad hoc*. Elle peut être initiée par les interes-

sés, et cela devrait devenir une règle. Tout ceci se passe dans le fédération en tant que communauté et fait de sorte qu'elle se développe et se constitue toujours d'en bas, comme une communauté sociale. Or, on ne peut pas contester à la fédération, dans le sens plus restreint, le droit de stimuler et d'initier cette coopération et aussi le droit d'y participer de façons diverses, y compris les fonds matériels et autres. L'expérience de nombre de fédérations dans le monde (et notamment celles des Etats-Unis) connaît la grande importance de cette collaboration «fédération-républiques» pour l'unité socio-économique et pour le progrès du pays et de tous.

Ce qui est essentiel, c'est qu'il s'agit ici d'intérêts communs qui sont définis et résolus sur une base volontaire entre les républiques, à l'unanimité et avec leur responsabilité directe et exclusive. Tout ceci n'était pas appliqué jusqu'à présent dans la pratique de la fédération yougoslave, ce qui est la conséquence non seulement d'une voie centralisée dans le développement antérieur du fédéralisme yougoslave mais aussi de l'influence de la mentalité étatique héritée dans les républiques elles-mêmes. Il va de soi, qu'une certaine territorialisation et un certain hermétisme des républiques, et en particulier les (non) rapports qui existaient entre elles ces temps derniers, ne pouvaient influencer sur les orientations modernes. Cette forme de collaboration interrépublicaine ou du fédéralisme coopératif limite les tendances de l'appareil fédéral à élargir les formes centralisées et même bureaucratiques du règlement des affaires communes, et la formulation de conceptions analogues de ces affaires.

Jusqu'à présent on adoptait cette procédure schématisée, car on ne voyait d'autre expression, meilleure, ou on n'avait pas d'autres voies coopératives, et non en raison, ou avant tout, d'un étatisme ou centralisme «inné» de la fédération.

3. Parmi les fonctions purement fédérales (présentant un intérêt général) et les affaires d'intérêt commun pour les républiques il y a aussi des affaires présentant un *intérêt commun* d'une catégorie spécifique. En principe, il existe là un intérêt commun pour les citoyens et les organisations, ainsi que pour l'unité fondamentale du système social et politique et son développement et sa position dans le monde, pour que tout soit résolu dans le cadre de la fédération. Dans ce domaine, les constitutions établissent (le même vaut pour la Constitution de la Yougoslavie, y compris l'Amendement XVII), les droits normatifs, soit les droits de l'Assemblée fédérale, en forme, selon la règle, des lois «générales», «de cadre» et autres lois analogues.

Le développement de la société entraîne l'élargissement ou le rétrécissement de ce domaine des affaires communes, et notamment en fonction du développement de l'intégration sociale, de l'extension des droits de l'homme et de la participation de l'Etat dans la communauté et l'intégration internationale. Ce domaine particulier a été matière des dites lois générales qui étaient, pour l'essentiel, comprises d'avantages comme centralistes que coopératives. Cet état de choses a pour résultat que l'on rejette, à la légère, ou que l'on sous-estime ces lois. Or, elles sont le moyen d'élargir les «intérêts communs» sur le compte

des »intérêts« généraux derrière lesquelles peut toujours s'infiltrer un centralisme normatif exagéré.

4. La distinction entre les »fonctions présentant un intérêt général« et celles qui sont d'un »intérêt commun« revêt une importance centrale pour la définition de la fédération et de ses rapports avec les républiques. Les fonctions d'intérêt général sont la condition de la fédération et par là même le droit propre (et exclusif) de sa structure politique et d'Etat. Envisagé du point de vue de la Constitution et du droit, l'exercice de ces fonctions n'est pas seulement un droit, il est aussi la responsabilité du système fédéral du pouvoir, si bien que sa formulation et sa réalisation ne peut être — de l'aspect du droit — conditionné par quelques consentements ou votes préalables, complémentaires et analogues, des républiques; et il est surtout — envisagé du point de vue de la théorie et rationnellement — en dehors de l'emprise de tout droit de veto. On renonce à cette logique de la fédération, seulement si les intérêts politiques et nationalistes ont une influence décisive sur les modifications constitutionnelles.

Or, le respect de la logique, c'est-à-dire de la fonctionnalité du système fédéral ne veut pas dire que dans toutes les questions controversées les organes de la fédération large et aussi certain que possible des citoyens et de leurs organisations, y compris les organes mêmes des républiques, et pas seulement leurs formes officielles ou d'Etat. En outre, dans l'exercice de ces affaires, et en partie sur le plan des actes régulatifs, peuvent (et doivent) participer les républiques, voire les provinces (telles que la politique extérieure, la défense nationale, la sécurité, etc.). Or, les affaires présentant un intérêt général pour la fédération dans son ensemble relèvent des droits et des devoirs, et par là même de la responsabilité intégrale de l'organisation fédérale. Une certaine responsabilité complémentaire et indispensable des républiques (et des provinces) ne réduit pas la responsabilité de la fédération. La transmission et la confusion des responsabilités et la pire forme d'irresponsabilité.

En ce qui concerne les *affaires présentant un intérêt commun* qui seraient décidées par l'entremise de la structure fédérale, les républiques devraient pouvoir participer aux initiatives préalables, et surtout à la prise de décision. L'adoption des lois générales devraient dépendre des propositions des républiques (quatre au moins, soit trois si les deux provinces participent), cependant que le contenu de la décision au niveau fédéral serait décidé au préalable par le Conseil des nationalités, par une majorité qualifiée des deux tiers de l'ensemble de ses membres. L'Assemblée fédérale (et le Conseil exécutif fédéral) auraient le droit d'amorcer des initiatives pour l'adoption de ces lois. Mais cette initiative devient projet moyennant le consentement des républiques. Ceci vaudrait aussi pour diverses politiques dans divers domaines de la vie sociale du pays.

L'on ne sait pas encore si la pratique constitutionnelle évoluera dans ce sens.

5. La différence entre l'exercice des fonctions d'un intérêt général et commun n'est pas un plaidoyer, et ne signifie pas l'existence d'une

supériorité abstraite quelconque de l'appareil de la fédération, en vue d'une «définition» des intérêts généraux comme «supranationaux», voire «supra-républicains (ces termes sont souvent ambigus, de même qu'il n'est pas tout à fait clair dans quelle mesure ils peuvent être régressifs, provinciaux et nationalistes). Bien que du point de vue de la théorie, de la Constitution et du droit les intérêts généraux présupposent la transcendance des intérêts individuels (même quand il s'agit des intérêts républicains) la formulation de ces intérêts se fonde dans l'actuel ordre constitutionnel, sur le consensus constitutionnel et sur le caractère des organes qui définissent concrètement ces fonctions. Ainsi, on a assuré dans la première catégorie de ces fonctions l'influence des républiques, influence qui est plus grande que dans aucune des fédérations jusqu'à présent.

6. Plus qu'une forme spéciale, le «fédéralisme contractuel» est l'un des possibles, aujourd'hui (selon les Amendements de 1971 et l'orientation politique) notamment. Ses instruments juridiques sont de formes orientées et la méthode du fédéralisme coopératif, soit ce qui est convenu d'appeler: concertations et conventions autogestionnaires qui sont encore une idée constitutionnelle qui doit s'affirmer dans la pratique. Ils doivent être mieux définis et acceptés. Et ils ne le seront pas uniquement et primordialement du fait d'avoir été introduits dans les amendements constitutionnels, mais plutôt par le développement d'une intégration véritable et si les rapports dans l'économie et la société deviennent moins compétitifs et mercantiles et plus socialistes et solidaires.

Un problème particulier de ces contrats, ou du statut des contrats, ou «contrat-loi» est leur contenu juridique et leur valeur juridique, leur caractère juridique, et leur protection. La science et la pratique du droit n'ont pas encore réussi à élaborer et à résoudre ces nouvelles questions intéressant le fédéralisme contractuel.

B. Le fédéralisme de participation, fonctionnel et limité

1. La participation des républiques dans la structure de la fédération est l'une des caractéristiques et originalités, nouvelles et à longue portée, de la République socialiste fédérative de Yougoslavie. La forme élémentaire du fédéralisme de participation concerne la structure et la composition des organes de la fédération, — Conseil des nationalités, Présidence de la R.S.F. de Yougoslavie et Conseil exécutif fédérale et les organes de l'administration fédérale qui sont formés de plus en plus comme corps délégués des républiques et des provinces, conformément au principe de parité, c'est-à-dire représentation égale des républiques et représentation correspondante des provinces.

Il ne fait pas de doute que dans une fédération multinationale, telle que la Yougoslavie, et avec l'état de choses actuel dans les relations politiques intérieures, et même en général, la représentation des républiques et des provinces dans les organes de la fédération est inévitable. Ceci dit, toute forme de discrimination ou de priorité des uns sur quelle base que ce soit: nationale, républicaine ou autre, ne pour-

ront être tolérées. Il est certain que dans la composition des corps politiques, tels que l'Assemblée et la Présidence de la R.S.F. de Yougoslavie, le principe de parité a sa rationalité politique. Or, toute absolutisation et transmission schématique de la parité sur le domaine de toutes les organisations et services changent la structure et le concept de fédération et créent des problèmes nouveaux et à longue portée, qui aiguiseront toute procédure superficielle et arithmétique de son application. Celui qui manque de s'en rendre compte porte préjudice non seulement à la fédération, mais à sa nation et nationalité, à sa république et sa province — et à l'homme avant toute autre chose. La règle élémentaire de toute politique raisonnée est que même le principe politique le meilleur ne devrait pas être idéalisé, c'est-à-dire appliquer sans égard aux conditions.

L'aspect radical du fédéralisme de participation est la participation directe des républiques dans la prise des décisions de la fédération, c'est-à-dire leur consentement. Ainsi, les amendements constitutionnels seront adoptés si approuvés par toutes les républiques et provinces (Amendement XXXII), et l'acte économique le plus important de la fédération est adopté sur la base des positions adaptées des républiques (si elles font défaut, on ne peut qu'apporter des décisions provisoires — Amendement XXXIII).

2. En ce qui concerne les fonctions de la fédération, la position et le rôle des républiques dans la communauté fédérative yougoslave sont caractéristiques des deux caractéristiques suivantes du fédéralisme en Yougoslavie:

a) fédéralisme fonctionnel;

b) fédéralisme limité, c'est-à-dire la limitation des fonctions de la fédération par des valeurs socio-politiques et constitutionnelles élémentaires.

Le fédéralisme fonctionnel comprend le processus (encore négligé et limité par les conceptions et relations territoriales-étatiques) de l'intégration autogestionnaire, intégration qui s'opère non seulement dans l'économie mais aussi dans les autres sphères de la vie économique et culturelle. Dans cette intégration agissent les forces et les besoins d'association des «affaires», selon la règle, d'un intérêt commun pour les sujets autogestionnaires et autres de la vie sociale et politique. Cette intégration est, au fond, fédérative dans le sens plus profond du terme, et elle doit être soutenue par les républiques, en tant que partie et tenant de la communauté fédérative.

Or, cette intégration ne peut se constituer conformément aux schémas aprioristes des relations entre la fédération et les républiques; au contraire, elle dépend du caractère et de l'activité des fonctions qui s'intègrent, et selon la règle, *elle dépasse le concept socio-juridique et territorial du fédéralisme*. Le fait que ce concept se maintient encore, pour l'essentiel, et qu'il tend à devenir universel, c'est là une conséquence du défaut de comprendre toute la complexité et la spécificité du fédéralisme démocratique et socialiste. Cet état de chose signifie en même temps une faiblesse dans la mise en oeuvre des principes proclamés et d'autres principes démocratiques, dans la constitution d'une

société socialiste comme «association libre des hommes libres». Le pouvoir fédéral (et l'assemblée même) est limité par cette forme de fédéralisme, et la république l'est aussi dans ses deux aspects (à la fois comme communauté et comme pouvoir) — et c'est précisément ce en quoi réside le concept du socialisme d'autogestion et de son système politique, qui est aliéné par la théorie et la pratique dans laquelle on cherche la primauté de la république comme «étatisme», c'est-à-dire le renouvellement des structures politiques de la république comme pouvoir véritable et dominant.

3. Quant à la position de la république, un autre concept est intéressant — celui du système politique et constitutionnel qui — théoriquement et d'après la Constitution — doit se libérer du centralisme bureaucratique et de la souveraineté parlementaire classique. La fédération n'est pas «supérieure» en tout, car elle est une communauté supérieure seulement dans le cadre des fonctions, déterminées par la Constitution, présentant un intérêt général, et partiellement commun. Dans le cadre de ses droits autonomes, la république est une communauté «supérieure» par rapport à la fédération. Ceci est garanti par l'existence et la fonction de la juridiction constitutionnelle, et en particulier de la Cour constitutionnelle de Yougoslavie qui est l'organe de la fédération en tant que communauté et non en tant que structure du pouvoir.

D'autre part, la fédération est limitée par toutes ces dispositions de la Constitution qui garantissent l'inviolabilité des droits autogestionnaires et autres droits élémentaires de l'homme et du citoyen. Même l'Assemblée ne peut modifier ces droits sans tomber sous le coup de la non conformité à la constitution. La république, en tant que milieu dans lequel se réalise pour l'essentiel ces droits et libertés, est intéressée dans la plus grande mesure pour cette conception et pour cet exercice des fonctions de la fédération, ou se transforme en bastion de conservatisme ou en appareil bureaucratique qui, au fond, n'a pas de force véritable bien qu'elle la cherche ardemment.

En outre, la république est elle-même, d'après ses droits, le facteur (et la force) de limitation des fonctions fédérales. Cette force doit être réelle non seulement en matière des droits, mais aussi de par son influence et ses moyens. En dehors des fonctions fédérales, présentant un intérêt général et partiellement commun, les républiques sont compétentes et responsables de toutes les autres fonctions générales et communes sur leurs territoires, dans la mesure où ces fonctions s'exercent par l'entremise du système du pouvoir et ne sont pas le droit constitutionnelle de la commune.

Le sens de ce «fédéralisme limité» n'est pas dans la valeur constitutionnelle des forces fondamentales du système politique socialiste démocratique: l'autogestion des travailleurs et les libertés de l'homme.

C. Autonomie provinciale comme élément du fédéralisme

1. Les autonomies provinciales (Voïvodine et Kossovo) ont été dès le début même de la création de la fédération yougoslave, dans un certain sens, un «élément du fédéralisme». Ce principe se traduisait dans ce que les autonomies représentaient l'objet, et même la

création de la Constitution de la fédération, et qu'elles elisaient directement leurs représentants à la Chambre des nationalités qui a toujours été, dans un sens déterminé, le conseil des peuples et des nationalités. Cette position de l'autonomie a été gardée, dans ses lignes générales, dans les Constitutions de 1953 et de 1963, bien que l'on soulignait un deuxième côté de leur autonomie, leur appartenance à la république.

Demeurant »dans la composition de la république«, les provinces ont reçu dans une mesure considérable une interprétation politique et constitutionnelle radicalement différente par les Amendements — Amendements XVIII de la Constitution fédérale et Amendement V de la Constitution de la R.S. de Serbie, et encore plus dans les Amendements de 1971 (qui n'ont pas encore été élaborés dans la Constitution de la R.S. de Serbie). L'explication théorique de ce changement et la place relativement exceptionnelle réservée à la question de l'assertion, devenue une sorte de prémisses idéologique, selon laquelle la province autonome est un »élément du fédéralisme«.

Ce terme a été créé en même temps pour mettre en évidence les provinces et pour distinguer l'autonomie et la république par rapport à la structure de l'Etat fédéral. L'Etat fédéral est la création des peuples (nations) et de leurs républiques. Il se comprend que les parties constituantes de l'Etat fédéral peuvent être seulement des Etats unis ou associés, cependant que logiquement ne peuvent ni l'être ni devenir les sujet les plus larges d'une autonomie politico-territoriale qui font partie d'une (en principe ou de plusieurs) république. Ce postulat théorique a été confirmé par le caractère de la fédération, comme communauté volontaire, et la volonté libre est l'expression du principe du droit des peuples à l'autodétermination y compris le droit à la secession, c'est-à-dire le droit de former un Etat indépendant. Ce droit n'appartient pas aux nationalités qui sont, selon la règle, des minorités nationales, voire des parties d'une nation qui a déjà son Etat.

Dans le processus de l'application des changements actuels dans la structure de la fédération, et notamment dans la position et les fonctions des républiques, qui sont maintenant définies plus précisément qu'auparavant comme Etats des peuples souverains (des nationalités aussi, dans le sens politique), on souligne en même temps le problème de l'élargissement ultérieur non seulement des compétences des provinces, mais aussi le problème de leur position et de leur rôle dans la communauté fédérale. Comme explication particulière de cette revendication on met en avant le postulat sur l'autonomie comme élément du fédéralisme.

De toute façon, le statut constitutionnel des provinces autonomes en Yougoslavie est sans précédent et en tant que tel il constitue une des particularités rares du fédéralisme dans ce pays.

2. Par quoi l'autonomie est-elle élément du fédéralisme? Négativement parlant, l'autonomie est élément du fédéralisme, ce qui veut dire qu'elle n'est pas une unité fédérale, et ceci d'autant plus si elle fait part de la république comme Etat souverain dans une fédération dont la base politique est constituée par le principe d'égalité consécutrice et intégrale des peuples et de leurs républiques. De là découle le principe

déterminé par la Constitution, principe selon lequel la province autonome n'est pas partie constituante de la fédération en tant qu'Etat fédérale, mais qu'elle est un élément important, et même sujet de la fédération en tant que communauté socio-politique et constitutionnelle.

Positivement parlant, la position de la province autonome en tant qu'élément de la fédération se refléterait concrètement par ce qui suit:

Primo, la province autonome comme expression des droits souverains des peuples et des nationalités est une catégorie de la Constitution fédérale et ceci dans la mesure dans laquelle la Constitution est appelée et autorisée à la définir et à lui fixer sa position par rapport à la fédération comme communauté et structure, et en principe par rapport à la république dont la province autonome fait partie;

Secundo, l'autonomie est participant dans le fédéralisme de participation, ce qui veut dire qu'elle envoie un certain nombre de ses représentants et de délégués dans les organes fédéraux qui sont formés selon le dit principe paritaire (Conseil des nations et nationalités, Présidence de la R.S.F. de Yougoslavie et Conseil exécutif fédéral).⁶ Aux ressortissants des provinces appartient une place correspondante dans la composition des autres organes fédéraux, organes qui sont formés conformément à l'application du principe d'égalité et de représentation égale des républiques et des provinces, dans une mesure déterminée; la province autonome est également partenaire dans le fédéralisme contractuel;

Tertio, la province participe directement dans la détermination de la politique et dans la responsabilité à partager quant à la mise en oeuvre de cette politique et des lois de la fédération, en harmonie avec son autonomie;

Quarto, la province a le droit de s'auto-organiser conformément à la Constitution yougoslave et dans le cadre de la Constitution de la république qui est l'expression juridique et la garantie de l'existence des intérêts généraux et de la république en tant qu'entité; adopte sa loi constitutionnelle et ses lois et d'autres actes dans la même sphère des compétences, comme les républiques, à l'exception du domaine des droits et devoirs des républiques en tant qu'entités, assurent par leurs Constitutions, les lois et d'autres actes, et par les influences des organisations républicaines du pouvoir et du gouvernement, — ce qui n'avance pas, mais exclut logiquement la nécessité de mentionner toujours dans la Constitution fédérale, les provinces à côté de la république (or, les amendements de 1971 ne sont pas toujours conséquent à cet égard).

Quinto, la province en tant qu'autonomie *sui generis* est élément du fédéralisme par le truchement de la république avec laquelle elle n'est pas dans un rapport fédéral, du moins dans la signification théoriquement acceptée de cette notion (ce qui ne veut pas dire que dans la

⁶) Le rapport entre la «délégation» de la province et la «délégation de la R.S. de Serbie n'a pas été résolu théoriquement constitutionnellement et juridiquement dans son ensemble (une solution est contenue dans les Amendements de 1971, quant à l'élection du membre provincial président de la Présidence; le droit à cette élection fait partie de l'ordre républicain.

pratique et d'après les Constitutions elle n'aurait pas une indépendance vaste et importante dans sa position et son fonctionnement, indépendance du type de super-autonomie);

Sexto, la province peut avoir sur son territoire des droits autonomes, des organes et des organisations comme la république, si et au cas où ces droits, organes et organisations sont fixés par la Constitution fédérale.

3. Ce dernier aspect du fédéralisme (et d'autonomie) exige d'être précisé à part, car il peut devenir et il est déjà objet d'interprétations différentes dans la composition de la Constitution yougoslave et des amendements constitutionnels, et en général, dans la détermination des droits, de même que des organes et organisations nouvelles sur le territoire de la province, soit en dehors de la république dont la province autonome fait partie ceci n'est pas un droit arbitraire qui incombe à la Constitution fédérale. Elle ne pourrait pas ainsi réduire ou changer substantiellement la position constitutionnelle et le caractère constitutionnel de la République en tant qu'Etat; de même qu'elle ne pourrait placer une république dans une position d'inégalité vis-à-vis des autres. De même, la Constitution ne peut pas porter atteinte à certains autres principes constitutionnels, tels que l'unité du marché et la souveraineté originaire des peuples de la république. Et il est encore plus important que la Constitution fédérale n'a pas le droit de limiter ou de modifier les droits de la Constitution de la R.S. de Serbie, d'autant plus que ces droits de la république ont été déterminés dans la Constitution même de la Yougoslavie (et surtout dans l'Amendement XVIII de 1968, et dans l'Amendement XX, al. 4, notamment). La Constitution de la Yougoslavie n'est pas la loi suprême et absolue en toute chose, mais elle est une loi fondamentale dans une dimension déterminée qui est l'expression du caractère et de la structure de la fédération, et actuellement, des républiques dans une mesure croissante.

De là découlerait le principe constitutionnel général sur l'attitude de la Constitution fédérale à l'égard de la province. En dehors de la réalisation des aspects précités dans le statut de province en tant qu'élément du fédéralisme, la Constitution fédérale doit se conformer au principe d'autolimitation. Elle ne peut pas élargir la position et les droits des provinces au-delà des principes déterminés par la Constitution, de même qu'elle n'a pas le droit d'établir, selon son propre choix, un contact direct entre la fédération et les provinces et encore moins d'égaliser, à son gré, la république et la province, ou de changer la première tout en changeant la deuxième. En tout cas, la Constitution fédérale doit contenir moins de dispositions sur la province que sur la république qui est déjà de moins en moins, et doit continuer dans ce sens, le sujet de la Constitution fédérale. Cette Constitution détermine les bases du système social et politique et l'organisation fédérale, et ce n'est que dans cette fonction qu'elle contient des dispositions de principe déterminées sur la république qui demeure le sujet originaire de sa propre constitution. La situation actuelle, et en particulier après l'introduction de l'Amendement XVIII (et d'après les nouveaux Amendements de 1971) n'est pas conforme aux principes et n'offre pas ni la

véritable image et la fonction de la Constitution fédérale, ni celles de la province et de la république.

Toutes ces questions devront être résolues définitivement dans le texte futur (nouveau ou révisé) de la Constitution de la Yougoslavie. Or, ceci n'«achèvera» pas la construction constitutionnelle de la province. La Constitution de la Serbie est appelée à circonscrire définitivement la position, les droits et la responsabilité des provinces, et à trouver une solution rationnelle à une suite de problèmes ouverts.

Tout ceci dégagera parallèlement le fait que les provinces autonomes ne sont pas seulement élément du fédéralisme selon la Constitution fédérale, c'est-à-dire dans le cadre de la fédération en tant que communauté, mais aussi selon la Constitution de la république en tant qu'entité. Ainsi, la constitution de la république devient un acte de confirmation et d'élaboration de l'autonomie en tant qu'élément du fédéralisme. Ce côté dans la position et le caractère de la province autonome exige une étude théorique plus profonde et une élaboration constitutionnelle dans la république et les provinces. La condition à remplir pour tout ceci, c'est de dépasser, dans le traitement de ces questions, les positions politiques élémentaires et les solutions quasi-pragmatiques. Le temps est venu, peut-être, pour l'entamer, et notamment pour repenser la conception selon laquelle l'isolement de la province n'est pas et ne peut être sa force. Au contraire, il est dans l'intérêt objectif de la province (de ses peuples, nationalités et des hommes) de faire partie de la république, tout comme la république reçoit d'une telle province un nouvel élément de la force.

4. A cet égard, tout comme dans l'ensemble, le nouveau fédéralisme en Yougoslavie peut avoir un intérêt pour la théorie et la pratique seulement si, en adoptant des solutions nouvelles pour les aspirations actuelles et justifiées des peuples et des hommes à s'exprimer et à être des sujets politiques de leur histoire, il n'affaiblit pas mais renforce et élargit l'unité et la solidarité dans lesquels les peuples et les hommes pourront s'affirmer plus librement et se sentir plus en sécurité que dans leurs petits milieux patriarcaux et dans leurs provinces et «pays» (ou petits Etats vassaux). Se diviser en vue d'une option libre et en vue de la création de communautés démocratiques plus vastes — ce sont des airs de la mélodie dialectique de l'histoire contemporaine, des airs qui atteignent déjà nos rivages. Aiguiser son ouïe pour pouvoir capter cette mélodie est la condition du progrès, de la paix et de la liberté.

Au début de ce siècle, le grand historien F. Turnis (*The Frontier in American History*) écrivait que le fédéralisme américain contient l'image du développement futur du monde. Ce n'est que partiellement exact. L'apparition du nouveau fédéralisme témoigne qu'il n'existe pas une formule fédérale unique et parfaite, mais qu'ici aussi la diversité des formes et la nécessité du changement deviennent la loi de l'histoire sociale et nationale du monde.

Dr JOVAN DJORDJEVIC

Dr Jovan Djordjević, professeur à la Faculté de droit de l'Université de Beograd et juge à la Cour Constitutionnelle de Yougoslavie, est né le 10 mars 1908 à Beograd. Promu au grade de docteur ès sciences à Paris en 1933, il fut nommé chargé de cours à la Faculté de droit en 1936. Pendant la guerre, il quitta son service pour prendre part à la lutte de libération. Depuis 1945, il est professeur titulaire à la chaire des sciences politiques et du droit constitutionnel.

Il est membre de plusieurs académies internationales et sociétés scientifiques, vice-président de l'Association internationale pour les sciences politiques et membre de toutes les académies de sciences yougoslaves. Il a fait des conférences à de nombreuses facultés étrangères. Membre actif de l'Institut international pour la philosophie politique et de l'Académie internationale pour les sciences politiques et le droit constitutionnel, professeur adjoint à la Faculté de Droit de Paris, docteur honoris causa de l'Université de Paris et de l'Université de Strasbourg. De 1961 à 1964, le professeur Djordjević fut vice-président de l'Association internationale pour les sciences politiques.

Dans le domaine des sciences politiques, une haute estime est accordée par les milieux scientifiques et par la critique aux œuvres capitales suivantes du professeur Djordjević: La Yougoslavie démocratie socialiste (1957), Le droit constitutionnel et le système politique (1961 et 1962), Le socialisme et la démocratie (1961), Le système politique (1967), Le droit constitutionnel (1967).

En soulevant des questions de base relatives à l'édification du socialisme et à ses perspectives en Yougoslavie et dans le monde, le professeur Djordjević a développé et appliqué systématiquement le concept marxiste de la politique dans la conception et l'analyse de la démocratie socialiste dans les conditions actuelles.

L'activité publique actuelle du professeur Djordjević comprend aussi d'autres obligations, parmi lesquelles il y a lieu de mentionner particulièrement sa fonction de rédacteur en chef de la revue «Archives pour la jurisprudence et les sciences sociales» et celle de président de l'Association yougoslave pour les sciences politiques. Le professeur Djordjević s'est distingué également comme participant et organisateur de maintes réunions scientifiques dans le pays et à l'étranger. En 1967, il fut élu juge à la Cour constitutionnelle de Yougoslavie.

Dr Najdan PAŠIĆ

Professor at the Faculty of Political Sciences

THE PRESENT JUNCTURE OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF SELF-MANAGEMENT IN YUGOSLAVIA

After more than twenty years of development (the beginning of which has been marked by the Law on handing over state economic enterprises to work collectives for management, in June 1950), self-management in Yugoslavia has reached an important historical turning point. The dilemmas with which the system is confronted and the direction in which settlements are being sought are expressed in the constitutional amendments adopted late in June of this year, above all in three amendments which are of greatest importance in this respect. These are amendments XXI XXII and XXIII which determine the character and direction of development of production relations.

The very problems which have emerged and which are due to be settled in the course of this stage of development show that the development of self-management in Yugoslavia, in spite of all avoidable and inevitable waverings and delays, has been a profoundly revolutionary process which has introduced radical changes into the basic social relations and has exerted great influence upon all institutions and spheres of social life due to which the Yugoslav society as a whole has landed in an absolutely new and original historical situation. The thing of which the most progressive thinking in Yugoslavia and in the world alike has been aware for a long time, has been confirmed: self-management, by virtue of its social substance, neither is nor can be reduced to a limited reform in the sphere of „industrial relations” which introduces certain corrections and improvement into the substantially unchanged wage-labour position of workers in relation to private capital or to the state. On the contrary, self-management has a realistic prospect and its important place in the contradictory transformations of the contemporary world solely as a definite form of the fundamental historical process of social liberation of work which, in the long run, represents the socio-economic and humanitarian contents of the socialist transformation of society. In this sense, the principal dilemma of the Yugoslav society at this historical juncture is the final transformation of self-management into a complete system of organization of the global society.

The present situation is characterized to the greatest extent by the not yet transcended dualism of the self-management and etatist organi-

zation in the global social sphere. Self-management has already become the legitimate form of life of every organization in the economy. An economic organization in Yugoslavia is characterized by social ownership of means of production and the unalienable right of all members of the work collective to make decisions directly and through bodies which they themselves elect (workers' councils and the like) about all questions of the organization and business operations of the enterprise and to appropriate and allot the income they create, exchanging their products and services through the market. „It is for the first time that the enterprise is constituted in an economic system upon the basis that direct producers are concurrently producers, managers and the first appropriators of their work”.¹

This new position of man in collective work is the lasting and biggest achievement of the self-management system in Yugoslavia — the foundation upon which the reconstruction of the entire social edifice has started and is being achieved.

Step by step, self-management has been expanded with the inclusion of other spheres of social life, social services and all other work organizations outside the economy. Every school, every hospital, every scientific institution, etc., is formed as a self-management organization living on the socially recognized results of its work and in which workingmen have in fact the same self-management rights as workers in economic enterprises.

It stands to reason that the development of self-management demanded also far-reaching changes in the political organization of society. These changes have been proceeding in the direction of a gradual replacement of state-bureaucratic centralism and conventional institutions of the political-representative democracy with directly democratic forms of political decision-making. A far-reaching decentralization has been carried out which has consolidated the material and political independence of municipalities as local bodies of authority and self-management and of republics as state and self-management communities, while councils of work communities, or rather assembly houses composed of delegates of self-management organizations from basic spheres of social work have been introduced in all assemblies from that of municipalities to the Federal Assembly.

And yet, in spite of all these changes the global organization of the state maintains still its explicitly dualist character. In the vital sphere of social life, in the use of the total social accumulation which serves as the material basis of social reproduction as a whole, extremely strong etatist elements have been retained. In a direct manner, through the budget, and in an indirect manner through influence upon centralized funds for financing social services and other requirements (pension and health insurance and the like, the development of undeveloped areas) the federal state still had the lion's share in the forma-

¹ See: Dr Berislav Sefer „Social development in the self-management society” Edition of the Institute for Political Studies of the Faculty of Political Sciences, Belgrade, page 47.

tion and allocation of investments. The position of individual enterprises and of entire economic branches still largely depends upon conditions for business operations which state bodies establish and regulate, upon innumerable regulations and measures of the current economic policy which are often altered introducing instability and insecurity in the business operations of work organizations and augmenting their direct dependence upon arbitrary decisions of the state apparatus.

Eventually, in spite of important changes made in the sense of the material independence of self-management enterprises and their associations as well as of placing social capital under their control, the banking and credit system as a whole is still less an instrument of an integrated economy and is more the extended hand of state control over the economy.

All these circumstances induce one to the conclusion: the fact that in the socio-economic system as a whole an adequate *self-management solution* has not yet been discovered for the total process of expanded reproduction, for the key question of the absolutely necessary concentration of „state capital” and its movement according to laws of the modern market economy and under the efficient control of associated producers themselves, emerges at the present level of development of the social system as a whole, creates internal contradictions and tensions in this system and has a negative retroactive effect upon the state of self-management relations even where they have already taken root, viz., in work organizations and their associations. This situation secures, on one hand, a still comparatively strong position of the professional political-managing stratum (in its mediatory and patronizing role) and, on the other hand, it kindles technocratic tendencies within individual enterprises, especially in big integrated entities (because workers are often willing — in a situation of economic insecurity and dependence upon external factors beyond their control — to give discretion to the professional-technical management, to the stratum which is termed „techno-structure” in the contemporary economic and sociological literature).

Consequently in order that self-management could progress further while overcoming bureaucratic-etatist and technocratic obstacles and, in general, in order that they be able to remain as a social reality instead of being reduced to a normative facade behind which different factual relations are hidden, it is absolutely necessary that it should develop and be built into a uniform system of global social organization. The problem in fact boils down to the question as to how to secure the process of expanded reproduction (the concentration and circulation of material means for such reproduction) to be placed under the direct and factual control of the self-management and organized collective work. This is the question of „to be or not to be” of the self-management system today.

A great importance of the above-mentioned constitutional amendments is in that they are directed to the settlement of this key question. Constitutional Amendment XXI established that „the basis of socialist self-management relations is composed of the socio-economic position of the workingman in social reproduction which guarantees to

him the realization of his own material and moral interest while working with means of reproduction owned by society and making decisions directly and on an equal footing with other workingmen in collective work, about all affairs of social reproduction”.

This same basic stand is even more directly expressed in Amendment XXII which says that: „it is the unalienable right of workers to manage affairs and means of social reproduction upon the basis of their work and to decide on the income achieved by the basic organization of collective work in which they work”.

Naturally, constitutional amendments are not confined solely to the establishing and formulation of the principled attitude on man in collective work with social means of production as the bearer of the right of decision-making on all affairs concerning expanded reproduction. They concurrently determine the method and instrument of realization of the principle proclaimed. In this respect two factors are of vital importance:

First, the thorough constitutional regulation of the position and role of the basic organization of collective work both within the framework of enterprises and broader organizational entities, as well as in the total process of social production, trade and distribution, and

Second, the definition and determination of the character, contents and role of self-management understanding and social agreement as the fundamental constitutional categories.

The basic organization of collective work is conceived in the constitution as the prime cell of the self-management economic organization of society (the elementary, definite form of Marx free association of associated producers). People in it achieve directly and in agreement (without external mediators such as the state and market) their fundamental self-management right to decide on all questions of their collective work and upon the basis of this work to distribute the total income — the socially confirmed result of the work in the market.

Since the basic organization of collective work is the basic cell of the self-management production relationship it cannot be an arbitrary creation of any body, any force and authority besides the workingmen themselves who constitute this organization. That is why the constitution guarantees that „workers in every part of the work organization (enterprise, institution and the like) which represents a work entity in which the result of their collective work can be confirmed as a value on the market or in a work organization and which can be freely expressed upon this basis, have the right to organize such a part as the basic organization of collective work”.

Through their basic organization of collective work, workingmen concretely and directly — and not solely in principle and through the mediation of the state — realize the fundamental right of managing and deciding on means of social reproduction, meaning on that part of their income created by means of their work which does not remain in the basic organization of collective work itself (for personal incomes and reproduction) but is engaged as part of the funds of social reproduction at the level of the entire enterprise or on a broader social sphere (investment in bank or in another work organization). For, the

basic organization of collective work is the prime subject in the process of association of social work and means upon the basis of the freely expressed interests of the associated producers themselves. It is the starting basis of self-management integration which is based upon it and develops its most varied forms without abolishing thereby its self-management individuality and autonomy.

Everything that is achieved as the economic result of such pooling of work and funds (in the form of interest on credit, or in some other form) „is the component part of the income which basic organizations of collective work achieve through their total activity” and this means that workingmen decide on this part of the income directly within the framework of their basic organizations of collective work. In this way basic organizations of collective work assume a double function of vital importance for the life and work of the self-management society:

First, they make possible — in contrast to the etatist and private — capitalist ones — a self-management solution of the question of concentration and circulation of means of social reproduction. It is only in this manner that the process of expanded reproduction is factually placed under the control of associated producers.

Second, they represent a substantial guarantee for the preservation of the self-management sovereignty and equality of workingmen within the framework of enterprises and broader integrated entities. For, in the event that basic organizations of collective work establish themselves in their role and function defined in the constitution, they secure that, even with the framework of intricate organisms of the modern economy and even within the framework of so-called „big systems”, the basic rights of decision-making are connected with the self-management basis of the organization however much its composition is complex. Securing the appropriation of the income upon the basis of the objectively (through the market mechanism) verified results of work, basic organizations of collective work withstand bureaucratic subjectivism and also arbitrariness by means of the objective logic of the law of values. At the present degree of development this is the vital condition for de-etatization of the production relation and affirmation of collective work in the role of the self-management subject of expanded reproduction.

However, de-etatization achieved by means of the consolidation of the independent role of the basic organization of collective work, is due to signify the further and more profound socialization of the process of global social reproduction, rather than the privatization and the substitution of social ownership with group ownership. It is evident that an economic system which would consist of independent molecules of basic organizations of collective work connected solely through the market, must necessarily signify an anarchic market, a great and continuously growing inequality in the material position of basic organizations of collective work and entire branches and regions, a conflict of interests within the working class and its factual disintegration and „privatization” (due to this kind of violation of the principle of distribution according to the work invested which means its factual dere-liction) the final consequence would be the setting up of group-owner-

ship relations towards social means of production with all elements of restoration of class relations which this implies.

The gradual but ever more consistent suppression of the state from the role of generally competent arbiter in the social surplus value of labour and in the management of the process of global reproduction (which has been and still is the basic source of bureaucratic power) must not signify giving up an adequate general social mechanism for the regulation of conditions of business operations, for a conscious orientation of the basic trends of reproduction and for establishing also an organized protection of such general criteria in the use of the social product by means of which are consolidated and secured management and appropriation upon the basis of work and not upon the basis of ownership.

From this stems the great significance of institution of self-management agreement which, in the course of the last few years and particularly following the Second Congress of Self-managers has been obtaining an increasingly important place in social practice. Under the new constitutional amendments they have also become an element of the constitutional system. Self-management agreements (which basic and other organizations of collective work and communities of interest conclude between themselves) and social agreements in which bodies of socio-political communities (bodies of authority) as well as the economic chambers and other self-management subjects are also taking part, are extremely important instruments for the independent regulation of a whole range of vital socio-economic relations. Under these agreements and accords are established, among other things the general bases and criteria for the internal distribution of the income within the basic organization of collective work, as well as mutual relations of these organizations in various forms of the pooling of work and of funds. Also, mutual obligations between workers in organizations of collective work for carrying out social activities (education, health service, etc.) and the users of these services are regulated in this way. Under a self-management understanding and social agreement one defines with precision the obligation of work organizations, in keeping with the principles of reciprocity and solidarity, to help organizations which land in exceptional economic difficulties and also to set aside funds for the employment, job retaining and the realization of their rights acquired by the workers, when because of technological and economic reasons the organization in which they have been working no longer needs their work.

But, what is happening in the event that self-management accords and social agreements are not concluded and for this reason there occur significant upheavals in the realization of the principle according to the work invested, the normal function of the economy and in the realization of equal self-management rights of workers, or in the event that these same consequences occur because certain organizations do not accept the accords and agreements that have been concluded and do not honour the obligations stemming from them? In this event it is possible to establish under law the measures which regulate relations which have not been regulated in self-management accord or social

agreement, or it is possible to establish that a corresponding social agreement is generally binding. In the same way „it is not possible to limit provisionally under law the use of the part of funds of social reproduction or to establish the obligation to pool these funds for the sake of financing certain absolutely necessary requirements of social reproduction”.

„Consequently, even under the latest changes which the constitutional amendments contain the state is not absolutely excluded from the process of expanded reproduction but its role is far more consistently reduced to the securing of general conditions and guarantees for the functioning of the self-management mechanism which is ever more independently and in increasingly greater spheres regulating basic relations in the process of expanded reproduction and is securing its socialist line and contents”.

„Under all these measures one has naturally not eliminated or transcended all the social contradictions that are inherent to commodity production and to distribution according to the work invested. With the transfer of expanded reproduction on the workingman and his basic work organization all these contradictions have not been eliminated. Only a new, different basis for their transcendence and self-management democratic settlement has been, or, better said, is being created. The strength of bureaucracy and technocracy has been stemming from contradictions of commodity production. As a matter of fact, commodity production requires a state under our new relations. Whether, due to this and in this setting, bureaucracy and social forces which are their vehicles will be strengthening, or will the forces which are the vehicles of self-management democratic relations be consolidated depends, among other things, also upon the manner in which these contradictions are settled. Unless we find a method for creating a self-management basis for this — we shall not develop the social basis for transcending bureaucracy... The de-etatization of economic relations in the sphere of production and distribution of values, in the sphere of expanded reproduction — for which constitutional-legal foundations have been given in Amendments XXI and XXII — is the point of departure for the de-bureaucratizing of political life.²

The full socialization of the policy through the process of liberation of work is a distant historical prospect in which scientifically perceived possibilities are necessarily intermingled with elements of social utopia. Consequently, it is a vision into which are transposed certain most progressive strivings and aspirations of the contemporary man, and not the reality of today or tomorrow. However, the self-management of people with conditions and results of their work and all changes which this causes in the entire organization of society, bring this vision closer offering possibilities for a clearer perception of paths leading in this direction and objective obstacles, rooted in the existing social relations which are due to be transcended.

² From Milentije Popovic's speech at the joint session of all Councils of the Federal Assembly held on March 29, 1971, quoted according to the book „The Constitution of the SFRY”, 1971, p. 21—23.

Society cannot yet live without political authority, but the development of self-management makes possible and demands that this authority should be as directly as possible under the control of collective work and that it be integrated into the structure and process of self-management decision-making from below upwards. This means, in fact, the development of such a democratic political system which makes possible the expression and free articulation of various interests based upon the existing differences in the social position of men, but which, at the same time, possesses such a mechanism of selection and guidance of social strivings and demands which secure the advantage and supremacy of long-term socialist interest of collective work. Historical experience shows that it is possible to develop such a system in an economically not yet highly developed country such as Yugoslavia.

Dr NAJDAN PAŠIĆ

Dr Najdan Pašić, professor of the Faculty of Political Sciences in Beograd, Editor-in-Chief of the review „Socijalizam”, and a Member of the Council of Peoples of the Federal Assembly. Born in 1922, in Skoplje. Graduate of the Faculty of Law in Beograd, diploma 1949; post-graduate studies from 1949—1951 at the Institute of Social Sciences in Beograd.

Professor Pašić began lecturing at the Faculty of Law in Beograd, in 1951, and in 1956. obtained his Doctoral Degree in the field of public corporations in the United Kingdom. From 1960. on at the School of Political Sciences in Beograd, as one of its first lecturers; full-time Professor at the Faculty of Political Sciences as from 1965 Editor-in-Chief of the „Socijalizam”.

Professor Pašić is actively engaged in the publishing activity and in journalism; as early as 1951, he started the magazine NIN and was its first Editor-in-Chief.

As one of the most active Yugoslav contemporary theoreticians in the field of political science he particularly concentrated his attention to the following problems: the theory of a modern state and the etatization of social life; comparative political systems; problems of self-managing society.

His publishing activity includes: several essays on national question and on federalism; more than a hundred articles, as well as five books (Public corporations in the United Kingdom, 1957; Contemporary state, 1960; Comparative political system, 1962; The social classes and the politics, 1968; and Political education of the self-managing society, 1970). For his book The social classes and the politics he was awarded the 1969 October Prize.

Some of Professor Pašić's articles and essays are translated into foreign languages.

Dr Dušan ČOBELJIC

Professeur à la Faculté des Sciences économiques de l'Université de Beograd

I

LE SYSTEME ECONOMIQUE ET LA PLANIFICATION EN YUGOSLAVIE DANS L'ETAPE ACTUELLE DU DEVELOPPEMENT

Le système administratif et la planification centralisée

Le développement de la planification économique en Yougoslavie passait par quelques périodes desquelles les plus marquantes sont: la période de la planification centralisée (administrative) et la période de la planification globale (sociale). Elles diffèrent par le choix des facteurs du développement économiques sur quels on peut influencer sciemment et surtout par des méthodes qu'on applique pour la réalisation du plan.¹

Les théoriciens sont en général d'accord que la planification centralisée n'était que la forme initiale du développement socialiste. Les divergences commencent du moment quand se pose la question de sa durée, cela veut dire, dans quelle étape la fonction de l'Etat doit passer aux producteurs directs, en quoi commencent des changements plus radicaux du système économique et l'étape nouvelle dans la planification socialiste.

Ce sont les raisons suivantes qui expliquent la nécessité de la planification centralisée dans l'étape initiale du développement:

1. — Il est venu jusqu'à la victoire de la révolution et jusqu'à l'édification du socialisme tout d'abord dans les pays sous développés. La tâche principale de ces pays était le développement plus rapide de l'économie et de la culture, pour rattraper ce qui était omis dans le passé et pour détourner la disharmonie entre la nouvelle organisation de la société et l'économie en retard.

¹ Voir: Dušan Čobeljić: Le mécanisme de la coordination du plan national et des plans des entreprises en Yougoslavie »Revue économique«, Paris, 1970, Mai, Vol. XXI, No. 3

2. — C'était le danger de guerre bien que le développement de l'économie de guerre qui a imposé certaine manière de la planification avec le rôle bien accentué du plan central. Dans ce temps le système économique, les méthodes de la gestion d'économie, la planification et la réalisation du plan étaient très semblables aux méthodes de l'économie de guerre dans laquelle l'importance dominante appartient à la distribution naturelle, à l'allocation des matières premières, en coopération avec des autres mesures administratives.

3. — Dans le système économique qui est prédestiné par l'arriération économique et culturelle, des préparations vastes de défense, des aspirations au sens des changements radicaux économiques et sociaux, la fonction économique-régulatrice de l'Etat est très marquée. L'Etat apparaît comme un facteur important par quel on change radicalement les rapports pris de la propriété et par quel on influe activement sur le développement plus vite des forces productrices. Tous ces moments, bien que nombreux d'autres, ici non mentionnés, prédestinent l'organisation spécifique de la société nouvelle, son système économique et avec cela aussi bien les formes et les cadres institutionnelles de la planification économique.

4. — En partant de la doctrine économique de Marx, la conception du développement économique adoptée et effectuée par tous les pays socialistiques, met en évidence la question de la reconstruction scientifique et technique de l'économie, la question du temps du développement économique, c'est qui est lié avec la productivité sociale du travail. Les cadres matériels et institutionnels dans lesquels on doit effectuer la conception du développement économique ont l'importance décisive autant pour le choix et le développement du système économique que pour l'organisation de la planification et les méthodes de l'achèvement du plan.

Il semble que dans l'étape initiale on ne peut encore poser le dilemme comment effectuer la conception du développement économique: à l'aide de la planification centrale ou de la planification globale. Le succès est possible à l'aide de la planification centralisée. Nous y avons déjà des expériences positives. La pratique jusqu'à présent dans les pays socialistes a démontré que la planification était au début centralisée. Quand on a réalisé des possibilités matérielles plus larges, la conception du développement accéléré peut être réalisée à l'aide de la planification globale, c'est-à-dire par la combinaison des éléments du plan et de l'espace plus large pour l'action du mécanisme du marché.²

L'autogestion ouvrière et la planification globale

Sur un niveau plus haut du développement économique la société socialiste tend à surpasser les méthodes expressément centralisatrices de la gestion et de la planification, donnant plus d'espace au dévelop-

² Voir: Dušan Cobeljić: La planification et le marché, »Tribune marxiste«, Paris, 1960, 1960. No 9; Dušan Cobeljić, Piano nazionale e piani aziendali in Jugoslavia, revue »Mercurio«, Roma, Anno XIX No 3 — Marzo 1971.

pement spontané de l'économie. Par là on explique les empressements des certains pays socialistes de découvrir des systèmes plus parfaits, des nouvelles formes de la gestion et de la planification et de démocratiser la vie économique et sociale. Dans le cas contraire, comme le soulignaient plusieurs économistes, il pourrait se poser la question du caractère socialiste des changements révolutionnaires, de la gestion ouvrière des entreprises comme leur conséquence logique bien que l'efficacité de l'action de gagner par le travail.

Ce dernier pour cela que le système administratif et la planification centralisée qui le caractérise, n'importe combien qu'il soit précise, ne peut remplacer dans une économie plus développée de la période transitoire toutes ceux possibilités qui peuvent offrir le marché et le développement spontané des forces productrices. En outre, ce sont les raisons pourquoi la planification ne doit pas supprimer le degré indispensable de l'indépendance du peuple travailleur, de l'entreprise et des autres unités socio-économiques, sans quelle est impossible l'initiative consciente et sans quelle l'homme cesse d'être le créateur.

Si on néglige pour longtemps les tendances de la démocratisation de la gestion de l'économie et les changements adéquats du système économique, la nationalisation des moyens de production au sens de leur étatisation commence à menacer le caractère socialiste de leur appropriation, car les travailleurs n'ont pas assez possibilité à influencer sur l'organisation de la vie économique et sur l'exploitation optimale des facteurs de la production. Cependant, la rationalisation de la production et l'augmentation de la productivité du travail demandent la mise en évidence de l'homme comme le participant le plus important dans le processus de la production. L'application de ce principe suppose des changements plus radicaux dans le rôle économique de l'état et dans le rôle des producteurs directs, et des organes de l'autogestion.

Les changements procèdent de même de l'évolution constante de la propriété socialiste des facteurs matériels de la production. Elle suppose leur utilisation dans l'intérêt de la société bien que la gestion ouvrière.

Pour cela l'Etat, respectivement son appareil d'administration, cessent successivement d'être le facteur décisif du développement de l'économie et des rapports sociaux. Le rôle du porteur du développement socialiste passe plus tard aux producteurs et aux autres organes de l'autogestion sur les niveaux divers de l'organisation graduée de la société. Avec les changements économiques et sociaux change de même le système économique et comme suit la mode de la planification.

Ces tendances générales, manifestées plus ou moins fort dans quelques pays socialistes, étaient très fort manifestées en Yougoslavie. En sortant de l'étape initiale du développement, la Yougoslavie change en pays industriel. L'expérience acquise et beaucoup de faits disent qu'après l'étape initiale s'accroît le rôle du marché et que s'impose la nécessité d'utiliser de plus en plus le marché à cause de la rationalisation de la production et comme la méthode de la réalisation des tâches de plan. Pour cela on peut dire que, dans l'étape actuelle du développement, une des caractéristiques principales du système économique yougoslave est le rôle très important du marché en ce qui concerne

l'enchaînement et l'ajustement de l'offre et de la demande et la régulation des mouvements économiques courantes. Mais la planification n'a pas perdu son importance. C'est pour cela qu'on conduit et dirige l'économie, auprès de la collaboration du marché, à l'aide du plan de la Fédération, des plans des républiques populaires, des provinces et des régions autonomes, des villes et des communes, aussi bien que sur la base des plans autonomes des entreprises économiques. Par conséquent, la direction et le rythme du développement économique dans notre pays sont toujours déterminés par des plans globaux et autonomes, qui sont, à son tour, déterminés par l'appareil économique qui les lie et les mit d'accord.

II.

La cybernétique, la théorie générale des systèmes et la planification de l'économie

Sous l'aspect de la cybernétique et de la théorie générale des systèmes on peut expliquer la nécessité de la régulation du développement économique à l'aide des plans et du marché de telle façon.

L'économie moderne représente un système complexe. Il est composé de nombreux sous-systèmes avec l'importance et des compétences plus ou moins larges. A partir des unités de consommation et des unités économiques — des entreprises — jusqu'à l'économie entière, il y a un grand nombre des sous-systèmes et chaque d'eux a ses spécificités et ses buts. Les sous-systèmes sont à la fois indépendants et interliés et ils dépendent de l'ensemble du système économique. Sans l'indépendance relative des sous-systèmes, le système économique complexe ne pourrait pas fonctionner rationnellement ni se développer. Les transactions marchando-monnaïres donnent dans l'étape actuelle du socialisme la possibilité aux sous-systèmes d'exprimer son indépendance.

Dans une économie développée, avec une avancée division de travail et spécialisation, l'interdépendance des sous-systèmes et leur liaison au système d'ensemble est très expressive. Le rapport entre la généralité et la particularité change alors si bien que le développement de l'ensemble du système économique devient décisivement important pour le développement des sous-systèmes. Avec cela on explique la nécessité de l'intervention de la société, cela veut dire, de la planification du développement économique.

La planification globale du développement économique a aussi bien pour but d'assurer le fonctionnement autonome des sous-systèmes. Une telle planification compte sur le marché comme sur un facteur de l'autorégulation des sous-systèmes. Mais, auprès du marché il faut que la société oriente et règle, conformément au plan, sciemment et organisée, l'activité des agents économiques, conformément aux objectifs et aux tâches communes. Hors de cela qui est déjà dit, l'indispensabilité de la planification demandent tant la dialectique du développement que des contradictions qui l'accompagne et les conflits des intérêts des sous-systèmes dans leur rapports mutuels ou et par rapport

au système économique en ensemble. L'économie planifiée et surtout l'économie planifiée socialiste suppose, pour résoudre rationnellement ces contradictions, l'intervention de la société et l'établissement de mécanismes compensateurs. Voilà quelques arguments pour cela.

Le développement du système économique dépend aussi bien de l'effet des lois économiques objectives et des événements fortuits dont l'effet ne peut pas être prévu et mesuré à coup sûr. Il est connu que malgré des savoirs satisfaisants du passé et d'acceptation des hypothèses initiales pour le développement futur, certains processus économiques ont un caractère de probabilité. Un tel caractère des processus économiques est d'autant plus accentué que dans les systèmes économiques susdits ou (et) dans les sous-systèmes agit un grand nombre des facteurs dont l'effet ne peut pas être prévu et mesuré. Par la planification économique on diminue considérablement l'incertitude des mouvements et des résultats futurs. Mais, afin que l'efficacité de l'économie soit plus grande, il faut aussi des autres mécanismes régulateurs. Ils se trouvent dans l'effet spontané des composantes du système. A leur aide on peut alléger les troubles casuels et pour cela ils font la part indispensable, organique du mécanisme entier de la régulation des rapports entre le système économique complet et ses parts.

Sur la base susdite, on pourrait conclure que de point de vue de la cybernétique sur le fonctionnement rationnel de l'économie moderne permettent à approcher des points de vue différents qui consiste en ce qui concerne le rôle du plan et du marché en économie socialiste. Pour nous, des attitudes seront la base de départ pour le traitement des questions plus concrètes résultantes des problèmes précédents. Nous y essayerons de déterminer dans l'étape actuelle du développement du système économique yougoslave la sphère des solutions de plan et de marché. Nous y rappelons incessamment que la polémique et des attitudes différentes insisteront longtemps justement sur ces questions.

Le domain du plan global

La complexité de la vie économique et l'existence des nombreux facteurs relevant, demandent que la planification globale renferme et exprime le mouvement d'un nombre déterminé des grandeurs des proportions — qui se trouvent en lien causal. C'est là nous nous rencontrons avec la question du contenu des plans globaux, avec la question du minimum de planification pour que l'on pourrait maintenir le caractère d'économie planifiée dans des conditions changées.

L'expérience yougoslave a démontré qu'on peut influencer sciemment sur les procès économiques même quand le plan est limité aux facteurs fondamentaux et aux proportions qui ont l'importance décisive pour le rythme et les proportions de la reproduction élargie. Par là change

substantiellement le contenu du plan.³ Mais il y a de nombreux facteurs de la nature endogène et exogène desquels dépend son contenu, c'est-à-dire sur quelles proportions fondamentales sera arrêtée la *planification* globale.

Au début de l'application de la planification globale la portée de l'intervention du plan était large et certains éléments de la planification centralisée étaient retenus. Cependant, avec la création des conditions et des possibilités nouvelles et du système économique nouveau, le contenu de la planification diminuait successivement. Le problème de la sphère d'activité de la planification n'est pas encore résolu dans l'étape actuelle de notre développement. Je prends la liberté d'exposer quelques points de vue.

L'importance décisive de la planification dans la société socialiste ne faudrait pas être contestable. Mais, le sujet des discussions, des débats et des recherches de solutions nouvelles et adéquates consiste dans la découverte du lieu pour des autres postulats dans le système actuel d'économie. A nos conditions apparaissent comme les postulats les plus importants la gestion ouvrière, la production marchande, l'effet des lois du marché etc.

Auprès de la planification, ces postulats ont aussi le caractère progressif qui consiste — entre autres choses — dans la stimulation et dans la rationalité économique. Ce n'était jamais l'objet de litige, mais — comme nous l'avons dit — l'objet de litige c'est la recherche du lieu et du rôle de chaque de ces postulats. Car, s'ils soient excessivement forcés, ils pourraient menacer et empêcher la rationalité et l'efficacité de l'économie. Pour cela il est nécessaire de trouver la mesure adéquate pour chacun, afin que leur rationalité et l'efficacité puissent s'exprimer.

³ En comparaison de planification centralisée, le contenu de la planification globale est plus étroite et par cela s'augmentent aussi les difficultés et la complexité de la régulation prudente de la vie économique. Cela s'explique par le fait que dans des conditions de la gestion ouvrière le rythme et les proportions de la reproduction de société dépendent de tous les porteurs de l'activité économique et de leurs décisions. Etant donné que les tâches du plan ne sont pas adressées aux exécutants, la solution du problème de la discipline de plan s'effectue à l'aide des règles de loi sur les droits et les obligations des organes de gestion et par des instruments, des stimulants. Il doit qu'ils assurent que les décisions des sujets économiques autonomes — des entreprises etc... soient en ensemble adéquates aux buts et aux fondamentales du plan. Par eux (des règles et des stimulants) est limitée et canalisée la liberté d'action de se décider des entreprises économiques et des autres porteurs des activités économiques en ce qui concerne leurs obligations auprès de la communauté de la société et de la communauté de travail.

La prescription des règles de loi et la découverte des instruments, des stimulants, est surtout nécessaire pour ceux secteurs d'économie dans lesquels on ne peut pas atteindre l'accordement de l'ensemble des décisions autonomes avec les tâches du plan.

La réglementation légale de l'état, des droits et des obligations des organes de gestion et des stimulants par quels est orientée leur activité économique, représentent un mécanisme indispensable sans quel la planification globale ne pourrait pas fonctionner rationnellement et efficacement. Par leur aide s'établit le lien entre des sujets globaux du plan et des formes concrètes de son achèvement.

La substance de la planification globale doit, en un mot, consister en régulation des processus de la reproduction conformément aux besoins. Cela va de soi que la planification doit comprendre toutes les phases (stades) de la reproduction: la production, la distribution, l'échange de quel provient la consommation, (il n'y faut néanmoins oublier que les classiques du marxisme et non seulement les classiques, soulignaient toujours la primauté de la production). Cela vaut dire que le planification doit partir de la production, car sans cela on ne peut pas faire l'examen ni de la planification de la distribution ni de la planification des autres phases de la reproduction.

1) A la différence de la planification centralisée, minutieuse, la planification globale ne concernerait que le volume de la production et son mouvement par des secteurs économiques de base. Dans les cadres de ces considérations élémentaires nous ne pouvons pas entrer aux longues explications du grade de l'élaboration des tâches de la production. Cela dépendra d'ailleurs de plusieurs facteurs et surtout d'une disharmonie plus ou moins grande existante en économie, de l'état de la conjoncture mondiale etc. etc.

Par la planification de l'économie on veut atteindre que l'économie soit un ensemble unique, sciemment organisé, fondé sur la division de travail haut développée. Une telle unité de l'économie demande une déterminée harmonie entre des activités des différents secteurs économiques et des unités économiques, entre la production et des besoins de la population. En cours du développement accéléré ces relations changent continuellement et pour cela il faut les rétablir systématiquement à l'aide de la planification.

Auprès de la production, la planification globale doit comprendre la planification de la distribution de base. Cette distribution contient: a) la distribution du revenu national, b) la distribution principale des investissements et c) la répartition régionale des forces productrices.

a) L'introduction des critères sociaux dans la partage du revenu national à l'accumulation et la consommation représente un des plus grands avantages du système socialiste. L'importance décisive de cette décision consiste en ce qu'elle détermine l'aptitude de l'économie à accumuler et par là le taux de la croissance économique. Il nous semble que cette distribution doit être déterminée par le plan, car d'elle dépend au plus haut degré l'édification de la société nouvelle. Les économistes n'ont pas omis à souligner l'importance de cette distribution. L'insistance sur cette distribution est d'autant plus nécessaire près de l'activité plus libre du marché et de l'existence des décisions autonomes des agents économiques.

b) En liaison causale et interdépendante avec la planification du volume et de la structure de la production se trouve la planification de la structure des investissements. Y appartient tout d'abord les rapports de structure entre les investissements économiques et des investissements en liaison du niveau social; et puis, la structure globale en dedans des investissements économiques. De cette manière on veut rétablir sciemment et ex ante la proportionalité dans le développement

des branches économiques en particulier et surtout le rapport rationnel entre des investissements productives directs et des investissements par quels on crée les conditions pour la production future.

Mais, la planification globale ne pourrait pas s'arrêter seulement sur cela. Il faut qu'elle découvre et détermine la production socialement optimale entre des investissements dans la production des moyens de production et la production des biens de consommation; la proportion entre des investissements dans les secteurs de base et les branches particulières d'économie, aussi bien que la proportion entre des investissements qui s'effectuent relativement vite et ceux qui s'effectuent plus lentement.

Par ce procédé de plan se termine le procédé précédent. Nous resolvons à l'aide de la planification de la structure des investissements la question suivante du développement accéléré — la question de l'efficacité sociale des investissements.

La distribution fondamentale des moyens d'investissements doit être complétée par des décisions de la disposition territoriale et régionale des investissements. C'est la manière la plus efficace pour diminuer et déduire à un degré supportable les inégalités plus grandes qui ont l'origine historique et qui sont maintenues dans le développement des forces productrices des régions et des républiques particulières.

Dans la science économique est adoptée l'égalité des droits de l'aspect de branche et d'aspect territorial du développement économique, et à cause de cela ce dernier aspect devient la part intégrale de la planification globale. C'est en liaison la plus étroite avec l'utilisation optimale des facteurs de production au but d'atteindre à long terme la haut taux de la croissance économique. Cette demande actuelle de la science et de la pratique quant à l'accélération du développement économique impose le besoin d'utiliser des ressources économiques tant selon la place de leur location que selon la place de leur utilisation.

La planification régionale ne serait pas limitée seulement aux régions insuffisamment développées. Elle est de même nécessaire comme le contreponds pour le financement des investissements par des fonds des entreprises, des communs et des républiques. A défaut de l'intervention de la société, à telles conditions, pourraient vaincre les tendances du retard continu et toujours plus grand des régions économiques insuffisamment développées et cela influencerait, comme nous l'avons dit, au relentissement de la croissance de l'économie en ensemble. Pour cela il s'impose comme le minimum nécessaire de la planification la disposition régionale des investissements à cause de l'utilisation optimale des ressources économiques et de la solution du problème du retard relatif des régions économiquement insuffisamment développées.

3) Enfin, le minimum indispensable de la planification globale dans le domaine de l'échange doit comprendre les proportions dans les transactions avec l'étranger, c'est-à-dire le commerce extérieur et la balance des paiements. La demande des socialistes, posée bientôt, en ce qui concerne le contrôle de société dans le commerce extérieur a souligné

l'importance extraordinaire de cette activité économique. Nous voulons nous en rappeler ici seulement par quelque peu mots. Nommément, il s'agit de la division du travail qui a reçu de nos jours des telles proportions qu'elle a lié vigoureusement des économies nationales avec le marché mondial. Sans cette échange il n'était pas possible de réaliser des changements structurels plus radicaux et l'accélération du développement de l'économie nationale, et à cause de cela l'échange avec l'étranger peut à peine assurer le taux optimal de la croissance de la production et de la consommation. Par cela on explique que la planification du développement économique doit inévitablement examiner, mesurer et prévoir l'importance déterminante de ces facteurs exogènes de même que leur répercussions sur le mouvement de l'économie nationale. Il y appartient le volume et la structure de l'échange des marchandises; le mouvement du capital; les conditions de la production dans le monde et chez nous et sur cette base la détermination de la politique d'échange internationale; la détermination des relations des prix et des frais.

Ce seraient les raisons qui indiquent à la nécessité de la planification du commerce extérieur, cela vaut dire à la régulation consciente des effets de l'échange avec l'étranger et à la détermination de la politique et des mesures afin d'atteindre le maximum d'utilité du commerce extérieur.

Nous pouvons résumer que le minimum indispensable de la planification en proportions globales devrait comprendre:

1) la planification de la production, de son volume et de la structure de base,

2) la planification de la distribution du revenu national en précisant la structure des investissements par branches et des investissements territorio-régionaux.

3) la planification des proportions dans les transactions des marchandises et des services en relations avec l'étranger.

Il nous semble que la planification, quoi qu'elle en soit fondée sur les grandeurs globales et sur le respect de l'importance et d'autres postulats dans notre système économique, doit comprendre ce minimum d'influence de la planification pour garder le caractère de plan de l'économie.

Le domaine des solutions de marché

La vie économique restante, qui se trouve hors de portée de l'intervention du plan, appartient à la sphère des solutions du marché. Il faut tout d'abord souligner le rôle du marché quant à régulation de la reproduction simple en économie entier. Puis, les investissements courants et des perfectionnements techniques continuels bien que la modernisation de l'économie se fondent principalement sur des impulsions du marché et de ses forces motrices. Après de cela, le marché règle les investissements pour les besoins de la production des biens de la

consommation. Le rôle du marché dans la régulation de la production des marchandises pour la consommation des masses s'étend aussi bien à tous les secteurs qui donnent les matières premières pour cette production. Les économistes soulignent que dans ces domaines l'effet du marché est le plus efficace et qu'il est difficile de le remplacer et le substituer par d'autres mesures.⁴

Le rôle du marché (comme d'ailleurs le rôle du plan) n'est pas donné pour toujours et définitivement. Il évolue et change d'un pays à l'autre et même en un pays, sous l'influence des nombreux facteurs intérieurs et extérieurs. Il semble que le domaine des solutions de marché dépend surtout de deux systèmes interliés: a) de la qualité du système des informations et b) du système des décisions économiques. A peine par leur coopération soit possible de déterminer les domaines adéquats de l'effet du marché. S'en tenir aux généralités, les domaines de l'activité du marché peuvent être déterminés si: 1) les facteurs du développement soient interliés et accordés et b) quand les directions de base du développement économique soient coordonnées dans le système entier du fonctionnement de l'économie.

CONCLUSION

L'interfonctionnement du plan et du marché, que nous avons déjà défendu dans nos travaux précédents est là motivé par des arguments nouveaux. De point de vue de la cybernétique et de la théorie générale des systèmes, le marché et le plan sont traités comme deux systèmes complémentaires. Ils peuvent avoir leurs domaines propres de l'activité exclusive ou prédominante. Les domaines de leur activité ne sont pas donnés définitivement, mais ils changent en cours du développement bien que sous l'influence des changements dans le système économique. Il nous semble, que dans l'étape actuelle de notre développement et près des solutions actuelles du système, leur activité pourrait se mouvoir dans les limites exposées dans ce travail.

⁴ B. Jelić, Sistem planiranja u jugoslovenskoj privredi, Beograd, 1962; D. Čobeljić, Plan i tržište u sistemu funkcionisanja socijalističke privrede, »Ekonomička misao«, Beograd, 1969. no. 3, p. 335-353; O. Lange, The Computer and the Market, dans le recueil des travaux dédiés à M. Dobb »Socialism, Capitalism and Economic Growth, Cambridge, 1966, p. 158, et L.A. Melentjev, K probleme optimalizaciji složnyh èkonomičeskikh sistem, »Ekonomika i matematičke metode, Moskva 1967, No. 4; D. Čobeljić, Planiranje narodne privrede, Beograd, 1967, p. 288—292.

Dr DUSAN ĆOBELJIC

Professor at the Faculty of Political Sciences of the

Le Dr. Dušan ĆOBELJIC est professeur régulier à la Faculté des Sciences économiques.

Il a publié plusieurs livres, études et articles sur la planification économique et le développement:

- Planification de l'économie nationale. Belgrade, 1967.
- L'analyse inter-sectorielle et la méthode du trend Titograd, 1965.
- Les méthodes de planification modernes, 1965.
- La planification de la consommation individuelle, 1958.

Nombre de ses études et articles du domaine de l'économie ont paru dans les revues yougoslaves et étrangères.

Né en 1916. Etudiant, il rejoint le mouvement ouvrier révolutionnaire. Dès le déclenchement de la guerre il aide le Mouvement de libération nationale pour devenir plus tard volontaire dans l'armée de libération nationale.

MEMORANDUM

TO : [Illegible]

FROM : [Illegible]

SUBJECT : [Illegible]

[Illegible text follows, appearing to be a memorandum format with several paragraphs of text that is too faint to transcribe accurately.]

Dr Aleksandar FIRA

*Professor at the Faculty of Political Sciences of the
University of Beograd*

RELATIONS BETWEEN NATIONALITIES IN THE YUGOSLAV SOCIO-POLITICAL SYSTEM

I

The present phase in the development of relations between nations and nationalities in Yugoslavia, which is characterized by exceptional dynamism and intricacy, rightly arouses the attention of the international public, no matter whether it is a question of friends of self-management socialist Yugoslavia or of an uninvolved observer or even of those who desire the disappearance of Yugoslavia. It is unfounded to expect that it is possible to illuminate and explain all the relevant factors of this complicated phenomenon in a summarized exposition, and that is why my report is confined solely to the making of points of analysis and the interpretation of global orientations, believing that even this is sufficient for approaching a conversation. I presuppose thereby the knowledge of a certain number of elementary facts and I am using them only to the extent to which this is absolutely necessary in this context.

This kind of orientation has also dictated the structure of my exposition which will encompass the basic elements of the evolution, the expression of relations between nationalities in the contemporary socio-political system in Yugoslavia (the term socio-political system in Yugoslav terminology is the synonym of what is called the political system in the world, while the adjunct "socio" expresses the fact that such a political system is involved in which the process of socialization of the policy is realized), and especially relations existing between self-management, as the basic social relation which people enter in collective work and in the management of social affairs, and relations between nationalities.

It can be seen from this that a whole range of relations between nations and nationalities (the term nationalities in Yugoslav terminology denote the ethnic groups which are called national minorities in the usual international terminology) such as cultural, psychological, economic and other relations, are not included. This certainly does not signify that I consider them to be insignificant, but this only expresses my limited possibilities and the restricted nature of expositions of this kind.

II

The first modern state-legal community of Yugoslav nations emerged comparatively late in the form of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes which formally began existing on December 1, 1918. Into the composition of the newly-formed state were included nations and nationalities which were at different levels of social and economic development, with a rather different history and extremely different state-legal status. All of them were connected not only by ethnical closeness expressed in their common descent, similar or even common languages and the like, but above all the historical interest which undoubtedly proved that national independence in this geopolitical area was possible only in a community. As a matter of fact, in the strivings of wide masses national independence was already at that time only the element of the revolutionary claim for full social liberation. For all these reasons, the creation of the first Yugoslav state community in recent time is no side-result of World War I, or an artificial creation of this or that policy of the great powers, even though either of these facts have influenced this. From the point of view of interests of the entire Yugoslav people this is a historical requirement and it is incontestably a progressive thing. By the way, this has not only been amply confirmed by their history but also by the later chain of events and especially the dramatic events in the course of the socialist revolution.

And yet, as this has been established in Yugoslavia's historiography a long time ago, even though the very act of unification had represented a positive accomplishment in the development of each of the Yugoslav nations separately and of all of them together, the method in which this unification was effectuated had been such that the expectations of all nations have been betrayed and the Yugoslav state community became the „jail of nations" instead of an equal community of nations. Unification was effectuated under the leadership of the Great Serbian bourgeoisie, with the lavish assistance of the bourgeoisie of other peoples of Yugoslavia and it concurrently marked the beginning of a twenty-year long policy of national deprivation of rights which, in fact, changed its forms, but whose substance remained the same.

This began as far back as in the period of state-legal transition (1918—1921) in which there was still no constitution of the new state and in which certain institutionally recognized elements of national pluralism still existed. A completely centralized state apparatus was created already at that time which nationally deprived of rights all Yugoslav peoples and including even the one in whose name it was formally appearing. The Vidov-dan constitution (in 1921) sanctioned this situation reducing the remaining pluralist elements to mere formality and it consolidated further the already formed unitarian-centralist state structure. As the ideological basis of this state system one has thereby been applying the "theory" that the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes are three tribes of a same nation while any individuality of the Macedonians and Montenegrins was denied.

The next step along this same course was made in 1929 when under a one-sided act of the King the constitution was abolished, every

free political life was banned and monarcho-fascist dictatorship was introduced. In that period unitarian centralism culminates and the last formal elements of any kind of national pluralism disappeared from the constitutional system. In keeping with this, ideological argumentation was also changed and the theory of a nation consisting of three tribes is replaced by the "theory" of integral Yugoslavism. In this sense was constituted and endorsed the constitution in 1931 which was unchanged and has been in force until the Summer in 1939. On the basis of the agreement between Cvetković and Maček (Dragiša Cvetković had been the premier and member of the Yugoslav Radical Community while Dr Vlatko Maček had been the leader of the Croatian Peasant Party) a statutory regulation was made on the Croatian Province under which Croatia obtained a form of state-legal autonomy and in indirect manner the national individuality of Croats was thus recognized.

Under this constitutional-legal setting in old Yugoslavia which prevented a free national expression of each of the Yugoslav peoples, the entire social and especially political life were burdened with the problem of relations between nationalities and it is no wonder that every social and political change was necessarily projected and expressed also as national confrontation. Just for this reason it is not at all exaggerated to say that the national problem has been a first class problem in old Yugoslavia and that its unsuccessful settlement has been one of the basic causes of its fall. It was according to the national question that all social forces have been committing themselves necessarily in Yugoslavia and it has been just in this that the bourgeoisie of all the Yugoslav peoples has displayed its historical unpreparedness and inability to raise and settle this question properly. If dilemmas concerning this had existed during old Yugoslavia's existence as an independent state, all these dilemmas have been eliminated in World War II when the bourgeoisie, for the sake of protecting its own class interest, irrevocably orientated itself to national treason. To the attitude of the bourgeoisie in fact corresponded — by its historical effect — the attitude of its political parties, even though considerable differences existed between them as well as certain exceptions which only confirm the rule.

The historical defeat of the bourgeoisie concerning the national question, on the one hand and the created connection between relations between nationalities with the factual class claims of the proletariat, on the other hand, have been the basis from which stemmed the possibility and inevitability that the working class should emerge as the sole social force entitled to settle factually the national question in Yugoslavia. After a long and not always painless evolution this commitment became the political course of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia which, although being illegal and persecuted, appeared already at that time with the concept of a federation of equal nations based upon the right of every nation to self-determination. The socialist revolution which evolved in Yugoslavia in the form of a nation-wide liberation war against the occupier and his domestic assistants, incontestably proved the correctness of this orientation.

The national liberation movement, led by the CPY, opposed to the policy of decimation of Yugoslavia and fratricidal war between its

nations which has been inaugurated by the occupier, the brotherhood and unity of all Yugoslav peoples and nationalities and a pure concept of federal community which had emerged already in the previous phase of the struggle of the workers' movement. Even though during the course of the armed revolution numerous, especially international conditions have not suited this purpose, the formation of the Yugoslav federation took place at that time and November 29, 1943, when it was decided on the internal system of the country at the II session of the Anti-fascist Council of the National Liberation of Yugoslavia, is considered to be the date of its emergence. As the policy of national equality has been finding since that time onwards its fullest expression in the political system through the evolution of the Yugoslav federation, it will be most sensible to follow it in this way.

III

The first stage in that development is the period before the constitution of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia was adopted on January 31, 1946. This period coincides with the end of the armed revolution and the undertaking of first measures which by their socio-economic nature meant the expropriation of the expropriators, represents in the development of federalism the constitution of the federation. The constitution of the federation does not encompass solely its internal structure through the federation of borders of federal units, but also the determination of the most general regime of relations between them and the federalization of central bodies of state authority. It is important to underline that this has not been the result of any construction of an artificial nature but the expression of the intricate national being of Yugoslavia. Even though old Yugoslavia has been living for more than twenty years in a unitarian form, federal units have not emerged as the result of mere political understanding. They stem from the earlier historical development, national consciousness and the determination of peoples constituting federal units, to live in a community which will secure their full national affirmation.

Even though in the internal structure of the federation there had not been any geometrical accuracy or numerical automation, the respect of the right of every nation to self-determination had concluded to the fact that serious dilemmas as regards the basic structure of the federation have not occurred. Federal units have been formed as national states of individual Yugoslav peoples, or rather as common states of a great number of nations. This has never been done on the basis of ephemeral political combinations but rather through the natural development of potentials which existed in a definite region, or rather social group. An especially important factor in this process had also been the fact that the creation of the internal structure of the federation which, in addition to the above-mentioned, encompasses also the emergence of autonomous units, goes along with the final consolidation of revolutionary authority, not only at the

federal level but also in member countries, or rather in autonomous units. In brief, the first phase of development of Yugoslav federalism, in which the autonomy of the federation has been completed, has achieved the basic state-legal conditions for national equality.

The second period in the development of federalism (1946—1953) is a sphere about which different opinions still exist. According to one group of authors, a certain so-called revolutionary etatism, which implicitly contains a high degree of centralization of every economic and political power exists throughout this period. In this kind of social climate, according to these assessments, the elements of federalism to a lesser or greater degree boil down to mere form and this certainly also holds true of the national affirmation of every individual nation, and even of their mutual equality. This evaluation is only partly accurate. One should not forget that this is the period in which, chiefly in the institutional-normative sphere, the further consequences of the federal structure and national equality are nonetheless produced. I recall the fact that it is for the first time that federal bodies of authority and administration are constituted, paying attention to the federal principle. Normative documents from that period contain numerous important elements which had been devoted to national equality and which have not lost their topical character even today. And yet, the fact remains that the degree of centralization in that period had been so great that its remnants have been existing until recently but one could not infer from this that the effect of the federal principle has been fully eliminated from the political system.

The period which has been lasting a whole decade, viz., from 1953 to 1963, is especially interesting. The vision of self-management was constituted for the first time in that period into an institutional system. This system is far from being perfect. It corresponded to the idea of self-management which existed at that time and which proceeded from an undeveloped and rather primitive society, but it is certain that it has been already at that time that the very basis of society had been abandoning, resolutely and radically, the etatist concept. The Yugoslav federation and relations between nationalities undergo a contradictory development. The general democratization of society brings about the demystification of relations which had been under a veil of secrecy in the phase of the absolute reign of etatism. Relations between nationalities became the subject of interest of the public and differences in national interests are a sphere of public confrontation.

This, on the other hand, seems to be clashing with certain institutional solutions which directly relate to the principle of federalism. The evolution of the Chamber of Nationalities which has been existing as an institution in the political system since the Constitutional Assembly in 1945, is the most characteristic for this fact. In the period between 1946 and 1953 it is an equal assembly house as the Federal Council which emerged upon the basis of general suffrage, irrespective of the principle of federalism. However, in that period there has not been one single case in which the two councils have failed to agree and their agreement has been demanded on the occasion of the adoption of every decision of the assembly. In the next phase the Chamber of Nationa-

lities was transformed into a voting factor which begins acting only in the event of an extreme disturbance of relations in federalism, or rather, of a blatant violation of the equality of nations. In the former case institutional mechanism had been ahead of factual possibilities for the expression of special national interests, while in the latter case it has been lagging behind.

The constitution adopted in 1963, even though it contained elements of the new concept of the federation has not directly changed the position and role of the Chamber of Nationalities and it has not drawn other consequences from the comparatively new idea of national equality either. This by no means signifies that the very principle of equality has not been present in it or that it has been neglected. On the contrary. Numerous constitutional provisions which are going to be dealt with, in fact perfectly prove the awareness concerning this set of relations. However, there have been no vitally new elements as regards the position of bodies of the federation and even in the manner of their function. It is for this reason that soon after the adoption of the constitution one has been considering its partial alteration which was made by means of the amendments in 1967 and 1968 and, to a smaller extent, in 1970, at least as far as the federation in a very large scope is concerned.

The principle of national equality which, as proved by the preceding evolution, is deeply built into the foundations of the Yugoslav community, is not only a general principle of the organization of the state but in fact it begins from the position of every man and citizen in society. Just as the greatest number of democratic political systems in the world the constitution of the SFRY guarantees the equality of all along with the ban on discrimination upon any basis and especially upon the national one. I think that Article 41 of the Constitution is especially interesting; it guarantees, in addition to the free expression of one's own nationality and culture and the free use of one's language, also the right of the citizens, in the event that he wants this, not to commit or declare himself as far as nationality is concerned. The propagating or implementation of national inequality, as well as the provoking of national hatred or intolerance is considered to be against the constitution and represents a serious criminal act.

Proceeding from these basic principles, the constitution devotes special attention to the problem of equality of languages and alphabets while social practice, especially in recent years, has been consistently observing this equality in all spheres of social life. The same principles concerning relations that exist between members of Yugoslav nations relate also to members of all nationalities living in Yugoslavia.

In the realization of this starting point of view in the political system of Yugoslavia there emerges in fact a new physiognomy of Yugoslav federalism which is otherwise the subject of a special report at this seminar. For our further review, instead of a possible repetition of what will be said there, it is more interesting to attempt to give elements for a reply to this question which is raised both in Yugoslavia and elsewhere: how come that after decades of common life the national question is again brought up and in quite an acute form as that?

Increasingly so, since it has been possible until recently to hear and read that the national question has been in fact settled in Yugoslavia, according to certain persons, even two decades ago.

This manner of bringing up this question, at least as far as Yugoslavia is concerned, and in my opinion even generally, is wrong. The national question is not a question in the grammatical sense of this word to which one can give a reply and in this way take the matter off the agenda. What is called the national question in the Marxist terminology is an extremely complicated set of relations between nations and nationalities which are being set up and developing in a lasting manner. In this sense, provided that we consider that it is true that under the Yugoslav federation, its position and development so far, the national question has been settled, or, let us permit this construction, it has been settled for a certain epoch, it is equally true that the national question will continuously be raised and settled., at least as long as nations exist.

Precisely due to this character of the national question its relationship with federalism in Yugoslavia must be reviewed in a different way. It is true that the federation is the basic institutional form of setting up and developing relations between Yugoslav nations and nationalities. And yet, the federal structure and all its instruments, both the latest and those from the past, are not a magic wand which in itself makes these relations harmonious, but rather an institutional setting in which, observing the principles set up in advance, it is possible and necessary permanently to coordinate and develop relations which are the social foundation, the social content of this institutional setting.

It is therefore especially significant, for all Yugoslav nations, that the process of coordination, the process of identification of the common interest is extremely intricate and sometimes even profoundly contradictory. There is quite a number of social situations in which the path to understanding proceeds through misunderstanding and the establishing of the initial points of the dispute is the beginning of a real understanding. It is not necessary especially to prove that the historical interests of all Yugoslav nations and nationalities are connected to the existence of the common state to such an extent that any thesis, no matter how it is formulated, which would look for a basis of existence of any of the Yugoslav nations outside the common state, would represent a historical mistake which nobody could justify.

Even though the advocating of this kind of approach to relations between nationalities is the advocating of maximum tolerance, the full expression and affirmation of a special national interest, one must never forget that the basic national interest of all Yugoslav nations is the preservation and further development of socialist Yugoslavia. The entire mechanism of the federation must be dedicated to this fundamental goal and the further development must evolve in that direction.

Federalism in Yugoslavia, just as throughout the world, historically emerged as the form of the internal system of relations in the state. Consequently, as the principle of the organization and system of the state. A phase had existed in our development in which federalism has

above all been this and remnants of this phase still exist. But, federalism has never been only this.

If federalism were solely a principle of organization of the state it would then only partly and in fact to a less important proportion be also the form of the settlement of the national question. That is why the new phase in the development of the Yugoslav federalization of non-state structures. More simply said, in addition to the perfection of the state-legal aspect of relations between Yugoslav nations, it is also absolutely necessary to draw consequences from the basic principles upon which the Yugoslav federation is resting in all spheres of social life.

It would be wrong, but such tendencies unfortunately exist, were the federalization of the Yugoslav society conceived as a pretext for the disintegration of the state. Federalism in general, by its basic idea, is not a form of social disintegration but is, as history is proving, a form of social integration. For this reason the federalization of the entire social structure would not be complete if it meant solely a mechanical creation of the autonomy of its parts. The creation of autonomy of parts of the social structure has the sense of elements of federalization only if it is the pre-condition for re-unification upon the basis of the common interest that is understood and adopted.

The federalization of the social political structure, for instance, is not necessary for the Yugoslav society for the sake of shattering — by means of acts and actions of the federalization — the ideological and political unity of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, or of any other form of socio-political organization, but rather in order to offer — in this form of political and social organization — an opportunity for the expressing of special interests, but also in order to discover and secure channels for the synthesis of these special interests into common ones.

In spite of our discontent with what has been achieved, there is no reason for the general evaluation in this respect to be negative. Let us take only, in a broader context, what has been taking place with the LCY since 1967 to the present day. The principles stemming from the basic sense of national equality and federalism in Yugoslavia, in a virtually absolutely clear version, have been accepted and have been implemented in the composition of the top ranking bodies of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.

The LCY has thus neither formally nor factually become the federation of absolutely independent national unions. Proceeding from its class and historical basis, it has in fact maintained its internal unity upon new foundations. The changes that have been effectuated in its internal structure have proved that the evincing of the special interest need not be an obstacle to the factual discovery of the common interest.

However, one must underline that the implementation of the same principle in various spheres of social structure does not produce the same organizational forms, even though in the sphere of socio-political organization the degree of similarity with solutions in the system of public authority and self-management will be considerable. And yet, one must not expect, or rather it would certainly be wrong to expect that forms discovered and applied, e.g., in the work of the

Federal Assembly can be merely transposed into all spheres of social life. It is absolutely necessary to observe the specific features of individual spheres and facilitate the implementation — through various institutional forms — of the same principle or rather the attaining of the same social goal.

The most complicated thing is to speak about new, but permanently present elements in the national question when this must be transposed into the system of socio-economic relations. Increasingly so since this, in the strict sense, transcends the settings of our theme which is confined to the political system. The political system is an autonomous part of the social system but it is nonetheless deduced from definite socio-economic relations and is based upon them. Finally, the greatest number of outstanding questions exists in this sphere in Yugoslavia and this makes the situation even more difficult.

In spite of all these reserves I have decided to express a warning. Even though Yugoslavia is a federation which consists of a number of nationalities and, according to certain criteria is quite loose, the socio-economic system is uniform. Or, more accurately, the degree of its uniformity is the basic criterion of the cohesion of the entire community. Simply speaking, there exists one Yugoslav socialism, or it does not exist at all, or rather it is jeopardized to the greatest possible degree. In a universal-historical setting it is not possible to imagine it in different manner. However, the principle of unity of the socio-economic system does not exclude a definite autonomy of individual parts. It is certain that this autonomy has limits which cannot possibly be established in an abstract manner. This is not at all an easy job, but it is possible and absolutely necessary. The autonomy of individual parts of the single socio-economic system could never and in no way result in autarchy. It is certain that none of the republics is sufficient in itself and Yugoslavia as an entity cannot exist separately from the world either.

In order to give a reply to the question of the relation between the national question and self-management it is necessary, above all, to warn to the fact that self-management in its substance does not represent a process connected to a people or nation, but is a general social process which is not solely Yugoslav either. If it were not so, if self-management were connected to any kind or anybody's national spirit, it would have no historical prospect whatsoever and it would be condemned to gradual atrophy and disappearance.

In the philosophical-historical sense self-management is a universal social process. That is why it is perhaps possible, unless the factual courses of development are discovered, to gain the impression that the universality of self-management represents the negation of national specific features. I do not mean to say that in individual actions and in individual sequences of the development of our society it is not possible to detect also this kind of conduct in the social practice. The full affirmation of nations is absolutely certainly not solely in the creation of a national state and still less in the creation of any kind of national state. It is known that class oppression and exploitation do not cease even in a homogenous state, without a social revolution.

The full affirmation of the majority of nations and of the majority in the nation is certainly connected with its internal democratization which, in the contemporary phase of social development in Yugoslavia, is bound to lead to self-management. For this reason, even though self-management is a universal phenomenon, it does not oppose the affirmation of the nation, but the affirmation of the nation is possible only through the process of development of self-management.

According to this state of affairs the separation of self-management from federalism and especially their opposition against one another, would also be untenable. Historically regarded neither federalism nor self-management in Yugoslavia can have any progressive alternative. In other words, self-management in Yugoslavia is possible solely as self-management in the Yugoslav federation. A federation in Yugoslavia, as the setting of national equality, is possible only as a self-management federation.

Dr ALEKSANDAR FIRA

Dr Aleksandar Fira, Born on May 4, 1929 in Kragujevac. He graduated from the Belgrade Law Faculty in 1952 where he obtained a doctorate in political science on "The Vidovdan Constitution" in 1960. In 1961 he became an assistant and later associate professor at the Law Faculty in Novi Sad. He became full professor of Constitutional Law at the same faculty in 1970.

Professor Fira has lectured at many universities in Yugoslavia and abroad. He has been active in developing Yugoslavia's constitution. He became a member of the Constitutional Court of Yugoslavia in December, 1969.

Professor Fira has had a large number of scientific and technical works published from the field of constitutional law and political science, including:

1. Constitutional Law — Part I,
2. Contribution to a Study of Bourgeois Democratic Political Systems,
3. Certain Aspects of Constitutional Jurisprudence in Yugoslavia and the World,
4. The Development of Constitutional Law in Old Yugoslavia,
5. The Constitutional Position of the Socialist Alliance,
6. Modern Tendencies in the Electoral System,
7. The Constitutional Judicial Development of Autonomous Units and Their Organizations in the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia,
8. Changes in the Constitutional System,
9. The Constitutional Law of the Socialist Autonomous Province of Vojvodina,
10. Elements of an Approach to Studying Political Systems of Socialism,
11. Socio-Political Organizations in the System of Self-Management,
12. The Relationship Between Personal and Collective Responsibility by Members of the Organs of Management,
13. Certain Institutional Aspects of Internationality Relations,
14. Problems of Federalism,
15. The Essence and Meaning of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in a Self-Managing Society,
16. The Chief of State in the Yugoslav Constitutional System,
17. Self-Management and Responsibility,
18. Problems in Implementing the Constitution.

Dr Stevan KUKOLEČA

Professor and Dean of the Faculty of Organizational Sciences at the University of Beograd

ECONOMIC POSITION OF YUGOSLAV ENTERPRISE AND ITS FUNCTION IN YUGOSLAV ECONOMY

I POLITICAL BACKGROUND

During the first years after World War II, the Yugoslav economy, which was previously an underdeveloped, rural-capitalistic economy, began to move towards socialist concepts of society. Some objective prerequisites for these changes were created by legal nationalization of the means of production in industry of 1945, and equipment and inventories in commerce a year later. At the same time the political power of the new State was being built and these two processes were to be co-ordinated. For these reasons the Yugoslav economy passed through different organizational forms, starting from the highly centralized type of economy to the present largely decentralized economic units.

1. Fundamental Constitutional Provisions

The most important deficiency of centralization was reflected on the socio-political level as the limitation of individual freedom of working people. From the political point of view, unilateral subordination of workers to any kind of executive was incompatible with the fundamental principles of a classless society as the final goal of socialist revolution. And from the economic standpoint, through this subordination to the hierarchy, the most creative powers of man were restrained in the general effort to achieve a higher living standard by developing the productive powers of society.

These fundamental basic points (political rather than economic), during the next few years after the early 50's, generated a process of shaping of new economic and socio-political concepts which could be outlined as follows:

(1) The working man is his own boss not only in his individual, but also in his collective work, which implies the need for the substitution of individual by collective management — substitution by collective

self-management which means managing his own work for management of some by others.

(2) The working man is not only the boss of his own work but also of the fruits of his work, which means, generally speaking, that he and only he, is authorized to distribute these benefits.

Without an awareness of these two crucial political principles any researcher of Yugoslav conditions and its social development is confronted with rather misleading conclusions. How far-reaching they are in shaping of the socio-political structure of the state and its performance is affirmed by the fact that they are formulated on the constitutional level by the Yugoslav Constitution of 1963 and even enlarged by the Constitutional Amendments of 1971. This formulation and the most important institutional concepts deriving from it are defined in the following sense:

(1) Self-management in the working organization includes in particular the right and duty of the working people: a) to distribute the income belonging to the organization in which they work (the enterprise) and to provide for the development of the material basis for their work; b) to distribute income among the working people; c) to meet the working organization's obligations to the social community. (Article 9).

(2) Any act violating the right of self-management of the working people is unconstitutional. (Article 9)

(3) The organization of work and management in the enterprise must enable the working people at every level and in every part of the working process, which constitutes an entity, to decide as directly as possible on matters of work, organization of mutual relations, distribution of income, and on other matters affecting their economic position, at the same time ensuring for the working organization as a whole, the most favourable conditions for its work and business. (Article 10)

(4) The working organization, after providing the means to renew the value of the resources expended in work, after allocating a part of the created value of the product for equalization of working conditions, shall apportion the income of the working organization to a fund to expand the material basis of the work and a fund to satisfy the personal and common needs of the working people. (Article 11).

(5) The working organization shall be entitled to a part of the created value of the product for the satisfaction of personal and common need of the working people proportionate to the productivity of work of the working people and subject to the success of the business. (Article 11)

These constitutional provisions have influenced to a great extent the shaping of the organizational and institutional features of the Yugoslav economy in the past eight years and are still doing so now.

2. Liberation of Labour as a Great Historical Ideal of Working People

Throughout history to date the worker has been subordinated to his work instead of being the master, because of the fact that his work was managed not by himself but by others — by managers. It was true not only for the capitalistic enterprise but also for the enterprise in the Eastern European socialist countries and for the Yugoslav enterprises until the beginning of the process of constituting workers' self-management, and public administration. The difference is only with respect to the origin of managerial power: in capitalist enterprise, it originated from the organizational administrative structure of the state involving economic enterprises as well as noneconomic social units.

However, one of the primary goals of socialist movements of the working class was to end the worker's subordination to the work and to make him the master of his own work instead of the servant. The Yugoslav economic and political development is in the course of fulfilling this ideal of working people. Therefore, the organizational structure of any one working unit — economic as non-economic — cannot be otherwise than decentralized. Even the concept of management is in the course of disappearing, though so far only theoretically rather than in practice. Nevertheless the improvement of scientific methods of decision making and the increase in the average educational level of working people are promising signs, so that one day this disappearance of management may become possible in practice.

3. Need for Collective Work

Contemporary industry, as we know, requires the division of labor which in itself constrains the workers in their dependence on work: the need for coordinated activities for the achievement of common goals imposes limitations to the implementation of the principles of labor's liberation. But these mutual links within a working community produced by the nature of work and division of labor are to be viewed from two different points when raising the question of worker's dependence on labor. First, as far as the professional and technological aspects of labor are concerned, the worker's freedom is not endangered by collective work at all: coordination of actions to achieve common goals generated only the opportunity for each member of the workers' community to play his own role with respect to his education, training and individual ability. By contrast to the professional aspect of human relations within workers' communities, the problem is quite different with respect to the process of decision making, because any decision, which involves for its realization two or more people, produces at the same time the need for authority to be imposed upon those people by someone. The exercise of such authority over other people can always endanger the political freedom of these people.

4. *Principle of Self-Management*

The principle of self-management is intended to solve this conflict between techno-economic postulates for collective work and the political need to keep the individual's freedom from subordination to his work. By this principle, defined and promulgated on the constitutional level, we understand the right of every worker to make decisions directly or indirectly, about essential questions of his work.

This is done directly in the case of small collectives ranging from more than two people to about 70 persons. In this direct decision-making each worker is involved in management by making collective decisions concerning the work. Differences between policy making and operational running of the enterprise disappear under these conditions of management.

Indirect control occurs when the size of the workers' community exceeds 70 persons which in practice means the overwhelming majority of the enterprises engaged in industry and commerce. In these enterprises, two kinds of managerial executives are acting: workers' councils and executive boards. Both are empowered by the workers' community to make decisions in the name of the community for its benefit, for the benefit of the enterprise as well as of society as a whole. The power given to them by the workers' community can be withdrawn at any time, restricted, or checked through referendum according to the statutory provisions. Individual members of these two executive bodies can be discharged from their duties in self-managerial organs according to the same statutory regulations. In practice there is little difference in power between the workers' council and the executive board although the latter is subordinate to the workers' council and does not even exist in enterprises of less than ten people. But because this is a small body (ranging from five to eleven members), it is more flexible and more accurate and therefore, has more influence even on the major aspects of the development of the business.

Self-managerial decisions imply only the formulation of the principal decisions which are the basis of business policy with respect to: the interests of the enterprise as the fundamental economic unit and the interest of society as a whole. All other decisions, while deriving from these fundamental decisions made by self-managerial organs, are made by the executive managerial staff ranging from the director general to the foreman of a group of workers. This means that the managerial function of the executive staff in the Western sense has not yet disappeared, but its existence in the future development of the decision-making procedure is uncertain.

The basic concept of self-management is of prime importance on judging its effect on the merger movements in the controversy over the centralized versus the decentralized economic body. Namely, integrating forces leading to monopolies are alleviated by such a degree that any kind of mergers in existing Yugoslav condition does not represent a monopolistic danger in the classical sense of the word, thanks to the ability of the workers' communities to dissolve mergers through the same procedure as they created them.

The self-management principle can be performed in real economic life only if based on firm organizational institutions capable of and interested in its implementation. By the constitutional provisions, these institutions are workers' communities formed on different levels of the social structure depending on the stage of social development achieved.

It is usual to identify the workers' community with the people working in an enterprise. But within such a community there can and do exist other communities not as hierarchical "sub-communities" but as narrower communities with the same power of internal self-management as workers' communities have for the enterprise as a whole. In Yugoslav economic practice of today, there exist working units within an enterprise, that is within the workers' community of an individual enterprise. Each working unit is fundamental producing unit within the enterprise. Each has to have its own technology regardless of whether its work results in products for the market or in semi-products to be finished in other working units of the same enterprise. How many working units there may be within an enterprise depends on how far a technological process may be divided into subphases without impeding its normal functioning, and on the desire of the working people of a unit to exist and perform as a separate unit.

This right of working units within an enterprise produces far reaching consequences on the movement from centralization to decentralization: any kind of integrated form within the economy of today can be disintegrated tomorrow and vice versa. Instability of organizational forms in this sense generates in its turn instability in exercising power for decision-making on the higher levels of integration and also with respect to the possible monopolization of production or distribution.

II ECONOMIC DECENTRALIZATION AND ITS IMPLICATIONS

The achievement of the freedom of labor through self-management, being one of the main political goals, generates a tendency towards disintegration of economic units into smaller and smaller ones. It produces the problem of a decrease of economic efficiency which is almost in direct correlation to the size of the unit. Problems caused by these opposite movements in the Yugoslav economy in the past decade may be outlined as follows:

1. *Techno-economic Disadvantages of Decentralization*

There is no doubt that large economic units have many techno-economic advantages compared with small ones: mass-production with decreasing costs per unit, more opportunity for mechanization and automation, faster process of innovation, large-scale accumulation of capital and so on.

In the first stage of Yugoslav decentralization through self-management, we were confronted with a situation having quite opposite

character to the above mentioned advantages of large economic units: small-scale production, lack of possibilities for research and development, slow pace of accumulation of capital and in very small units no accumulation, difficulties in allocating funds for investment according to the modern technical development, short-run development policy, stagnation in productivity, etc.

Even at that time, we were aware that the success of decentralization through self-management depended on the rate of techno-economic progress as much as the degree of freedom of labor and incentives for progress generated through freedom. Therefore, we were from the start aware of the possibility of conflict between concentration of means of production and the positive political effects of decentralization provided by self-government.

2. Integration as a Process of Opposite Movements to Decentralization and Conciliation of These Opposite Movements

Our experience in the past year brought us to the conclusion that the benefits of technical progress could be exploited to the full while decentralizing the economic system through self-management only by creating opportunity for a flow of capital independent of the organizational levels of self-government. This means that accumulation and funds for reinvestment must be allocated in a way appropriate to the technical requirements of modern development, independently of the forms and levels of self-managerial institutions. If so, then generally speaking, capital accumulated in an enterprise should have been transferable to investment in other enterprises; or capital accumulated on the level of the working units of an enterprise should have been transferable to investment on the level of enterprise (new plant erected for the needs of different working units within an enterprise using their combined funds), or on the level above the enterprise for the needs of different enterprise (research and development agencies for the needs of different enterprises).

Such forms of solutions seem to be required to generate tendencies of self-management. In other words, while self-management on one hand was permitting the liberation of labor, on the other hand, the flow of capital should have been creating the integration of technical means of production. But in effect it is much easier to construct a general model of that kind in order to reconcile opposite movements of decentralization versus centralization than to make it work. But the results achieved in the last few years in this respect have encouraged us to believe that we were on the right track.

3. Enterprise As the First Order Techno-Economic Integrated Form

The enterprise viewed from this standpoint of simultaneous and opposite processes of decentralization of decision making and of centralization of means of production can be treated as the first order

techno-economic integrated form. Namely, the level of working units within the enterprise is the basic organizational level. Full decision making authority is generated within its framework through the immediate decisions of all members of the working unit. Its machinery and equipment is homogeneous, not offering the benefits in economic results of those on a higher level of technological combination, which allows large scale production. Neither decision making nor equipment is integrated on this level of working unit.

On the level of the enterprise, the degree of integration of means of production is relatively high and consequently so is their techno-economic efficiency. The enterprise as an integrated economic organization of this kind, involving in itself more than one working unit, provides an increase in techno-economic efficiency, because of the technical integration achieved, but at the same time, raises the question of integration of decision making which does not exist on the level of the working unit. Because of higher efficiency (results of the enterprise must be always greater than the sum of its working units working independently), priority must be given to the specific interests of the enterprise if they do exist. But this means that authority for decision-making does exist on the level of the enterprise and in fact, it does in the form of the workers' council. This institution (workers' council) is nothing else but the integrated form of decision-making, restricting the power of decision-making on the level of working units, although the decision-making authority originated from them.

Therefore, it is not only among the politicians but also among other experts in Yugoslavia that the existing enterprises are considered as the transient forms to a higher level of organization with more technical integration and at the same time more decision-making freedom on the level of working units. Although to nobody is it quite clear what should be the form of these higher organizations above the level of the existing enterprises, such orientation in searching for better solutions is very often emphasized while promising simultaneously more freedom and more economic efficiency.

4. Integrated Enterprises As the Second Order Techno-Economic Form

At this time in Yugoslavia there do exist organizations resulting from the process of integration of existing enterprises. Usually in these cases the enterprises do not disappear so that the new organizational forms are of the second order (working units — enterprises — integrated enterprises).

This type of specific merged business organization may be preferable from the point of view of techno-economic efficiency provided other subjective conditions exist. Among these conditions is the need for restrictions of decision-making power on lower levels in order to make top decisions more efficient. And here again is some incongruence of the self-management requirements of merged enterprises (even in their working units) and the objective techno-economic efficiency pro-

vided by merging. In looking for the solutions of such controversies when they occurred in past years, during the process of integration, which was stimulated by the government, the inviolability of the self-management principle, having constitutional strength, usually prevailed. But it was not only because of the constitutional strength of the self-management principle that many integrating processes were slowed down and some organizations which had emerged through integration disappeared soon afterward. The interests of members of workers' communities, depending on the situation in which they found themselves, played an important role in this process of merging and dissolving.

In those cases in which it was obvious to anybody that integration of more enterprises could generate very considerable business improvement, workers agreed with integration even when this required unconditional transfer of much decision-making power to the highest levels of decision-making (central workers council, director general). But these cases were rather the exception than the rule. In many other cases there emerged many obstacles to merging, the most common being:

— Although it was suggested as a measure for improving technoeconomic efficiency, proposals for merging were often made even among very different technological activities promising very little improvements if any;

— In other cases, enterprises wishing to merge had had different degrees of business success in the past so that the more successful did not agree to merge with the others perhaps risking being confronted with bankruptcy;

— In some cases wide differences in the organizational level between the enterprises to be merged was an impediment to success.

So far experience with merging in the past few years leads us to the following conclusions:

1. In contrast to similar processes in a capitalist environment, mergers did not result creating large and powerful organizations to the extent that they could impose their will on others, the customers, or competitive organizations.

2. In the cases where mergers did succeed, it was only to the extent of the coincidence of interests of the merged workers' communities with the business interests of the new organizations. As soon as events showed evidence that this coincidence of interests was disappearing, signs of willingness of worker' communities to use their right for self-management emerged.

III ECONOMIC BEHAVIOUR OF ENTERPRISE

1. *Enterprise and Market*

The Yugoslav economy is a market economy in the real sense of the word. In practice there is perhaps more freedom for the Yugoslav entrepreneur than for those in capitalistic enterprises because of the

absence of close ties between established producers through mergers of professional organizations, and because of the low level of State interference. Features of a market economy are shown by the following characteristics:

A guiding principle in pursuing planned economic goals is the principle of profitability for each enterprise. Of course, profitability in the specific Yugoslav sense of the word means that the profitability is measured by the difference between gross revenue and material costs of production. In other words, the term "income" includes not only money to be paid to the State and the allotments to the different enterprise funds but also the workers' personal incomes.

The market prices are determined by the supply and demand for each good. Competition from abroad exercises an important role in the Yugoslav market because of the moderate level of protection afforded by customs duties. As the result of these two principles — the principle of profitability and the principle of free pricing — there has been in the last ten years a strong tendency towards a long-run increase of prices. In fact, over this period prices have, on the average, tripled.

The connection between producer and customer is becoming closer. One cannot any longer produce unsaleable goods or goods of poor quality, as was possible in the period of centralized administration, which ended in the mid-sixties. Since that time there has been a period of great shortage of all kinds of commodities, but Yugoslav products now have the same quality as (often even better quality than) imports. In this respect Yugoslavia has solved one of the key problems of socialist economy — the problem of quality and of diversification of products.

A capital market is taking shape in the same way as the market for material goods. Banks are functioning as credit enterprises with the same rights as all other enterprises, namely, those of self-administration, the same conditions for doing business, the same opportunities to realize income, and the same opportunity to distribute this income. The main sources of their long-term credit resources are: the interest paid on the existing means of production (fixed assets and circulating funds); credit granted by different enterprises; credit granted to the business banks by the National Bank. Short-term credit is granted on the basis of short-term enterprise deposits and the saving deposits of individuals. Borrowers have to pay interest at the rate influenced by the National Bank.

2. Decision-making in Yugoslav Enterprise

Authorities empowered to make decisions in the enterprise (temporarily let us call them decision-makers; later, we shall describe these organs in somewhat more detail) are at least as free as are decision-makers in capitalist corporations. Any decision imposed from outside, may it be by the State, the Party, or third parties, is really illegal. The chances of such a decision's being implemented are really very small. For a better understanding of the comparison of this decision-making

procedure with that in, let us say, an American corporation, it would be better to explain what the decision-maker is not allowed, instead of what is allowed by statutory provisions:

Self-administration is a constitutional rule, and the workers' communities (i.e., the workers) in an enterprise cannot alienate this right by empowering, for instance, a group of friends among them to administer. From the point of view of joint ventures with foreign capitalist enterprises this means that such a joint enterprises must be subordinated to the general rules by decision of the relevant workers' community, as are all domestic enterprises.

Generally speaking, workers' communities can decide to sell the means of production (assets, equipment, plant, factory), but under one condition: the proceeds cannot be consumed as personal income. Such assets must be either reinvested in a new industry, or transferred to the economic fund of the local social community in the territory in which the dissolved enterprise was located.

The statute of an enterprise is a kind of constitution for that enterprise. Each enterprise is empowered to write and promulgate its own statute, but it must conform to the terms of the constitution and legal provisions. The statute comprises all the rules concerning the permitted functions of the enterprise and all the rules concerning inter-relations among the members of workers' communities — that is, their rights and duties to each other. The statute can be passed only by a majority of all workers in the workers' community. But no community can pass a statute providing for the dismissal of a worker for a reason not provided for by law. It is legally possible to dismiss a worker only; (1) when he becomes redundant as the consequence of increased productivity (or because of other kinds of rationalization) and when it is not possible to employ him in another position within the enterprise, and (2) when dismissal is a punishment for being guilty of acts contrary to the regulations concerning job relations as provided by the statute or by special regulations deriving from the statute.

In Yugoslavia more emphasis is put on the differentiation between the administration and the management within an enterprise than is usually done in an American corporation. To administer means to make general decisions relating, especially, to business policy, such as those having to do with income distribution and allotment to different funds. The management function involves current operational decisions. Accordingly there are within an enterprise clearly differentiated administrative organs on one hand and managerial organs on the other.

Administrative organs are the policymakers in the enterprise. They draft the general lines of business policy and are responsible for its implementation. All members of the workers' community and executives in the enterprise are responsible to these organs for the implementation of goals to be achieved as a result of this policy. Again, generally speaking, this top administrative organ is formally the workers' community as a whole. But this is actually the case only in small shops, handcraft workshops and small industrial plants. This power can be effectively and directly exercised in enterprises ranging at the

most to thirty to fifty workers in total. In all other cases which form the overwhelming majority of industrial and commercial enterprise, the administrative power, in the sense of policymaking, can be exercised only indirectly, i.e., through the workers' councils. These workers' councils, ranging from eleven to sixty-five persons, are elected by the workers' community in a secret ballot and entrusted to pursue the business policy over a period of two years, half of the members being reelected each year.

Even from this sparse information one can deduce the following important conclusions with respect to policy-making:

1. Members of workers' communities, as well as of the workers' councils, are not professionally trained for the formulation of business policy.

2. The procedure for collective decision-making absolves the decision-makers from responsibility for unsatisfactory decisions.

This latter conclusion does not mean that there is no responsibility for non-achievement of goals, for misuse of power for lack of success in business, and so on. There is another line of control, the operational decisions formulated by the managerial network, at the top of which is the director of the enterprise. He is responsible for all failures due to business policy, despite the fact that the policy decisions were made by others, usually the workers' council. As illogical as such a provision may seem at first glance, there is some logic in it. The director, and the executives acting on his authority are professionally trained in management, and are supposed to know clearly the interests of the enterprise, and are empowered (especially the director) to interfere if the workers' council is about to pass an unwise decision, although their interference is limited to a consultative role. If in spite of such involvement the council decides against the director's advice, then there may be other reasons involved, possible special personal interests of the council members. In such cases, legal prosecution may very likely be initiated on the basis of the statutory provisions. However, this relationship between administrative and managerial organs in the enterprise does generate misconception and internal friction, sometimes with serious consequences.

3. Income as the Major Incentive

In contrast to other East European countries, in Yugoslavia the so-called principle of income is the major incentive in stimulating production and supply to the customers. While in the East European socialist countries the implementation of plans and the quantity of products are the most important manifestations of business success, in the Yugoslav enterprise it is the income which provides the most powerful driving force in industry. In this respect, a Yugoslav enterprise is similar to the capitalist one. As the capitalist corporation is interested in maximization of profit, the Yugoslav enterprise is in the same way interested in maximization of income, as we have defined income pre-

viously (i.e., gross revenue less cost of materials). One might even say that this interest is much stronger in the Yugoslav case because every member of a workers' community is equally interested in increasing income, unlike in a capitalist corporation where we find some conflict of interest between the workers and the company with regard to profit.

The Yugoslav system has positive as well as negative effects on business success. A positive effect is doubtless a higher degree of motivation for the increase of production and, hence, of income. This has been convincingly proved because Yugoslavia has, in fact, registered a 14 per cent average rate of economic growth in real from 1960 to 1965. But from the point of view of the larger community (i.e., the national economy), the income motivation may be negative, which is difficult to explain to readers who are familiar only with the capitalist enterprise. Namely, taking into account the fact that income in a Yugoslav enterprise is the difference between the gross revenue realized in sales and material costs excluding costs of labor, income can be increased either by increasing the selling price or decreasing the costs per unit, or both. From the national point of view, the first measure is negative and the second, positive. Both are positive from the point of view of the workers' community of the enterprise, because they result in greater income. Under real conditions the workers' community will take the path of least resistance even if it may be against the interest of the larger community. And if figures are produced showing false costs, untrue production level, and so on which is quite possible, and the real facts of the situation not disclosed until a future period, if ever, then it is clear that there may occur many conflicts between the business policy of the enterprise and the State economic policy.

In the long run policy interests of the larger community and of the State must take precedence over the interest of a single enterprise, but such precedence is not always easy to accomplish.

4. Lack of Competition Despite the Free Market

Producers, distributors and retailers are free in regard to the choice of products and the setting of prices. And despite the fact that there are no monopolies of supply in the sense of capitalist monopolies, one cannot claim that there is a competitive market in the real sense. The point is that there exists a chronic imbalance between supply and demand in favor of the producers. This phenomenon appears for many reasons, including the following:

1. The relatively small national economy (20 million inhabitants) which is supplied almost completely by a small number of producers, thereby giving the latter a kind of ipso facto monopolistic status.
2. Restrictions on imports imposed by the low level of exports. Because of the increased consumption of agricultural products in the country, Yugoslavia became an importer of agricultural products in-

stead of an exporter as before the war. Some disproportion between the industries producing semifinished products and finishing industries in favor of the latter resulted in large scale import of semifinished products, which in turn has created some shortage in supply of many finished goods which would otherwise have been imported.

3. Self-administration of workers' communities plus the system of income distribution and the increase in the purchasing power of consumers results in an ever increasing consumer pressure on the market, thereby producing a climate conducive to price increases. This is a special complex of market problems about which we intend to say a little more.

5. Problems in the Procedure for Income Distribution

The net income of the enterprise is deduced from the gross sales revenue after the subtraction of, first, material costs (cost of material and depreciation of equipment); second, interest on all business funds (sources for increased investment); third, repayment of credit and interest on this credit. The workers' community, or workers' council in the larger enterprise, is empowered to allocate this net income to the fund for personal income and to the various enterprise funds for the further improvement of the business (i.e., investment). This is a procedure which poses great temptations in many cases. The development of the enterprise implies the need for a relatively fast increase of enterprise funds, while on the other hand the same requirement is posed by the fund for personal income in order to increase the living standard of the workers' community. Given such temptations, the interests pushing towards consumption by the workers' community nearly always prevail. As a result, in the past six to seven years while this system has been in use, the nationwide personal income level has been continually increasing in relation to the size of enterprise funds. In some drastic cases, the latter almost disappeared while the funds for personal income increased rapidly.

A general rule for the increase in personal income is that it should be proportional to the increase in productivity. But as experience in the near past shows, the increase of personal income, on the average, has been twice as fast as the increase of productivity.

There are also problems for business policy and policy-makers. It is not only a question of a lack of foresight in allotting a greater part of income to personal consumption and leaving an insufficient amount for the enterprise funds. There is also the problem of forming objective criteria for income distribution strategy, because all is in a state of flux, especially prices. For instance, if productivity is increased by 10 per cent, and at the same time prices increase by 20 per cent, the increase of personal income can be proportionately greater than the increase of productivity. But how much more? In theory this does not seem to pose a difficult problem, but in practice it is quite different.

6. Inflationary Pressure on the Market

Let us not go further in studying this complex of policy problems, but accept the reality that personal incomes are increasing faster than productivity, thereby generating a new problem for policy makers, that being an ever growing pressure exercised by consumers on the market. This pressure causes a tendency towards a steady price increase, which of itself generates no pricing problems in the enterprise.

From the point of view of market relationships there is a spiral movement in the sense that the increase of personal income pushes prices to a higher level and this higher level, in turn, generates a still greater increase of personal income, and so on. From the point of view of decision-making it is a vicious circle which no decision-maker is able to prevent.

The events in the near past confirm the reality of these tendencies. They were a common phenomenon until the economic reform of 1965, one of the most important targets of which was to decrease these inflationary tendencies and to bring more stability to the economy. As far as one can see to date these tendencies have been reduced but not completely eliminated. The character of the changes is confirmed by the new restrictions imposed by the Government at the end of the past year on the right of income distribution in those organizations in which there is no firm basis for applying the principle of proportionality to changes in productivity to income increases. Those include banks, commercial enterprises, public agencies, and public institutions (such as schools).

Through the whole period of the last twenty years Yugoslavia has had a relatively high average rate of investment, though, of course, with considerable fluctuation over time. In view of the rather low initial productive power of the economy, a great effort was necessary to alleviate the shortage of capital because of the pressure on funds for investment. There was not only pressure on the capital market, but also on the supply of professionally trained. In the period following the end of World War II, Yugoslavia really did not have such personnel at all in the real sense of the word, which situation is a usual result of revolution and large socio-political disturbances. But one is forced to accept people as they are. Attempts to rectify this situation led to varying degrees of success. One result was a high degree of differentiation from plant to plant as measured by their economic efficiency and usefulness from the socio-political point of view.

From the managerial standpoint, i.e., from the standpoint of decision-making, this situation created new problems by underscoring discrepancies between desired results and real capabilities, in many cases, as well as problems of overcapacity in other cases. It became clear that these imbalances constituted one of the key problems requiring successful resolution by decision-makers. Yet management skills were inadequately developed to meet the problem.

In addition to all these and many other troubles in pursuing a sound business policy, one must emphasize that in recent years Yugo-

slavia has been pursuing a positive course towards an increasingly consistent application of fundamental economic principles in formulating business policy. In the first years after the break of close links with the Soviet block, virtually no one in Yugoslavia was concerned about economic principles. Everyone considered the implementation of plans as the most important — if not the sole — economic goal. The importance of the plan is not underestimated in business policy today, but its implementation is conditioned by the application of three economic principles:

- 1) the principle of productivity
- 2) the principle of efficiency
- 3) the principle of rentability,

which corresponds to profitability under capitalist conditions.

By the first, the principle of productivity, we refer to the ratio between production, i.e. quantity of goods produced in some period, and the labor force (i.e., man-hours) involved in this production. Application of this principle may not be of primary interest from the point of view of an enterprise acting in a market economy because the final measure of its business success will be shaped only by market achievements. But in the interests of society, increased productivity comes first, being the only way to improve the capacity of the society as a whole to consume.

By the second principle, that of efficiency, we refer to the ratio between the value of goods produced in a given period and of goods consumed (i.e., the relative costs of production and sales revenue). It expresses the degree of rationality — in terms of consumer demand — in exploiting existing, or available means of production. This is an important principle from the point of view of the need to conserve scarce means of production (which is the overriding concern in the East European countries), as well as to improve the competitive ability of the enterprise in the market (which plays an important role in the Yugoslav money-commodity economy). One must agree that this principle has been applied in all socialist countries, but almost without effective benefits for the individual enterprise, except in Yugoslavia. There, the application of this principle began to have stronger influence on business success following the more radical measures of decentralization and self-administration (i.e., self management). Now cost reduction is almost, although not quite, as important a means of increasing income as increase of market prices. The qualification must be injected for several reasons, but especially by reason of the inclination of enterprise to pursue their goals along the line of less resistance.

By the third principle, that of rentability or profitability, we refer to the ratio between the income of an enterprise and the total average amount of funds (fixed assets and circulating funds) engaged in production. As the application of the first principle, the principle of productivity, fits best to the interests of society in providing the greatest opportunity to satisfy economic needs through increasing production by increased productivity, application of the principle of ren-

tability benefits the enterprise because by pursuing in the enterprise accumulates the maximum income, which in turn gives the maximum opportunity to increase the amount of personal income.

This polarization of interests between society as a whole, expressed through the principle of productivity, and the enterprise, expressed through the principle of rentability, often generates an incongruence of goals between society and the enterprise. Measures of general economic policy introduced by the state are mainly intended to decrease these incongruences. These measures mainly relate to the improvement of productivity on a national scale and to the control, or the suppression, of income derived from unjustified price increases, and similar measures. It is a difficult task, very complex in the overwhelming number of cases, but a task which is likely to prove increasingly fruitful with the refinement of the measures used for determining business success and for income distribution. Although Yugoslavia has not yet found a final and wholly satisfactory solution of this problem, one must agree that visible progress in this field has been achieved.

Dr STEVAN KUKOLEČA

Dr. Stevan Kukoleča was born in Glina in 1913. He graduated from the Belgrade Law Faculty in 1936 and obtained a doctorate from the Belgrade Economics Faculty in 1954. In 1951 he was appointed visiting instructor at the same faculty for the Organization and Economics of Enterprises, where he later lectured part-time as a full professor on the Economics of Enterprises to undergraduate students and on the Theory of Reproduction in Enterprises to graduate students. He taught the same subject at the Economics Faculty Graduate Schools in Ljubljana and Subotica, and now lectures on this subject at the Economics Faculty in Skopje to graduate students. While at the Economics Faculty in Subotica he also lectured to graduate students on the Cybernetics of Organizational Systems. Dr. Kukoleča was appointed permanent visiting professor at the Technical and Metallurgical Faculty in Belgrade in 1957, and became a permanent full professor in 1962 for The Fundamentals of Organization and Economics in Enterprises. Between 1967 and 1968 he spent eight months in the United States and two months in England and Western Europe studying the latest scientific and methodological achievements in the field of the organizational sciences, and in particular dealing with the theories of systems and cybernetics. He lectured in the field of the organizational sciences and the economics of enterprises at universities in the United States, England and Germany.

Dr. Kukoleča has had 152 works of various kinds published, consisting of 27 books and textbooks (of which six were written with co-authors) numbering a total of about 8,000 pages. The majority of these books have had more than one edition, some as many as nine. His remaining works include 15 booklets popularizing science and 110 articles and short papers. Most of these works deal with the organization and economics of enterprises, some offer an analysis of Yugoslavia's economic structure and development and others are methodological statistical studies.

Dr. Kukoleča is an associate in the Yugoslav Statistical Society, the League of Economics Societies, the League of Engineers and Technicians and the Yugoslav Society for Econometrics and the Organizational Sciences. He is one of the founders of the periodical "The Organization of Work" and has been on its editorial board for twenty years.

Dr Borislav BLAGOJEVIC

Professeur à la Faculté de droit de l'Université de Beograd

LA SOCIÉTÉ SOCIALISTE AUTOGÉRÉE ET SON DROIT ADEQUAT

I — Dans chaque révolution, y compris la révolution socialiste, la question capitale est certainement celle de pouvoir. C'est non seulement une prémisse théorique du marxisme mais aussi une expérience acquise dans la pratique de l'humanité. Si la révolution a le caractère de révolution socialiste, cette question se ramène à celle de changement de classe dirigeante et, à ce sujet, à la question d'appartenance — d'exploitation des moyens de production de base et d'organisation de la production avec ces moyens. Naturellement, avec cette question fondamentale s'imposent bien d'autres, qui accompagnent nécessairement chaque changement révolutionnaire radical de structure sociale. Celui-ci entraîne des changements extrêmement importants sur le plan de nombreuses autres questions et institutions ayant eux aussi un caractère révolutionnaire, mais qui sont, en dernière analyse, en rapport étroit et reflètent le caractère, la portée et la qualité de la révolution elle-même dont ils sont l'expression dans les différents domaines des phénomènes sociaux et de la vie sociale, et dont ils doivent partager et suivre la destinée et l'évolution.

Amenant au pouvoir la classe ouvrière la révolution socialiste a aboli la propriété privée sur les moyens de production de base, expropriant ainsi les expropriateurs. C'est la composante nécessaire et commune de chaque révolution socialiste. En tant que composante commune, elle est suffisante pour le caractère socialiste d'une révolution et d'un système social tel que le socialisme, qui, après avoir aboli la propriété privée sur les moyens de production de base, s'organise sur la propriété socialisée, collectivisée de ces moyens. Comment sera organisée la nouvelle société socialiste, dans son ensemble et dans tous les secteurs de sa vie, sur la base de cette propriété nouvelle, à cet égard, à notre avis, il n'y a pas, et il ne saurait y être, d'approches et de solutions identiques pour tous les Etats socialistes. Une série de conditions, de circonstances, de conceptions et d'idées, de caractère historique et contemporain, influent nécessairement sur l'organisation et la structure de la société de chaque Etat socialiste pris en particulier. Et cela, comme faits objectifs qui doivent absolument être pris en considération et qui conditionnent nécessairement la variété des solutions des différentes questions intéressant le contenu des rapports

sociaux socialistes établis par la révolution socialiste, mais qui continuent à se développer et transformer en fonction de l'édification ultérieure du socialisme dans chaque Etat particulier. C'est pourquoi on parle à juste raison de l'édification et du perfectionnement continus des rapports sociaux socialistes, justement au sujet du développement des conditions objectives et subjectives, et des forces de chaque société socialiste, qui doit favoriser la réalisation de la société communiste par sa propre édification et son développement. Il convient de tenir toujours compte de ce fait qui représente »la loi d'airain« du socialisme, ce qui revient à dire que le système de rapports sociaux et de solutions des diverses questions dans chaque Etat socialiste doit être édifié sur la base des conditions et conceptions concrètes. C'est ce qui aura pour effet que le socialisme, en tant que système social uniforme, se réalisera malgré la variété de ses solutions, système dont l'uniformité est fondée justement sur l'existence des différences objectivement nécessaires dans la formulation et l'édification des institutions sur la base de la propriété socialisée des moyens de production de base, et sur la base de la production socialisée avec ces moyens, sans quoi, répétons-le, il n'y a pas de socialisme, mais ce qui est, au fond, suffisamment commun pour le socialisme en cours d'édification dans les différents Etats. Tout ceci, en y ajoutant l'unité des institutions fondamentales telles que le gouvernement de la classe ouvrière et l'abolition de la propriété privée sur les moyens de production de base, signifie qu'il n'existe, et ne peut exister, aucun »schéma« ou »standard« concernant toutes les institutions de la société socialiste et le mode de leur réalisation. Et cela, dans n'importe quel domaine de la vie sociale de la société socialiste et, par conséquent, dans la sphère du droit aussi. C'est ce qu'indique et démontre l'évolution en cours, qu'on le dise explicitement ou non. C'est la réalité d'une réalité qui devient de plus en plus évidente à mesure que le socialisme devient toujours davantage un processus mondial, à mesure qu'il se réalise toujours davantage dans les différentes régions de l'humanité contemporaine, ce qui veut dire nécessairement dans des conditions et avec des solutions de plus en plus différentes. Il convient de ne pas perdre de vue ce fait, qui est une des réalités de l'humanité contemporaine. C'est en tenant compte de l'existence desdites différences, et en les respectant, qu'il faut discuter et formuler les institutions et phénomènes communs par lesquels se manifeste, ne fût-ce que comme un minimum, l'unité du socialisme en tant que système social. D'où le besoin d'une connaissance bien plus approfondie des solutions dans tous les domaines de la vie sociale, y compris celui du droit, adoptées par tel ou tel pays socialiste, mais en même temps le besoin de connaître les fondements, les causes et les raisons de ces solutions, souvent différentes, visant toujours à édifier et perfectionner les rapports socialistes aussi réels que possible. Dans cet ordre d'idées, il est nécessaire de se débarrasser de toute attitude a priori et d'avant-garde, de tout sentiment de modèle dirigeant ou à suivre. En effet, il faut avoir de la confiance dans la classe ouvrière de chaque Etat socialiste qui recherchera et réalisera, dans ses conditions objectives et par ses forces subjectives, justement les solutions qui lui répondent le mieux, tout en profitant, bien entendu, là où elles s'avèrent justifiées,

des expériences et des réalisations de la classe ouvrière d'autres pays socialistes.

II — L'Etat socialiste, en tant qu'Etat de la classe ouvrière, comporte la dictature du prolétariat. En ce qui concerne les formes d'exercice de la dictature du prolétariat, donc, les formes de participation de la classe ouvrière à l'exercice du pouvoir et à l'organisation de l'ensemble de la vie sociale et notamment des rapports dans la production et dans la vie économique en général, elles peuvent être, et elles le sont effectivement, différentes tant selon les Etats que les étapes parcourues par chaque pays socialiste. C'est ce que démontre et prouve l'expérience acquise jusqu'ici, et il faut s'attendre à ce que le développement futur du socialisme dans les Etats socialistes déjà existants et surtout l'apparition de nouveaux Etats socialistes dans des conditions différentes des révolutions socialistes, se traduisent par de nouvelles formes de participation de la classe ouvrière à l'exercice du pouvoir, ce qui ne peut qu'enrichir le socialisme et la démocratie socialiste. Au fur et à mesure de l'expansion du socialisme comme système mondial et du triomphe du socialisme dans un nombre croissant de pays, la classe ouvrière de ces pays édifiera incontestablement des formes de plus en plus spécifiques de son pouvoir, tout en les perfectionnant sans cesse, en vue de l'émancipation toujours plus large de l'homme de ce qui l'entravait comme citoyen et producteur. Cependant, même le socialisme dans les divers Etats ne sera pas à même d'écarter ces entraves dans les premières phases de son existence, mais chaque Etat socialiste doit agir dans ce sens dès les premiers jours de la formation, s'il veut devenir une communauté de producteurs directs libres, ce qui constitue, on le sait, en ce qui concerne la structure sociale, le degré le plus élevé de la société socialiste.

De toute évidence, aucune règle ne peut être édictée concernant les formes de participation de la classe ouvrière à l'organisation de la vie sociale dans son ensemble, plus spécialement les rapports dans la production et dans la vie économique en général. Toutefois, une tendance doit être de plus en plus présente, tendance consistant dans la réclamation d'établir toujours davantage, au lieu du pouvoir au nom de la classe ouvrière, le pouvoir direct de la classe ouvrière elle-même, d'établir et de réaliser toujours davantage, au lieu du pouvoir au nom du peuple, le pouvoir direct du peuple comme tel. En effet, malgré l'application des formes de démocratie socialiste, l'Etat socialiste ne représente qu'une forme, certes, nécessaire et justifiée, de participation indirecte de la classe ouvrière à l'exercice du pouvoir, forme qui existera et qui sera nécessaire aussi longtemps qu'existera la société socialiste. Or, la question qui se pose est celle de recherche et de réalisation d'autres formes d'organisation de la vie dans la société socialiste, par lesquelles la participation de la classe ouvrière et des travailleurs serait plus directe et plus immédiate. Et cela, à tous les niveaux et dans tous les secteurs de la vie sociale et notamment dans le domaine économique, plus spécialement dans la sphère de la production.

La question de place et de statut des travailleurs et de la classe ouvrière dans l'exercice du pouvoir et dans la réalisation de toutes les activités sociales devient ainsi une des questions capitales intéressantes

le développement ultérieur du socialisme, de la société socialiste et des Etats socialistes. La question de l'autogestion socialiste des travailleurs dans le travail associé devient, donc, la question fondamentale du développement futur du socialisme, étant donné que «la libération du travail et du travailleur ne consiste pas seulement dans un morceau de pain plus grand que celui d'hier, et qui dépend d'un tiers, mais avant tout dans l'action conséquente d'édification du statut de l'homme dans le travail associé, avec des moyens de production sociaux, qui en fait, dans une, mesure toujours plus grande, le maître de sa propre destinée» — comme le dit Marx à propos de la Commune de Paris. Dans le système politique du socialisme où l'appareil d'Etat se voyait attribuer un rôle dominant «la désorganisation du praticisme de tous les jours fit naître des tentatives faites pour substituer au centralisme d'action de la révolution le centralisme étatico-bureaucratique administratif, et pour transformer la gestion des moyens de production nationalisés en une sorte de monopole étatico-patrimonial et technocratique-administratif». C'est sur cette base que virent le jour les tendances à identifier le système politique de la révolution et de la dictature du prolétariat avec l'absolutisme politique de l'Etat centralisé. Or, il ne fait guère de doute que de pareilles tendances ne mènent pas à l'élargissement de la place, du statut, de l'influence, de l'importance et du rôle déterminant direct des travailleurs et de la classe ouvrière dans un Etat socialiste. Il s'est avéré que la lutte contre ces tendances ne peut être efficacement que par le développement résolu des formes d'autogestion et de démocratie au sein de la société favorisant l'engagement économique et politique aussi direct que possible et le contrôle des travailleurs dans leurs organisations de travail et autres et, par l'intermédiaire de ces organisations, dans toute la politique sociale, plus particulièrement dans la production et la reproduction sociale.

Dans le contexte de cette constatation fut formulée la réclamation demandant l'affirmation de l'autogestion des travailleurs dans le travail associé donc, demandant une société socialiste autogérée. En ce qui concerne la Yougoslavie et l'expérience yougoslave dans ce domaine, «le sens historique du passage de la société yougoslave à la forme d'autogestion des rapports socialistes dans la production ne consistait pas dans l'idée utopique d'établir un système statique sans conflits d'institutions socio-économiques et démocratiques et de rapports idéaux entre les hommes. Le sens et le but de cette mesure a été le désir des socialistes de s'opposer à la domination de certaines tendances du monopole étatico-patrimonial, étant donné que ce monopole non seulement commencerait à aliéner le travailleur vis-à-vis de sa fonction étatico-administrative et de sa fonction de gestion du travail social, mais, se transformerait de plus en plus dans son maître. C'est pourquoi fut amorcé en Yougoslavie, sous forme d'autogestion, un processus visant à transformer graduellement les rapports dans la production et la répartition en rapports ou le travail, comme le dit Marx, devient «vraiment libre», et où la fonction d'administration de l'Etat et du travail sera, avant tout, la fonction d'administration des choses, et toujours moins la fonction d'administration des hommes. C'est ce qui constitue l'essence des rapports socialistes entre les hommes.»

«Or, le point de départ et le moyen de réalisation de cette orientation doit être l'effort déployé pour permettre aux travailleurs dans toutes les formes du travail associé de gérer, dans toute la mesure du possible, leur travail de participer, sur la base de ce travail, aux résultats du travail associé et influencer, en vertu de leurs droits économiques et d'autres droits autonomes, sur ce travail, à partir des formes élémentaires dans le processus de travail direct, par le système de reproduction élargie en général et la circulation des moyens sociaux, jusqu'au plan social et autres décisions d'intérêt général. Un tel statut socio-économique des travailleurs est la stimulation matérielle et morale indispensable favorisant le développement accéléré des forces productives et l'accroissement de la productivité du travail. En effet, dans la société socialiste le promoteur de ce développement ne peut être aucune contrainte extérieure, mais seulement l'intérêt du travailleur même. C'est là le facteur décisif de développement des forces productives dans les conditions actuelles du progrès scientifique et technique, au moment où l'homme est devenu de nouveau, certes, le principal animateur et promoteur du développement, moins comme force physique et davantage comme force créatrice consciente et indépendante, avec ses intérêts sur la plan du travail et de la création, et avec ses capacités créatrices». Le socialisme et la liberté du travailleur deviennent ainsi deux côtés indissolubles du progrès social. Dès lors, l'acquisition la plus importante apparaissant dans le développement autonome est la démocratisation continue et de plus en plus complète de la société sur la base des changements révolutionnaires intervenus aussi bien dans les rapports socio-économiques qu'en ce qui concerne les formes politiques démocratiques de réalisation de la participation des travailleurs aux décisions sur les affaires sociales. L'autogestion s'affirme donc de plus en plus comme facteur de dépassement de l'aliénation du travailleur vis-à-vis des conditions et des résultats de son travail et de dépassement de la désintégration de la personne humaine, qui ne cesse de s'approfondir dans les conditions de la division moderne du travail. D'où la réclamation exigeant que l'autogestion soit réalisée dans tous les secteurs de l'activité et du travail social, qu'elle devienne en système embrassant tous les rapports et le chemin menant à la liberté plus complète de l'homme, permettant ainsi aux producteurs directs de devenir dans la plus grande mesure possible les principaux facteurs dans la production et la société en général.

III — La société socialiste autogérée fait également naître, incontestablement, une série de réclamations concernant le droit dans de nombreux secteurs. C'est ainsi, par exemple, qu'on pose la question de représentation, dans le système d'organes du pouvoir, des producteurs directs — dans leur ensemble ou par groupements — donc, la question d'existence d'un ou de plusieurs chambres des producteurs dans les corps représentatifs de toutes les formations territoriales du pouvoir (Etat, départements, arrondissements, communes, etc.). Une autre question qui se pose est celle de système de composition et d'élection des chambres et des conseils des corps représentatifs, notamment la question de système de délégués, dans le but d'assurer une meilleure représentation directe des producteurs et des travailleurs en général. La

question des structures juridiques des collectivités de travail se pose elle aussi, afin d'assurer la participation la plus directe des producteurs à l'organisation du travail et la gestion des affaires. Nous arrivons ainsi à une transformation importante de la notion de personne morale et à la possibilité de reconnaître la qualité de personne morale aux collectivités de travail dans le cadre de l'entreprise en tant que personne morale. Une série d'autres questions se posent sur le plan du droit, ce qui ne signifie pas et ne peut nullement signifier, soulignons-le, la négation de nombreuses institutions juridiques élaborées par l'humanité progressiste notamment depuis l'apparition du socialisme. Au contraire, la société socialiste autogérée, comme d'ailleurs chaque société socialiste, doit utiliser les nombreuses institutions juridiques formées au cours de l'histoire, en les incorporant dans son système juridique et en les appliquant conformément aux conditions particulières et aux changements imposés nécessairement par le socialisme dans les différents domaines.

Nous ne traiterons pas ici de toutes les questions du droit que la société socialiste autogérée impose et requiert comme innovations. Toutefois, nous tenons à indiquer deux questions: la question de propriété, et la question des rapports fondamentaux de droit civil qui devraient faire l'objet de la réglementation par le Code civil.

IV — A propos de la question de propriété, le problème du sur-profit est indubitablement l'un des problèmes capitaux: le sur-profit appartient-il au propriétaire des moyens de production ou aux travailleurs qui ont produit le sur-profit et, en conséquence, qu'est-ce qui a le droit de disposer du sur-profit.

Jusqu'ici, parallèlement à la propriété en tant que catégorie socio-économique, il existait un concept juridique correspondant de propriété ou d'institution du droit de propriété, avec un titulaire déterminé de la propriété. Dans la société socialiste, pour ce qui est des objets les plus importants de la propriété sociale, c'est l'Etat, ce qui était nécessaire dans chaque Etat socialiste immédiatement après la révolution socialiste. C'est se qui avait pour conséquence juridique celle que l'on connaît — l'apparition de l'Etat comme titulaire de caractère monopoliste de la propriété sur les moyens de production de base.

Cependant, l'édification de la société socialiste autogérée porta à l'ordre du jour la question du processus de transformation graduelle de la propriété sociale comme forme de monopole étatico-patrimonial en propriété commune effective, qui appartiendrait à tous les travailleurs et envers laquelle chacun aurait de pareils droits économiques et autres, dans la mesure où il contribue, par son travail et sa création, au renforcement et à l'efficacité des moyens de production sociaux, ainsi qu'à la productivité du travail social. L'autogestion atteindrait ainsi certainement son but essentiel: le processus de libération du travailleur et de son initiative créatrice devient effectivement l'affaire de la classe ouvrière elle-même, des travailleurs eux-mêmes. La classe ouvrière s'émanciperait ainsi de plus en plus de la mentalité de salariat, devenant en même temps plus consciente de sa responsabilité sociale.

En partant de l'idée selon laquelle le socialisme doit libérer l'homme, en particulier celui en rapport de travail, de tout sentiment de la dépendance sur la base de l'existence d'un propriétaire des moyens avec lesquels il travaille, le droit de la société socialiste autogérée yougoslave prend pour point de départ l'inexistence d'un droit de propriété, au profit de qui ce soit, sur les moyens de production sociaux, niant et interdisant ainsi toute appropriation des résultats de la production et du travail en général au titre du droit de propriété. Les moyens de production et de reproduction sociale appartenant à la société deviennent ainsi, comme le dit Marx, «de simples instruments du travail libre et associé», — la base matérielle commune et le moyen de travail de tous. Le but est donc de voir la classe ouvrière et tous les travailleurs devenir chaque jour davantage les maîtres de leur propre destinée, ce qui dépend, dans la plus grande mesure, du fait qui disposera du sur-profit au titre du droit de propriété ou au titre du travail, de sorte qu'en dernière analyse le processus de socialisation du sur-profit — de la valeur qu'il crée — apparaît comme source de principales contradiction et conflits dans chaque société socialiste, ce qui est également le cas de la société yougoslave.

Aussi »l'un des dilemmes fondamentaux du socialisme contemporain consiste-t-il justement dans le fait qui, et comment, dispose du »capital« social, devenant ainsi le facteur décisif dans la vie sociale et politique: — l'Etat même et son appareil, qui gouverne au nom de la classe ouvrière, manifestant en même temps inévitablement la tendance à devenir son maître; un mécanisme technocratique-administratif fondé sur le savoir et l'organisation moderne du travail, tout en faisant preuve de tendance à développer des centres de puissance économique et politique et de pouvoir sur la classe ouvrière, aliénés vis-à-vis de celle-ci; ou bien c'est le travailleur dans l'organisation autonome du travail associé qui lui permet de s'appuyer sur les fonctions professionnelles et administratives du travail social, tout en les subordonnant aux intérêts communs des travailleurs«.

Cependant, la négation de tout droit de propriété sur les moyens de production sociaux, par la gestion sociale organisée de la classe ouvrière et des travailleurs en général, permet non seulement aux travailleurs de gérer directement le sur-profit socialisé, mais aussi à chaque travailleur de participer directement — en fonction de sa contribution aux résultats du travail associé — au sens économique, au revenu global résultant du travail associé. D'où la reconnaissance, en faveur des collectivités de travail, du droit de répartir elles-mêmes le revenu total de leurs organisations de travail respectives et d'en disposer. Dans cet ordre d'idées, de la plus haute importance est le partage du revenu entre les revenus individuels des travailleurs et la fraction du revenu destinée à la reproduction élargie. Compte tenu du fait que le revenu global de l'entreprise est formé en fonction des rapports de marché, deux questions très importantes et actuelles se posent dans la société yougoslave contemporaine: la détermination des critères communs concernant le montant des revenus individuels sur la base du travail, et la connexion d'intégration des entreprises en vue de la politique productive et économique commune, notamment dans la sphère

de la reproduction élargie. Tous ces problèmes doivent être réglés de la part des organisations de travail et des entreprises en général, de sorte que dans le système juridique apparaissent de nouveaux instruments intitulés d'habitude «arrangements d'autogestion» conclus sur les questions mentionnées directement entre les organisations de travail et les entreprises intéressées.

Cette position, en premier lieu idéo-politique, concernant la propriété sociale et la négation de l'existence du droit de propriété sur les moyens sociaux, position qui a revêtu son expression juridique fondamentale dans la Constitution de 1963, n'est mise en oeuvre qu'en partie dans l'ensemble du système juridique de Yougoslavie. Il s'agit d'un processus en cours et dont la réalisation ne se déroule pas sans difficultés et déviations en pratique. Mais ce n'est pas tout. La pensée théorique dans la science juridique yougoslave n'a pas une vue unanime sur la bien-fondé de cette position de la Constitution sur le droit de propriété des moyens sociaux, ni en ce qui concerne les conséquences juridiques à tirer de cette conception. D'où une série de théories qui militent en faveur de la propriété partagée sur les moyens sociaux, ainsi que de propositions de reconnaître aux organisations de travail le droit de propriété sur les moyens sociaux avec lesquels elles travaillent, du fait que le droit d'usage (par analogie au droit de gestion opérationnelle) reconnu par la Constitution aux organisations de travail sur ces moyens a, au fond, presque tous les attributs et le contenu du droit de propriété.

V — Le problème d'édification d'un droit adéquat à la société socialiste autogérée se pose notamment au sujet de la préparation du Code civil en Yougoslavie. La question qui se pose est celle des rapports fondamentaux de droit civil qui devraient faire l'objet de la réglementation par le Code civil. Dans les discussions en cours sont soutenues des opinions très différentes, voire contradictoires, en ce qui concerne l'approche et les rapports fondamentaux de droit civil. Nous disons l'approche, car on est d'accord pour reconnaître qu'il faut profiter, pour tous les rapports reposant sur les relations de marché, des institutions juridiques déjà constituées, pour ainsi dire traditionnelles. C'est le cas, par exemple, de tous les rapports d'obligations, du droit de propriété (qui ne concerne que les objets de propriété personnelle et privée) et des autres droits réels, du droit de succession ainsi que d'une série d'autres rapports de droit civil de sorte qu'à cet égard, en ce qui concerne le système, le Code civil yougoslave ne représentera rien de particulièrement nouveau, à l'exception des innovations relatives au règlement des diverses questions et rapports.

Les divergences d'approche fondamentale apparaissent en ce qui concerne les vues sur les rapports au titre du travail avec les moyens qui sont la propriété sociale, rapports établis entre les travailleurs dans une organisation de travail, entre les travailleurs et leur organisation de travail, et au sujet de la place et du statut de l'organisation de travail elle-même. La question se pose de savoir si ces rapports ont le caractère de rapports de droit civil, ou bien le caractère de rapports de droit de travail ou de droit administratif. Les vues et positions sur cette question sont très contradictoires. D'après une conception,

tous ces rapports dans une société socialiste autogérée doivent avoir le caractère de droit civil et, comme tels, ils doivent représenter les institutions fondamentales du Code civil d'une telle société. D'après une autre conception, ces rapports ne sont pas de caractère de droit civil et ne doivent pas faire l'objet d'une réglementation par le Code civil. Les conceptions différentes qui viennent d'être exposées sont non seulement d'une portée et valeur formelle, mais expriment deux vues sur la question de savoir si c'est le droit de propriété ou un patrimonial correspondant qui doit être le droit patrimonial fondamental dans le droit socialiste autogéré, ou bien le droit du travailleur de travailler avec des moyens de production sociaux.

C'est cette dernière vue qui correspond certainement davantage à ce qui vient d'être exposé sur la société socialiste autogérée et le droit adéquat à celle-ci, ce qui ne veut pas dire que cette conception sera entièrement adoptée et mise en oeuvre dans le nouveau Code civil, malgré la place importante qui lui a été accordée dans le projet d'amendements constitutionnels en cours de discussion et qui seront vraisemblablement adoptés prochainement. Il est possible que cette conception soit représentée et appliquée dans une mesure bien plus grande dans une série de lois particulières sur divers rapports et institutions juridiques, sans être dominante dans le nouveau Code civil. En effet, le concept traditionnel du contenu du Code civil est présent avec force, alors que l'acceptation de bien des innovations n'est pas aisée, à plus forte raison lorsque les avis des juristes sont tellement contradictoires en ce qui concerne leur bien-fondé.

Par ailleurs, ces conceptions fondamentales différentes reposent sur la conception différente qu'on se fait des rapports socio-économiques fondamentaux dans la société yougoslave, naturellement en ce qui concerne le droit civil qui doit être une expression adéquate de ces rapports. La question se pose de savoir si c'est l'appropriation ou le travail, donc, la conception de propriété ou de non propriété des rapports socio-économiques. La première entraîne certaines modifications essentielles du système de droit civil; la seconde propose des changements structurels, au moins dans le système de droit civil, moins dans l'ensemble du système juridique. En effet, les innovations proposées pour le Code civil ont déjà trouvé leur réalisation dans d'autres textes législatifs du droit yougoslave, de sorte qu'en ce qui concerne le contenu des solutions juridiques, les innovations sont, au fond, bien moins importantes par rapport à celles proposées au sujet du contenu du politiques particulières, indique-t-on, pour le rôle du droit justement dans l'édification des rapports socio-économiques qu'il réglemente.

La conception dite de non propriété des rapports socio-économiques est basée sur les caractéristiques suivantes de ces rapports: la production socialiste de marché des travailleurs librement associés dans le travail avec des moyens appartenant à la société et, en principe, le caractère non étatique de la reproduction sociale; puis, l'autogestion des travailleurs tant dans les organisations du travail associé dans l'économie et d'autres activités que dans toutes les communautés sociales; et, ensuite, la détermination du statut matériel et social de l'homme

en fonction du travail et des résultats du travail. En conséquence et conformément à ce qui précède, ce qui constitue l'être et l'essence de la société socialiste autogérée et ce qu'on souligne au premier plan, c'est le travail et les résultats (fruits) du travail, en tant que fondements des rapports socio-économiques entre les hommes, d'où doivent découler les droits subjectifs fondamentaux des travailleurs et des organisations de travail, droits dont le caractère est civil, ce qui veut dire indépendants dans leur formation et existence vis-à-vis de tous les organes d'Etat. Ce sont ces droits qui doivent garantir la liberté et l'égalité de tous les participants aux relations économiques, dans la détermination des droits et obligations mutuelles et dans la prise des décisions autonomes au sein des organisations de travail et d'intérêts. On dit: »si le travailleur se voit reconnaître dans le droit socialiste d'autogestion, par la constitution, des droits subjectifs déterminés (droit au travail, droit aux fruits du travail, droit au revenu individuel et droit à l'autogestion), ces droits doivent être »transformés« aussi dans le système du Code civil comme droits subjectifs, avec les qualités des institutions juridiques traditionnelles de droit civil. En effet, pour pouvoir réaliser le droit au travail et les autres droits constitutionnels, dit-on, le travailleur doit avoir, comme personne dans le travail associé, comme travailleur associé, le droit au travail avec des moyens sociaux constitué de manière à pouvoir toujours décider, de concert avec d'autres, de son travail et de l'affectation des moyens de travail; pour réaliser le droit aux fruits de son travail, il doit être indépendant dans les décisions sur le revenu et les autres rapports économiques dans le travail associé; les décisions dans le travail associé, pour être la réalisation effective du droit à l'autogestion, doivent reposer sur le droit individuel et inaliénable du travailleur de statuer sur ses communautés de travail et d'intérêts de base et plus larges, ainsi que sur leurs organes, leurs attributions et leurs responsabilités«.

C'est sur la base de ces positions que furent formulées les Thèses des dispositions fondamentales et générales du Code civil, qui sont actuellement l'objet de vastes discussions et des critiques assez véhémentes. Nous allons présenter ci-après les plus importantes d'entre elles, qui font ressortir le concept de non propriété des rapports de droit civil:

Thèse 1 (formation des rapports de droit civil): Les rapports de droit civil, en tant qu'expression des rapports socio-économiques, existent dans le domaine du travail associé et personnel, de la formation des communautés d'intérêts, de la circulation des biens et des services, de la réparation du revenu, de l'usage des moyens du niveau de vie social et d'autres moyens sociaux, ainsi que dans la réalisation des droits de la personne.

Ces rapports sont constitués en vertu du contrat et d'autres actes juridiques, ainsi que d'autres faits constitutifs, en vertu de la loi, des rapports juridiques de droit civil.

Thèse 3 (droits fondamentaux du travailleurs dans le travail associé):

Tout citoyen dans le travail associé (travailleur) a:
le droit de travail avec des moyens sociaux,

le droit à l'auto-organisation,
le droit de décision sur le revenu, et
le droit au revenu individuel.

La renonciation à ces droits et tout acte qui empêche leur réalisation est sans effet juridique.

Thèse 4 (droit de travail avec des moyens sociaux):

Le travailleur a le droit de travailler avec des moyens sociaux réalisés, dans l'organisation du travail associé, par le travail ou qu'elle s'est procurés d'une autre manière, ainsi que le droit de statuer, sur un pied d'égalité avec d'autres travailleurs, sur l'affectation et la disposition des moyens sociaux.

Les travailleurs sont tenus de garder la valeur des moyens sociaux globaux et, dans les cas définis par la loi, leur capacité de reproduction.

Les moyens sociaux dans l'organisation du travail associé ne peuvent être enlevés que dans les cas et aux conditions prévus par la loi conformément à la constitution.

Thèse 5 (droit à l'auto-organisation):

Le droit à l'auto-organisation consiste dans le droit de tout travailleur de statuer, sur un pied d'égalité avec d'autres travailleurs, sur la formation de l'organisation du travail associé à tous les niveaux ou dans chaque phase du processus de travail qui constitue un tout, sur la sécession de l'organisation de travail, sur l'association et les autres rapports statutaires de l'organisation du travail associé, ainsi que de participer à l'élaboration du contrat statutaire, des statuts et d'autres actes sur les rapports statutaires au sein de l'organisation du travail associé.

Des décisions sur les rapports statutaires au sein de l'organisation du travail associé doivent être conformes à l'unité technique ou technologique fondamentale du processus de travail et ne peuvent porter atteinte aux intérêts communs d'autres travailleurs dans l'organisation de travail prise dans son ensemble.

Thèse 6 (droit de décision sur le revenu):

Le droit de décision sur le revenu consiste dans le droit de chaque travailleur de statuer, sur un pied d'égalité avec d'autres travailleurs, sur le revenu réalisé dans l'organisation du travail associé.

La répartition du revenu ne peut porter atteinte aux intérêts généraux déterminés par le plan social et la loi, aux obligations définies par la loi et le contrat, ou aux intérêts communs précisés par l'arrangement autonome et l'arrangement social.

Thèse 7 (droit au revenu individuel):

Le travailleur acquiert le droit sur le revenu individuel à la charge du revenu réalisé dans l'organisation du travail associé selon les résultats de son travail et du travail associé.

Thèse 8 (droits et devoirs fondamentaux de l'organisation du travail associé):

Les travailleurs réalisent leurs droits résultant du travail associé dans l'organisation du travail associé.

Dans l'organisation du travail associé est mis en oeuvre le processus de travail, fixé le mode de fonctionnement et élaborés les plans et programmes de travail et de développement.

L'Organisation du travail associé a les droits et devoirs fondamentaux suivants:

conclure des contrats et d'autres actes juridiques dans le cadre de sa capacité juridique;

exercer les droits définis par la loi relatifs à la totalité des moyens sociaux avec lesquels les travailleurs réalisent leur droit de travail, et disposer de ces moyens;

exiger la cessation des actions empêchant ou entravant les travailleurs dans la réalisation de leur droit de travail, et

demander la restitution des moyens sociaux utilisés illégalement par autrui.

Ces droits appartiennent à l'organisation de base du travail associé sauf disposition contraire prévue par le contrat statutaire.

Thèse 9 (contrats et statuts comme fondement d'établissement des droits et obligations dans le travail associé):

Les droits et obligations dans le travail associé sont réglés de la part des travailleurs par le contrat sur les droits et obligations réciproques dans le travail associé, par le contrat statutaire et les statuts.

Le contrat sur les droits et obligations réciproques dans le travail associé est passé par les travailleurs dans l'organisation de base du travail associé.

Le contrat statutaire règle les droits et obligations réciproques et les autres rapports des organisations du travail associé dans le cadre de l'organisation commune.

Les statuts de l'organisation du travail associé règlent les rapports dans le travail associé, le mode de prise des décisions, les problèmes relatifs aux organes de gestion, leurs attributions et responsabilités, ainsi que d'autres rapports internes.

Les statuts ne peuvent modifier les droits et obligations définis par le contrat statutaire.

VI — L'autogestion est la caractéristique essentielle de l'ensemble de la vie sociale contemporaine en Yougoslavie et cela dans tous les domaines. Elle est le résultat de l'évolution des rapports socialistes entre les hommes. Or, il ne faut pas s'imaginer qu'elle se réalise sans difficultés, sans résistances et manifestations négatives. Au contraire, Elles ont existé dès le début d'instauration de l'autogestion, et elles existent même de nos jours, à plus forte raison que le contenu et l'essence des effets de l'autogestion changent et se développent sans cesse dans la vie des particuliers et de la société dans son ensemble. En conséquence, le système d'autogestion, comme toutes les autres manifestations et institutions sociales, doit être modifié, complété et perfectionné, du fait notamment que l'autogestion comporte nécessairement le changement de caractère et de fonctions de l'Etat prolétarien. A l'heure actuelle, l'Etat prolétarien est incontestablement un instru-

ment très important et en de nombreux points décisif de la classe ouvrière et des autogestionnaires. Cependant, il ne peut aucunement être un Etat au-dessus du travail et de la société, mais l'Etat ayant un système politique qui sera l'instrument du travail et de la création. C'est pourquoi le processus essentiel dans la société socialiste autogérée est celui de transformation graduelle du caractère et des fonctions de l'Etat socialiste. Ce processus se déroule actuellement en Yougoslavie, certes, pas à pas, mais il mène indubitablement au dépérissement successif du monopole étatico-patrimonial sur les moyens de production et de la disposition monopoliste des moyens de reproduction, tout cela par la suppression de certaines formes de compétence de l'Etat concernant la détermination des conditions de travail des travailleurs.

Dans ce contexte, il faut souligner, bien entendu, que l'autogestion n'est ni un slogan magique ni une clé universelle pour tous les problèmes du socialisme. L'autogestion n'est pas un but d'elle-même, mais un moyen. Le but de l'autogestion est le but du socialisme — la libération de la société de la bureaucratie et de la domination, et la libération de l'homme pour ne plus servir à autrui et à »sa« nature aliénée. Pour le socialisme et la libération de l'homme, la fonction essentielle et véritable de l'autogestion réside dans la transformation du système socio-politique et son dépassement — dans l'établissement d'un état nouveau d'administration et d'organisation sociale. Chacun des systèmes politiques jusqu'à nos jours a été et demeure, plus ou moins, le gouvernement organisé d'un groupe d'hommes sur les autres — le système de domination. La domination est caractérisée par un double pouvoir: le pouvoir de l'Etat vis-à-vis de l'homme et du citoyen, et le pouvoir des propriétaires et des gérants des moyens de production sur les hommes privés de ces moyens, qui sont obligés de travailler pour pouvoir vivre. La transformation radicale de la domination, c'est là le sens et la justification du socialisme et de son slogan de »transformation du gouvernement sur les hommes en gouvernement sur les choses«. Grâce à l'autogestion, ce slogan est acutellement plus réel et plus riche. La réalisation de cette fonction de l'autogestion et son sens historique supposent et exigent qu'elle devienne le principe fondamental, radicalement nouveau, de constitution d'un système social et politique distinct, — du système socio-politique. Ce système socio-politique repose sur l'autogestion mais s'édifie sur la base de celle-ci, en établissant des rapports non hiérarchiques mais autonomes et responsables entre les différents niveaux dans la sphère de l'autonomie«.

Dans un tel système socio-politique, il est certain que le droit, lui aussi, peut subir des changements que l'on retrouve dans de nombreux domaines du droit. Ce serait un mérite remarquable du droit et des juristes s'ils réussissent à les édifier à temps et d'une manière répondant à leur contenu, conformément aux changements intervenus dans le système sociopolitique de la société socialiste autogérée.

Dr BORISLAV BLAGOJEVIĆ

Dr Dr h.c. Dr h.c. *Borislav T. Blagojević*, professeur à la Faculté de droit, est né en 1911 à Valjevo (Serbie), licencié es droit à la Faculté de Beograd en 1933, promu docteur en droit à la même Faculté en 1934. Jusqu'à 1938, assistant à la Faculté de droit de Belgrade, il devient chargé de cours à la Faculté de droit de Subotica, et, en 1940 professeur à la même faculté. Pendant la guerre le prof. Blagojević est sans occupation. Après la libération du pays en 1945 le prof. Blagojević enseignait le droit civil, la procédure civile, le droit romain, le droit économique, le droit international privé et le droit civil comparé. A la Faculté il en était élu doyen, et à l'Université en 1954 prorecteur. Depuis 1956 jusqu'à 1963 il a été recteur de l'Université de Beograd.

Le professeur Blagojević est un homme de science très fécond, dans les différents domaines de la théorie du droit. Il a publié, en plusieurs langues, dix livres et plus de 200 études et articles.

Outre la carrière d'enseignant qu'il suivait, le prof. Blagojević en a exercé une série d'autres fonctions. Ainsi, il était directeur du Département de science et de culture du Commissariat pour l'instruction publique de la République Populaire de Serbie, directeur de l'Institut bibliographique, fondateur et directeur de l'Institut de droit comparé à la tête duquel il se trouve aujourd'hui, président de l'Arbitrage du commerce extérieur auprès de la Chambre fédérale de commerce extérieur, fondateur et président de l'Association de droit comparé, député à l'Assemblée de la République Socialiste de Serbie, Conseiller juridique en chef au Secrétariat d'Etat pour les Affaires Etrangères, et aujourd'hui aussi le juge de la Cour constitutionnelle de Yougoslavie.

Dr Branislav SOSKIĆ
Professor at the Faculty of Economics in Beograd

ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW SOCIO-ECONOMIC RELATIONS IN EDUCATION AND SCIENCE IN YUGOSLAVIA

Education and science are without doubt important factors of economic development. This has been confirmed by contemporary scientific, particularly economic analysis as well as by the actual socio-economic development. This is true particularly of countries which are aware of the crucial impact of education and science on socio-economic movements and on their intensity and which have taken corresponding steps in order to improve the material and social position of science.

For education and science to become still more decisive factors of the Yugoslav socio-economic development and the development of self-management relations, the following is necessary:

a) a complete and consistent introduction of new economic relations in education and science, that is the introduction of the principle of income earning on the basis of the economic price of education and scientific work, and

b) a more direct association of working organizations in the field of education as well as the linking of education and science with other spheres of associated work, i.e. with working organizations for which they are training the personnel and for which they perform various types of scientific and research work.

The introduction of the principle of working income, or in other words, the introduction of economic relations on the basis of the economic (not just any) price of education and scientific work, is the precondition which will equate the socio-economic position of educational and scientific organizations with that of business organizations and other working organizations. This is a natural and inevitable process aimed at the further development of independence and self-management of working organizations in these fields.

However, various subjective and objective obstacles have to be overcome first. The resistance to the introduction of economic relations in science and education has been often explained on the ground of the specific character of educational and scientific working organizations (universities and institutes) in relation to other, primarily business organizations. The example usually given is that of business

organizations producing material goods as opposed to business and scientific working organizations — whose price serves as basis for the income earned by these organizations.

There is no doubt that educational and scientific organizations are specific ones. However, there are no theoretical reasons which would discourage the introduction of economic relations in these areas. Moreover, economic analyses reveal that educational and scientific working organizations — particularly in view of the high degree of integration of various levels and areas of education as well as of education and science — bear in most cases all the main features of business and even production organizations.

Production in general, particularly the contemporary one, does not imply only the direct production of consumer goods. It is becoming more and more an indirect round-about production of factors of production. Viewed as a whole, production is nothing else but a combined use of the human factor of production (skilled and other labour) and other technical and natural factors of production, that is means of production.

The skilled and educated labour force is becoming a more and more decisive factor of contemporary production. Working organizations in the area of education and science (outside or within working organizations) create or "produce" skill, professional knowledge, i.e. that particular element which characterizes labour as the decisive factor of contemporary production. Educational and scientific working organizations actually do produce the most valuable elements of this decisive factor of production and of the socio-economic development in general by transferring knowledge and skill on the labour force. The knowledge acquired in this way is being of course improved and expanded in the process of work itself.

Working organizations in the area of science and education (or corresponding units of business organizations) participate directly or indirectly in the production of other, primarily technical factors of production by improving the existing and developing new, more productive factors of production. Education and science have become in this way decisive factors of the accelerated economic growth. Hence their specific social and economic significance.

Even if education and science did not have such an economic and productive character, yet their specific nature could not be accepted as argument countering the introduction of economic relations on the basis of the economic price of education or of the economic price of scientific-educational or scientific-research services.¹⁾ Many economic and other working organizations outside the area of education and science do not produce material goods, but render services of various kinds. The price of these services is the basis on which the income of these working organizations is formed. Organizations in the area of education and science render certain services of an educational and scientific nature, which have got their price. The price of these

¹The term "services" is used in the sense of economic theory.

educational, educational-scientific and scientific services should also serve as basis for the income-earning of working organizations in the area of education and science.

Another argument which has been presented against the introduction of economic relations in the field of education and science is that it is impossible to calculate the price of education as well as that of scientific services. Some difficulties in the measurement of the personal component of that price and above all in the measurement of the quality of educational and scientific work certainly do exist. In addition, the quality is of an extraordinary importance in these activities. However, the problem of different qualities and of how to measure this difference exists in all the areas of social activities. It is a well-known problem in economic theory and practice. Every society and economy establishes, in one way or another, certain relations between individual types and qualities of work. The market plays likewise an important role. The level of personal incomes of those with the same or similar qualifications and professions can and should serve as some sort of guidance in the evaluation of the scientific and educational work.

As for the quantity of work or rather the number of those employed in the area of education and science, that is the staff which performs a certain amount of educational and scientific activity, it depends primarily on the nature, the level and the type of educational and scientific work. It is impossible to go below a minimum standard for the number of staff needed to perform the educational, the scientific-educational and the scientific-research process. However, a higher standard or rather more teachers and research workers in relation to the number of students, which implies a more comprehensive, a more profound and a more intensive educational and scientific work, might and probably will be set by working organizations in the field of education and science, if such an interest will be accompanied by corresponding resources, which well cover the costs of such a structure of educational, scientific-educational and scientific-research services.

The risk and uncertainty which manifest themselves in the results of some types of the scientific research work bring about difficulties in the calculation of the economic price of services in science and research. However, similar difficulties are to be found also in many other working organizations. We know from experience that they may be nevertheless solved.

Two further elements should be mentioned in connection with the personal component of the price of education and scientific work.

Firstly, the to-date evaluation of personal incomes, which has been carried out by communities of education for years, under conditions of relatively limited funds, was below the economic level as a rule. In other words, the economic price of education did not serve as basis for income-earning in educational and scientific working organizations. This is true also of organizations which have determined certain elements and criteria for the measurement of the price of education and scientific-educational services.

Secondly, the share of personal expenses in the total funds for education and science is incommensurately large if looked at as a

whole under the aspect of the reform in education and technological requirements. Both these shortcomings should be overcome as soon as possible.

As fair as the material component of the economic price of services in education and science is concerned, there are no major problems. A minimum standard for the technical equipment can be set in dependence of the nature of the scientific and educational process. These elements have been evaluated on the market for the most part. It goes without saying that working organizations in the area of education and science are more than willing to set a higher standard of technical equipment in dependence of the interests of the users, if that interest were accompanied by their willingness to supply the financial resources for such a higher standard.

A higher standard for both the technical equipment and the personnel would secure, as a rule, better and more diversified results, which would correspond better to contemporary demands of science and technology. These standards should be set, as a rule, on the ground of an agreement reached between organizations in the area of education and science on the one hand and the users of scientific and educational services or rather those financing educational and scientific activities on the other one.

We have implicitly answered the question whether the price of education and the price of scientific services are a fixed value or not. In the case of the price of scientific-research work or of scientific-research services it obviously depends on the given project, on its nature and size and on the stipulated standard of the technical equipment and staff. In the case of the price of education, particularly the price of educational-scientific services (universities) matters used to be simplified and there was some misunderstanding. The economic price of education varies in dependence of the level, the type, the intensity and the quality of the educational process and its results. These standards depend on the place and educational policy as well as on the funds which are necessary for the implementation of this policy. The standard for educational and scientific work relates to the number of teachers and researchers and their qualifications for the performance of scientific and educational work. These qualifications are based on various degrees and titles, e.g. B.A., M.A., Ph.D. and several others.

When all these factors are taken into account, it is obvious that the price of education, the cost of education per pupil or student must vary. The economic price of education of students of the same department will not be the same unless the staff, in number and quality, as well as the material and technical equipment are the same. The economic price of the education of students will be higher if laboratories, libraries and workshops are well equipped. However, regardless of what the standard may be (minimum, medium or higher), the economic price of education must ensure the economic, and not just any, valorization of personal incomes. In other words, the working income must depend on the quantity and quality of the work done or on the results of work.

The principle of solidarity should ensure a certain minimum standard of staff and technical equipment, particularly in the case of elementary education, the more so if the latter is a constitutional obligation, as it is the case in our country. Agreements reached on a self-management basis and decisions made by representative bodies ought to set limits of solidarity in the area of education in two different respects:

a) As to the territorial respect it has to be agreed upon whether the principle will work only within a given working organization, a local community or the basic socio-political community, the commune, or within a broader inter-communal region, the province, the republic (through some form of supplementary financing of education in under-developed regions) or even within the federation (through subsidies for under-developed republics and provinces).

b) As to the level of education, it should be agreed upon whether it will be restricted only to elementary education or whether it will include also the secondary and higher education.

The narrower the limits of solidarity are, both in respect to territory and level, the worse will the situation be both for under-developed regions and for the poorer strata of the population. Namely, the quality of education will be worse and the number of pupils and students attending various schools and faculties will be smaller. In other words, the negative circumstances will have a far-reaching detrimental effect on the economic development of under-developed regions, since education plays an outstanding and more and more important role in the socio-economic development.

Another question, which has caused a lot of misunderstanding is the question who should determine the economic price of education and the price of scientific services. This question has been already answered in part. In a self-managing society and in a market economy working organizations should enjoy a maximum degree of autonomy in their activities. Scientific and educational institutions should enjoy the same status as working organizations in other spheres of social activities. It would be therefore natural if working organizations in the area of science and education offered the price of their educational and scientific-educational services individually or through their associations, the more so since they are best acquainted with the nature of the educational and scientific process.

This price could be fixed, particularly in the case of science and research. However, in the area of education it would be usually differentiated, particularly in university education. Namely, there would be several variants in dependence of the different standard for the staff and the technical equipment (minimum, medium and higher) and for the number of pupils and students since some cost elements are fixed and others variable.

The definite price of education and scientific work would be determined in direct contact between the educational or scientific working organizations on the one hand and these employing the trained staff on the other one. These organizations should have available funds for

educational and scientific work. We mean thereby business and other working organizations and communities of education and scientific work.

Those employing the trained personnel — or let us use the term "financiers" of education should conform their needs for personnel with various job qualifications to the financial resources necessary for their training on the basis of the economic price of education. If they want to finance the training of a larger number of students without increasing the funds, then they could, as a rule, look for a solution — without jeopardizing the economic level of the price of education and the economic level of personal incomes of teachers and the auxiliary staff (being the most important component of the price of education in our country) — only in a lower standard of education. This would imply less teachers with minor occupational qualifications and/or a worse material and technical equipment.

Vice-versa, if they want a higher standard of education, whose main precondition is a better staff (more teachers or a better occupational structure) and/or a better material and technical equipment, then would the solution lie in a smaller number of students, provided that the funds for education remain unchanged. The other solution would call for a larger sum of money for the education of one pupil or student, that is for a higher economic price of education, which necessarily implies a higher standard for the personnel and for the material and technical equipment.

The same principles hold, *mutando mutandis*, for the area of science. Those making use of scientific or professional and research services should adjust their needs to the amount of resources necessary to perform a given amount of scientific work on the basis of the economic price of scientific work. It goes without saying that the quality is equally important. If for the same amount of resources they want a larger amount of scientific work done, without jeopardizing the economic level of the price of scientific work and the personal incomes of the scientific and auxiliary staff, then would the solution lie in a lower standard of scientific work (a smaller number of scientists with minor qualifications and/or a poorer quality of material and technical equipment). And vice-versa, if they want a higher standard of scientific work which calls for a superior staff in the first place (more and better trained researchers) as well as for a better material and technical equipment, then could the solution lie in a smaller amount of scientific work, in less pretentious requirements with regard to the scientific or professional analysis, provided that the funds remain unchanged. A further solution would lie in an increase of the funds earmarked for that particular project, in other words in a higher economic price of scientific work.

The personal incomes of scientists and teachers should as a rule not be subject to continuous bargaining, if account is taken of the level of personal incomes of people with similar job qualifications in other activities in the respective region. If no account is taken of these proportions, then will the price of education and the price of

scientific services not be economic ones. This may occur and has occurred in the past as the result of administrative decisions and the hitherto monopolistic position held by the „financiers“ of education — by budgetary organs and by the existing communities of education.

These „financiers“ of education could, thanks to their monopolistic position and to administrative decisions, spread the network of schools. However, conditions of education were bound to aggravate in this way. Namely, the number of pupils and students willing to attend various schools was rising from year to year. They were all admitted to school, which was in itself a positive circumstance. However, the funds were far from covering the economic price of education even of a minimum standard for the personnel and the material and technical equipment. The deficit used to be made up in such cases through lower personal incomes in the area of education and/or through a lower standard for the personnel and equipment, which could fall even below the minimum.

Decreased and non-economic personal incomes of the teachers have prevailed in our country on almost all the levels of education and in all the regions, particularly in the under-developed ones. A low standard of material and technical equipment, sometimes below a permissible minimum, is particularly widespread in elementary schools of under-developed regions and in some secondary schools, in which the equipment is of a vital importance. The inadequate number of teachers (also below a permissible minimum) is common particularly at universities, where the ratio of teacher to student happens to be one to several hundred.²

The main problem and the main objective difficulty impeding the introduction of new economic relations in education is the disproportion between unlimited desires (the wish to ensure education for every student) and limited funds for education. In fact, the main task in this area of socio-economic relations is to strike a balance between our progressive, ambitious educational policy or rather our unlimited desires, and the needs for educated personnel under conditions of limited funds. Educational and scientific working organizations would be thus finally on an equal footing with other working organizations and they would earn their income on the basis of the economic price of their educational and scientific services.

As to the total funds invested in education, we must point out that comparisons are made on an international scale. Namely, what has been compared is the percentage of the national income which has been set aside by various countries for purposes of education. However,

² Statistical data on university teachers in our country have been frequently misinterpreted. Namely, the total number of teachers (including assistant professors) has been compared to the total number of students if we wanted to obtain the ratio of students to one teacher. This figure should represent the number of students each teacher works with. However, this figure should be multiplied by the number of subjects in which every student has to take examinations during his studies — at some faculties there are as many as thirty of them. Only then shall we have the real ratio between teachers and the number of students they teach and examine.

this percentage in itself is inadequate. What is much more important is the total national income and the number of inhabitants, that is the per capita national income. What counts is the actual sum of money invested in education and the percentage of the population that is being educated — the percentage of a certain age-group that is attending school. In other words, the most significant figure is the sum of money per student.

This is important, among other things, because certain material and technical elements of educational expenditure have got a definite price, which cannot be expressed in percentages. The actual sum of money spent per student does not provide a complete insight either. The inherited accumulated investments and technical basis of education (school buildings, libraries, laboratories etc.), which is considerable in advanced countries, must be also taken into account. In countries in which this basis is not yet developed or where it is just being developed (which happens to be the case in our country), where a powerful expansion of the network of schools and universities is just under way, a considerable portion of funds earmarked for education will be spent on capital investments of this kind.

The situation is more or less the same in the area of scientific work.

It would be therefore most appropriate to reduce the economic price of education to costs per student. The reasons are obvious.

In the first place, every student ought to know how much his education costs (during one school year or during the whole educational cycle). This is important particularly in cases in which the costs of education are borne by the community or by business, and other working organizations out of their funds either directly or through the community of education. This is a fact which the educational and scientific working organizations should also be aware of. It also contributes to the feeling of responsibility of both the students and the schools.

Whoever the financier may be, whoever may be paying the price of education for the student (the economic tuition), the student will be the factor on which the sum of money for education will depend. Namely, if he fulfills various conditions in the framework of the anticipated number of pupils or students for whose education there have been provided the necessary funds, then will the economic price of his education be deposited at the beginning of the academic year with the school or faculty which he is attending. The student brings thus upon his enrolment certain funds to the school or faculty which he is going to attend. The grown-up pupil or rather the student is thus better off. He may also exert some influence on some aspects of the educational process.

Secondly, those absorbing the trained staff (business and other working organizations and communities of education) — who are the financiers of education, should also know the price of education per student. The price of education can help them to calculate how much money they need for the training of the staff in which they are interested. This is the only way in which the needs in personnel can

be adjusted to the available financial resource under conditions of economic criteria and the economic valorization in terms of the economic price of education or scientific-educational services.

Thirdly, the price of education per student should be the basis for those employing the trained staff directly or through communities of education — when running contests for the financing of pupils and students who qualify best for enrolment (in dependence of their former success, the entrance examination etc.). Contests of this kind, in which the number and the structure of students would be set on the basis of the economic price of education at the beginning of every academic year would be a new and very important step towards the establishment of entirely economic relations among educational or scientific-educational working organizations, the students and those employing the trained personnel.

Fourthly, we have to determine the price of education per student in order to settle mutual obligations (if any) between communities of education on the level of the region and the republic or between governmental bodies and communities of education or educational-scientific organizations. These obligations have to do with the recompensation of costs, particularly for foreign students. It is also necessary for comparisons on education in various regions and as basis on which steps will be taken in the area of social solidarity. The price of education per student is also necessary when individuals have to pay for education or if they participate in it. This holds for foreign students and for those Yugoslav students who do not qualify at contests and whose costs of education will not be covered by working organizations employing the trained personnel.

Fifthly, in a situation in which education is financed out of social or associated funds of a number of working organizations (within the frames of territorial or special communities of education) we must know how matters stand with costs of education per student (pupil attending the secondary school or student), if funds are to be granted in the form of a credit to students who have not fulfilled the conditions of the contest for enrolment and who have not been granted the funds in some other way.

We must consider now in a somewhat greater detail the introduction of credit relations in the area of education, the more so since credit relations are becoming more widespread in the contemporary society, in developed economies and in the Yugoslav economy too.

We do not bear in mind credits which may be granted to students and which have already taken hold in our country. These are credits which cover the costs of living (rent, food, transport etc.). We have in mind credits which would cover the costs of their education, i.e. the economic price of education in the narrow sense of the word.

The financing of the whole system of guided education could be based on credits. In that case the credit could amount to the total costs of education, i.e. to the full price of education for all the years of studies stated in faculty statutes. Of course, it could be also granted for a longer period, or until the student finishes his studies. The credit could be also granted in an amount which would not cover all the costs

of education. In this case the rest would be borne either by the student or by his parents. The amount of the credit would depend, in this case, upon the former success of the student as well as on the results he has achieved during his studies, on the time it takes him to finish various courses as well as on the material position of his parents.

Students could be also stimulated in different ways. For instance, they could be encouraged to work harder for their examinations, to finish their studies sooner etc. Students from families with low incomes could be likewise stimulated. Namely, there could be introduced differentiated obligations for the repayment of credits. In dependence of the success of the student, the duration of his studies and the material position of his family, he may be exempt from the repayment of the credit. Some students may be put under obligation to repay it in part, while some of them would have to repay the whole amount. The credit would be repaid after the student has graduated or a few years after he has begun to study. It would be repaid in small and long-term instalments. The longer the repayment date is — which is desirable — the lower would the monthly instalments be.

There are several reasons favouring the long-term repayment (over a considerable number of years) in small monthly instalments. In principle, the credit might be repaid in two ways — either by graduate students or by working organizations which will employ them. If the credit were repaid by students after they have graduated, they could repay it out of their personal incomes (which would be higher thanks to their higher job qualifications). The instalments could be either the exact equivalent of the credit (corrected for the rise in prices) or a permanent, fixed percentage of personal incomes throughout the years they are in work, which would be a form of solidarity.

The other form of repayment, that is the repayment of credits by working organizations in which the qualified staff will be employed later, would be more in accordance with our system. It would be natural for them to repay this amount out of their total revenue and in instalments, but only while former students are employed in them. In that case it would be most appropriate if the repayment period were approximately equivalent to the reproductive working life-time of the employed (25 years on the average) so that the instalments would amount to about 4% of the economic price of education for the regular duration of studies. It would be paid throughout the actual working lifetime of all the employed. This instalment would be, in fact, equal to the depreciation rates for the simple reproduction of the staff. It would help to secure the simple reproduction of the personnel.

If a student had received a higher amount of credit because he had studied longer than stated in the statute of his faculty then would the surplus credit be repaid, as a rule, by the borrower, that is by the graduate student. It may be repaid in one of the two above mentioned ways (in the absolute amount or as percentage of his personal income throughout his years of service). Of course, the repayment of this surplus credit may be settled by agreement between the borrower and the working organization which will employ him.

Students could run the entire risk involved in the choice of their future profession under such a credit system. However, it would be

preferable if working organizations and establishments set aside, on the basis of self-managing decisions, funds for education, which would depend on their specific needs. They would be entitled to place their requirements with regard to professional specialties of the staff, bearing thus directly on contests for enrolment into various schools. They could even set higher standards for the personnel as well as for the material and technical equipment.

Social and economic reasons favour the introduction of credits as form of university education in the first place. The university education is, in fact, a privilege enjoyed by a very small percentage of every generation. People with university education have much higher personal incomes, of which they can set aside a small portion to repay — partly or fully — the credit they received during their studies, even if the working organizations employing them refused to do so.

However, it would be natural in our socio-economic system if working organizations which employ people with university education covered the costs of regular studies, regardless of whether a credit is involved or not. The question of how to repay the credit for education will not arise in the case when a working organization finances directly a pupil or a student, who is already employed in this organization or who is going to be employed there after having graduated from school. The obligations of both the student and the working organization will be regulated by direct mutual agreement.

The system of the financing of education through credit, regardless of whether the one or the other alternative is acceptable, would expand relatively quickly the material basis of education. It would create rather soon the material conditions for a system of free university enrolment and a free choice of profession. Apart from the needs in personnel of the working organizations, the inclinations and desires of students could manifest themselves as well.

The funds for the education would be continuously increased in this way and there would be better chances for a larger number of students or rather for a higher percentage of each school-age generation. This is one of the main factors of our social and economic growth. Finally, this would be the least painful way of solving the problem of how to refund the costs of education of university trained people working abroad.

As we have already pointed out, credits for education, i.e. credits which will cover the economic price of educational services (offered by educational working organizations to secondary school pupils or university students) should not be mixed up with credits which are granted to students or should be granted to them to cover their costs of living. If we want to decrease the differences among students from families belonging to various income groups, we must undertake either direct actions of social solidarity or grant credits for their maintenance. In the area of elementary education there advocate all the arguments the direct actions of social solidarity (textbooks, food, accommodation, scholarships). On higher levels of education and particularly in the case of university education, maintenance credits seem to be more appropriate. In both cases our goal should be to ensure that the quality, the talents and results of work of students should

be the decisive factors determining the level of education they will be admitted to (elementary, secondary schools, universities, postgraduate studies).

The amount of maintenance credits should be increased and they should be granted to a larger number of students. This necessity has nothing to do with the way in which credits are treated — as personal incomes of students in the working organization in which they are or will be employed or as his income as student at the faculty.

Without entering in greater detail into the problem of how to incorporate credits for the maintenance of students into the economic price of education in the broader sense, and leaving aside the impact of this incorporation, we hold that the first alternative would be more in line with our socio-economic system. Namely, students who do fulfill the conditions for enrolment into schools and faculties in which the working organizations are interested, might not only enter into contractual relationships with working organizations. They ought to be incorporated rather into them, having all the rights and obligations, particularly with regard to learning and studying. Their personal incomes, in like manner as the personal incomes, of other workers, would depend in that case primarily on the results of their work, i.e. on the success they have achieved at school as well as on the duration of their studies. It would be possible to stipulate in the contract the repayment of credit, if the student fails to perform his obligations. Many conflicting situations of a broader social scope could be avoided in this way.

The calculation of the price of scientific research work is no special problem. The economic price of research work should be calculated, as a rule, for every particular project or for certain scientific services.

We have to consider now which sources and methods for the financing of education and science would correspond best to the nature of these activities and to our self-managing society. We have to find out further the most appropriate way for the integration of these activities with other spheres of social labour.

The preconditions for the fuller development of self-management in education and science are new sources and methods of financing. The dependence upon budgets and budgetary forms of financing should be overcome as soon as possible. In this respect, the progress made in the sphere of education is not the same as in the sphere of scientific-research work. On the whole, education has managed to free itself from budgetary channels and regulations more rapidly. Regulations on the financing of education and on communities of education which have been passed on the level of both the federation and republics have contributed a lot.

Firstly, the budget is no longer the sole or dominant source of financing. Taxes for the financing of education have become more independent. They flow now directly and not through budgetary channels into the funds of territorial communities of education, mainly on the level of communes and republics. The main source of special taxes for education are the personal incomes or rather the gross personal incomes of citizens holding jobs. As a rule, a special tax rate is paid to communal or inter-communal communities for education,

out of which the elementary and secondary school education is financed. Another tax rate is paid to communities of education on the level of republics or autonomous regions, out of which the higher and the university education are financed. This is at the same time the source of the additional financing of elementary and secondary-school education, where it is inevitable. Socio-political communities are obliged to finance education out of budgetary funds in cases in which it cannot be financed in the regular way, that is through special taxes for education.

A further step towards the advancement of self-management and a greater independence of education was the formation of communal (in some cases inter-communal) and republican communities of education, which are in charge of the financing of education and are gradually becoming also the educational policy-makers. What is typical is that educational working organizations delegate their representatives to these educational communities. In educational communities there prevail representatives of educational working organizations and not representatives of business and other working organizations and socio-political communities.

These are undoubtedly two important steps towards the introduction of new socio-economic relations in education. We hold, however, that they have to be considered as two transitional stages in this development.

The field of scientific-research work lags behind in both of these respects.

In the first place, the scientific-research work has been for a long time financed through budgets consisting of republican, regional and federal funds for the financing of scientific-research work. This does not hold, of course, for research departments in the frames of business and other working organizations. Unlike education, there are no separate taxes for scientific work. An innovation was the fact that funds for science which were set aside on the level of the federation depended on the amount of the national product. The process was automatized in this way and there was a steady and dynamic inflow of funds. The Federal Fund for the financing of scientific activities has been dissolved now, while the financing of scientific work has been transferred to the republics.

It is important to note that funds for scientific work which were collected on the level of republics and the federation used to be allotted for the most part to independent scientific research institutes outside universities. This can be explained by the fact that the funds for the financing of the scientific-research work were limited and that the majority of independent non-university research institutes had no other source for the financing of their activities. The universities on the other hand financed their scientific work out of funds which were allotted by communities of education on the level of regions and republics. However, the extremely limited funds of educational communities could hardly cover the economic price of educational activities.

Secondly, the setting up of councils for coordination and of funds for the financing of scientific activities was the first step towards self-management in the broad sense and towards independence in the

area of science. Namely, the educational policy was implemented by these coordinating councils and funds for the financing of scientific activities. They as well as their boards and commissions were composed mainly of scientific workers from the university and from independent research institutes. However, they were not nominated by working organizations in the area of science, but were appointed by republican (or regional) authorities.

The next step towards the development of self-management in the broad sense and towards a greater degree of independence in science, which has been taken in some republics, is the setting up of communities for scientific work. It is important to note that working organizations in the field of science delegate their representatives to the communities for scientific work. Communities for scientific work are composed mainly of representatives of scientific-research and educational working organizations in like manner as communities of education. Representatives of business and other working organizations and socio-political communities have far less representatives in them.

In order to foster the further development of socio-economic relations in the field of education and science, we have to find differentiated solutions regarding the sources and way of financing as well as forms of association.

Sources of funds for education should not be the same for all the levels of education, as it is mainly the case in our country. It would be most natural if the main source of funds for elementary education were mainly the personal incomes of citizens, since elementary education is obligatory according to the Constitution. Territorial communities of elementary education seem to be most appropriate. Namely, it is in them that the principle of social solidarity could manifest itself best. However, communal borders should not be borders of social solidarity. This is why broader communities of education should be established instead of communal ones.

In principle, social solidarity can be also secured through the so-called supplementary financing of elementary education, e.g. through communities of education on the level of republic. However, in practice and under conditions of inadequate financial resources of educational communities on the level of republics it is likely that the principle of solidarity will be seriously impaired. On the other hand, the funds for education may be spent in an unreasonable way. Namely, if the administrative borders of communes will be also the borders of communities for elementary (and also for secondary) education, then will a much larger number of under-developed communal educational communities depend on republican (or regional) educational communities.

Various under-developed and poor communes tend to rely frequently on their rich center. Children who have finished the elementary school in these surrounding communes come to the center, where they attend schools of a higher rank. Later on they find jobs there. Their job qualifications and knowledge will be utilized thus by the developed commune, or rather by business and other working organi-

zations in it. However, the costs of their elementary education were borne by the inhabitants of the surrounding, under-developed commune.

The principle of solidarity could manifest itself better if communities for education covered a broader territory, e.g. various communes, inclusive of the developed commune and the surrounding ones, which tend to move towards the developed one. Questions regarding a certain minimum standard for the staff as well as for the technical equipment could be solved more rapidly and fuller in these frames — without much interference on the part of republics or their communities of education. Education should surpass communal borders in like manner as the economy.

In the area of education as well as in social life in general we come across so-called conflicting goals. Apart from the principle of social solidarity, which favours broader educational communities, there is also the necessity to bring educational communities closer to those interested in them — to citizens, and parents, who set aside the financial resources for elementary education and who are vitally interested in the education of their children. This would favour the formation of narrower communities of elementary education — particularly in urban environments — than is the territory of the commune. On the other hand, the communes as basic socio-political communities have to play a very important role in the implementation of the constitutional principle of obligatory elementary education. If communities of elementary education covered a broader area than the area of a commune, then would the direct responsibilities of the commune be limited.

We ought to find a solution which would take account of all the three requirements. 1) There ought to be achieved a social solidarity which would not be confined to the borders of the commune and which would look for solutions not only to the republic (the region), ignoring the very important fields of gravitation which surround educational and economic centers (inter-communal regions); 2) Account should be taken of the direct interests of citizens as tax-payers for education. 3) The obligations of the communes regarding the constitutional principle of compulsory elementary education should be also borne in mind. In brief, rights and obligations in policy-making and financing of elementary education should be settled in such a way as to ensure the maximum respect for the above mentioned principles and the maximum endeavours of all those interested in and responsible for elementary education.

A very important principle (in our opinion) should be stressed in this connection. New educational communities, not only of elementary but also of guided (professional) education should be composed largely of tax-payers for education, of people who contribute to funds for education, which does not happen to be the case with existing ones. Namely, these are people who are entitled to formulate the educational policy. In other words, communities of elementary education should be composed of tax-paying citizens, or rather of their representatives.

Republican (and regional) communities of elementary education could then concern themselves not only with common matters, but

could provide the supplementary funds for under-developed communities of elementary education, which are inevitable if we want to secure standards for the staff and for the material and technical equipment.

As to secondary and university education, the main sources of funds for guided education should be the total income of working organizations. Namely, business and other working organizations employ the educated personnel, which has been trained in various secondary schools, in colleges and at faculties (these are schools of direct professional education) as well as in high schools (schools of indirect professional education). This calls for an altogether different attitude towards the educated staff, the qualified human factor of production.

Under the present system of financing in education, the tax for education has been deducted mainly from personal incomes. However, those employing the educated personnel can hardly exert any influence on the way in which these funds are spent nor on the number and structure of the personnel which is being trained for business and other working organizations. On the other hand, no attention has been paid to the simple and expanded reproduction of educated people. It is possible to find people with certain qualifications, which are not always the most suitable ones, but are to be found »ready-made« on the »market« of skilled labour. Working organizations have focused their attention mainly on the simple and expanded reproduction of other technical and natural factors of production, that is on the reproduction of means of production and not on the indispensable preconditions for such a reproduction.

The period to come should bring about a radical change. Business and other working organizations should immediately tackle the simple and expanded reproduction of the qualified personnel, in other words the financing of the staff with job qualifications they are interested in. To ensure simple reproduction means to ensure a sufficient number of trained personnel which will replace the existing staff with the same or with similar job specialties, which can no longer participate in the working process for biological reasons. The expanded reproduction of the trained staff means the education (training) of new experts.

This is why we need a new type of associations of business and other working organizations on the one hand and of educational organizations on the other one. The most appropriate forms of association would be, in our view, communities of particular (professional) education. They could be formed on the professional or on the branch principle, in dependence of both the need for certain job specialties and the number of the trained staff employed in various branches of economic activity.

A uniform organization of schools and faculties is neither necessary nor feasible. This holds also for highly specialized schools. Namely, they train the personnel which will find jobs not only in one particular branch of economic or social activity, but as a rule in several branches of economic and social activities. In other words, business and other working organizations employ, generally speaking, not only one parti-

cular type of personnel, but people with different job qualifications and different grades.

The division on the professional or on the branch principle do not exclude each other. Every working organization and all associations of working organizations should analyse their needs in various job specialties and levels of education. Sometimes it might be sufficient to carry out this analysis in the frames of a single large working organization. Having analysed these needs in personnel in the frames of branch communities of education, for instance, we would have to form professional sections or professional communities of education, in which all the interested business and other working organizations would be represented, whereas educational working organizations (schools and faculties) which train this personnel on secondary and higher levels would be represented only in part (perhaps in the authorities of the community). Interested business and other working organizations would be represented commensurately to their needs in particular job qualifications. However, these needs should be accompanied by corresponding financial resources, calculated on the basis of the economic price of education.

It would be natural if professional sections (related professional groups of branch communities of guided education) and corresponding special communities of guided education organized on a professional basis merged either into broader professional communities, covering the region or republic, or into sections of republican or regional communities of guided education. This would be desirable and even indispensable for the setting of standards for staff and for the material and technical equipment, which are necessary for the education of the personnel of related job specialties (professions). It would be possible to exercise thus a direct influence on education, on the curricula and programmes of various courses and various levels of training.

This is indispensable for the simple reason that there are, as a rule, much less educational working organizations training the staff with different job qualifications than there are working organizations employing the personnel which has been trained at these schools and faculties. Frequently there is only one faculty in the whole area, in the region and even in the republic at which young people are trained to perform jobs. However, graduates from this faculty can find jobs in almost all the working organizations in all fields of activities. It is hard to imagine that the school or faculty will meet the demands of all the numerous working organizations with regard to various standards of staff and material and technical equipment of education, curricula and programmes of instruction.

While recommending separate — branch and professional communities of guided education, we do not wish to deny the need for a general or republican (and regional) community of guided education as association of separate communities. This general community of professional education could have professional sections for related groups of qualifications, which would unite professional sections of

branch communities and perhaps also professional communities of guided education.

Business and other working organizations should become thus gradually responsible for the simple and expanded reproduction of all factors of production. We mean thereby also the simple and expanded reproduction of the human factor of production, that is of the personnel with certain qualifications and grades. In other words, financial resources for guided education would be formed primarily out of a) the total income of working organizations as part of depreciation funds, i.e. funds for the simple reproduction and b) out of the profits of working organizations as part of investment funds, i.e. funds for the expanded reproduction of the personnel, i.e. for the engagement of new additional personnel.

In this way a long-run and much discussed question will be solved finally. This is the question whether education should be ranked as common consumption or as an integral part of social reproduction. Guided education and general education of medium grade, which is only the first step of guided higher education, will become thus both de facto and de jure an integral part of social reproduction. This holds in the last instance also for the elementary education, which in itself provides a certain amount of qualification, which is indispensable for the work in business organizations as well as for the private work. On the other hand it is the necessary precondition for all the higher grades of education.

It must be mentioned here that the personnel will be employed not only by business organizations, but by all the other working organizations, including educational and scientific working organizations as well. They will use their depreciation and investment funds to finance the education of future teachers and researchers, i.e. their simple and expanded reproduction. The costs of reproduction of teachers and researchers at the university will have to be included into the prices of education and scientific work.

In this way we shall be able to answer the question whether there is much educated personnel in general in our country or whether we have got only many specialists of a particular type. We shall gain thus the best insight into the needs in staff with various job qualifications and grades. All the hitherto projections of needs in specialists have borne an administrative imprint and they were subject to arbitrary estimates. These projections differed very much and they were often incompatible, due to different methodological approaches and other factors. Absolute and unrealistic requirements manifested themselves.

Working organizations were neither willing nor able to secure the corresponding funds for the financing of education of this personnel. However, what is true of other fields is true of education too. To put it in economic terms, it is not the absolute demand that matters but rather the effective demand — in this case the demand for personnel — if we want to incorporate educational and scientific working organizations fuller into the flows of our self-managing society and self-managing market economy, under the principle of the working

income and on the basis of the economic price of education and scientific work.

All the main attitudes which have to do with education, primarily with the source and way of financing on one hand, and the association and merger of business and other working organizations with working organizations in the field of education on the other one, hold, *mutando mutandis*, also for the field of research work.

Such an orientation should be accompanied by corresponding normative acts. The existing legal solutions ment once a step forward, if compared to the former state of things. However, they curb the further progressive and self-managing movement in these areas and in the relationship between the economy and other working organizations on one hand and education and science on the other one. We hold that these regulations ought to be adjusted as soon as possible to this new progressive orientation. However, communities of education and scientific work based on the professional and branch principle should be organized as soon as possible.

The expenditure of funds in the frames of communities and sections for guided education should depend on the decisions made by business and other working organizations. These organizations ought to have at hand the funds which have been set aside for the education of the staff with various job qualifications and for the research work in various scientific disciplines. In other words, business and other working organizations ought to retain already now one part of the taxes which have been deducted from the personal incomes of the working people employed in them and which are earmarked for the financing of the medium, the higher and the university education. The working organizations would be, of course, obliged to spend this money on the education of the specialists they need.

Before closing our consideration of economic problems of education and science and problems involved in their integration with other areas of associated labour, we would like to concern ourselves in brief with the relationship between education and science, between working organizations and scientists in these areas.

Firstly, education and science are closely connected, particularly at universities. Without scientific work we can imagine no university studies. The research work will become particularly important when the university reform is over.

Secondly, it goes without saying that the majority of scientific workers engaged in scientific-educational and scientific-research work is concentrated at universities. Apart from a few exceptions, they rank among the highest specialists.

Thirdly, it would be natural to expect a closer relationship between universities and independent institutes for scientific work in our country, as it is the case in many advanced countries. Universities ought to be associations of faculties, but also of corresponding institutes for scientific and research work. They would, like faculties, keep the status of independent and self-managing working organizations. The research work would be done by members of the university as well as by non-university scientists.

Fourthly, all scientists ought to have access to university titles. Legal regulations ought to be simplified so that non-university scientists — employed in institutes outside the university, in the economy, in governmental and other establishments — would be able to receive all university titles for teachers and researchers (including the Senior Assistant, the Assistant Professor and the Professor) — provided that they fulfill certain conditions. They should be also included, as much as possible, into various forms of the teaching process.

Whatever has been said above advocates the integration of certain related communities of guided education and of communities for scientific work, particularly of professional communities or professional sections for guided education and scientific work.

Dr BRANISLAV SOŠKIĆ

Dr Branislav Šošković, professor at the Faculty of Economics of the University of Beograd and director of the Institute of Economic Research. Dean of the Faculty of Economics from 1964 to 1967. Now deputy and chairman of the Board of Education at the Federal Assembly of Yugoslavia (at the Educational and Cultural Chamber).

Chairman of the Council of the International University Center for Social sciences of the University of Beograd.

Awarded the Doctoral Degree in 1954 at the Faculty of Economics, in Beograd. In the 1955—56 and 1956—57 academic years studied under the auspices of the British Council at the universities of St. Andrews and Cambridge in the United Kingdom; 1962—63 spent at the universities of Harvard and Berkeley, in the United States of America, under the Ford Foundation arrangement.

More important books published: *The Development of Economic Thought*, Beograd, Institute of Economic Research (1965), 1968, and 1970; *Production, Employment, and Stabilization — Contemporary Macro-economic Analysis*, Beograd, Institute of Economic Research; 1970, 1971. *The Distribution of Incomes in the Market Economy — Contemporary Micro-economic Analysis*, Beograd, Institute of Economic Research, Contemporary Administration, 1971; *Theory of Value — a Classical Economic Analysis*, Beograd, Institute for Economic Research, Contemporary Administration, 1971.

Co-author of numerous books, collection of works, and encyclopaedia. Author of many articles and reports for domestic and international scientific symposia in the fields of theory of economics and economic policy, as well as that of economic of scientific research and education published in Yugoslav and foreign periodicals.

Dr Branko PRIBICEVIC

Professor at the Faculty of Political Sciences in Beograd

POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS IN YUGOSLAVIA

In an analysis of the political system in Yugoslavia two factors must continuously be borne in mind. First, in many of its defining features *this system is the original, specific and independent expression of the social environment in which it develops*. While emphasizing this, we do not forget that specific features in forms of political organization are a trait of every society which develops more or less freely, which has an opportunity to commit itself independently without being hindered by various external factors. In the case of Yugoslavia the fact of the system's distinctiveness, its differences of the unique nature in relation to other types and models of political superstructure, has especially great significance. In their attempt to meet the requirements and needs of a self-managing socialist community composed of a great number of nations and nationalities in the best possible way, the leading political forces have turned to a form of political organization which is substantially unique. Its specific features are most apparent when it is a question of the position, role, internal structure, method of action and mutual relations of political organizations within Yugoslavia. These areas of the Yugoslav system are so atypical that it is completely impossible to fit Yugoslavia into any of the known, easily described contemporary political systems. By this we refer to classifications which proceed from the position, role, function and mutual relations of political organizations.

The division of political systems into multi-party and one-party systems is frequently adopted as fundamental in the political theory of today. This is incontestably extremely significant, although it is not the only angle from which various types and political organizations are reviewed. An overwhelming number of political systems can be logically and consistently classified into one of these two categories. The vital characteristic of the Yugoslav system is the fact that it transcends both the requirements and criteria of this division and that in many of its elements it surpasses it as far as theoretical concept is concerned. Plainly said, this system is neither the one nor the other — it is already lacking certain basic elements of the traditional one-party system but at the same time it resolutely declines to adopt the alternative of the multi-party pluralism.

The second factor is that the system of political organization in Yugoslavia is just now in the *process of profound transformation*. Thus we cannot consider it to be a fully developed, complete and finished theoretical model. Moreover as a practical-political system it is lacking tradition as well as internal stability to a certain extent. Along with this, certain important theoretical questions are still outstanding, while various difficulties and problems have emerged in the practice of internal development of individual organizations, their function and mutual relations.

Still it stands to reason that this system of political organizations represents an attractive subject of research for modern political thinking. Numerous researchers are stimulated by the knowledge that a process of constituting a type of political super-structure of socialist society that is specific and original in many points, is under way in this country.

For the leading political forces in Yugoslavia, the original nature of this path is both a source of inspiration and a source of various difficulties. The latter is due to the fact that the new type of political system is developing in a small and comparatively poorly developed country. In the development of our political system (and of the social system in general) we often face problems which are ours, Yugoslav, to such an extent that to seek answers in the experiences of other countries cannot help to solve problems or replace an independent search. We cannot exploit the experiences of others just because we have built into the very foundations of our social system the resolve to be ourselves, because we have realized that examples of other countries are intrinsically unacceptable to us.

The importance of this factor, the so-called negative attitude towards existing models, can be seen by the fact that in our thinking concerning the new political system we have often proceeded from a preliminary, quite accurate definition of what we do not want and only after this we have attempted to define our positive objectives. Thus, for example, while opening an extensive debate on the change of the political system we have first emphasized publicly that multi-party pluralism and the well-known forms of the one-party system are equally unacceptable to us, and it has been after this that we went forward to a positive definition of our goals. Also, understandably, we have not always been so clear and certain in this as we have been in dissociating ourselves from the models we did not want.

Even in the first phase of our quest for a specific political system which would correspond to the requirements and needs of society such as ours, we were criticized for seeking to square a circle or solve the insoluble. These criticisms underlined that there exist only two types of coherent political organisation (multi-party and one-party) and that, for this reason, there was no third way. The leading forces of this society have discarded such pessimistic evaluations and are confident that a »third« solution exists and that the two currently prevailing models do not contain all possible choices in the struggle for socialism and democracy. We define the »third« in brief as *direct, participatory democracy*. Consequently our ideal is neither the multi-party nor the

one-party system, but rather to transcend also this form of thinking. That is why we say that our long-term commitment can also be defined as a »non-party political system«.

The difficulties we are encountering in the development of this political system are extremely serious and they even have a discouraging effect upon some persons. We are striving to build a system which will secure the greatest degree of democratic participation so far in a country which possesses modest democratic traditions. It also requires a developed democratic political culture which we are in the process of developing. Numerous outstanding theoretical and practical-political problems put heavy demands on our scientific still rather limited potential. When we add to this the extremely delicate international position of the country, which has often been exposed to various kinds of external pressure, we can get a good picture of the complicated, unfavorable circumstances under which we work in building our specific type of political organization.

Although these difficulties can be upsetting and discouraging they also, in some sense, act as a challenge and impetus for persevering. For a movement such as the revolutionary movement in Yugoslavia which has been faced on several occasions in its recent history with extremely serious situations and trials, with problems which appeared insoluble at first glance, our difficulties have served to consolidate the resolve of leading subjective forces to persist in their commitment.

I

Before explaining the basic characteristics of the system of political organizations and the role these organizations play in the political life of the country, we shall try to describe the more important *factors* which have been conclusive to the emergence and affirmation of the specific type of political organization. In other words, we shall try to answer the question of why Yugoslavia has proceeded along this road in the development of its political system or rather, why does its system differ to such an extent from the majority of other systems. Unlike so many questions about Yugoslavia, it is possible to reply briefly, simply and in fact, very accurately. The specific nature of political organizations in this context, is determined by the unique features of self-management socialism which, in numerous aspects, differs from forms of social organization of other socialist countries. Significant differences in the basic production relationship, economic system and position of the workingman also required a different conception of the political superstructure.

Even though this, most succinctly said, is the gist of the reply, we shall nonetheless list the most important theoretical deliberations and practical-political circumstances that have influenced the basic commitment in conceiving and developing our system.

Theoretical Foundations and Considerations

The theoretical premises from which we have proceeded in the development of the system of political organization are the following:

1. The realization of the idea of socialism (the abolition of classes and every form of exploitation, the liberation of man and the transcending of all forms of human alienation, in brief, the development of a truly human community) representing such a profound and complicated change that it absolutely cannot be achieved without a permanent *conscious guidance and articulation of the will and demands of social and political forces committed to socialism*. In the socialist process there exists also room for spontaneous movement, but such action cannot bring about lasting and fundamental advance of socialism. From this basic premise is drawn the conclusion of the historical inevitability and importance of the role of the revolutionary vanguard, the leading subjective force of socialist transformation.

2. While conceiving the historical role, tasks and position of the revolutionary vanguard Yugoslav communists proceed from essential *concepts of Marx's and Lenin's theory of the party* and especially from those speaking about the relationship between the class and party and about internal relations in the movement. These concepts have a permanent and exceptionally great value to us in that they underline that the role of the revolutionary vanguard is not in usurping the right to speak *on behalf of the class*, but in creating conditions which will make possible independent action of the class itself.

3. There exists no universal model of revolutionary. The works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and other great thinkers — socialists, contain precious ideas and keynotes but by no means a generally valid example or pattern showing what internal structure, the method of action or mutual relations between individual parts of the revolutionary movement should look like. *In order that an organization might be able to achieve the role of revolutionary subject it must reflect in its being, not only the general values and objectives of socialism but also the entire gamut of specific social conditions of the environment in which it acts*. The forms of organization and method of activity which are the best for one environment can be completely unsuitable and inadequate for other social conditions. In the same way — the type of organization which has corresponded to demands of the revolutionary struggle at a certain period of time, can be transcended or, due to other reasons, inadequate at another time. Thus, for example, it is quite certain that the type of organization which scored the best results under conditions of a bitter struggle for power, especially under conditions of underground activity, does not correspond to tasks of the vanguard after the conquest and consolidation of the revolutionary authority.

4. In the being of the revolutionary vanguard there must continuously exist and interact the contradictory elements of genuine inter-

nal democracy and ability to act, or rather unity of action. The unity of these two contradictory elements represents the ideal for which we are striving but which we can never attain in a permanent sense. The best solution can be defined as an equilibrium between these two factors which, however, is subject to constant disturbances. The history of revolutionary movements shows that in practice the tendency is permanently present either to weaken, undermine or shatter the capability of the vanguard for action, on behalf of internal democratization and conflict of ideas or, vice versa — on behalf of unity of action to substantially limit and even definitely stifle free thinking and democracy within the framework of the movement.

The principle of *democratic centralism* represents an attempt to achieve a dialectical synthesis («equilibrium») of the two above-mentioned contradictory elements. This principle is built into the foundations of communist and numerous other workers' and socialist party as well as of progressive national movements. From experience so far it can be inferred that in most cases the element of democracy has been rudely violated and subordinated to requirements of centralism. There have been few successes in the attempt to find a factual balance (dialectical synthesis) between the two above-mentioned basic elements. This is so in the history of the revolutionary movement in Yugoslavia as well.

The transformation which the League of Communists of Yugoslavia is undergoing at present is largely motivated by a striving to modify and if possible, also to eliminate this imbalance, to secure actual inner-party democracy while preserving the necessary degree of centralism and unity of action.

5. Political organizations — the League of Communists, the Socialist Alliance, the TU Federation, youth, students' and other organizations — represent the *concomitants of a single movement*. They have different tasks but common basic goals unite them. In the system the League of Communists occupies the most important place as the leading ideological-political force of this society. Other organizations adopt the programmatic principles of the League of Communists as the basis of their ideological-political orientation. In the process of defining and achieving their direct tasks all organizations should possess a high degree of political independence.

II

Political Motives and Factors

Let us look at the *political factors* which have influenced to the greatest degree the commitments of the leading political forces of Yugoslavia to such a system and the manner in which one should explain the resolve and ability to evaluate critically foreign examples and to build independently one's own form of political organization. I think that the following circumstances have had a decisive influence:

First, the *specific nature of winning power by the socialist forces* exerted decisive influence not only on the political system but also

upon entire development of Yugoslavia after the classes of proprietors were dispossessed of their rights. One must underline here above all that the Communist Party of Yugoslavia achieved, in the course of the war, full independence in waging its armed revolution. For well known reasons, the authoritative international centre objectively was not able at that time to vitally influence, or to interfere in the directing of the revolution. Confronted with an exceptionally serious situation (the country divided into six parts, the treason of the ruling circles, the onset of the fratricidal war, terror of the occupier and Quislings of unprecedented proportions) Yugoslav communists *quite independently developed the strategy and tactics of revolutionary struggle. The main feature of this strategy was a truly successful merging of the struggle for national liberation with the struggle for a social transformation into a unified movement.* The »secret« of the success of the armed revolution in Yugoslavia is just in this aspect of the policy of the Communist Party. This policy was adopted by large circles of the working population while the classes of proprietors, or rather organizations expressing their interests found themselves chiefly on the other side. The logic of an uncompromising liberation war brought the major part of the ruling circles and the old state apparatus to the side of the occupier and, this meant also to national treason. Thus the liberation war assumed all the vital features of a profound social revolution.

Consequently, the armed revolution in Yugoslavia had a specific character. It differed largely from the socialist revolutions so far, as well as from certain (abortive) attempts of revolutionary movements to take power. The root of many specific features of the subsequent socialist development must be sought in the independence which Yugoslav communists won at that time.

The fact that the *question of political power has been settled in Yugoslavia in the direct conflict between social and political forces in the country itself* is of extreme importance for our study. External factors had comparatively little importance in inflicting military defeat of the forces of the old system. This is not to minimize the importance of the international factor in the outcome of the Yugoslav revolution because Yugoslav communists took power within the context of the victory of the anti-Hitler coalition. This war created the general setting for the take-over of power. The question of achieving power was settled without external assistance. This course and outcome of the armed revolution has been and still is today, the source of the moral and political strength and self-reliance which characterize the conduct of the leading political forces of this country and of wide circles of politically engaged persons.

Secondly, the conflict in 1948, with Stalin, or the Information Bureau of Communist Parties, (Cominform) was equally important. In the course of the six-year long conflict which in many ways reminds one of a contemporary version of the classic clash between David and Goliath the Yugoslav society was exposed to a truly monstrous campaign of slanders and of political, ideological and economic pressure. Under conditions in which neither the friends (their number was quite small at that time since Stalin's

campaign against the Communist Party of Yugoslavia was supported by absolutely all communist parties of the world as well as by many other political formations which were related to communist parties), nor the opponents believed in the success of the resistance. There just happened the thing which nobody had expected: »David«, withstood all attacks from outside and established his right to build an absolutely independent internal and foreign policy. These brutal attacks on the freedom of the country and the independence of the CPY caused serious rethinking and investigation into the causes of the Stalinist policy. Thus this difficult period of the struggle for the preservation of independence has been a strong impetus for extremely fruitful theoretical work. The affirmation of political independence of the country and of its revolutionary vanguard represented a broad setting and stimulus for *ideological emancipation* from Stalinism. Confronted in such a brutal manner with specific manifestations of Stalinism, we began reexamination of our own theoretical thinking and political practice, and resolved to eliminate everything that could produce such negative phenomena. That is why it is not at all by chance that the basic outlines of self-management socialism, specific paths of international development and of the foreign policy of Yugoslavia, were established precisely in the course of that period.

Thirdly, *the building of self-management into the foundations of the entire social structure* demanded definite changes in the political system and, in this context, also in the position and functioning of political organizations. The type of political organizations which corresponded to the period of the so-called revolutionary etatism, (i.e. the first post-war years when the top political leadership had concentrated in their hands enormous social power and directly decided on all more important social problems), could not survive under conditions of self-management organization of the society whose basic pre-requisite was that workingmen should decide alone and independently on conditions of their own work and life.

Fourthly, *the complicated multi-national structure of the Yugoslav community strongly marked* the constitution of the entire political system. (I bear in mind, above all, certain specific characteristics of Yugoslav federalism with a strong position of associated republics and provinces). This factor is also extremely important for understanding the constitutional changes adopted in 1971 and whose most important feature is the provision aimed at the consistent realization of the principle of the fullest equality of all nations and nationalities in Yugoslavia. Under these provisions has been concurrently achieved a substantial reduction of rights and competences of the Federation and a corresponding consolidation of republics as the expression and vehicle of the statehood of individual nations.

This trend of development of the overall political system produced inevitable repercussions on the position and structure of all political organizations. The high degree of decentralization in the structure of the state, the shift of centres of decision making from the Federation toward republics, could hardly coexist with the previous centralized structure of political organizations.

III

Since we have described the principal characteristics, theoretical surmises and constitutive factors of specific forms of political organization in Yugoslavia we can now review more closely the structure, function and mutual relations between the existing political organizations. In view of the character of this report, it is neither possible nor necessary to speak in detail about all organizations. I think that it will be the most advisable to focus on the League of Communists which, as the leading political force, represents the key for understanding not only the position of all political organizations, but also of the entire political system.

Let us see first of all certain most important data and information. The League of Communists of Yugoslavia — the LCY (until 1953 known as the Communist Party of Yugoslavia — the CPY) was founded in 1919 by merging and uniting the left wings of the socialist and social democrat parties existing in individual parts of the country at that time (Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Vojvodina and Dalmatia). The new party has been established outright as the strongest current in the workers' movement in the country. Throughout the period between the two world wars, even during the period when the CPY had been driven to underground and exposed to most brutal persecution on the part of the police, the Socialist Party — as the expression of the rightist, reformist current — never managed to seriously compete with the position of communists as the most powerful leftist group in the political life of the country. The CPY had strong positions not only in the workers' movement but also in the political life of the country as a whole. The fact that communists obtained fifty-nine mandates at the first parliamentary elections held in 1920 and became the third strongest party in parliament, is extremely indicative. At municipal elections they won control in the city councils of Belgrade, Zagreb, Skoplje, Kragujevac and in almost all other big towns.

The increase of the influence of communists to such an extent alarmed the proprietors' classes so that the regime made a decision in 1920 on banning the work and dissolving the Communist Party. The peak of the policy of reprisals was attained at the time of the dissolution of parliament and open dictatorship of King Alexander (1928 — 1934), when the regime managed physically to liquidate a considerable part of the leading personnel of the Party.

In spite of all repressive measures the CPY succeeded in retaining powerful positions in big workers' centres, with considerable support on the part of the peasantry and in circles of progressive intelligentsia. One may quote as an example the University of Belgrade where communists had a predominant influence among students since the late twenties up to the occupation of the country and the closing of the University. Almost all more important trade union organisations were also under the control of communists. In Dalmatia, Montenegro and in some other areas they had strong support among the rural population.

On the other hand, it must be underlined that until 1937 the CPY has been experiencing rather serious inter-party, factional conflicts. These conflicts considerably damaged the influence of the Party in the country and its position in the Communist International. The Party landed in an extremely serious crisis in the mid-thirties when the police has managed to shatter a number of organizations and when factional clashes in the top ranks threatened to involve all the available forces into futile internal struggle. The reputation to the CPY was shaken to such an extent in the Comintern that the idea of its dissolution was quite seriously contemplated in 1937 and 1938. At that time Josip Broz Tito came at the head of the Party with the task to put an end to factional clashes and to renew the Party organizations which the police had managed in many cases to suppress or shatter. During the course of four years (until the war broke out and the country was occupied) the new leadership succeeded in achieving the full political consolidation of the Party and the number of members was trebled. The CPY entered the war with 12,000 Party members and about 36,000 members of the Union of Communist Youth. These were, in fact the principal political effectives with which the CPY entered the liberation war and revolution. The CPY came out of the war with 140,000 members, great moral and political prestige and with the position of the undisputably leading political force.

In the course of the last two and a half decades the number of members increased considerably, the social composition and structure of the Party have changed and, as we have seen, the method of realization of its leading role has been radically changing in recent years.

The number of Party members has been growing most rapidly during the course of the first post-war years. In 1946 the number of members increased to 258,000, in 1948 to 482,000, in 1950 to 607,000 and it reached the figure of 1,006,000 in 1960. In the course of the next ten years the number of members has been chiefly oscillating about this figure. The greatest number of members was reached in 1968 — 1,146,000, while in the course of the last three years there has been a drop of almost 100,000.

As regards the social composition, the principal longterm tendencies are expressed in the dramatic drop of the participation and the absolute number of peasants, the slow increase of the participation of manual workers and an extremely great increase of various groups of white-collar workers. In the course and by the end of the armed revolution peasants represented about 60% of the total number of members while today they do not represent more than 6.5%. The great participation of peasants in the course and immediately after the war is explained by the fact that the principal strongholds and source of completion of partisan armed forces had been in rural environments. Later, the steady drop of the number of peasants is explained, first with the discontent of peasants with certain measures of the agrarian policy of the CPY especially in the first post-war years, (compulsory purchase of agricultural produce — naturally at extremely low, non-economic prices; the attempted collectivization and continued low prices of agricultural products almost throughout the whole post-war

period, with detrimental consequences for the rural population with respect to the share of the national income). Most often these measures, however unpopular they may have been, were nonetheless absolutely necessary for securing funds for accelerated industrialization. A definite exception was the attempt aimed at forcible collectivization which was not an economic necessity and had extremely unfavourable, not only political but economic consequences as well. If one bears in mind the fact that almost half of the total number of the active population is still living in the countryside, it is clear that the above-mentioned data on the participation of peasants in the structure of members of the League of Communists indicates one of the extremely serious political problems.

Manual workers represent almost 35% (a few years ago this percentage amounted to 38-40%) while various categories of white-collar workers are the most numerous — from 39 to 41%. If one adds to this the fact that at the same time there has been an increase of the number of workers in the total active population, then this is certainly an extremely unfavourable balance. We consider that one can by no means make conclusions concerning the character of a political organization solely on the basis of its social structure, but it is also incontestable that this is a very important factor. The above-mentioned tendencies in the development of the social structure of the League of Communists is estimated to be unsatisfactory and it is the subject of quite serious discussions.

The age structure evolves in the direction of a steady increase of the participation of the middle aged and older generation. Comparisons with the first post-war years could induce one to make extremely pessimistic conclusions, but this comparison is rather unrealistic. During the course of the first post-war years the category of members under thirty years of age were by far the most numerous. This is understandable since young people constituted the major part of partisan armed forces from where most of the members were recruited in that period. When the CPY took power, young people became the principal source of its recruitment. Those who had been young people twenty-five years ago in the meantime, became men of between 40 and 50 years of age, and they are still a very important age group in the Party. In addition to this objective factor it must be underlined that since the end of the fifties there has been a much slower influx of young people. In the years 1967 and 1968 the drop of the participation of young people assumed very serious proportions and this was considered to be an important political problem. Partly for this reason and partly due to other circumstances there was campaign in 1968 after which the number and participation of young people in the structure of members of the League of Communists has quite perceptibly increased.

The Role in Society

In analyzing the social role of the League of Communists, one proceeds above all from the thesis that the socialist society is not liberated from various internal contradictions; conflict of interests of

various social groups and strata. Certain contradictions which had characterized the former, class society, have been transcended in this society. However, some of the earlier contradictions remained for quite a long time in the period of transition between the class and classless society. The new society also produces certain new contradictions which are peculiar to it, and they are the more profound and more serious as the process of transformation is taking place in a relatively poorly developed country which must settle in a comparatively short period of time both certain tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolutions and, especially, of the economic development. In our society we encounter contradictions and conflicts of interests of various social and professional groups, regions, nations, the countryside and towns, sectors and branches of the economy, etc. We consider that even within the working class there emerge conflicts of interests which reflect the differences in the objective position of individual parts of the working class in the process of social reproduction. In brief, we reject as an inaccurate and dangerous illusion the allegation that social relations in a socialist country are characterized by the harmony of interests, as a situation in which there is no room for social tensions and clashes.

The task of political organizations, above all of the League of Communists is to serve as an agent of mediation and settlement of social contradictions. In the conflict of different, objectively given interests, the League of Communists steadily strives for the fullest possible affirmation of basic, long-term interests of the working class and for the interests that are along the line of general interests of the working class to prevail in the conflict between numerous and different, narrow partial interests. This is the main difference between the social role of the League of Communists and that of other political, social and professional organizations. While the latter organizations are often, primarily, motivated by individual narrow interests and serve as a means of articulation and expression of individual partial interests, the League of Communists is obliged to achieve, through its being, doctrine and policy, the synthesis of which will ensure the supremacy of the general over the special, of the broader over the partial. Naturally, this must be viewed as a constant striving and orientation and not as a patent recipe. In other words, nothing guarantees that the realistic policy of the leading political force will absolutely and in the best possible way reflect the general interests of the working class and the basic values of socialism in every concrete situation. It is not excluded that certain narrow (local, or constituted in some other way) partial interests sometimes predominate. Consequently, it is vital that the League of Communists should have as a lasting orientation the affirmation of basic historical strivings and interests of the working class. Only in this way can it be confirmed as the leading political force.

The manner in which this historical function is achieved is extremely important. Reference to the basic interests of the working class can be and often is, a pretext and justification for setting up a political monopoly, for manipulating people and for arbitration by dictate. It is both specific and characteristic for the concept of the social role of the League of Communists that one should directly arbitrate as little

as possible, while the principal accent is laid on the creation of conditions that will help those who are closest to the lasting interests of the entire class to prevail in the freest possible confrontation of varied interests. The League of Communists strives for *workers and workingmen in general, to settle, decide on and manage things on their own as much as possible, instead of this being done by someone else on their behalf*. Decision-making and management *on behalf* of the working class of workingmen represent the basic source of numerous negative phenomena in the recent history of socialism. Alienated social power, even when it is in the hands of benevolent leaders managers, contains extremely dangerous political and social potentialities.

The implementation of this concept of the revolutionary avant-garde represents the essence of the thesis on a leading, in contradistinction to a guiding, role of the communist political organization. In the political theory of the League of Communists the term guiding implies in fact a situation in which the party directly decides on all important social problems, where the party manages and reigns on behalf of the class. This is a situation in which the *»ruling class«* achieves its role indirectly, through the institution of the ruling, or rather guiding party. The concept of the leading political force implies the endeavour that the working class should express and achieve its historical role as directly as possible, that the need for *mediation on behalf of the class* be reduced as much as possible, since any mediation creates a possibility for tutorship, arbitrariness and despotism. This thinking was decisive in the making decision to change the name of the Party into the League of Communists which was done in 1953 at the VI Congress of the LCY. Since that time there has been continual struggle to implement the new concept. The change in question (from a leading to guiding position) is so great and complicated that it represents not only a long process of internal transformations, but also of clashes. In the social position and activity of the LCY elements of both the old and the new still exist. The point is that the new concept is being increasingly established in the course of time.

The new social role of the League of Communists demands a *coherent and elaborate ideology*. It is of an exceptionally great importance for the realization of the leading role of the League of Communists. On occasions when, between numerous intertwined and opposite partial interests, it is necessary to uphold those which are closest to the long-term and lasting interests of the working class, it is extremely important that the basic values and goals of socialist development be clearly and accurately defined. Provisions established in this way have the character of reliable guideposts and points of orientation, which substantially help workingmen themselves to place individual claims and partial interests in the context of the basic line of development and requirements of that development, to see their specific situation through the prism of imperative of the general socialist development. It is solely in this way that an opportunity is created for thousands and millions of working people to participate directly in the coordination of the general and the separate, of the broader and the narrow. In the event that an ideology developed in this way did not exist, the arbitration by

a political elite that is considered to interpret better the needs and interests of the broad community, is inevitable.

For a developed ideology of socialist self-management it is important it should possess, not only the most elementary, so-called final or ultimatum objectives of socialism, which we have mentioned earlier (liberation of work, equal opportunities, humane community, etc.), but also clearer provisions concerning the values and tasks existing between the ultimate goals and the present time and which, for this reason, have a definite *instrumental importance*. In the Yugoslav revolutionary movement a high degree of accord has been achieved as regards a greater number of the goals which have, both a long-term strategic importance and direct relevance. Among them stand out positions such as the *self-management basis of the social system, full equality of nations and nationalities, aid proffered to undeveloped parts of the country by developed parts, the policy of non-alignment, etc.*

Place in the Political System

For the understanding of the role of the League of Communists in Yugoslav society the provisions relating to its place in the political system are extremely important. Those are the aspects of the new concept of the avant-garde which establishes its attitude towards other organized political factors of the global social system. I am bearing in mind above all, the relations between the League of Communists and the state on one hand, and the League of Communists and other socio-political organizations on the other.

In the development of the new concept we proceeded from critical re-examination and then from the impugment and transcendence of the *transmissive model of the political system of the dictatorship of the proletariat*. This model was defined by Stalin in the mid-twenties in his well-known work »Problems of Leninism«. In his famous definition of the dictatorship of the proletariat Stalin said that this was a political system which secured the following: a) the making of all important decisions by the leadership of the party; b) the relaying of these decisions through the mediation of the state apparatus and all social organizations (the system of transmissions) and c) the implementation of these decisions by working people.

In the course of decades this definition has been the inviolable basis of development of the political system of socialist countries. In the political practice it has had results which cannot be denied. Under exceptionally difficult conditions of socialist development, achieved in extremely undeveloped countries this model has made possible a very high degree of concentration of social and political power which was extremely necessary to solve the complicated and difficult tasks with which the revolutionary forces were confronted after taking power. This is particularly connected with the tasks of development and of the consolidation of the new authority, with the suppression of the power of the dispossessed classes and the need for the greatest possible con-

centration of decision-making of accumulation and the allocation of new funds.

On the other hand, since the very beginning this model was weighed down by serious internal contradictions and weaknesses. The stipulated concentration of decision-making in the party opens the door to various usurpations of authority, bureaucratic deformations and to the passivization of all other organized political forces of the socialist society. Thus the party itself becomes a shadow organization. The only active factor, the genuine demiurge of the entire system became the top leadership. Lower-ranking leaderships, especially the masses of the members, are brought into the position of mere executors of decisions in the creation of which they had virtually no participation.

In the course of the first years after the conquest of power the League of Communists basically adopted and implemented the above-described variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The political system, at that time, in fact possessed all the essential features of a transmission belt. The further development brought about its critical transcending. In the political theory of the League of Communists it has been rejected as unacceptable in a democratic self-managing socialist society, and in the political practice it is being steadily suppressed in favor of a new, substantially different concept.

For the rejection of the transmissive concept it has not been only its negative consequences and our awareness that this type of political organization opens the door to various abuses of authority, that it can degenerate into uncontrolled autocracy of individuals that were important. These have certainly been important considerations but we have concurrently borne in mind certain fundamental theoretical factors. Our deliberations concerning socialism and democracy have led us to the conclusion that the transmissive concept is *unacceptable in principle* as lasting basis of the political system of socialism. In other words, it would be unacceptable even in the event that we obtain guarantees against the above-mentioned deformations, if we were sure that its immanent negative tendencies would not materialize. This is so because it objectively closes the paths to setting up the authority of the working class in the sense of its independent activity, and because it always tends to be *perpetuated as the* authority on behalf of the working class. This is a concept which places the worker, individual and class as a whole, in the passive position of executor of ideas and decisions of the omnipotent party top ranks, a concept to which the lasting alienation of authority in relation to the class is immanent. This represents the source and basis of many other forms of alienation of the modern man. That is why we think that this form of political system cannot easily be coordinated with the fundamental values and objectives of socialism.

Proceeding from these ideas we have reached substantially different stands from those of other socialist countries concerning the position of the leading political organization in our political system. Differences exist, both as regards the relations between the League of Communists and the state and between the League of Communists and other political organizations.

When it is a question of the *state*, it must be underlined above all that an important »division of work« between the state and the League of Communists has been carried out, that the previously existing parallelism of tasks has been transcended to a fair extent. While these two structures had previously merged into a single mechanism of political authority in which the state apparatus represented a junior partner in relation to the leadership and apparatus of the party — i.e. their »extended hand«, — a certain delimitation has now been effected as regards the tasks of the League of Communists from those within the jurisdiction of the state. In brief, a considerable independence of the state in the performance of this function has been achieved.

It is vital to bear in mind the fact that in the political system of Yugoslavia bodies of authority are not solely the expression of state functions, but are organically related to the self-management system, direct socialist democracy and that the self-management concomitant is present in the constitution of bodies of authority ranging from the local commune up to the top, personified in the Federal Assembly.

In the above-mentioned »division of work« between the League of Communists and the state there naturally does not exist a strict and unchangeable demarcation line. This delimitation has first of all been defined in the theory of the political system in which the roles of the League of Communists and of the state are established fairly clearly. In practice, of course, matters are never equally clear and »pure« and that is why there still exist many cases of »intermingled« functions in the sense that bodies of the League of Communists review, and sometimes decide on matters that are not »theirs«, but primarily the competence of the state. In the period of transition, in which the political system is now involved, such wanderings and »conflicts of jurisdiction« are completely understandable, comprehensible and inevitable. And yet, it is important that relations which correspond to the theoretical model are being increasingly established in practice.

Does the division we mention here signify that the League of Communists is no longer interested in the creation and pursuance of the internal and foreign policy of the country, that it has »devolved its rights on the state«? In certain environments this is just what the changes in Yugoslavia are considered to be. It is said that the League of Communists has chiefly become a society for »debating« the socialist doctrine but these interpretations do not correspond to political realities of the Yugoslav society.

The League of Communists has firmly resolved to retain its role of social avant garde. In this respect there have been no dissensions or waverings in the League. Conflicts solely emerged concerning the method to be applied in realizing of this role. When it is a question of the development of the country, its internal and foreign policy, the League of Communists undoubtedly has a decisive influence. The division which we have mentioned, on the main, has the following meaning: the League of Communists retains in its hand the direct initiative in discussing and establishing the long-term guidelines of the economic, political, cultural and general social development of the country. In addition to this, it is the right and duty of the League of Communists

to suggest solutions for individual more important topical questions of the development of the social system and the settlement of more important current problems. Its role can also be defined as a force fighting for the creation of such general social conditions in which the fundamental programmatic commitments of Yugoslav communists will be expressed as fully as possible in everyday life.

Bodies of state authority possess a high degree of independence in performing their functions. In view of the general orientation towards the consolidation of self-management, the conventional functions of the state have been perceptibly limited. Numerous important affairs from the sphere of the economy, culture, education, health and social security, have been almost completely developed on self-management organizations or on communities of collective work (factories etc.) constituted in a self-management method.

State organs are directly responsible for their work to legislative bodies — ranging from local ones to the Federal Assembly. This required a substantial change of the role of elected assemblies which are increasingly becoming in fact the top ranking vehicles of authority.

The independence of bodies of the state in performing their functions and in the implementation of the above-mentioned »division of work« has the consequence of *transcending of parallelism* between these two structures. For instance, the League of Communists is not a shadow government with »portfolios« which correspond to the principal spheres of state administration. This has made possible a *drastic reduction of the professional Party apparatus* during the course of the last ten years. »Party ministries in miniature« have been completely abolished (for instance, sections in committees of the League of Communists for agriculture, industry, communications or schools), for they no longer have any justification. The League of Communists is no longer engaged in the direct management of the economy, communications or schools and that is why it does not need services composed of numerous departments which would be, in fact, superior to state administration.

The role of the League of Communists can be defined as the general, overall ideological-political direction of the total social development. Direct management, settlement of concrete problems, including conflicts between various interests, have become the function of state and self-management bodies. The League of Communists can »interfere« in discussion of these questions in cases when it is apparent that the existing mechanism of state authority has no adequate power to absorb the growing tensions. That is why it strives for such »cases« to be as infrequent as possible and for the self-management structure to be consolidated to such an extent as to be able to settle them independently, but, at the same time, the League of Communists will not keep aside for any doctrinaire reasons and permit individual conflicts of interests to assume proportions which could seriously jeopardize the functioning of the self-management system and endanger the political stability. It is in this sense that one must view also certain rather direct and concrete interventions of the political top ranks of the League of Communists in recent years — for instance, the dispute concerning

the distribution of resources between republics for the building of modern highways, or the engagement of the political leadership of the League of Communists in the preparations for the draft of the recently adopted constitutional amendments. In both these cases the leadership of the Party has »mediated« or rather assumed the task of coordinating interests which should have been carried out in assembly bodies but, certain signs indicated that no agreement could be reached there.

For the understanding of relations between the League of Communists and other social and political organizations, the following factors are essential: first, all these organizations, together with the League of Communists represent part of a *single movement* and that is why they cannot be regarded as rivals vying in a struggle for authority. Secondly, the *League of Communists has the leading role* in this united movement. It realizes this role in such a way that all existing socio-political organizations adopt its program as the basis of their own programmatic orientation. Thirdly, other *socio-political organizations* are independent in the realization of their various social roles and tasks and, proceeding from the basic programmatic principles of the League of Communists, they independently chart the programs of their activity and they are equally independent in their implementation. The League of Communists strives, through its members who are active in these organizations, for its programmatic orientation and basic political line to be expressed as much as possible in their activities.

In relations developing at present between the League of Communists and other socio-political organizations the elements of authority, or hierarchical subordination are consciously and resolutely suppressed. Leading bodies and personnel of the League of Communists, in principle, cannot assume an attitude of patronizing nature towards other organizations. They cannot teach and still less give orders. The new concept demands that they fight publicly and democratically everywhere and on every occasion, for the affirmation of the programmatic orientation and of the political line of the League of Communists.

In practice, of course, elements of the earlier relationship still exist in which, within the setting of new institutional solutions one seeks to retain the practice of the transmission belt relationship. Bearing in mind the fact that this has been the manner in which one has been acting for years, that definite habits and method of decision-making have been formed, the earlier type of relations could not be abolished under a decree of congressional resolution. It is important to underline that political life is increasingly bringing in its wake the affirmation of the new concept. Moreover, we encounter cases in practice in which, in the name of independence of action, there emerge strivings resembling very much party pluralism. These are the cases in which the new concept of realization of the leading role of the League of Communists is exploited as the means and cover for pursuing a factually opposi-

tional policy and for affirming publicly ideological concepts substantially differing from those which represent the programmatic basis of the entire Yugoslav revolutionary movement. The above-mentioned difficulties do not have alarming proportions. The League of Communists in fact manages to pursue its policy in a new way, sometimes with certain delays and even with concessions, but not of such nature which would impugn the general line of development and, in the long run, this is the most important thing.

Democratization in the League of Communists

I see the third, most important dimension of changes which the League of Communists is undergoing, in the democratization of internal relations. As the revolutionary avant-garde which bears serious responsibility for the development and destiny of this country, the League of Communists must strive to achieve in its internal relations the synthesis between two basically contradictory elements: democracy and aptitude for action, freedom of thought and unity of action.

It is considered that the *principle of democratic centralism* offers favourable institutional possibilities for the realization of the above-mentioned strivings. This principle has been built into the foundations of the Yugoslav revolutionary movement as far back as at the time when it has been constituted, and that is why our commitment for the principle of democratic centralism does not have the character of the selection of a new type of organization. As regards the development of internal relations one is fully proceeding from Lenin's theory of revolutionary party. The innovation is not in the basic principle but rather in its theoretical interpretation and, this being even more important, in its practical implementation..

Analyzing the well-known manifestations of Stalinism, especially the stifling of elementary norms within party democracy, we reached the conclusion that the cause of these phenomena had not been the principle itself, but rather, its interpretation. In other words, the opinion prevails in the League of Communists that the principle of democratic centralism in itself need not inevitably bring about non-democratic relations. The explanation has been sought and found in definite historical circumstances in which the first major thrusts of socialism in the practice of social relations have been carried out. (One particularly bears in mind various difficulties that have been the accompaniment of the birth of a new society in the Soviet Union).

In the practice of the League of Communists so far, this being also the case with majority of other communist parties, the principle has been interpreted in such a way that there has been a great degree of centralism, great power of the party top ranks, and very little democracy, factual participation of members in the charting of the party policy. The discrepancy between statutory norms and factual relations in the party has been extremely great. The process of decision-making differed to a great extent from the system stipulated in the statute. The most important decisions were often made by bodies that were

not authorized to do so under the statute, and congresses and conferences have often been in a position to ratify passively decisions which had in fact been made previously. The elections of individuals to important leading bodies also contained numerous elements of formalism. Official gatherings — congresses and conferences — at which the elections were due to be carried out, in fact solely confirmed the previous informal, but nonetheless decisive elections and the system of responsibility was different in practice than in statutory norms. Far more prevalent were elements of responsibility towards the higher forums (responsibility »upwards«) than towards members and the body provided under the statute (responsibility »downwards«). The position of executive bodies of the party has been far stronger than envisaged under the statute.

The above-mentioned tendencies cannot be interpreted only as the expression of definite deformations and subjective weaknesses. Numerous communist parties have gone through such situations in their development when the formation of exceptionally strong political centres with an enormous concentration of power and the introduction of iron, virtually military discipline had been historically inevitable. Of course, we do not mean to diminish the importance of incontestable deformations that have also been emerging as the consequence of definite subjective weaknesses.

The substance of internal transformations, which have been taking place in the League of Communists in the course of the last few years, lies in the endeavour to give to the principle of democratic centralism its original, authentic, Leninist interpretation. Leading forces in the League of Communists strive for an equal affirmation of both sides of the formula, both democracy and centralism, for the setting up of such internal relations in which there will be room for the freedom of thought and for unity of action. It stands to reason that it is easier to proclaim this than to realize it. We have realized that there is no theoretical formula which would secure the *lasting coexistence* of the above-mentioned elements which are contradictory in their natures. We do not labour under the illusion that the claim for unity of action harmonically supplements the idea of the need for democracy within the party, which will create space for a free debate and conflicts of ideas. These are elements which steadily suppress one another and, under definite circumstances, even exclude one another. We have found this out, not only by means of theoretical analysis but also through political practice in which, even at present, strivings are continuously expressed factually to deny and undermine the unity of action in the name of the request for a free debate. On the other hand there emerge tendencies to exclude factually, in the name of unity of action, the possibility for any critical view and absolute obedience is sought in respect to party forums of officials.

For the realization of the new interpretation of the principle of democratic centralism one needs, not only the sincere commitments of leading forces of the movement, but also the order of forces helping this. In addition, objective circumstances in which the movement is acting, the seriousness and intricacy of tasks which it must settle, are also important. It is certain that under more difficult objective circum-

stances the demands for unity of action will naturally be in the limelight and that there will be less patience and willingness for a public debate on acute political problems.

It must be recalled that factual, or invented objective circumstances (complicated and difficult situation) are often taken as a justification of non-democratic practice. To prove that unfavourable circumstances need not inevitably bring about the stifling of democracy within the party, it is enough to recall the relations that had reigned in the Bolshevik party in the course of the first years after the October revolution. Acting under factually unprecedented difficult conditions, Lenin had managed, just in the course of these years, to secure a degree of actual democracy within the party which has not yet been reached in numerous communist parties even at present.

The above-mentioned three spheres are not the sole distinct features of the system of political organization in Yugoslavia. We have dwelt on them because we consider them to be explicitly important. We will mention, in the end, only another two factors which are important for the understanding of this system. The first consists in the *specific role of the Socialist Alliance of the Working People*, as a mass political organization. In contrast to some other countries, the Socialist Alliance has never represented a substitute for or the expression of party pluralism. It has never been conceived as a coalition, or quasi coalition of progressive parties which accept the leading role of the communist party. During the war, this organization was formed as a means of political engagement of the broadest strata of the working population. Today it is a massive basis of the entire political system which has an important and independent role in the electoral system and in the constituting of numerous most important links of the political system.

I see the second distinctive factor in the manner in which the *national component has been incorporated into the building of political organizations*. The principle of full national equality has been built into the entire political system, not as a formality but as a factually acting factor. The practical expression of this orientation is found in the perceptible decentralization of all political organizations, or rather in the fairly strong position of republican and provincial organizations and in their relative independence. This is considered to stem from the adoption of the well-known Marxist thesis on the right of nations to full independence up to the right of secession. Constituting the republics as vehicles of the sovereignty and statehood of individual nations, the leading political forces in this country have realized that in the vertical linking of political organizations certain diametrically opposite principles can absolutely not be valid. While foreseeing a high degree of political independence of republican and provincial organizations, one is concurrently insisting upon the inevitability of a unified ideolo-

gical and programmatic orientation in which one sees one of the most significant collaterals of the unity of the entire system.

*

The path along which we are proceeding in the development of the new system of political organizations in Yugoslavia is certainly not at all simple and still less an easy one. Almost in all above-mentioned spheres there still crop up individual outstanding theoretical questions which are the topic of extensive discussions both in the organizations themselves and in scientific circles. In the practical implementation of new concepts numerous outstanding problems and sometimes even serious difficulties are expressed. These problems and difficulties sometimes produce pessimistic reactions and dejection. This, however, is not characterizing the overwhelming state of mind in our political life. The opinion prevails that these are inevitable difficulties in the constituting of an original, substantially new political system.

Dr BRANKO PRIBICEVIC

Born 1928. Studied law and politics at Warsaw and Zagreb universities. Got his B. A. Degree in law in 1951 at Zagreb University. From 1952 to 1954 worked at the Institute for International Politics and Economy, Beograd as Research Assistant. 1957 got Ph. D. degree at Oxford University in Social Sciences. For five years (1957 — 1962) Head of Department for Western Countries in the Institute for International Labour Movement. Since then professor at the Faculty of Political Sciences of the Beograd University, where he holds the position of the Head of Department for International Political Studies. Editor of the official monthly theoretical journal of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia »Socijalizam«. Member of the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Serbia. Member of the Commission of the Presidency of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia for the Party organisation.

Has published numerous studies covering several aspects of contemporary socialist doctrines and movements. One book »Shop Stewards Movement and Workers' Control« was published in Great Britain in 1959 by Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

PHILOSOPHY DEPARTMENT

PHILOSOPHY 101

Dr Branko HORVAT

Fellow of the Institute of Economic Sciences in Beograd

CURRENT PROBLEMS OF YUGOSLAV ECONOMIC SYSTEM: SELF-GOVERNMENT, MARKET AND SOCIALISM

It has often been ascertained that socialism and markets («commodity production») are incompatible. That was the basis of Paul Sweezy's criticism of Yugoslav economic policy as a »gradual transition from socialism to capitalism«.¹ Sweezy argues that the market restricts socialist relations and transforms social ownership into a sort of collective ownership. Material incentives and market orientation necessarily generate a profiteering mentality. The evaluation of social usefulness by profit is characteristic of a capitalist system. Gadgetry and acquisitiveness replace socialist values. This sort of criticism is fairly common. J. Djordjević argues in reply that the undesirable social phenomena are the result of industrial civilization and not only the consequence of the market. The abolition of the market means a return to etatism and state property. Self-government implies free disposal of earned income and, more generally, business autonomy which, in turn, implies markets. If this is not understood, the alternative is an old one: the eschatological idea of the state rule and re-education of man. »Man would be placed under the tutelage of the state (or party, or some other mechanism) to be prepared and educated, so that one day he may become an adult socialist subject«.²

Yugoslav economists are quite unanimous in believing that the market ought to be maximally exploited as a device of economic organization. Philosophers, however, have their doubts. M. Marković, a leading philosopher actively interested in economic affairs, believes that initial forms of workers self-management cannot be achieved without material incentives which imply market competition. However, if exclusive reliance on money relations became a permanent feature of the society, self-management might gradually degenerate into a sort of capitalist cooperative. If the results of work were permanently evaluated in terms of income, and if the desire to earn as much money as

¹ P. Sweezy, »*The Transition from Socialism to Capitalism?*«, Monthly Review, 1964, 569-90.

² J. Djordjević, »*A Contribution to the Theory of Social Property*«, Socialist Thought and Practice, 24/1966, p. 96.

possible became a permanent and basic interest of a worker, this would produce a personality type not basically different from the type produced by a capitalist society.³

Referring to Marx, some of my philosopher colleagues declared that socialist commodity production was a *contradictio in adjecto*. In Marx's sense commodity production implies market relationship which result in »commodity fetishism« and various alienation phenomena. I tried to classify matters in the following way. The familiar statement that commodity production generates capitalism ought to be reversed. Commodity production existed in slavery, feudalism, capitalism as well as etatism. It clearly did not determine all these socio-economic systems; on the contrary, it was determined by some more fundamental social relationships and was shaped by respective social systems. Thus, for instance, capitalism resulted from private ownership, etatism from state ownership. Since there are so many types of commodity production, it need not be surprising if we also find socialist commodity production. The elimination of private ownership does not necessarily produce socialism, although it may restrict the rate of the market considerably. If private ownership is replaced by the state ownership, capitalism is replaced by etatism and commodity fetishism by office fetishism. In both cases relations among people are reified, social inequality preserved, class exploitation continued, essentially human existence made impossible. In socialism social ownership makes social capital equally accessible to anybody while authoritarianism of a privately managed or a state managed firm is replaced by self-management. In this context the market and planning are not goals but means. If a working collective is to be really autonomous in economic decision-making the market is indispensable. But planning contradicts the business autonomy of an enterprise and so the choice is between planning and the market — says a time-honoured fallacy. In fact social planning, far from restricting, enlarges the autonomy of enterprises for at least three reasons: (1) it reduces uncertainty which is the basic restriction on free decision-making; (2) it increases the rate of growth, the market expands and so the number of available alternatives increases; (3) it equalizes business external conditions which he cannot control and which are economically and socially irrational.⁴

The nature of the relationship between the market and the plan is a frequently discussed subject. Plan and market have been traditionally contrasted as two separate mechanisms. But some economists try to develop a monistic approach. V. Bakarić argues that there can be no contrasting, that the law of value reigns supreme and that planning is just one, although the most important, element in it⁵. This statement seems to be the reverse of what I said in the preceding paragraph.

³ M. Marković, »Socijalizam i samoupravljanje«, in Smisao i perspektive socijalizma, Zagreb, 1956, p. 70.

⁴ B. Horvat, »Socijalistička robna proizvodnja«, Gledišta. 1968, 1321-30.

⁵ V. Bakarić, *Aktuelni problemi izgradnje našeg privrednog sistema*, Zagreb, 1963.

But the contradiction is more apparent than real. What Bakarić tries to do is to combat the voluntarism of etatist planning and to show that there is an objectively given framework within which planners are obliged to move. I. Maksimović understood this statement to mean too much *laissez-faire* to his taste. He criticises the inconsistencies of the officially proclaimed economic policy and warns that an insufficiently controlled market causes damage to individuals (negation of distribution according to work), to enterprises (different business conditions in various industries) as well as to the society at large (less than optimal production). All this tends to generate an ideology which maintains that socialism is not economically superior to organized capitalism, that inequality and exploitation are products of human nature and cannot be eliminated.⁶

Late Professor Mišić saw shortcomings of self-management, as it exists to-day in Yugoslavia, primarily in the fact that it is confined to the enterprise. Investment resources are not allocated rationally, in the present situation self-management and planning contradict each other, the socialist distribution principle is negated, there is a tendency for group ownership to arise. As a result a *laissez-faire* approach is extolled. Mišić suggests that the self-management structure be completed upwards. He believes that the integration processes are neither fast nor quite appropriate. Mišić pleads for an integral system of self-management in which co-ordinating self-management bodies would be created on the level of industries and also regionally. Membership in such associations would be obligatory.⁷ Mišić's system resembles the system of Higher Business Associations which existed in the two-year transitional period 1951—1952. A few years after self-management became operative, the present author suggested somewhat different approach. A careful study of economics of the oil industry showed that there was very little to be gained by competition and a lot to be achieved by a co-ordinated policy based on independent and competent research. I suggested that industries possessing similar characteristics establish common but independent economic-technological research institutes. The institutes would prepare alternatives for major policy decisions. The most acceptable alternative, perhaps modified in the process, would be chosen by the representatives of enterprises through some sort of self-management mechanism. The industrial research institutes would also serve as development planning institutions and as such would cooperate with territorial planning bureaus.⁸

Self-management in enterprises is just one element in an integral system of social self-government. E. Pusić points out such a system has three basic components: territorial (various levels of government), functional (enterprises and institutions, i.e. work organizations) and

⁶ I. Maksimović, »Razmišljanja o nekim teoretskim i idejnim pitanjima robne proizvodnje povodom našeg privrednog sistema«, *Ekonomist*, 2—3, 1964, pp. 209-26.

⁷ D. Mišić, »Sistem integralnog samoupravljanja u jugoslovenskoj privredi«, *Ekonomist*, 1965, pp. 289-312.

⁸ B. Horvat, *Ekonomika jugoslovenske naftne privrede*, chapter 24, Beograd, 1962.

social (cultural, religious and other associations of individuals). Pusić is mostly concerned with the first component. He is thus first among Yugoslav authors to study systematically the problem of withering away of the state — generally considered utopian outside Yugoslavia. The state will wither away when government over individuals is replaced by the management of things. Engels took this famous phrase over from Saint-Simon. The latter, as well as other writers of his time, maintained that public administration was exclusively an instrument of power but that it was otherwise unimportant for the life of a nation. Marx and Engels agreed with first part of the statement, but regarded public administration very important. Later an important duality appeared: public administration was no more exclusively an instrument of power, but was also entrusted with various socially necessary activities. Education, medical care, social welfare etc., basically differ from defense, police and judiciary. The monopoly of physical power might occasionally be useful but is not at all necessary when social services are concerned. In socialism public administration without state political power becomes the question of the day. In other words, systematic planning and coordination of social services does not presuppose any more existence of a commanding center such as is political power.⁹ The interest unions and the quasi-market represent an attempt to move in this direction.

Self-government is not a purely economic phenomenon. While economists are, naturally enough, primarily interested in economic aspects, other social scientists explore additional dimensions. Ij. Tadić, the political scientist, points out that Yugoslav self-government socialism is mostly confined to the economic sphere. It has been developed on the micro level without a corresponding reflection on the macro level, that of the global society.¹⁰ S. Stojanović, the philosopher, maintains that without faster political democratization it is impossible to create self-government on higher levels of social organization.¹¹ R. Supek, the sociologist, explains that political pluralism does not mean a multi-party system which can also be bureaucraticized. In a self-government setting political pluralism means direct control of various centers of power. How is this to be achieved is an open problem. Supek expects a certain duality of power to develop at first, a combination of classical representative democracy and self-government.

Evidently, self-government is not a closed and complete system. Many questions are still open, many problems active for some time to come.

⁹ E. Pusić, *Samoupravljanje*, Zagreb, 1968.

¹⁰ Symposium of Yugoslav and Czech philosophers, »Savremeni trenutak socijalizma«, *Filozofija*, 2/1969, p. 55.

¹¹ Op. cit. in note 10, p. 34.

Dr BRANKO HORVAT

Born in 1928. Leaves secondary school to participate in the National Liberation War. Studied engineering, economics and philosophy at the Zagreb University 1946 — 52.

Diploma in economics, Zagreb University, 1952; D. Sc. in economics, Zagreb University, 1955; Ph. D., Manchester University, 1959; Titular Docent, Zagreb University, 1959; Research Associate, Institute of Economics, Zagreb 1953—55; Head, Research Department, Federal Planning Bureau, 1958—62; Associate Professor, University of Belgrade, 1962—63.

Director and Professor of Economics, Institute of Economic Studies, Beograd, 1963—70. Visiting Professor to University of Ljubljana, University of Michigan and American University (Washington). Member of the Federal Planning Board, 1958—62; member of the Economic Council of the Government, 1963—65; member of the Committee for Market and Prices of the Federal Government 1967—71. Member of: Econometric Society, International Association for Research in Income and Wealth, Yugoslav Economic Association, and Yugoslav Statistical Society.

Boks: Economics of Yugoslav Oil Industry, History of Yugoslav Oil Industry (three volumes), Interindustry Analysis, Economic Models, Towards a Theory of Planned Economy, Economic Science and National Economy, Business Cycles in Yugoslavia, An Essay on the Yugoslav Society, and Economic Analysis I. IES monographs: The Application of the Interindustry Analysis in Economic Planning; Self-government, Centralism and Planning; An Integrated System of Social Accounts for Yugoslavia. Articles in Economic Journal, Ekonomist, Ekonomski pregled, Ekonomicky časopis, Income and Wealth Series, Journal of Political Economy, Yugoslav Encyclopedia, Konjunkturpolitik, Manchester School, Pregled, Sankhya, Socialist Thought and Practice and elsewhere.

Boks and articles translated into English, Czech, French, German, Hungarian, Italian, Russian, Slovakian, and Spanish. Invited lecturer to some fifty universities in Europe, Americas and Africa. Editor of: Economic Analysis. Professional interest: political economy of socialism, economic planning.



Dr Mihailo POPOVIC

Professeur the Faculty of Philosophy in Beograd

SOCIAL DISPROPORTIONS AND CONTRADICTIONS IN YUGOSLAV SOCIETY AND THE SOCIAL POSITION OF THE INDIVIDUAL

It is absolutely certain that the historical development of mankind at present has proved that even socialist societies have their disproportions and contradictions which can become serious to such an extent that in certain situations they endanger even the very foundations of the socialist system. In contrast to some earlier forecasts and »theories« which have been proclaiming in advance that socialism is a classless society or reduced it solely to the existence of »friendly classes« between which there allegedly exist relations of »peaceful cooperation«, a number of historical events such as those in Hungary and Poland in 1956, or those in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and in Poland in 1970, have proved that social differences can grow, even in socialist countries, to such dramatic proportions, that they do not vitally differ from class and similar social conflicts in the previously existing societies.

Yugoslavia's path of socialist development is specific in many points but it is also not immune from serious social disproportions and contradictions. The development of workers' self-management and other institutions of socialist democracy in Yugoslavia has caused the emergence of certain conflicting relationships which, on the main, do not exist in other socialist countries, but it has equally caused certain socialist contradictions to be expressed publicly and in a more democratic form (for instance, the difference between a still strong political centralism and tendencies for a freer economic and social development).

Sociological Distinction Between Social Disproportions and Contradictions

We think that it is absolutely necessary to draw already at the beginning a clear sociological distinction between the terms »disproportion« and »contradiction«, especially so since in practice and even in theory these terms are often confounded. Both disproportions and contradictions are the sources of social tensions and possible social conflicts, but, as the causes of these social situations, they mutually differ substantially. *Social disproportions* emerge as certain *disharmonies*

between social *values and goals* on the one hand and insufficient or inadequate *means and conditions* necessary for their realization on the other. *Social contradictions* (and also contradictions in the highest degree of their development) emerge upon another basis, because of the incompatibility appearing between the very social *values* or rather *goals*, behind which are the *interests* of various social groups, classes or strata. An example for the first case is the disharmony between the socialist principle »to everyone according to his work« and uneven social conditions of work which hinder or even thwart the realization of this principle. A typical example for the latter case is the difference between the development of the system of social self-management and bureaucratic structures and tendencies. The first disproportion and the second contradiction provoke certain tensions and conflicting situations but it is evident that the causes of these social situations are of a substantially different kind, so that possibilities for transcending these conflicting situations also largely differ.

True, social contradictions and disproportions often converge or are intermingled this resulting in the fact that their effect in the creation of conflicting social relations is augmenting. For example, bureaucratic forces can be interested in maintaining uneven conditions of work which in themselves prevent the consistent implementation of the socialist remuneration according to the work performed. And yet, uneven conditions of work would exist even if there were no bureaucratic tendencies at all, although the process of reducing and overcoming differences between uneven conditions of work would probably be easier in that event.

Certain most important social disproportions and contradictions which have emerged in the development of the Yugoslav society will be presented and briefly analyzed in this paper. At the same time, definite consequences upon the social position of the individual which can stem from these sources of conflicting social relations will also be summarily described. It is not necessary to emphasize that this extremely abstract and succinct analysis of certain most important causes of conflicts in the Yugoslav society must be incomplete and superficial on occasions.

(a) *Disharmonies Between the Principle of »Everyone According to His Aptitude« and Existing Social Conditions for Social Mobility*

The socialist principle »everyone according to his aptitude« could be fully implemented consistently solely (a) if all members of society had absolutely equal social conditions for developing their aptitude and (b) if there existed no social obstacles whatsoever for everyone to occupy the work place and position in society which correspond best to his aptitudes freely developed in this manner. It is evident that such ideal socialist society does not exist and that in fact in socialist countries there is a minor or major digression from the principle »everyone according to his aptitude« to the degree to which the above-mentioned conditions have not yet been fulfilled.

True, the development of socialism in a number of European countries has resulted in considerably greater vertical mobility of the population and in a massive expansion of schooling, so that perceptibly greater chances for the realization of this socialist principle have been created. For example, about 45 per cent of students from workers' and rural families in East Germany studied at university schools and high schools, while the percentage of students of the same social origin in West Germany amounted to only about 7 per cent.¹⁾ Opportunities for schooling in Yugoslavia today have considerably increased in comparison with pre-war Yugoslavia. This can be seen from the following table showing the number of individual types of schools and the number of their students in the years 1938/39 and 1964/65.²⁾

Number of schools and students in 1938/39 and 1964/65.

Type of school	Number of schools		Number of students	
	1938/39	1964/65	1938/39	1962/65
Elementary schools	9.190	14.317	1.471.000	2.972.000
Technical and other secondary schools	53	536	11.000	190.000
Secondary schools (Gymnaziums)	205	370	125.000	162.000
University schools	20	93	16.491	98.631

In addition to the general increase of the number of all kinds of schools and students in Yugoslavia today there has occurred also a considerable improvement of conditions for the education of children and young people whose parents are workers or farmers. Thus, for instance, in the ten-year long period, between 1951 and 1960, the number of workers in relation to the total number of employees increased only by 33 per cent, while the percentage of students of workers' origin increased approximately by 100 per cent (from 8 per cent to 15 per cent) and the percentage of students of employees' descent was reduced in that period by 11 per cent (from 52 per cent to 41 per cent).³⁾

And yet, there still exist considerable social differences and limits in the Yugoslav society, in spite of the system of free education, and they prevent the creation of equal chances for the education of all citi-

¹ H. Engelstädter und H. Heinze, *Gesellschaftlicher Fortschritt und Socialistische Hochschulbildung*, in *Soziologie und Wirklichkeit*, Berlin, 1966, s. 199.

² Source: Federal Bureau of Statistics, *Statistical Calendar of Yugoslavia*, 1966, Belgrade 1966, pp. 94-98 (edition in English).

³ M. Popović, *Social conditions and possibilities for the education of young people in Yugoslavia*, »Sociologija«, 1968, No. 1, p. 94.

zens, irrespective of their social origin, and thus also the realization of the vital condition for the implementation of the socialist principle »everyone according to his aptitude«. In the course of the fifties, for instance, children of employees and of persons engaged in free professions, in comparison with children of workers and farmers, were in a three and even more times more favourable position to use the possibility for free attendance of secondary schools, while as regards studies at universities they used these possibilities even up to ten times more.⁴ Moreover, during the course of the sixties there has been a certain worsening of conditions for the education of young people from the lower income strata.

As has been mentioned, it is not enough to develop in a socialist society a system of absolutely equal social conditions for all citizens for obtaining school education, for the implementation of the socialist principle of »everyone according to his aptitude«. It is also necessary to fulfill the other condition, that is, that *all those* who have freely developed their aptitudes have *equal chances* for occupying work places which correspond best to their aptitudes. Considerable progress has also been made in the Yugoslav society in this respect, especially in recent years when an ever greater number of young educated people obtain employment at corresponding work places. And yet, there still exist certain obstacles which are causing, for example, persons without corresponding school and professional training to occupy leading posts of directors in economic organizations. One of the most frequent factors which conduces to such a situation is the existence of so-called *informal groups* whose members in an enterprise are closely connected and manage to impose on other members of the work organization their criteria which are usually incompatible with the proclaimed criteria and requirements of the enterprise as regards definite kinds of experts. This deformation of the value-normative self-management structure is in practice one of the most frequent causes of formalism and evasion of competitions which are otherwise an important democratic institution in a society.

(b) *Disharmonies Between the Principle of »Everyone According to the Work Performed« and Work Conditions.*

The full implementation of the principle »to everyone according to the work performed« would be possible were technological and other economic conditions under which all work organizations are working equated to such a degree that equal earnings would be the consequence of the same amount of work invested. Evidently, such conditions have not been achieved in any socialist country.

In the so-called etatist period of socialism the system of »fixed salaries« or »changeable earnings« are determined by state bodies and this at least to a certain extent neutralizes the negative effect of different conditions of work. However, such a system evinces two serious

⁴ M. Popović, op. cit., p. 93.

weaknesses: certain *arbitrariness* in the determination of criteria for remuneration and a considerable *lack of economic stimulation* in the method of remuneration. The economic stimulation for greater earnings of those who achieve greater working effects is mostly lacking or is being completely replaced by a more political form of remuneration in the form of social commendations («shock work» and the like). This method could produce good results in certain, especially difficult situations when citizens have been requested to make serious efforts and great sacrifices (for example, in the post-war period of reconstruction of the Yugoslav society which had great material losses and casualties in the course of World War II).

With the transition to the period of workers' self-management in Yugoslavia and especially with the activation of the market economy and economic criteria of business operations the above-mentioned weaknesses of the system of remuneration in the so-called statist period have been eliminated, but certain difficulties have concurrently emerged and they call in question the possibility for the implementation of the socialist principle of »to everyone according to the work performed« as a *general* social principle and not solely as a criterion applied independently within every work organization. It is known that the market economy often tends to create even greater differences in conditions for business operations between individual enterprises or economic branches. This tendency is all the greater the more the economy is scattered, heterogenous, technologically extremely uneven as regards its development and often at a lower level, such as is chiefly the case today with the Yugoslav economy.

Concurrently, this state of heterogenous conditions for business operations is increasingly aggravated by the economic system and the economic policy which often give preference to certain economic branches while making the development of others more difficult. This is achieved not only by the system of interest rates and other forms of usurpation of the surplus value of labour of enterprises but also by the varied systems of prices. For example, agriculture and branches producing raw materials in Yugoslavia have been for quite a while in a more difficult »systematic position« than enterprises of the processing industry since the prices of the former are chiefly controlled while the prices of the latter are most often freely formed.

Under such conditions of business operations the differences of which are systematically maintained by means of a definite economic policy or stem from different levels of technological development, it is evidently extremely difficult to implement consistently the principle of socialist remuneration according to the work invested as a *general social* principle. For all these reasons (and for some other reasons) there is the occurrence of transfer of »capital« from certain enterprises or economic branches working under more difficult conditions to other organizations or branches working under »privileged« or even monopoly conditions. Under such conditions greater earnings do not signify also more work invested on the part of workers but this is often the consequence of better social conditions of business operations or greater possibilities for the sale of goods in the market.

What is the method for transcending this serious disharmony between the socialist principle of remuneration and inadequate socio-economic conditions? This is neither the reverting to the system of rigid centralist planning which ignores the economic interest of workers, nor the »market socialism« whose protagonists often believe that the socially uncontrolled market spontaneity is the »fairest judge« for the distribution of the social income. In fact, the sole consistent socialist method is the development of an *integrated* economy, integrated upon *self-management* foundations, which will be able alone to neutralize the negative effect of important differences in conditions for business operations between individual enterprises and entire economic branches, by means of corresponding institutions and mechanisms. When those employed in the economy will be able to settle alone the question of remuneration as a *social* problem at the level of the entire integrated economy, the socialist principle of »to everyone according to the work performed« will be transformed out of a political slogan into practical reality.

Serious steps and efforts in the direction of integration of the economy have been made in Yugoslavia in the course of the last few years. Several big enterprises have been formed, various forms of association of work organizations from various places have taken place, as well as from various regions and republics. With the further process of integration of the Yugoslav economy, along with the consolidation of its self-management, material and organizational basis, more favourable conditions are created for the socialist principle of remuneration. Within the setting of such favourable social prospects circumstances are created for regulating the *position of the individual* as a »worker«, as the one who is due to obtain an *equivalent* remuneration for the work he has invested. Thus are increasingly disappearing conflicts between groups and between individuals provoked by the discontent because of the unjustified or unjust distribution of personal incomes, both in an enterprise and within the society as a whole.

(c) *Disproportions Stemming From the Different Socio-economic Development of Regions, Republics and Provinces*

Yugoslavia is a country with several nationalities and a society with considerable differences as regards the economic development between republics and between individual inner-regions within republics. Due to this there occurs, among other things, the transfer of funds

between republics through the mediation of the market, and this can be seen from the following table.⁵

*Transfer of Funds Through the Mediation of the Market
(in millions of new dinars)*

Republics	Inflow	Outflow	% of the income achieved
Bosnia and Herzegovina	—	570	6.44
Montenegro	—	83	6.44
Croatia	273	—	1.24
Macedonia	131	—	3.24
Slovenia	382	—	2.76
Serbia	—	94	0.31

However, the problem is not solely in where the funds are going, which republic or which region is »receiving« and who is »losing«. Even though this is an extremely important indicator, the fact that the region which is more developed socially and economically has thus *better* conditions for its development than regions that are at a lower degree of development, is socially more relevant. Thus, the tendency exists for differences between regions to increase rather than to be reduced. True, a Fund for assisting or rather financing undeveloped republics and provinces has been set up in Yugoslavia and it is due to alleviate the negative effect of »natural« tendencies for the increase of differences between regions. It is difficult to say how great the effect of this Fund is but according to certain views it hardly manages to neutralize the differences which emerge as the consequence of the transfer of funds from less developed into more developed regions through the market.

It is natural to expect that the regional economic inequalities will cause lesser or greater tensions and even clashes between republics or smaller regions. And yet, the manner in which these tensions and conflicts are expressed vitally differ today from those in the previous, etatist period. With a firm centralist political structure Yugoslavia has been withstanding after World War II the possible internal upheavals which could have emerged on account of regional differences in its general economic development. Problems emerging due to this have been settled above, »in the top ranks« of the political and state leadership and chiefly far from the eyes of the public. At the best the public could only watch the consequences of such »mysterious« political decisions made in the federal centre.

⁵ This table is taken from an article published in the paper »Politika« under the heading »Tug of cord between republics« on August 30, 1970.

Today, under conditions of the definite development of socialist democracy and the consolidation of the market economy, questions of development between regions have not only become a public social problem but have even been exacerbated under the increasing influence of the market economy which, by virtue of its development »normally strives to intensify rather than to reduce the inequality between regions« as this has also been observed by G. Myrdal.⁶ Due to the fact that uncontrolled market spontaneity has increased in Yugoslavia in recent years, because a *corresponding system of planning* has not been developing according to the principles of the economy integrated in a self-management manner, there has occurred the intensification of economic differences between regions. Their intensification has been increasingly expressed as the exacerbation of political problems in national relations between republics, or rather between provinces.

The growing of nationalism of late has necessarily been expressed also in the sphere of relations between individuals at least in certain cases and situations. The over-emphasizing of the importance of national adherence, language, historical past of one's nation, has created the impression that for an individual and his position in society it is more important whether he is a Croat, Serb or Macedonian than whether he is a worker, private craftsman or political executive, or rather a politically progressive or conservative member of society, an atheist or »religious socialist«. Such nationalist patterns have been created of late, especially in certain national and cultural environments on the part of individual writers or other cultural workers.

*

(a) *Contradictions Between Self-management and Etatist-bureaucratic Structures and Tendencies*

If we have been reviewing so far the most important forms of disproportions between socialist goals and inadequate means and conditions, we shall now analyze in brief some of the most important kinds of social differences, or rather, contradictions resulting from the conflict *between opposite goals and values* in the development of the society in Yugoslavia. It is certain that in this respect the fundamental contradiction is the one between self-management and etatist-bureaucratic structures and tendencies behind which are various social forms with their varied, often opposite interests.

When the socialist state developed and reached unpredictable proportions, taking upon itself the right to administer virtually all social

⁶ G. Myrdal, *Economic Theory and Under-developed Regions*, London 1957, p. 36.

affairs, it became fairly clear, at least in the Yugoslav experience in the fifties, that an extremely strong state need not signify also an extremely strong society. Although being extremely strong it was nonetheless not so powerful to be able to foresee and direct all social processes and relations. We have seen for ourselves in practice that Marx' idea on the »withering away« of the socialist state is not solely a political slogan but above all an objective socio-historical imperative to proceed along the path of socialist democracy, ranging from the economy up to science, education and art. The first workers' councils were set up in 1950 and it was then that a permanent struggle began between those who strive for the preservation of the state-socialist structure and young, often feeble but historically promising forces of self-management.

The conflict certainly has its roots in the varied, often *opposite values and norms* as social standards of behaviour, behind which are various social forces. These are, on the one hand, the strict subordination of individual and group interests to *general* interests and goals such as they are seen and interpreted by the political-state bureaucracy, humility and obedience in relation to those »above«, discipline in the execution of tasks, considering that the party is the supreme judge, not only concerning political questions but also as regards other social questions (for instance in arts), etc. On the other hand, new social values and norms are gradually being formed — the domination of general interests without attention being paid to special, group and individual interests is being rejected, emphasis is laid on economic motives and the *initiative of workers*, the individual rights and freedom of citizens are more accentuated, there is a greater recognition and appreciation of autonomous values and criteria of science, arts and other spheres of cultural creativeness. It stands to reason that a *gradual shift* to other social values is involved in which not only conflicts between various values but also digressions from the goals proclaimed frequently occur.

The etatist-bureaucratic structure strives to establish firmly the first system of values and norms of behaviour, to consolidate social relations that will rest upon them. The self-management-socialist structure strives to be built upon another system of values and norms and this inevitably spells conflicting situations.

This »drama« of the Yugoslav society is still lasting today but such dilemmas and conflicts are involved in it behind which there is not always a real conflict between two opposite systems of values. Institutions and forms of social organization are sometimes attacked and denounced as bureaucratic, even though they need not necessarily be such. Every centralist system is rejected as bureaucratic, for instance in the sphere of use of electric power, communications, post offices, etc., although modern technology in fact demands the formation and function of big, centralised systems in these and in other spheres of social life. On the other hand, there also emerge phenomena of »social mimicry« when bureaucratic forces and processes emerge under a guise, with a »self-management face« adapting themselves in this manner to new conditions of the political struggle.

It is not necessary to prove that these political confusions prevent one from discerning actual bureaucratic processes and their vehicles

and in this manner make the political struggle against them more complicated. And yet, as matters in political life do not happen always in the »proper« but rather in the »distorted« (ideological) light the processes and tendencies in the development of self-management are far more difficult and intricate than their protagonists usually consider them to be.

(b) *Contradiction Between Social Planning and Spontaneity of the Market Economy*

The contradiction between self-management and bureaucratic etatism is not the only basic contradiction in socialist society, as the majority of Yugoslav political theoreticians usually think. The contradiction between socialist planning and the uncontrolled market economy is equally fundamental and important according to its social implications. The market economy has its logic, its values and norms which are often incompatible with the socialist values and norms. The basis of its value structure is above all the striving for personal earning and the economic profitableness of the enterprise. In themselves, they are not anti-socialist but, in the event that they emerge as the **sublime goals** of human activity, they clash with authentic social values — with the principle of social equality, with solidarity, with the view that man is the sublime social value.

Let us take a typical example. The development of modern technology usually reduces the need for the quantity of labour force, the number of workers. From the point of view of economic profitableness of enterprises it is necessary to discharge the redundant labour force in that event. From the point of view of socialist solidarity and humanism, on the other hand, such act is inhuman in itself unless society seeks to find employment elsewhere for these workers.

For example, about 800.000 Yugoslav workers are working abroad today. Even though all of them have not left because they had been unemployed in the country, the Yugoslav community has been obliged to secure employment for most of them. It is perhaps *economically* more profitable that »redundant« Yugoslav workers should be employed abroad, but this is certainly not a solution that corresponds to principles of socialist solidarity and humanism.

The striving for personal (or group) earnings becomes non-socialist in the event that it emerges as the *principal, exclusive motive* of man's work and social conduct in general. Unless it is controlled and limited by other, higher socialist motives (awareness on common welfare, interests of others, social progress) the striving for personal (or group) earning becomes a non-socialist motive. In certain cases it can result in the increase of economic profitableness of the enterprise, its more successful activity in the market, but it concurrently clashes with the general interests of the socialist community as a socialist one. Consequently, it is not a question of denying man's striving for earnings but of its ennobling and integration into the system of socialist values and norms of behaviour.

The very market economy, even in the event that it is without private ownership as a prevalent social relationship and without capitalists as the ruling class, cannot secure this. The socialist society will not prove its advantage over the capitalist one in the event that is concentrated only on developing greater productivity and more profitable economy. It can prove its historical advantage and justification solely if it develops a different social system with more human social relations, even in the event that these relations do not always stimulate a demand for profitableness to the degree to which this is done by market relations in the capitalist system.

By the way, it may be an outstanding question as to whether more human social relations in themselves necessarily stimulate greater profitableness and increase of productivity. The point is that they secure a *fairer distribution of the social income* and a *different attitude towards man as the basic social value*. Uncontrolled market economy with its specific values and principles of functioning cannot secure this on its own. That is why it is absolutely necessary steadily to develop the system of socialist planning, upon principles of the self-management and integrated economy which, unfortunately, we in Yugoslavia have not yet managed to achieve.

*

In all the above-mentioned reviewing we have been seeking to present the social position of man as an individual and as a personality, or rather, the manner in which basic disproportions and contradictions in the development of Yugoslav society are reflected in him. It is unnecessary to prove especially the thesis that every conflicting situation spelled by these disproportions and contradictions is also expressed as the conflict between individuals and their individual interests or at least as a situation of interindividual tension. If the social conditions and means for the consistent implementation of the socialist principle »everyone according to his aptitude, to everyone according to the work performed« have not yet been created to a sufficient extent, it is natural to expect that these digressions and deviations will affect quite a number of individuals, especially those from »lower« socio-economic strata. If the Yugoslav society is affected by collisions between different and opposite values and norms (self-management and bureaucratic-etatist, self-management-socialist and economic, which characterize the free market economy) they are necessarily expressed as conflicting situations in which individuals and groups collide being guided by vitally different motives and social goals.

Socialism stands a greater chance to prove its advantage over capitalism in the event that it develops more human social relations than by increasing the technological level of production and productivity. A more human position of a personality in the socialist society is the historical prospect which Marx and Engels have described as such form

of association »in which the free development of every individual is the condition for the free development of all« (Manifesto of the Communist Party). Yugoslavia is a country which in fact strives to develop such a system of socialist social relations, encountering thereby numerous serious social disproportions and contradictions some of the most important of which we have sought to analyze here.

Dr MIHAILO V. POPOVIC

Born in Beograd in 1929. Professor at the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Beograd and Head of the Department of Sociology. Field — general sociology (theory of sociology).

Graduated at the same Faculty in 1950 and obtained a Doctorate in 1956. Published more than 30 studies and articles in the field of general and political sociology. Books published: *Contemporary Sociology*, Kultura, Beograd, 1965, 2nd ed.; *The Subject-matter of Sociology*, Institut društvenih nauka (Institute of Social Sciences), Beograd, 1966; *The Problems of Social Structure*, Kultura, Beograd, 1967.

Dr Žarko MRKUSIĆ

Directeur de l'Institut des sciences économiques à Belgrade

LES RELATIONS ECONOMIQUES DE LA YUGOSLAVIE AVEC L'ETRANGER

Les relations économiques internationales d'un pays ne peuvent être envisagés autrement que comme rapports dérivés qui se dégagent des rapports économiques globaux de ce pays. Aussi les relations économiques avec l'étranger reflètent toujours toutes les réalités économiques dans l'organisme économique national, si bien que l'approche véritable à l'examen théorique des relations économiques internationales devient inévitablement liée aux agrégats économiques généraux et à leur analyse.

Les relations économiques de la Yougoslavie avec le reste du monde ont toujours porté en elles des caractéristiques essentielles des conditions économiques générales dans le pays, ce en quoi le système économique, bien que construit de façon très dynamique et la structure des relations économiques avec l'étranger et aussi par rapport à ce que l'on pense d'habitude et à ce qu'attend du système économique dans son ensemble. Au cours des 25 années de développement après la guerre, la Yougoslavie a souvent modifié les principes fondamentaux de son système économique en général et du système des relations économiques avec l'étranger, sans pour autant changer substantiellement ces relations ni en ce qui concerne l'intensité ni en ce qui concerne leur structure. On pourrait en conclure que l'économie globale est responsable de la physionomie des relations économiques avec l'étranger, beaucoup plus que les décisions de système. D'ailleurs, ce phénomène n'est pas seulement caractéristique pour la Yougoslavie. Qui plus est, on pourrait même aller jusqu'à dire qu'il représente un phénomène spontané d'importance pour tous les pays en voie de développement économique.

Historiquement pris, les rapports économiques avec l'étranger ont été, pendant toute la période de l'après-guerre, placés sous l'influence de l'hermétisme de l'économie nationale. En principe, ceci est valable aujourd'hui encore malgré le principe proclamé de l'ouverture vers l'étranger, comme un des principes fondamentaux de la réforme économique et sociale. Une économie nationale est, en principe, fermée aussi longtemps que sa monnaie nationale ne devienne, du moins, *de facto* convertible, ce qui, pour sa part, sous-entend une libéralisation quanti-

tativement bien poussée des relations économiques avec l'étranger, et en premier lieu des importations, une monnaie nationale assainie et son cours de change réel qui, par l'ouverture du marché de devises dans les conditions de la convertibilité extérieure formellement proclamée, ne s'éloignerait pas de la parité monétaire plus loin que les points d'intervention officiels, même sans une intervention des organes monétaires.

Tout autre état d'une économie nationale n'est rien d'autre qu'un état d'hérmetisme de principe, quelque soit la grandeur du volume des échanges commerciaux avec l'étranger et du coefficient de dépendance du marché mondial. L'ouverture ou la fermeture à l'égard de l'étranger est mesurée d'après l'ouverture ou la fermeture du principal canal qui relie l'économie nationale à l'économie mondiale. Ce canal est ouvert quand il y a possibilité de conversion libre des valeurs dans le contact de l'économie nationale et internationale, et ceci sur la base de paramètres qui s'affirment sur le marché sans qu'il soit nécessaire d'intervenir sans cesse. Si cette condition n'est pas remplie, alors, l'économie nationale est de principe une économie fermée. Aussi j'affirme que les relations économiques de la Yougoslavie avec l'étranger ont été dans toute la période après la guerre et le sont encore des relations types d'une économie fermée.

De là découlent des conséquences importantes pour l'estimation de la qualité des relations économiques de la Yougoslavie avec l'étranger. La première conséquence réside en ce que la structure jusqu'à présent et le volume des échanges de commerce extérieur ne sont pas le résultat des développements économiques autonomes dans l'économie nationale, mais cette structure et le volume des échanges sont induits et dérivent d'une attitude fondamentalement non économique de l'économie nationale vis-à-vis de l'économie mondiale. Il serait très précieux, du point de vue de la science, d'analyser l'exportation et l'importation yougoslaves potentielles, c'est-à-dire l'exportation et l'importation qui pourraient être opérées dans les conditions d'une économie ouverte. C'est à ce moment que l'on pourrait se rendre compte de la mesure dans laquelle la production nationale est en état de répondre aux exigences du marché mondial et dans quelle mesure la consommation dans le pays a tendance à avoir recours aux sources d'approvisionnement à l'étranger.

Ceci est, évidemment, pris indépendamment de la question de la protection. La protection a toujours existé et existera encore. Il y a en eu même à l'époque de l'économie du laissez-faire. Ce qui est essentiel c'est que cette protection ne devrait pas dépasser certaines dimensions économiques déterminées. Les limites pour ces dimensions doivent être recherchées dans les comparaisons du degré de maturité des économies nationales quand elles aspirent à satisfaire les besoins des consommateurs de tous niveaux et toutes catégories. Il est certain que l'économie yougoslave aura besoin d'une protection proportionnellement plus grande qu'une économie se trouvant à un degré de maturité plus élevé. Or, cette protection ne peut être calculée de sorte à enlever à la production nationale ne fut-ce que la moindre partie de son champ d'action normal

dans la lutte pour la productivité et la compétitivité. Les modèles nationaux de l'optimalité de la protection peuvent différer seulement d'après la tension des processus de développement nationaux, ce qui est en rapport avec les différences dans la maturité de ces économies. Pour une collaboration économique internationale bien fondée, il s'avère nécessaire d'accepter des critères de protection ainsi inspirés. Evidemment, il n'y a pas lieu d'idéaliser les possibilités d'une collaboration internationale sur ce plan, ni sur aucun autre, mais c'est dans l'intérêt propre que les critères de protection doivent se déployer autour de ces limites.

Il est caractéristique pour les échanges commerciaux de la Yougoslavie avec l'étranger qu'ils ne se sont jamais basés sur ce qui pourrait être appelé le comportement économique d'un acteur dans ces échanges. L'exportation a été par définition quelque chose que l'on devait extraire de l'économie nationale, à l'aide d'instruments du régime de commerce extérieur. De l'autre côté, l'importation représentait ce que, de l'avis non pas toujours des consommateurs eux-mêmes, l'on devait se procurer de l'étranger dans le cadre d'un système de rationnement des devises mal posé. Ainsi, l'exportation provoquait spontanément la résistance des agents producteurs chaque fois que les instruments régissant les exportations ne compensaient pas à l'exportateur la valeur que celui-ci pouvait réaliser sur le marché national, dans des conditions de présence, plus ou moins permanente, des tensions inflationnistes. Aussi l'exportation témoignait d'un décalage permanent entre le volume planifié et le volume réalisé. Même quand l'appareil administratif voulait réagir à temps utile aux changements dans les rapports des prix, l'exportation ne pouvait pas ne pas venir à bout de souffle, ce qui est caractéristique pour une économie aux changements y compris, dans ce cas, le mécanisme du cours inter-monnaire.

D'autre part, l'importation avait toujours tendance à dépasser sensiblement les proportions planifiées. Et ceci malgré le taux modeste de libéralisation de l'importation, qui, même dans les temps les plus récents, ne dépassait pas 20%, sous-entendant ici la catégorie des importations réellement libres selon les standards mondialement reconnus. Il apparaît impossible que l'importation dépassait les cadres planifiés en raison seulement de l'existence de cette catégorie d'importation libre, ce qui est d'ailleurs prouvé par toutes les analyses faites dans cette direction. Dans une plus grande proportion l'accroissement imprévu de l'importation a été le résultat de la percée des catégories restrictives du régime d'importation, ce qui parle en faveur de l'assertion selon laquelle l'ensemble du régime d'importation n'était pas efficace. Cette inefficacité découle du fait qu'une partie relativement grande des capacités d'importation est quantitativement *a priori* immensurable, car elle dépend des cadres mobiles que l'on ne peut pas envisager d'avance avec exactitude. Ici viennent les-dits droits d'importation qui se rattachent soit au montant de la quote-part, soit au montant de l'amortissement de devise, ou tout simplement le rattachement des capacités d'importation avec la réalisation dans l'exportation (groupements qui se trouvent sous le régime dit de rattachement de l'importation avec l'exportation). Quand on ajoute à tout ceci les possibilités d'importer à crédit, soit des crédits obtenus à l'étranger ou des crédits en devise obtenus dans le

pays, alors on peut facilement comprendre que les catégories fondamentales des importations restrictives (quote de devise globale, contingent de marchandise, contingent de devise, permission) ne sont pas en mesure de maintenir les importations dans des cadres planifiés, de sorte que des excès se produisent facilement, qui découlent des titres juridiques pour la réalisation des importations en dehors des catégories régulières du régime des importations. Ainsi, une analyse faite récemment a démontré que 50% environ des importations yougoslaves s'opèrent en dehors des catégories régulières du régime des importations, ce qui est, à n'en pas douter, la confirmation la meilleure de l'inefficacité totale du système de commerce extérieur.

En outre, en Yougoslavie il n'y a jamais eu suffisamment de connexion entre les forces qui poussaient à l'augmentation des exportations et celles qui opéraient dans le sens de l'augmentation des importations. L'économie n'est pas organisée de sorte que la responsabilité pour les exportations soit étroitement liée à la responsabilité pour l'approvisionnement de la production nationale. Ces responsabilités sont dans l'économie yougoslave séparées institutionnellement, ce qui parle en faveur de la thèse selon laquelle le système yougoslave d'autogestion n'a pas encore réussi à créer, entre les forces d'exportation et les forces d'importation, des mécanismes que devraient impliquer une société d'autogestion bien organisée. La responsabilité des exportations et la responsabilité de l'approvisionnement sont séparées par le fait même qu'il n'est pas possible de constater analytiquement un parallélisme quelconque entre l'approvisionnement meilleur, dû aux importations, et l'accroissement des exportations. Les raisons de cette séparation des responsabilités, qui se traduit négativement sur la balance des paiements, doivent être recherchées dans le fait que les restrictions sur les importations avaient été en vigueur par trop longtemps dans l'économie yougoslave et qu'elles ont inévitablement affaibli le sentiment de responsabilité de l'économie pour la nécessité d'établir un équilibre entre la réalisation et la consommation des moyens à l'étranger. Le système autogestionnaire n'a pas été en mesure, pour des raisons identiques, à établir des mécanismes satisfaisants dans ce domaine, et son affirmation dans l'avenir dépendra, en ce qui concerne les relations économiques avec l'étranger, de la cadence selon laquelle on va passer aux méthodes caractéristiques pour une économie ouverte.

Malgré les grands changements opérés dans la conception générale du système économique et de la politique économique, le système de commerce extérieur et le système de devises demeurent profondément imprégnés d'idées antérieures du monopole d'Etat sur le commerce extérieur et le monopole des changes. L'inertie de l'appareil administratif dans toute la période après la guerre empêcha non seulement la déclenchement d'initiatives nouvelles, mais aussi celles qui venaient d'autres milieux, et notamment des cercles scientifiques. Ainsi les grands vestiges du monopole de l'Etat liés à l'inertie de l'appareil administratif empêchaient toute élimination des embouteillages créés par le déficit constant de la balance des paiements. Au lieu de voir s'affirmer la conception selon laquelle la libération des éléments propulsifs dans la dynamique des exportations dépend de la libéralisation des importa-

tions, et notamment des importations des moyens pour la production, l'administration parvenait à imposer et à maintenir la conception d'après laquelle l'atténuation des tensions dans la balance des paiements réside dans les restrictions sur les importations. Tout au long des 25 dernières années notre pays accusait constamment un déficit de la balance des paiements et avait un contrôle des devises, tandis que tous les autres pays d'Europe parvinrent à assainir leurs balances des paiements et d'abandonner le système de contrôle des devises pour passer au système multilatéral et aux monnaies convertibles. Nous nous trouvons aujourd'hui dans le cercle des pays de l'Europe de l'Est, qui ont un monopole d'Etat traditionnel, et de la Turquie qui n'est pas encore parvenue à établir des relations monétaires saines et des relations économiques avec l'étranger, fondées sur une base saine, en raison d'une mauvaise politique économique.

La Yougoslavie n'a pas réussi de mettre en valeur sa position politique favorable, dans l'après-guerre. Elle n'a pas réussi de mettre à profit des chances rarement favorables qu'elle avait et a encore parmi les pays du tiers monde. La politique économique erronée n'était pas en mesure de mettre en jeu des instruments progressifs et efficaces du système économique. L'erreur fondamentale de la politique en matière des relations économiques avec l'étranger consistait dans la prémisses selon laquelle pour remédier aux perturbations de la balance des paiements il valait mieux raccourcir le jable plus long au lieu d'allonger le plus cour. Ce concept erroné est également coupable des difficultés les plus récentes, qui ont déjà évolué en une véritable crise de la balance des paiements et des devises.

Il n'y a pas de chances qu'une aide efficace et rapide vienne ni de l'extérieur ni de la politique économique nationale, et surtout de la politique monétaire et de crédit. Les expériences acquises démontrent avec évidence que les moyens financiers de l'étranger ne trouvent pas dans le pays un climat qui leur permette d'être utilisés comme il se doit. D'autre part, la politique monétaire et de crédit, dans les conditions de potentiels de production insuffisamment exploités, ne peut pas représenter une plateforme à partir de laquelle pourraient être résolus avec efficacité les problèmes attenants à la balance des paiements, accumulés au cours des 25 dernières années. Si les choses sont telles qu'elles sont, il ne reste rien d'autre que d'emprunter une voie qualitativement nouvelle dans l'institutionnalisation des relations économiques.

Cette nouvelle direction dans le développement devrait être recherchée dans la création d'instituts qui agiront en feedback sur la scène économique nationale et obligeront que des mesures correctives très sérieuses soient prises dans l'ensemble du système de l'activité économique. Je ne crois plus qu'une politique de stabilisation, qui s'inspirerait de motifs intérieurs, puisse être efficacement mise en oeuvre et aboutir à l'assainissement monétaire, si elle ne comprend pas des instruments pouvant empêcher que le développement des relations économiques avec l'étranger dans une économie relativement fortement dépendante, de ce développement notamment, ne commence à menacer sérieusement la stabilité économique. Jusqu'à présent cela fut très caractéristique pour l'économie yougoslave dans laquelle les relations avec

l'étranger représentaient en permanence un facteur déséquilibrant la stabilité.

Si l'on parvient à imbriquer dans le système des relations économiques avec l'étranger des stabilisateurs correspondants, ceux-ci exerceront, dans une économie nationale fortement dépendante des relations avec l'extérieur, une influence décisive sur la réalisation de la stabilité économique intérieure. Et on voulait nous faire croire justement le contraire, à savoir que la stabilité économique intérieure doit préluder à la normalisation des relations économiques intérieures doit préluder à la normalisation des relations économiques internationales de la Yougoslavie, vu que cela représentait dans la théorie et la politique traditionnelle une approche dominante à la solution du problème. Cependant, pour les pays en voie de développement qui, dans une mesure considérable, dépendent des relations économiques avec l'étranger, ces relations auront un tel effet réversible sur le développement des conditions économiques intérieures, qu'une politique de stabilisation, souffrant d'ailleurs d'inefficacité, quand il s'agit de ces pays, devra se heurter à des forces destructrices par la tendance prononcée de hausse relativement forte des importations par rapport à l'accroissement des exportations.

Il n'est pas facile de modifier cette tendance quand il s'agit de ces pays. Un changement éventuel pourrait résulter d'un développement à long terme. Prédire que les importations doivent croître plus lentement que l'accroissement des exportations représente dans les conditions actuelle une tentative de fuir la réalité et d'ignorer les phénomènes spontanés fondamentaux de la croissance économique, relevés nettement par la théorie moderne. Par conséquent il serait fatal si la normalisation institutionnelle des relations économiques avec l'étranger continuait à être ajournée.

Nous allons devoir compter encore longtemps sur le déficit dans la balance des paiements. Mais l'on va pouvoir y remédier plus radicalement si nous permettons que le processus d'assainissement monétaire comprennent aussitôt que possible l'institut de la convertibilité et du marché de devises sur lequel s'affirmerait le véritable cours économique en devises. Autant que cette opération d'assainissement monétaire puisse paraître risquante et posée à l'envers, elle semble être, d'après les expériences acquises jusqu'à présent, la plus souhaitable dans les expériences acquises jusqu'à présent, la plus souhaitable dans les circonstances présentes. Ces circonstances sont loin du climat véritable à recommander pour de telles entreprises. Or, sans cela nous allons sans cesse connaître une aggravation du climat, et nous allons ajourner ainsi sans cesse des entreprises radicales.

La convertibilité, qui commencerait avec la création des conditions favorable à la convertibilité extérieure *de facto* par la voie de l'élargissement de la transférabilité du dinar, et le marché de devises d'un type de marché interbancaire limité représenteraient des conditions propices à la formation d'un cours de change toujours plus réel, et celui-ci, de son côté, piloterait les développement des exportations et des importations justement dans le sens que nous voulons et qui nous conduira à l'assainissement de la balance des paiements, en enco-

urageant dans les conditions d'expansion économique les exportations et en ralentissant les importations. Avec le cours de change non réel que nous avons maintenant, c'est justement le contraire qui se produit, on décourage les exportations et on stimule les importations. Et en plus on néglige le problème de l'incongruité des phases du cycle de conjoncture dans les économies nationales, ce qui fait que par un cours de change non réel on favorise les exportations au moment même où elles sont déjà très attrayantes grâce aux phénomènes de recession sur les marchés extérieurs. La réversibilité du cycle économique rencontre dans le cours de change réel un régulateur économique déterminé qui concourt à la politique anti-cyclique.

Il convient d'ajouter que dans les relations économiques de la Yougoslavie avec l'étranger la part intolérablement grande du bilatéralisme représente justement un traitement contre-indiqué de l'instabilité économique nationale. Toutes les réformes monétaires opérées des échanges bilatéraux des effets contraires à ce qui étaient attendus. Si en plus on a en vu l'attitude économique-politique beaucoup plus efficace des partenaires yougoslaves dans le domaine des échanges de clearing, et notamment ceux qui ont encore le monopole de l'Etat sur le plan des échanges avec l'étranger, alors il devient évident que tout changement de parité de notre monnaie nationale représente un don fait directement à ces pays sans possibilité aucune qu'il soit compensé d'une manière ou d'une autre. Aussi est-il évident que la Yougoslavie devra liquider au plutôt les vestiges du bilatéralisme. Si cela était jusqu'à présent un problème insoluble, cela était dû au fait que dans l'institutionnalisation des relations économiques avec l'étranger nous n'agissions pas comme si l'abandon du bilatéralisme devenait un élément dérivé du système des relations économiques avec l'étranger. Si nous passons à la convertibilité et au marché de devises, alors le sort des vestiges du bilatéralisme est décidé. Il n'y a pas de raisons que nos partenaires de la zone clearing d'hier ne voient dans le marché yougoslave une partie intégrante de la région convertible avec toutes les conséquences que cela pourrait avoir.

Enfin, il reste encore quelques questions relatives à la stratégie commerciale. Jusqu'à quand la Yougoslavie pourra-t-elle, sans conséquences de plus en plus graves, résoudre d'une façon tout à fait improvisée les problèmes de ses rapports économiques avec certains groupements économiques régionaux. Il me semble qu'il s'agit là d'une question à laquelle on peut, avec certitude grandissante, donner une réponse négative, et au sujet de laquelle on peut constater un rétrécissement marqué du champ de manoeuvre. L'Europe connaîtra sur le plan du commerce des processus d'intégration de plus en plus poussés, à l'Ouest et à l'Est. Ces processus seront d'intensités différentes, mais dotés d'une même logique économique. Quelle attitude prendre dans le contexte de ce processus est une des questions cardinales de la nouvelle stratégie commerciale.

Une deuxième grande question est liée au système préférentiel mondial de l'avenir. Quelque lente que soit son évolution, il est certain qu'il sera réalisé à l'époque où la Yougoslavie aura commencé à émerger de la phase du sous-développement économique. Dans quelle me-

sure elle sera bénéficiaire du système préférentiel, et dans quelle mesure elle se transformera, dans un avenir proche, en donateur de préférentiel, c'est une question à laquelle il serait difficile de répondre en ce moment. Toutefois, elle doit édifier ses positions sur cette question en se liant aux pays qui connaissent des problèmes analogues. Il est certain que le temps ne travaille pas en faveur de la Yougoslavie et que dans ce contexte elle se voit confronter d'une façon plus aigüe aux problèmes de la compétitivité, du progrès technologique et du développement de la productivité et de l'organisation au niveau de l'entreprise. Par ailleurs, l'intégration de plus en plus intense aux développements économiques signifie pour la Yougoslavie une nécessité de redoubler d'efforts à cet égard. Ceci exige, pour sa part, un système d'activité économique plus efficace, accompagné de flexibilité croissante dans la production ce en quoi l'importation du capital dans des formes les plus diverses commence à occuper une place de plan en plus importante. Ceci complète certainement tout ce qui a été englobé antérieurement sous l'institutionnalisation des relations économiques avec l'étranger.

Dr ŽARKO MRKUŠIĆ

Le Professeur Dr. Žarko MRKUŠIĆ est conseiller scientifique de l'Institut des Sciences économiques à Belgrade, Doyen de l'école des études post-graduées de l'Institut, Directeur de l'Institut. Professeur à la Faculté des Sciences organisationnelles à Belgrade. Il s'est spécialisé pour le domaine de la théorie et de la politique du commerce internationale. Diplômé de la Faculté de droit de Zagreb, en 1940, et de la Faculté des Sciences économiques de Belgrade, en 1947. Devient Docteur ès sciences économiques en 1947 après avoir défendu à la Faculté des Sciences économiques de Belgrade sa thèse intitulée: Le système des restrictions des devises et le commerce mondial.

Membre de l'Institut international des finances publiques à Saarbrücken. Membre de la section scientifique de l'Union des économistes de Yougoslavie.

Tient régulièrement des cours pour les post-gradués à la Faculté des Sciences économiques à Belgrade et à Zagreb. Il a donné également des conférences dans les universités de Cologne, de Bochum, de Muenster, de Halle, de Budapest et de Mannheim.

Ses oeuvres sont souvent citées dans la littérature économique yougoslave et étrangère.

Livres parus:

- Le commerce international et la politique commerciale, Belgrade 1963.
- L'économie mondiale, Belgrade 1965.
- Les finances internationales, Zagreb 1968.
- Le commerce international, théorie et politique, Belgrade 1971.
- Les fondements de la théorie des systèmes de devises, Belgrade 1972.

Ses articles ont paru dans les revues yougoslaves et étrangères.

Il a présenté aussi nombre de rapports à des conférences scientifiques nationales et internationales.

Dr Ljubivoje ACIMOVIC

Director of the Department of International Relations of the Institute of International Affairs and Economy in Beograd

YUGOSLAVIA'S NONALIGNMENT POLICY AND PROBLEMS OF EUROPEAN SECURITY AND COOPERATION

I

Yugoslavia's foreign policy is determined by three basic factors: the socio-political system, the geo-political position and this country's approach to and place in world politics. This is succinctly expressed in the definition that Yugoslavia is a *socialist, European, nonaligned country*. Each of these elements is vital both from the point of view of the nature of its foreign policy and from the point of view of its national security. Namely only a successful socialist development — a development along the line of self-management socialism in keeping with its specific conditions at that — secures the strength and cohesion of its society as a factor of its national security and defines its special place both in the nonalignment movement and in world politics in general. In the same way, its active and adequate policy in the European plane serves the interests of its safe and successful internal development while concurrently representing a contribution to general objectives of nonalignment. Finally, solely an independent and nonaligned Yugoslavia can attain its free socialist development and act successfully on the European scale. A change in any sphere — digression from its own socialist development or the disregard of the European policy or the forsaking of the nonalignment policy — would inevitably affect its vital national interests of security and progress as well as its position and role in international relations. The positive experience so far is the best proof that these surmises are true. That is why the above-mentioned definition that Yugoslavia is a socialist, European, nonaligned country represents the starting point for the pursuance of Yugoslavia's foreign policy as well as for its comprehension on the part of its partners and all those who are interested in it.

Lack of understanding or witty impeachment of the compatibility and inseparable connection between these, three elements had existed in practice, especially formerly. There had existed theses, for instance, that a socialist country cannot be nonaligned but that it must join a community (or rather the bloc) of socialist countries; that Yugoslavia's activity in the nonalignment movement signifies its disengagement in Europe; or, that the intensification of its foreign political activity on the European scale means the desertion of the nonalignment move-

ment. Practice has convincingly denied these and similar outlooks on and attitudes towards Yugoslavia's foreign policy.

Having underlined the need for a thorough envisioning of Yugoslavia as a subject in international relations we shall dwell in this paper upon *two basic concomitants of its foreign policy — nonalignment and activity on the European scale*. To begin with, as it already results from the above-said, these are two component parts of one single entity; Yugoslavia's nonalignment policy and the policy of vigorous activity in Europe cannot be separated. Since the time it has committed itself for the policy of nonalignment and has been actively engaged in this movement, Yugoslavia has never — this has not been objectively possible either — neglected the problems of Europe and its activity in this sphere, but has always done as much as the situation in that part of the world warranted. On the other hand, in its foreign political activity in Europe it has always acted as a nonaligned country, it has consistently been guided by principles and objectives of the nonalignment policy while concurrently never diminishing its efforts within the setting of the movement of nonaligned countries. If there have been certain oscillations in some periods of time it has not been a question of oscillations in the foreign political orientation but rather of possibilities for its realization in concrete action depending upon the development of the situation in international relations.

Nonalignment, both as a foreign political philosophy and as a movement, indubitably represents a significant phenomenon in the post-war world politics. True, it has often been wrongly interpreted and even disparaged both in the foreign political practice of other countries, above all of the great powers, and in the doctrine of international relations. However, experience so far has already proved to a great extent that its significance in contemporary international relations is greater, that the settings of its content are broader and that its function in international relations is of more lasting nature than has been considered and maintained by many people. That is why it is advisable to point to the *basic factors that have historically caused the emergence of nonalignment and to the vital elements of the concept of nonalignment, its nature and content*. Space certainly does not permit to do more than to advance these questions in an extremely condensed form.

The emergence of nonalignment has been determined above all by the following *historical circumstances*. First, there has been the military-political polarization in post-war international relations which has been expressed in the cold war and in the formation of blocs as an instrument of power politics and confrontation of principal rivals in this phase of world history. Secondly, the disintegration of colonialism which led to the national liberation of millions of people of these two continents and to the emergence of a large number of new states. And thirdly, enormous differences in the degree of economic development whereby it has been just the newly-liberated and other countries outside blocs, chiefly of the southern hemisphere, that found themselves in a state of economic backwardness. Thus have economically undeveloped countries, which have mostly been concurrently newly-liberated countries and had been in the initial phase of the process of formation

and consolidation of their national states, found a common denominator of their vital interests under conditions of the cold war conflict between two bloc groups of the industrially developed world. On the other hand, their interests had not been identical with the interests of the developed world which were involved in the conflict between antagonistic blocs. Their inclusion in that conflict would serve only other people's interests and would be detrimental to their own interests, but the prolongation or escalation of that conflict also jeopardized their security and unhindered development.

That is why the first manifestation of the nonalignment policy has been expressed in the desire and endeavour of these countries to *remain outside blocs* and their mutual conflict. This factually passive foreign political attitude has been the reflection of the given historical situation in the late forties and early fifties of this century. And yet, it is already in this attitude that has been contained also the gist of the active attitude of nonaligned countries towards world politics in the sense that they had not been only anxious to remain outside blocs and their possible military conflict but they had been also vitally concerned that this conflict should not at all take place, or rather, that international peace be preserved and international security consolidated. For, it was absolutely clear to these countries already at that time that a possible holocaust would inevitably involve also their territories. Moreover, it has soon been proved in the post-war development that the confrontation of the super-powers leads to local wars, precisely in the territories of underdeveloped, or rather nonaligned countries which are embroiled in these conflicts for the benefit of industrially highly developed countries organized into blocs.

Consequently, if nonalignment assumed the form of passivity in the first phase this has not been the expression of the political orientation of this movement but in fact the expression of the inability to do anything else under given conditions. And yet, as has already been underlined, the endeavours of nonaligned countries to mobilize their forces against the escalation of the cold war have gradually been increasingly expressed already in this phase along with their strivings to remain outside blocs and their conflicts. The characteristic feature of this phase has been the Korean war in the course of which nonaligned countries had first sought above all to remain aside while they have later played an active part in the settlement of this conflict in the course of negotiations. The wrong qualification of the policy of nonalignment as passive neutrality in relation to the conflict between blocs is the consequence of the misunderstanding of this initial phase in which nonaligned countries had been unable to do much more than they had done, i.e., not to be involved in that conflict. That is why one must underline as one of the vital characteristic features of nonalignment its *active attitude towards world problems*, or rather, its orientation to playing an active role in world politics.

Just as nonalignment has often been wrongly qualified as a passive foreign political attitude and neutrality, its *goals and function* have also been given an extremely limited interpretation. As a matter of fact, proceeding from the fact that nonalignment historically emer-

ges as reaction to the formation of blocs and to their confrontation, the role of nonalignment had previously been reduced solely to the prevention of the spreading of these cold war formations and to the transcendence of the state of cold war. However, the entire subsequent development has denied this concept and has proved that the role and objectives of nonalignment are far broader. The fundamental and most general definition of the program of political action of the movement of nonalignment is the substantial transformation of the present system of international relations upon the principles of the UN Charter and peaceful active coexistence. In other words, the purpose is to shift from the system of equal and democratic relations and security which is not based upon the balance of terror. Observing nonalignment in its activity one can notice, within its above mentioned general orientation, especially the following basic trends of its program of action: prevention of the spread of blocs and of the cold war as well as the transcendence of this state of affairs; the general consolidation of international peace and security (peaceful settlement of disputes, measures aimed at disarmament and arms control etc.); the anticolonial struggle; economic development; and civil rights, especially the struggle against racial discrimination. This extensive platform developed gradually in the process of evolution of the nonalignment movement and today already represents a clearly expressed entity.

The next, third significant characteristic feature of nonalignment which must be underlined consists in its *long-term prospect* which naturally stems from the previously listed features of this international movement. As a matter of fact it is not question of an ephemeral phenomenon, or rather of a movement the role of which is confined to the period of the cold war conflict between blocs. By virtue of the fact that the activity of the nonaligned is defined by their long-term interest in fundamental changes of the system of international relations, this movement necessarily has a far more lasting historical role than has been considered, especially in the earlier phase.

Finally, the non-alignment movement, while realizing its extremely far-reaching goals, concurrently becomes the representative of *general interests of peace and progress*. Nonalignment has historically emerged as resistance and opposition against definite tendencies of the industrially developed part of the world in the sphere of world politics but its long-term goals and its function reflect general interests, i.e., even the interests of the part of the world from whose contradictions the cold war has developed. For this reason nonalignment naturally becomes an ever broader movement and its platform offers grounds for pooling and mobilizing all positive efforts for the development of a better world — a world which corresponds to requirements of the contemporary development of human society.

In connection with the basic characteristic features of nonalignment the question of the *general definition of this international phenomenon* is also raised: whether this is primarily a foreign political doctrine, or rather, an outlook on the world which has gradually developed at gatherings of the nonaligned countries; or whether it is a definite type of foreign policy or rather the sum of identical or similar

foreign political orientations of a certain number of countries; or whether a new system of international relations, which is in the process of its gradual making, is involved. In the theory of international relations these three concepts chiefly appear. Each of these outlooks contains elements of a reply to the question that has been brought up but none of them is sufficient in itself. The proper answer must be sought in their synthesis. As a matter of fact, nonalignment is concurrently also a foreign political doctrine and a foreign political action and a system of international relations which must develop in practice and replace the existing system that has resulted from the cold war. As a doctrine nonalignment is based upon the principles of the UN Charter and peaceful active coexistence along with the specific accents which the post war development has brought in its wake; as foreign political practice it represents the concerted effort of nonaligned countries for the realization of general goals of the above mentioned platform, striving theory to an ever broader mobilization of all progressive forces; as a system of international relations nonalignment represents the negation of bloc structures and power politics in the sense of the integration of the world into a democratic community of equal countries.

In addition, nonalignment is also an international political movement in the sense of the concerted efforts of countries which belong to it for the sake of the realization of common goals. One must underline that this movement has all along been without of any kind of permanent organizational forms and that it is characterized by a flexible form of cooperation. The nonalignment movement has also never implied the coordination of foreign policies in the realization of specific goals of countries belonging to it; they always freely form their views on questions in which they are directly interested. Finally this movement has never appeared as a bloc either, or rather, as the third bloc towards the two antagonistic blocs of the industrially developed world and it has also not relied in its actions upon force which it does not possess either. The nonalignment movement solely possessed moral-political power and practice has proved that this factor is not unimportant in world politics.

First concepts of the nonalignment policy appeared soon after World War II — even before the formation of blocs and the flaring up of the cold war, before the fall of colonial empires and the formation of new states in Asia and Africa. As a matter of fact as far back as 1946, Nehru, as Vice-Premier in Lord Wavell's cabinet, made the first declaration on nonaligned foreign policy, emphasizing in his statement that India would pursue an independent policy in foreign affairs, aligned one against another. In the course of the Korean war Indian representative to the United Nations used for the first time the term »nonalignment«. The first gathering which has in fact initiated nonalignment as a movement had been the Bandung Conference in 1955 which had rallied upon the platform of the struggle for the liquidation of colonialism but which had transcended these settings with its results. Then followed *meetings and conferences which have marked the development of this movement*; the tripartite meeting between Nehru, Nasser and Tito in Brioni (Yugoslavia) in 1956; the meeting of five heads

of state of nonaligned countries — Nehru, Sukarno, Nasser, Nkrumah and Tito on the occasion of the session of the UN General Assembly in New York in 1960; the Belgrade Conference of heads of nonaligned states in 1961; the meeting of high-ranking government representatives of nonaligned countries in Cairo in 1962 devoted to problems of economic development; the Cairo summit Conference of nonaligned countries in 1964; the second economic conference of nonaligned countries in Lusaka in 1970.

Troughout this period of time a complete concept of nonalignment has been formed, the nonalignment movement has been built and developed (by the number of its members it has more than doubled) and it has given its indubitable contribution to the promotion of the situation in the world in all basic spheres — of peace and security, decolonization, economic development and civil rights.

As can already be partially seen from some of the above-mentioned data, Yugoslavia has been playing an active role in the movement of the nonaligned since the very beginning. The roots of Yugoslavia's commitment for the policy of nonalignment must be sought in the historical experience and the tradition of the struggle of its peoples for freedom and independence, and particularly in the tradition of its revolutionary movement that had been the vehicle of the liberation struggle in World War II and of efforts for the creation of a new, socialist society; also, in the specific conditions in which this country found itself in the first post-war years when its free and independent development had been seriously jeopardized by the endeavours of the two blocs to establish their domination over it; and finally in its national interests to be connected with countries of the so-called third world and to contribute to the concerted efforts for the improvement of the situation in international relations.

As soon as Yugoslavia managed to overcome the isolation in which it had landed after the serious conflict with the Stalinist policy of the USSR and its bloc, i.e., since 1950, Yugoslavia began developing relations with overseas countries, both political and economic and cultural relations. In that same year, in 1950, the Yugoslav government officially announced its nonaligned policy at the Fifth regular session of the UN General Assembly when its spokesman declared that Yugoslavia cannot agree to mankind having to choose between the domination of the one or the other great power and that it is in favour of a world of free and equal nations and for a democratic struggle in that direction. Since the above-mentioned meeting of heads of three nonaligned countries in Brioni in 1956, Yugoslavia has continuously been in the centre of all activities of nonaligned countries.

With its principled foreign policy, successful industrialization and economic growth and original socialist social system, Yugoslavia has gained reputation and confidence among other nonaligned countries and has occupied a prominent place in this movement. However, in keeping with the basic goals and principle of nonalignment and guided by its special interests as a European country, Yugoslavia managed also to set up relations upon an equal footing and cooperation with all countries of both the blocs already in the mid-fifties. Moreover, in the

sixties Yugoslavia also achieved regular relations with regional economic organizations of that continent. Along the line of these same goals of the nonalignment and realizing the policy of transcendence of the artificial division of the world and as fruitful as possible all-out cooperation, Yugoslavia has opened its borders and it is today the only country which has abolished upon a reciprocal basis, visas with all countries of East and West Europe except Spain, Portugal, Albania and Greece, as well as with a certain number of countries of the third world.

The prominent position of Yugoslavia in the third world conduced to the consolidation of its role in world politics and concurrently of its national security. It is still the only European country in the non-alignment movement and, vice versa, the only active nonaligned country in Europe, Its long-term nation interests determine its active engagement in the movement of the nonaligned just as its geo-political position causes its manifold activity in the European plane.

II

The review of the policy of Yugoslavia in the European plane demands a preliminary description of certain general characteristics of the international situation in this area in the post-war period.

Europe has been not only the principal arena of World War II but also the area where the *cold war* between the super powers — together with their allies — had broken out evolved and attained some of its culminating points. The severity and intricacy of this conflict have been ever greater since, for one thing, an area of key political and economic significance was involved and, for another, because it was just in this area of the world that the effects of World War II have been the most far-reaching in every respects: to begin with, the constellation of forces has been vitally altered; with the disappearance of the Third Reich in Germany a vacuum has been created which was provisionally filled with allied occupation; significant territorial changes have been effectuated; a strong concentration of military forces, their stationing in alien territories, direct mutual confrontation between the super-powers and strict demarcation of their spheres of interest have taken place while in the socio-political sphere the process of revolutionary changes has started in a whole range of countries.

The speedy escalation of the cold war strongly deformed relations in Europe so that the first and fiercest battle of the cold war conflict in the mid-fifties ended in a rigid division of Europe, Germany and Berlin into two antagonistic parts (East and West) and the alignment of countries and these two parts of Europe into two rigid bloc formations which were led by the two super powers.

It stands to reason that under these conditions all outstanding problems which World War II had left in its wake have been decisively affected by the cold war: under its influence not only any progress in the settlement of these outstanding questions was virtually blocked, but even their nature has changed. As a matter of fact outstanding questions in relations between the former allies during the war that

had elapsed (the signing of the peace treaty with Germany, the recognition of territorial changes and new borders, the status of Germany etc.) became then contentious problems of irreconcilable interests between the contesting parties in the cold war. In the post-war period the European problem in fact increasingly less amounted to the settlement of outstanding inter-allied questions stemming from World War II and increasingly became a specific product of the cold war or rather of the political conflict between the two super powers for supremacy in the world. Consequently, the elements of the European problem certainly originate from certain elementary outstanding problems stemming from World War II but it is today in fact the result of the cold war and it is upon this basis that one must look for a reply to the question concerning the substance of the European problem and its settlement, as well as about the paths for attaining this goal.

The basic reply amounts to the fact that the *essence of the European problem* is in the nature of contemporary international relations, i.e., in the division of Europe into spheres of interest and in power politics and in the hegemonistic position of the great powers. It is a question of a dissatisfactory condition as the part of the general state of international relations in the world — a state of unequal relations, artificial barriers and impeded international cooperation as well as the lack of full and stable security, particularly as regards smaller countries. As far as concrete outstanding questions which are originating from the last world war, above all those from the so-called German complex are concerned, their settlement is certainly absolutely necessary and important but it does not represent the substance of this problem. The elimination of these outstanding problems will create the pre-conditions for the realization of basic changes in Europe, but solely pre-conditions which need not or rather will not automatically bring about the basic goal that is desired. As a matter of fact if nothing were to be vitally changed after this in the nature of relations in Europe, all the substantial components of the existing dissatisfactory situation would be still present. To make it more concrete: if Europe — after the regulation of border questions, the status of East Germany and its relations with West Germany, the status of Berlin and similar, incontestably important questions — would still remain divided into spheres of interest and organized into blocs, and the great powers would retain their hegemonistic position and the possibility to resort to force at will, then it would not be possible to speak about a substantial change of the state of affairs in Europe.

From the essential content of the European problem defined in this way will stem also the basic reply concerning the *essence of its solution*. As a matter of fact, if the essence of this problem is in the existing system of international relations the way out must also be sought in the change of that system. In fact, the only and real alternative to the existing unsatisfactory state of relations in Europe (and not only there) i.e., the only factual solution of the problem consists in such a transformation of the existing system by means of which will be eliminated the bloc structures and barriers as well as the hegemonistic position of the great powers and by means of which a new system will

be built of genuinely free and equal international relations in the spirit of principles of peaceful and active coexistence. The emancipation of European countries which represents a vital concomitant in this complex does not signify solely their independence in relation to one of the two super powers but also the exclusion of Europe from the confrontation of these super powers, or rather, a guarantee that they should not involve it in their conflicts as well as that they should not possibly achieve some sort of condominium over it.

However much this definition of the European problem and its solution may at first glance appear to be excessively generalized and simplified, as an ideal and unfathomably distant objective, it nonetheless expresses the essence of the matter and it represents the absolutely necessary criterion for the evolution of every concrete initiative, concept and drive in this sphere. For, there exist drives which could even bring about some apparently positive results (such as a momentary stabilization of relations and the expansion of cooperation between countries of divided Europe) without, nonetheless, being acceptable as a factual contribution to the settlement of the basic problem of this continent in the event that they would factually mean the consolidation or perpetuation of the system of spheres of interest and bloc structures or, on the other hand, the setting up of a bilateral arrangement between the two super powers at the expense of the sovereign rights of European countries. In brief, the above-mentioned substantial solution means above all a long-term orientation toward action and not a directly attainable goal.

In view of the fact that the substantial solution of the European problem presupposes profound changes in the system of international relations it is clear that a longer period of time is needed for the realization of that goal. This concurrently signifies that there exist no great solutions and sudden about faces but that the process of transformation by means of partial and transitional solutions will be realized under conditions of the further existence of bloc structure and other elements of the present system. Evolution will consist in their gradual limitation, change and replacement with new elements. This is the only realistic approach because it is evident that blocs cannot be merely dissolved, spheres of influence abolished and the great powers simply talked into or forced to give up the hegemonistic policy.

Proceeding from this reality one must also seek the best possible replies to the question on the *immediate steps, line and methods of the political action of European countries* which, in the long run, are due to bring about the achievement of the ultimate goal in the solution of the European problem, or rather, the transformation of the existing system of international relations in the spirit of the UN Charter and peaceful and active coexistence. We shall describe here certain more important factors in this respect.

To begin with, in view of the fact that the European problem is in fact the result of fundamental universal contradictions, especially of those existing in relations between the two super powers, the action of European countries must create conditions for the change of the policy of these powers, this necessarily implying both the achievement

of corresponding cooperation with them in this job and the shattering of the monopoly they had so far in the settlement of European problems. If the emancipation of Europe from the confrontation of the super powers and their spheres of interests represents one of the essential characteristics of the European settlement, it is absolutely necessary that the action for the realization of the goal desired should become independent, or rather »European« so that all countries of this continent obtain the place, role and influence naturally belonging to them in the settlement of vital questions of their existence, security and prosperity.

In their activity European countries should continuously strive to an increasing limitation of the effects of bloc structures and to the limitation of the space for the implementation of the policy of spheres of interest and hegemonistic rights of the great powers in them, with simultaneous efforts to introduce new solutions (of non-bloc nature) into the system of international relations. The process of gradual transcendence of the bloc division of Europe also presupposes a progressive opening of all possible channels for contacts and relations between European countries and nations in order to create, by means of an ever broader and more intensive circulation of people, goods and ideas, a network of common interest, to change and bring closer together concepts concerning vital questions of coexistence and cooperation in this area of the world.

The gradual implementation of certain measures in the sphere of arms control in Europe would not only represent part of the general effort for the achievement of disarmament in the world but would directly conduce also to the increasing security of European countries in an improved political atmosphere which is not an insignificant factor in this process. Even though we are aware of the intricacy and of the delicate nature of this question, as well as of the fact that it is conditional upon the military-strategic ratio between the two super powers, we nonetheless think that it is both necessary and possible to approach the pursuit and realization of individual partial settlements already in this, initial phase. Without embarking on the review of all the more important aspects of this problem we shall just mention certain measures which, in our opinion, could represent the initial steps along the path of its settlement.

To begin with, if one bears in mind the fact that the military-political presence of the super powers in Europe and the influence they exert upon the situation in this part of the world are the basic factor of the abnormal situation and potential danger for the security of European countries, it is vitally important that their presence should diminish, particularly their military presence as an instrument of force in the implementation of political goals. The first useful step in this direction would be to halt any further escalation in this sphere. By undertaking definite international obligations in this respect one would not only prevent or at least make more difficult the further escalation of foreign military presence which has been taking place especially in certain extreme situations, but good pre-conditions would also be created for the beginning of a gradual reduction of this presence. The dis-

continuation of the escalation of foreign military presence in Europe should certainly encompass all aspects of this process, quantitative and qualitative alike: from the setting up of new military bases, or rather the expansion of foreign military presence with the inclusion of new countries, through the increase of their volume in countries where they already exist, to the transfer of troops and bases in these countries to strategically and politically neuralgic areas and the introduction of new weapons disturbing the equilibrium.

It is also certain that definite restrictions in the sphere of military manoeuvres represent a measure which is not unattainable even in this initial phase and which would also contribute to a certain extent to the stabilization of the situation, to a better political atmosphere and greater security in Europe. The advisability of this measure can be clearly perceived if one bears in mind various situations in which military manoeuvres have been exploited so far as the means of pressure and of the policy of force. With the acceptance and respect of definite regulations concerning the dimensions, site (vulnerable areas, other people's territories, and the like) and method of execution of manoeuvres one would obviously achieve one of the results which facilitate further, even more important undertakings.

The setting up of atom-free zones in Europe is certainly a rather complicated thing and it is not likely that it would be possible to make definite suggestions and forecasts in that respect for the present phase of development of the European and world situation, but one must nonetheless not disregard efforts in this direction either. It is probable that within the setting of other broader arrangements certain results even of peripheral importance could be achieved.

All these and other similar measures not only fail to mean the provisional postponement of basic efforts towards achieving a balanced reduction of armed forces in Europe but presuppose parallel actions provided that the above-mentioned measures are due to make possible and facilitate the successful realization of these efforts.

We think that it is superfluous to advance specially in this rather limited space a series of measures in the economic, cultural and other spheres of cooperation which could be achieved to a considerable extent already in this phase. There exist fairly extensive possibilities for achieving, by means of bilateral and multilateral arrangements, a varied all-European cooperation to which countries of this continent are naturally directed.

The need to perceive as realistically as possible all possibilities and to study all elements of settlements that can be reached in the near future, proves the advisability of a certain pooling and coordination of efforts of all European countries in this direction. As the most realistic aspect of this action emerges the possibility for the setting up of a European committee of experts which would systematically deal with the study of these questions. In its work it would not be so vital to adopt joint drafts and recommendations to governments as much as it would be important to achieve a constructive exchange of views and a factual effort for contributing to the discovery of a settlement.

Finally, it is certain that one of the first all-European gatherings should result also in the general adoption of principles upon which

relations in Europe must be founded. Even though the principles of the UN Charter are involved, which are binding for all states, it is nonetheless politically advisable to confirm them once again and to apply them concretely upon the situation in Europe.

The realism of the expectation that in the sphere of European security and cooperation it is possible to achieve definite results in the present phase is also confirmed by a certain *progress that has been achieved recently*, especially in the course of the last eighteen months. In this respect one must particularly underline the following: first, the results achieved in the normalization of relations between West Germany and East European countries (the agreements that the Bonn government has signed with the governments of the USSR and Poland; the beginning of a dialogue between heads of governments of the two Germanies; as well as the moving of the negotiations on Berlin from a standstill); secondly, the further development of bilateral economic relations between East and West European countries, among which arrangements on industrial cooperation are particularly important (above all on the building of important projects in the USSR by big West German, Italian and French firms); thirdly, the beginning of some sort of initial dialogue between the two blocs on the question concerning the convocation of a conference on European security and cooperation and the introduction of somewhat greater flexibility into their stands concerning this question (we have in mind above all the meeting of the NATO Council in Rome in May 1970 and the meeting of Foreign Ministers of the Warsaw Pact countries in Budapest in June of that same year); and fourthly, the intensified activity of European countries in the sphere of the settlement of the question of security and cooperation in their continent (in contrast to the previously existing situation when initiative was virtually exclusively in the hands of the super powers).

As far as the very *Conference on European security and cooperation* is concerned, for the holding of which initiative has been given quite a long time ago, it can be said that, as the result of the above-mentioned latest development, the chances for its realization are now considerably greater than previously although there still exist numerous serious obstacles along this road. However, in connection with this conference we would like to underline certain factors. To begin with, it is wrong to reduce the entire European action to the realization of this conference and to over-emphasize its role. It certainly represents an important link in the process of settlement of the European problem but it does not exhaust the entire international activity in this sphere. In fact, the conference can be solely the result of the preceding evolution of relations in Europe and consequently its sense is in sanctioning the progress that has been achieved as well as in giving new stimuli and possibly also organizational setting for further actions and also for institutionalizing relations of cooperation in Europe upon a new basis. Also, in order to realize this gathering one should avoid posing conditions in advance, but it is equally necessary, realistically regarded, to eliminate beforehand the obstacles to its successful work, or rather to

settle in advance certain basic concrete outstanding questions between individual East and West European countries. These questions (such as the status of East Germany and West Berlin and border questions) cannot be settled by the conference but their existence can thwart the conference. Finally, the conference must be conceived only as the first in a series of gatherings of this kind, because it is evident that an extremely intricate job which seeks a continuous action is involved. From the first conference one can expect only modest results, but it must not be convened before these results are certain. Failure is more detrimental than not to hold this conference altogether. Increasingly so since, all things considered, this conference must take place in the near future. As a matter of fact, it is important that it should take place as soon as possible but it is equally important that it should produce results. The securing of results which would correspond to the given conditions determines the time when it can be held.

It is quite evident that this idea of, and approach to the problem of European security and cooperation is fully in keeping with the goals and principles of the policy of nonalignment. In fact, it can be said that they represent an adequate implementation of the general platform of nonalignment upon the specific conditions of the European situation.

According to its possibilities *Yugoslavia* has incontestably offered an important contribution to the promotion of the state of affairs in Europe. To begin with, the very fact of its consistently nonaligned position in a neuralgic area of this continent has been of great importance for the stabilization of relations. In addition, its successful policy of good-neighbour relations and the development of allround cooperation with countries surrounding it, as well as significant results in achieving extensive cooperation with other European countries as well, including also the full opening of its borders — do not represent solely a contribution to the improvement of the situation in Europe but also an extremely convincing example of realistic possibilities for the implementation of the policy of active and peaceful coexistence in this part of the world.

For the sake of contributing to general efforts for the settlement of the European problem and especially the realization of the idea of all-European agreements, *Yugoslavia* has developed a considerably extensive activity. In this sphere it has been especially engaged in the action of nine (later of ten) European countries in the implementation of the resolution of the UN General Assembly of December 21, 1965; unfortunately, this action has not produced results because of the negative attitude of the great powers. Recently, Yugoslav diplomacy in the sphere of Europe has been extremely active: fairly intensive and close contact of cooperation have been achieved with virtually all European countries in connection with the convocation of the conference on security and cooperation and the settlement of European problems in general. Within this setting an exceptionally important place belongs to the visits of President Tito to numerous European countries by the end of last year and early this year. It is in the interest of *Yugoslavia*, as well of all other European countries, that the all-European talks on security and cooperation take place as soon as possible but under con-

ditions which will guarantee their success. That is why Yugoslavia will keep investing efforts in this direction proceeding from its clearly defined positions of the nonalignment policy.

Dr LJUBIVOJE AĆIMOVIĆ

Head of the Department for International Relations,
Institute of International Politics and Economics.

Born on September 9, 1923 in Belgrade, Mr. Aćimović graduated in 1950 from the Belgrade Law Faculty.

He has been engaged in scientific work at the Institute of International Politics and Economics since 1955 in the following capacities: scientific associate (1955—1958); head of a research group dealing with international organizations (1959—1960); head of the Department for International Relations (1961—1962); Deputy Director (1962—1968).

He has been lecturing since 1969 on »Theories and Research Trends in the Science of International Relations« to Masters candidates in international relations at the Faculty of Political Science and the Institute.

His more important scientific works are:

— »Peaceful Settlements of Disputes in the United Nations«, International Problems, Number 3—4, 1955. (»Mirno rešavanje sporova u Ujedinjenim nacijama«, Međunarodni problemi, br. 3—4, 1955).

— »The Relationship Between the United Nations Security Council and General Assembly in the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes«, The Yugoslav Review of International Law, Number 2, 1956. (»Odnos Saveta bezbednosti i Generalne skupštine UN u mirnom rešavanju sporova«, Jugoslovenska revija za međunarodno pravo, br. 2, 1956.).

— »The Codification of Regulations of International Contract Law«, Institute of International Politics and Economics, Belgrade, 1957. (»Kodifikacija pravila međunarodnog ugovornog prava«, Institut za međunarodnu politiku i privredu, Beograd, 1957).

— »The Development of the United Nations System« (Author of the introductory paper and editor), Institute of International Politics and Economics, Belgrade 1959. (»Razvoj sistema Ujedinjenih nacija, Institut za međunarodnu politiku i privredu, Beograd 1959).

— »A European Settlement and East-West Relations«, (mimeo.), Center for International Affairs, Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., USA.

— »Non-alignment in the World of Today«, edit., Institute of International Politics and Economics, Belgrade 1969.

— »Cohesion and Conflict in Relations Between the East European Countries«, International Problems, Number 4, 1969, (English edition 1970).

— »Die blockfreien Länder und die europäische Sicherheit«, Europa Archiv, 23/1969.

— »European Security and Cooperation in the Present Stage of International Relations«, International Problems, Number 1, 1970, (English edition 1971).

— »Yugoslav Concern for an Independent Mediterranean«, New Middle East, No. 17, February 1970 and Survival, Institute for Strategic Studies, May 1970.

— »On Peace Research and the International Peace Research Association«, International Problems, Number 1, 1972 (English edition 1972).

Mr. Aćimović has been the editor-in-chief of the Institute's Annual since its founding in 1963.

He was a member and associate at the Center for International Affairs, Peace Research Association (IPRA) 1964—1971.

He was a member and associate at the Center for International Affairs, Harvard University, 1967—68.

Mr. Aćimović took part in the work of a group of UNESCO experts on the Role of the Social Sciences in Development, Peace Research and the Role of International Organizations in International Relations.

Ing. Prvoslav RAKOVIĆ,
General Manager of »Crvena Zastava« automobile factory, Kragujevac

FOREIGN CAPITAL INVESTMENT IN YUGOSLAVIA

1. *Why is Yugoslavia Encouraging Foreign Capital Investment in the Form of Joint Ventures With Yugoslav Economic Organisations?*

Thanks to the 1965 reform of the Yugoslav economy, based on the principles of joining in the international division of labour through raising labour productivity to a level comparable to that achieved in corresponding branches of the industry in industrially advanced countries, a liberalisation of the market and other measures, the Yugoslav economy became competitive in relation to the economies of other countries. The proclamation of the economic reform was accompanied by a series of regulations on the basis of which economic organisations and their banks should take upon themselves the responsibility for financing simple and expanded reproduction, that is to say for the use of foreign resources and for their repayment.

The industry should be guided in its development by the market both as regards assortment and quantities under conditions of a certain degree of liberalisation.

Finding themselves in this situation, economic enterprises naturally carried out various investigations of the market in order to define their position in relation to the market and their mutual interdependence.

The main difficulty economic organisations immediately came up against was the lack of funds which restricted all further activities.

They realized that there were four possible sources of funds:

- their own resources (auto-financing),
- mobilisation of resources of interested production organisations, banks and foreign trade companies — through shares and participation,
- credits from domestic and foreign banks, and
- foreign capital investment in domestic enterprises.

Two of these possibilities were particularly interesting, i.e., the mobilisation of domestic capital of interested economic organisations and the investment of foreign capital in domestic enterprises.

The participation of domestic capital, through bonds or directly, reflects the interest of the country's economy in, for example:

— helping the production of the final product which is in demand on the market and for which the interested enterprise supplies parts, subsets, sets and generators,

— having a share in the profits obtained through sales, as a marketing organization,

— participating, as a foreign trade organization, in export and import deals of the producer apart from sharing the enterprises profits,

— investing money at a higher profit than offered by banks in the form of interest rates.

The need for the participation of foreign capital, arises in the first place, because of a shortage of foreign currency resources but also because of increased interest among foreign firms in the success of their Yugoslav partners, i.e., in an up-to-date organization of the process of production and the application of modern technology which all goes to decrease production costs.

In the past 25 years Yugoslavia has managed not only to reconstruct its economy, but to build a large number of new plants and to buy hundreds, perhaps even a thousand foreign licences. This has helped it to overcome its inherited backwardness and with its present per capita income of roughly \$ 600 it is now approaching the medium developed countries.

However, under conditions of accelerated technological development in the world, based in the first place on highly developed research activities which require highly qualified and expensive personnel, the Yugoslav economy would find it difficult to make further progress without establishing closer ties with corresponding foreign partners who would be more than just creditors or licensors. They would have to be partners who would share responsibility for the application of modern technology, the organisation of work and would share in the profits.

2. *What Attracts Foreign Capital to Yugoslavia?*

If we take foreign capital investment in the classical sense, i.e., investment with a view to obtaining a net profit on invested capital, Yugoslavia does not have to offer its foreign partner what the countries of the West have, for reasons of social order, the size of the market, technological development, etc.

Yugoslavia has adopted the principle that the market should be the decisive factor in its economic system. In view of this country's economic development and its purchasing power at this stage, when the industrially advanced countries are competing to expand the market for their products, the Yugoslav market has a definite place particularly in economic developments in Europe.

In our view foreign businessmen are interested in investing their capital in this country primarily for the following reasons:

1) To expand their influence over the Yugoslav market by marketing their products or parts, by licence sales or by organizing industrial cooperation and supplying the engineering, know-how, technical assis-

tance, etc. The struggle for marketing and an expansion of the market is particularly keen on markets where the population's purchasing power grows rapidly. According to its purchasing power, the Yugoslav market has an important place in Europe as evidenced by the following figures on imports in 1970:

— passenger cars roughly	170.000
— refrigerators roughly	450.000
— television sets roughly	320.000
— washing machines roughly	240.000

2) The shortage of labour in the industrially advanced countries of Europe makes it more profitable to invest a certain amount of resources in the expansion of capacities in Yugoslavia or the construction of new ones which would on the one hand, supply the mother factory abroad with parts, sub-sets, sets and generators and on the other, by an up-to-date system of organization of cooperation, based on a division of the production programme, ensure customers for parts, sub-sets, sets and generators or finished products. In this way the foreign partner is resolving at one blow the problem of shortage of labour force and a whole series of problems arising in connection with imported labour, such as material, social, housing and even political problems.

In the case at hand, the achievements of the Yugoslav industry and the quality of Yugoslav qualified and un-skilled labour are of utmost significance for the foreign partner.

3) In a period of boom on the market of an advanced country, businessmen naturally invest in the development of production capacities to meet demand on their own market. These investments are usually considerable in scope and the goods produced are intended for the local market. However as periods of boom are usually followed by periods of recession, economic organizations that invested excessively in new capacities relying exclusively on a particular market, find themselves in great difficulties for the firing of personnel, even if they are foreign nationals, presents numerous difficulties that are not easily overcome.

Investments in the organizations of other countries, particularly as part of the funds are supplied by the local organization, and the absorptive power of the local market is integrated with the absorptive power of the market of the investor, offer much more favourable possibilities both in periods of economic expansion in the country exporting capital, as well as in possible periods of recession. There is a growing number of foreign firms that are realizing the advantages of such joint ventures and are making offers in that sense.

In the case of Europe there is an obvious tendency among the highly and medium advanced countries of the old continent to integrate their markets and production capacities and to divide their production programmes. One of the main reasons for their interest in joint

ventures is their desire to enhance their economic power as defense from other more powerful economies (in the first place the American economy) and to ensure more favourable conditions for marketing their goods on third markets where competition is becoming extremely keen.

Naturally, for Yugoslavia, a country that was among the first to proclaim the policy of peaceful coexistence among states with different social and economic systems, economic integration is a natural follow-up and logical complement to that policy.

3. What are the Facilities Offered to the Foreign Investor by Yugoslav Law?

The first Yugoslav regulations on foreign capital investment in Yugoslav enterprises for joint ventures were published in the Yugoslav Official Gazette of July 19th, 1967.

The main feature of these regulations is that foreign capital investments in Yugoslavia are regulated by written contracts. Particular emphasis is laid on the motive behind the signing of the contract, i.e., an increase of production, productivity and exports, the introduction and application of up-to-date technology techniques and organisation of production and business in Yugoslav enterprises or the advancement of scientific-research work.

The foreign partner invests capital in the Yugoslav enterprise on a lasting basis. The enterprise in which the capital is invested functions in accordance with Yugoslav regulations.

In principle, foreign capital may be invested in any Yugoslav enterprise. However, foreign resources may not be invested in enterprises in the sphere of banking, insurance, domestic transport, trade, public utilities and similar establishments and social services (except for scientific-research purposes).

On the basis of the contract, the foreign partner may invest capital in the Yugoslav enterprise in the form of financial resources or non-financial resources, such as: installations, machinery, patents, licences, etc. In principle, the value of funds invested by the foreign partner in the Yugoslav enterprise may not exceed 49% of the total funds invested by the domestic and foreign partners put together.

The resources invested by the foreign partner into the Yugoslav enterprise are used and decided upon by the Yugoslav enterprises in which the funds were invested. Property and legal relations between the partners are regulated by contract.

Should the foreign partner decide to transfer the rights and obligations envisaged by contract to another legal or physical person or to a different domestic economic organisation, he is obliged to first make a written offer to the economic organisation in which the resources were invested and the latter must pass a decision to accept or reject the offer within a set period.

The contract envisages the rights of the foreign partner investing funds in the Yugoslav enterprise. However, the foreign partner may

not have any other or greater rights than those enjoyed by the domestic economic organisation.

The contract may envisage that the partners should realize their rights, which they determine by mutual agreement, through a joint organ, e.g. the business board whose competencies are also decided by agreement.

The way in which the income will be distributed is also determined by contract. The net income or profit is distributed after the balance sheet has been approved by the workers council of the Yugoslav enterprise at the end of the year.

The foreign partner may transfer the resources he earns through the joint venture in accordance with the foreign currency regulations. The foreign partner is obliged to pay tax, in accordance with the law, on the basis of his share in the income of the joint venture. However, this tax is calculated by and payable to the Yugoslav partner.

A contract on foreign capital investment in a Yugoslav enterprise is valid if it is registered by the Federal Secretariat for Economy. By registration with the authorized organ the validity and legality of the contract is confirmed.

In the last three years a large number of theoretical papers have been written on foreign capital investment in the Yugoslav economy in Serbo-Croatian and in several foreign languages. We would like to recommend a detailed study by dr. Miodrag Sukijasović entitled »Foreign Investment in Yugoslavia« published by the Belgrade Institute for International Politics and Economics in collaboration with Oceana Publications of New York, at the end of 1970.

4. *A Review of Foreign Capital Investment in the Yugoslav Economy up to December 31, 1970.*

Up to the end of 1970, 31 Contracts of foreign capital investment in Yugoslav economic organisations were registered with the Federal Secretariat for Economy. Two of those contracts were subsequently deleted so that we shall review here only 29 contracts which are in the process of implementation.

According to region, the largest number of contracts on the participation of foreign capital have been signed with companies in the West European countries, i.e.:

— Italy	9
— Federal German Republic	6
— France	3
— Switzerland	2
— Great Britain, Belgium, Sweden, Austria and Denmark	1 each.

Among the socialist countries of Eastern Europe one contract has been signed each with Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic. Also one contract has been signed each with firms in the United States and Japan.

It is interesting to note that the Yugoslav enterprises in which foreign capital has been invested are exclusively industrial enterprises. The division by branches is as follows:

— metal industry	7
— chemical industry	5
— electrical industry	3
— textile industry	3
— non-metallic minerals	2
— tobacco industry	2
— ferrous metallurgy	1
— timber industry	1
— paper industry	1
— leather industry	1
— printing industry	1

Of the total amount of invested foreign resources amounting to \$ 71,022,270 the metal processing industry accounts for \$ 47,777,400 or 67%. Within this grouping the motor industry comes first with \$ 34,280,000. which is the equivalent to almost half the total invested foreign capital. The »Crvena Zastava« motor industry of Kragujevac alone, accounts for \$ 25,000,000 which is more than 35% of all the foreign capital included in the resources of Yugoslav enterprises put together.

The share of foreign capital in other economic branches is relatively small. Substantial resources have been invested in the leather processing factory »Konus« of Slovenske Konjice and the non-metallic minerals factory »Kamen« of Pazin.

In view of the fact that the regulations on foreign capital investment in the Yugoslav economy were passed just over three years ago, we are still not in a position to review the results achieved in respect to productivity and profitability of joint ventures.

5. *Participation of Foreign Capital in the Yugoslav Motor Industry* — e.g. »Crvena Zastava« of Kragujevac

When the »Crvena Zastava« factory of Kragujevac, decided to expand its capacities, as the only producer of passenger cars in the country it looked for financial resources both domestically and abroad. The automobile factory was built in 1962 with an annual capacity of 32.000 cars which two years later rose to 50.000. Since the needs of the market were still far greater, the factory planned its further development in two stages — the first to reach an output of 80.000 vehicles and the second close to 200.000.

The first stage was completed at the end of 1969 and the necessary funds were partly supplied by the factory and partly raised through the sale of bonds in the country carried out by the factory in cooperation with the Yugoslav Investment Bank. A third source of funds was

Fiat of Turin which supplied foreign currency for the purchase of equipment and tools.

The bonds were purchased partly by enterprises supplying »Crvena Zastava« with raw materials, semi-finished products, parts, sub-sets and generators, which were interested in the further development of the motor industry, and partly by business banks.

At that stage, i.e., february 1968 — a contract was signed on the participation of capital by the factory's foreign partner FIAT of Turin.

Production in the expanded plants began late in 1969 and the results achieved in 1970 reveal that production of passenger cars increased by 21%. Productivity and profitability have also been increased so that the planned profit is expected to be 70% higher than previously.

The second stage of development was financed partly by the factory itself and partly from other sources:

- the participation of interested Yugoslav banks and other economic organisations, and

- the participation of interested foreign partners, i.e., FIAT and the International Finance Corporation (IFC).

The resources supplied by the domestic economy amounted to 200 million dinars (\$ 16,000,000) and those supplied by foreign partners, including the financing of the first stage of development, amounted to roughly \$ 25,000,000. The contract with FIAT was signed in May 1969 and with IFC in March 1970.

The second stage of development is now under way in »Crvena Zastava«. The production of a new model of passenger car is expected to begin at the end of 1971 but full capacity production will not be achieved before 1972.

The basic contract on capital investment with FIAT was signed after the decision was made to expand production capacities through the first stage of development, and after the decision to proceed to the second stage, an addendum to the basic contract was drafted.

We should like to acquaint you in brief with the main provisions of the »Contract on technical-production cooperation and financial participation of FIAT in »Crvena Zastava«.

As stated in the heading, the contract envisages not only the financial participation of FIAT but also technical-production cooperation between FIAT and Crvena Zastava. This is only natural since Crvena Zastava has been a FIAT licensee since 1954 and since it built its initial production capacities up to 50.000 vehicles with a loan obtained from the Italian state through FIAT.

The goals of the contract are:

- development of »Crvena Zastava's« production capacities,
- introduction of up-to-date principles of organization in Crvena Zastava in respect to production, technology, planning, and high quality products and more profitable business methods,

- a greater assortment of the production programme and,

- product development.

In order to meet these goals the foreign partner extends to Crvena Zastava full technical assistance, engineering and know-how to help

the domestic partner achieve a higher and more economical production and to train personnel for product construction and development which is of particular significance for us.

The resources invested by FIAT in the first stage of development completely covered the cost of the purchase of equipment from the West, and those invested in the second stage covered those costs to a considerable extent.

A depreciation rate was set by agreement at a level corresponding to the normal depreciation rate in the automobile industry in Europe and it was agreed that upon the depreciation of equipment FIAT would recognize financial participation to the value invested in the venture. In the same way, should the contract be prolonged after expiring, FIAT would be considered to have participated in funds instead of in equipment.

FIAT's participation in the results of „Crvena Zastava“ is determined every year on the basis of the balance sheet and according to each partner's share in the factory's resources. This ratio serves as the basis for a division of profits.

It has been agreed that the results which will be considered as a basis for division of profits between „Crvena Zastava“ and FIAT should be:

— gross results according to economic accounts minus:

- a) contribution to Crvena Zastava's reserve fund at rates provided for by Yugoslav law (FIAT also participates in changes of the Fund),
- b) personal incomes by decision of Crvena Zastava's management organs, taxes and other contributions on personal incomes,
- c) contributions to joint reserve funds as stipulated by law,
- d) other present and future contributions required by Yugoslav law.

The contract also envisages compensation for technical aid, know-how and services.

FIAT agrees to extend technical aid not only in the sphere of production but for all services including market research, sales and exports.

In order to establish a balance of payments, deliveries are envisaged by „Crvena Zastava“ for FIAT based on the principles of industrial cooperation.

A joint organ known as the Business Board is composed of three representatives of each partner one of whom is appointed head of his group.

The Business Board is obliged to implement the contract on technical-production and financial cooperation, i.e. to realize all the techno-economic parameters of the contract, its addenda and technological investment projects.

The Business Board is not authorized to decide about matters falling within the sphere of competence of the organs of management in the enterprise in accordance with the Law on Self-management.

Since the contract was previously approved by the organs of management and not only by the central management organ but by management organs in work units of Crvena Zastava, the Business Board can actually be said to be the executor of the decisions passed by Crvena Zastava's management organs.

The decisions of the Business Board are made unanimously. The Board meets in Belgrade, and if the need arises, in Turin. The host prepares the papers for the meeting and acts as chairman.

In the case of a dispute which the Business Board fails to resolve, the general managers are called in to make the decision.

The contract has been signed for a period of ten years. If it is not prolonged after that period, it has been agreed that the original investment should be turned into a credit to be repayed in a fixed number of years after that, with a minimum interest rate.

In the event of serious violations of the contract and an impasse in resolving difficulties, FIAT's participation becomes a credit relationship and the credit becomes repayable 12 months after the contract has been broken off, in equal annual rates with a minimum interest rate.

The transfer of profit and taxation of the same is carried out in accordance with positive laws on foreign capital investment in this country. In the case of amendments and addenda to those regulations, the stipulated contract is subject to them if the novelties present an advantage from the point of view of the foreign partner.

This brief appraisal makes it clear that this is not a case of classical capital investment which would anyway be in contradiction with the Yugoslav social and economic system. It is also clear that the foreign partner's interest in investing capital in »Crvena Zastava« is connected with his desire to increase its influence on the Yugoslav market and by expanding capacities, extending technical aid, producing a richer assortment, to in fact create conditions for organizing industrial cooperation by sets and, through a supplementary programme, a certain assortment of vehicles.

From the point of view of „Crvena Zastava“, this contract is of significance not only because it ensures a sources of financial funds, but also because through industrial cooperation it leads to integration with the foreign partner ensuring through continuous techno-economic cooperation the advancement of its own organisation of production and business and developing abilities in Crvena Zastava itself for work on product development.

Talks were conducted in 1968 and 1969 with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in Washington and with the International Finance Corporation on the possibilities for these organisations' participation in „Crvena Zastava's“ resources for financing the second stage of development.

We must point out that contract on FIAT's capital investment in »Crvena Zastava« and the contract on production-technical cooperation between »Crvena Zastava« and FIAT had a favourable influence on both INRD and IFC.

IFC's participation in „Crvena Zastava's“ capital is in the form of foreign currency for the purchase of equipment. However the Corporation would not agree to a Business Board being formed feeling that the Board that exists for „Crvena Zastava“ and FIAT was sufficient since it was a case of automobile production for which FIAT is fully competent. Therefore, IFC felt that FIAT's participation and commitment in the „Crvena Zastava“—Fiat Business Board was quite an adequate guarantee for the protection of IFC's interests.

Of course „Crvena Zastava“ is obliged to send, through the Yugoslav Investment Bank, regular reports and annual balance sheets so that IFC should be able to follow the activities and financial situation in »Crvena Zastava«.

The basis for IFC's economic calculations was the project on the second stage of technological development of „Crvena Zastava's“ capacities drafted by FIAT expert together with experts of „Crvena Zastava“ and the Investment Project elaborated by »Crvena Zastava« in accordance with Yugoslav regulations.

The contract on the participation of IFC's capital is purely a financial contract and IFC retains the right to require a conversion of the contract should the contract between »Crvena Zastava« and FIAT be terminated, i.e., on December 31st 1984. In that case the credit would be repayed in a certain number of equal rates depending upon the number of years agreed upon.

In the future, that is in the so-called third stage due to begin in 1975, »Crvena Zastava« plans to carry out a considerable expansion of its production capacities.

The funds for this will be made available by „Crvena Zastava“ itself and by interested economic organisations in the country and abroad. A much broader integration of the domestic and foreign markets is expected to be achieved through industrial cooperation and a further division of the production programme with a view to producing in larger series and implementing the latest technology and economic principles in production.

From all that has been said above, in our view it is realistic to expect foreign capital investment in the Yugoslav economy to continue to grow primarily in the form of industrial cooperation, division of programmes and specialisation and in order to ensure the investors' influence over domestic producers. On the other hand, purely financial investments will only serve as an additional aspect of cooperation by means of which the Yugoslav partner will be equipped for speedier action on the market in the common interest of both partners.

**CONTRACTS ON FOREIGN CAPITAL INVESTMENT IN YUGOSLAV
ECONOMIC ORGANISATIONS REGISTERED UP TO 31st
DECEMBER 1970**

No	PARTNERS	Economic branch	Sum invested	Date
1	Crvena Zastava, Kragujevac and FIAT, Turin, Italy	metal motor industry	\$ 5,000,000	23.2.1968
2	Belgrade Printing Institute, Belgrade and Printing Developments International, London, Great Britain	printing industry	\$ 159,250	17.5.1968
3	Cinkarna, Celje and Vereinigung Volks — eigener Betriebe Lacke und Farben, Berlin, East Germany	chemical industry	\$ 11,064,000	24.4.1968
4	Lead and Aluminium Products Factory, Zagreb—Kerestinec and Tubettificio Ligure, Abbadia, Lariana, Italy	metal industry	\$ 152,400	11.9.1968
5	Collector Factory, Idrija and Kaut & Bux OHG, Stuttgart, West Germany	electrical industry	\$ 430,000	28.8.1968

6	»Kamen« — Pazin and »Ilma«, Aquiterme, Italy	non-metallic minerals industry	\$ 1,329,051	10.3.1969
7	Crvena Zastava, Kragujevac and FIAT, Torino, Italy	metal motor industry	\$12,000,000	22.5.1969
8	Elektrosrbija, Belgrade and Financiere des applications d'électricité, Bruxelles, Belgium	electrical industry	117,600	18.4.1969
9	»Konus«, Slovenske Konjice, and Masny Prumysl, Prague Czechoslovakia	leather industry	\$ 4,768,000	5.5.1969
10	Chromos-Katran-Kutrilin, Zagreb and »Major«, Torino, Italy,	chemical industry	\$ 84,450	23.5.1969
11	Progres invest, Belgrade and Produits chimiques, Pechiney, Saint Gobain, France	chemical industry	\$ 88,200	14.3.1969
12	Energoinvest, Sarajevo and Bosanski Brod Refinery and Compagnie française d'étude et de construction, Ruel Malmaison, France	oil industry	\$ 66,841	20.3.1969

13	UNIS, Sarajevo and Aktiebolaget Svenska Kuglagerfabriken, »AB SKF« — Geteborg Sweden	metal industry	\$13,296,000	14.5.1969
14	VEGA, Ljubljana, and Maruman, Tokyo, Japan	metal industry	\$ 49,000	15.2.1969
15	Elektrosrbija, Belgrade and Messwandler-Bau Bamberg, West Germany	electrical industry	\$ 90,000	24.6.1969
16	»Vesna« Sjenice and Halstenbäch, Bergenland, Austria	textile industry	\$ 300,546.4	26.9.1969
17	Crvena Zastava, Kragujevac and International Finance Corporation, Washington, USA	metal motor	\$ 8,000,000	12.2.1970
18	»Kamen« — Pazin and General Cave, Calle Umberto, Italy	non-metallic minerals industry	\$ 128,240	5.2.1970
19	Generalexport, Beograd and AGIP, Roma, Italy	oil industry	\$ 640,000	18.12.1970

20	»Sloga« — Zrenjanin, and LIPIG, Vaduz, Switzerland	textile industry	\$ 130,044.5	24.3.1970
21	»Natron«, Maglaj. Generalexport, Belgrade and Centroprodukt, Milano, Italy	paper industry	\$ 366,000	29.7.1970
22	FAP FAMOS, Belgrade and Daimler Benz A.G. Stuttgart, West Germany	metal motor industry	\$ 9,280,000	15.7.1970
23	»Meblo« Nova Gorica and Harvey Guzzini, Recanati, Italy	timber industry	\$ 51,392	4.5.1970
24	Chromos-Katran-Kutrilin, Zagreb and Hennemel's Marine Paints, Copenhagen, Denmark	chemical industry	\$ 224,000	9.9.1970
25	JUGOTUTUN, Skoplje and Baumgartner Papiers, Lausanne, Switzerland	tobacco industry	\$ 392,000	29.5.1970
26	»Regeneracija« Zabok and Helsa-Werke, Gefrees, West Germany	textile industry	\$ 18,400	15.5.1970

27	»OHIS« — Skoplje and Produits Chimiques Pechiney, Neuilly-sur-Seine, France	chemical industry	\$ 2,250,000	16.9.1970
28	OLT, Osijek and Wendell, Emailfabrik, Dillenburg, West Germany	ferrous metallurgy	\$ 496,000	14.11.1970
29	Tobacco Factory, Ljubljana and »Reemtsma«, Cigaretten- fabriken, Hamburg, West Germany	tobacco industry	\$150,788.16	16.6.1970 and 28.12.1970
	T O T A L:		\$71,022,270.06	

ING. PRVOSLAV RAKOVIC

Born on August 11, 1914 in Niš.

He graduated machinery at the Belgrade Technical Faculty.

First employed on May 23, 1939 at the Locomotive Repair Shop of the Yugoslav National Railways in Belgrade.

After the war he worked for the Railways in Belgrade and in Novi Sad and then in the Ministry of Transport.

As of April 1, 1955 he has been the General Director of the »Crvena Zastava« Institute in Belgrade.

Mr. Raković is a deputy in the Economic Council of the Federal Assembly, a member of the Executive Board of the Yugoslav Bank for Foreign Trade, President and member of the Mixed Italian—Yugoslav Society for Economic and Technical Cooperation (SACET) in Milan, member of the Yugoslav—Italian Committee for Economic, Industrial and Technical Cooperation, President of participating groups with an interest in the production of »Zastava« vehicles, and President of the Council of the Federal Chamber of Commerce for Economic Relations with Foreign Countries.

Le Centre universitaire international des sciences sociales de l'Université de Beograd a édité en 1969 le premier recueil des conférences tenues aux séminaires du Centre au cours des dix premières sessions. Cependant, dans ce recueil, qui par mégarde n'est pas marqué comme premier, ne figurent pas toutes les conférences des dix premières sessions: on a fait une sélection, en donnant la préférence aux conférences de la X-ème session.

Ce volume renferme d'abord, en guise d'introduction, les trois articles suivants:

Prof. Borislav T. Blagojević: *Au nom de l'éditeur*

Prof. Vladimir Jovanović: *Dix ans d'activité du Centre universitaire international des sciences sociales de l'Université de Beograd.*

Prof. Savka Gligorić: *In memoriam — professeur Dragoslav Todrović, un des fondateurs et premier directeur du Centre.*

Les conférences de ce recueil sont réparties selon les thèmes traités et sont imprimées dans la même langue dans laquelle elles avaient été prononcées lors des sessions, en français ou en anglais:

THEMES GENERAUX

Dr Jovan Đorđević: *Le système politique et constitutionnel de la Yougoslavie*

Dr Branko Pribičević: *Yugoslavia and the Contemporary Workers and Socialist Movements*

Dr Radovan Samardžić: *L'évolution des cultures nationales des peuples yougoslaves.*

Dr Vladimir Šolaja: *Science and progress*

THEMES ECONOMICO-JURIDIQUES

Dr Ljubiša Adamović: *Yugoslavia and International Division of Labour*

Dr Borislav T. Blagojević: *Some Characteristic Private Law Institutions in the Socialist Countries*

Dr Živomir Đorđević: *Les formes de propriété en Yougoslavie*

Dr Andrija Gams: *Aspects juridiques de la propriété sociale*

Dr Vladimir Jovanović: *Le statut juridique des entreprises économiques yougoslaves et leurs rapports avec l'Etat*

Dr Miladin Korać: *Differences in the Amount of Personal Incomes between Economic Branches*

Dr Ivan Maksimović: *Yugoslav Economic Reform and Certain Problems in the Policy of Reform*

Dr Branislav Šoškić: *A Yugoslav View on the Main Trends and Schools of Economic Thinking*

THEMES PHILOSOPHICO-SOCIOLOGIQUES

Dr Veljko Korać: *Personality and Community under Socialism*

Dr Radomir Lukić: *La stratification sociale dans le socialisme d'autogestion*

Dr Dušan Nedeljković: *La conception moderne du monde et l'humanisme de la liberté d'autogestion*

Dr Vuko Pavićević: *Sur quelques problèmes de la morale socialiste*

Dr Branko Pavlović: *Les fondements philosophiques de l'autogestion*

Dr Miroslav Pečujlić: *Socialism and Class Changes*

Dr Mihailo V. Popović: *Influence, Power and Authority in Socialism*

Dr Svetozar Stojanović: *From Primitive towards Developed Communism*

Dans l'annexe du présent volume est donnée la liste des membres du Conseil du Centre du temps de la publication du premier recueil.

A la différence du présent recueil, le premier ne contenait pas une liste complète des auditeurs, car il ne s'agissait pas d'une seule session, mais d'une sélection des conférences tenues au cours des dix sessions précédentes du Centre.

Le premier recueil a été envoyé aux rectorats des universités en Yougoslavie et à l'étranger, ainsi qu'aux instituts des sciences sociales et à d'autres institutions. Les intéressés peuvent commander ce livre en s'adressant directement au Secrétariat du Centre.

Après le recueil ci-dit le Centre publie chaque année le recueil des conférences de ses sessions. Ces recueils sont numérotés par des chiffres 2, 3, etc. et sont distribués de la même manière.

Dragiša Stijović

Le Secrétaire du Centre

**CONSEIL DU CENTRE UNIVERSITAIRE INTERNATIONAL
DES SCIENCES SOCIALES**

MEMBRES DU CONSEIL:

1. Predrag ALEKSIC
Professeur à la Faculté des Sciences économiques
2. Toma BUNUSEVAC
Vice-recteur de l'Université de Beograd, professeur à la Faculté de
Sylviculture
3. Vida ČOK
Collaboratrice scientifique supérieure à l'Institut de droit comparé
4. Radomir DJUROVIC
Professeur à la Faculté de Droit
5. Dragiša IVANOVIC
Recteur de l'Université de Beograd, professeur à la Faculté
d'Electrotechnique
6. Dejan MEDAKOVIC
Professeur à la Faculté de Philosophie
7. Pavle NIKOLIC
Professeur à la Faculté de Droit
8. Aleksandar PERIC
Professeur à la Faculté des Sciences économiques
9. Mihaiko POPOVIC
Professeur à la Faculté de Philosophie
10. Branko PRIBICEVIC
Professeur à la Faculté des Sciences politiques
11. Dimitrije PRODANOVIC
Collaborateur scientifique à l'Institut des Sciences sociales

12. Nikola ROT
Doyen de la Faculté de Philosophie, professeur à la Faculté de Philosophie
13. Dragiša STIJOVIĆ
Directeur du Département de la coopération internationale de l'Université de Beograd
14. Milan SAHOVIĆ
Chef du Département du droit international à l'Institut de politique et d'économie internationales
15. Branislav SOŠKIĆ
Ancien doyen de la Faculté des Sciences économiques, professeur à la Faculté des Sciences économiques
16. Novica VOJINOVIĆ
Collaborateur scientifique à l'Institut du mouvement ouvrier international

PRESIDENT DU CONSEIL:

Branislav SOŠKIĆ

Ancien doyen de la Faculté des Sciences économiques, professeur à la Faculté des Sciences économiques

DIRECTEUR DU CENTRE:

Pavle NIKOLIĆ

Professeur à la Faculté de Droit

SECRETAIRE DU CENTRE:

Dragiša STIJOVIĆ

Directeur du Département de la coopération internationale de l'Université de Beograd.

LISTE DE PARTICIPANTS

ALEMAGNE (REP. DEM.)

Dr Morgenstern Karl, professor
Dr Dörrer Horst, professor
Tatsch Vroni, Oberassistent

ALEMAGNE (REP. FED.)

Reinhard Koglin, professor
Schlick Klaus, étudiant
Jeutter Peter, student

ARGENTINE

Gomez Jose Maria, étudiant
Mozzicafreddo Juan Pedro, licencié des sciences politiques
Quintana Gomez Graciela, étudiante

CANADA

Phillips Donald Rhys, graduate student

CHILI

Precht Jorge, professeur
Renan Jorge Chuaqui Kettlun, sociologist
Irena Chuaqui, lektor

BELGIQUE

Alfred Wauters, juge d'instruction

ESPAGNE

Lluis Y Navas Jaime, professeur
Rebul Farre Cristina, étudiante
Guerra Paricio Consvelo, institutrice

ETATS UNIS D'AMERIQUE

Robert F. Miller, associate professor
Milan Reban, assistant professor
Lippincott Jonathan Ramsay, student

FRANCE

Gjidara Marc, professeur agrégatif

Gilles Motel, étudiant

Dr Jean Paul Buffelan, directeur d'Institut de recherche
d'informatique juridique

Jallet — Auguste Anita, assistante

Saint-Pierre Josiane, étudiante

GRECE

Joannidou Georgia, collaboratrice scientifique

HONGRIE

Dr Bauer Ilona, adiunkt

Dr Szamarasz Janisz Oresztesz, docent

Antal Kalminne, research worker

Havas Peterne, research worker

IRAK

Hanna Michael Gauguey, professeur

ITALIE

Gennaro Ferrentino, enseignant

Anna Maria Rao

Ciarlo Pietro, étudiant

Liliana Bellanca, laurea in filosofia

PAYS—BAS

Van Dijk Adrianus A.

Dr Rigo de Nolf, professeur assistant

PEROU

Ortiz Raoul, docteur sc. économiques

POLOGNE

Ewa Rajkięwicz, student

Ursula Cynalewska, assistant

Dr Maria Banasiewicz, adiunkt

Witold Szulc, adiunkt

R. A. U.

Ahmed El Sharkawi, student,
Mechaal Mustapha Abdel Sayed, assistant
Dr Hassan Sabri, professor

ROUMANIE

Florin Bucur Vasilescu, juriste
Popesco Sorin, juriste

ROYAUME—UNI

Richard Moss, student

The first part of the book
 deals with the general theory
 of the subject. It is
 divided into two parts.
 The first part is
 devoted to the study
 of the general theory
 of the subject. The
 second part is
 devoted to the study
 of the special theory
 of the subject.

SOMMAIRE — CONTENTS

<i>Dr Branislav Šoškić et Dr. Pavle Nikolić:</i> INTRODUCTION . . .	III
CONFERENCES	
<i>Dr Jovan Djordjević:</i> LES CHANGEMENTS DANS LA STRUCTURE DU FEDERALISME ET LA QUESTION NATIONALE EN YUGOSLAVIE	3
<i>Dr Najdan Pašić:</i> THE PRESENT JUNCTURE OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF SELF-MANAGEMENT IN YUGOSLAVIA . . .	37
<i>Dr Dušan Čobeljić:</i> LE SYSTEME ECONOMIQUE ET LA PLANIFICATION EN YUGOSLAVIE DANS L'ETAPE ACTUELLE DU DEVELOPPEMENT	45
<i>Dr Aleksandar Fira:</i> RELATIONS BETWEEN NATIONALITIES IN THE YUGOSLAV SOCIO-POLITICAL SYSTEM	57
<i>Dr Stevan Kukoleča:</i> ECONOMIC POSITION OF YUGOSLAV ENTERPRISE AND ITS FUNCTION IN YUGOSLAV ECONOMY	67
<i>Dr Borislav Blagojević:</i> LA SOCIETE SOCIALISTE AUTOGEREE ET SON DROIT ADEQUAT	83
<i>Dr B. Šoškić:</i> ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW SOCIO-ECONOMIC RELATIONS IN EDUCATION AND SCIENCE IN YUGOSLAVIA	97
<i>Dr Branko Pribičević:</i> POLITICAL ORGANIZATION IN YUGOSLAVIA	117
<i>Dr Branko Horvat:</i> CURRENT PROBLEMS OF YUGOSLAV ECONOMIC SYSTEM: SELF-GOVERNMENT, MARKET AND SOCIALISM	139
<i>Dr Mihailo Popović:</i> SOCIAL DISPROPORTIONS AND CONTRADICTIONS IN YUGOSLAV SOCIETY AND THE SOCIAL POSITION OF THE INDIVIDUAL	145

Dr <i>Žarko Mrkušić</i> : LES RELATIONS ECONOMIQUES DE LA YUGOSLAVIE AVEC L'ETRANGER	157
Dr <i>Ljubivoje Aćimović</i> : YUGOSLAVIA'S NONALIGNMENT POLI- CY AND PROBLEMS OF EUROPEAN SECURITY AND COOPERATION	165
Ing. <i>Prvoslav Raković</i> : FOREIGN CAPITAL INVESTMENT IN YU- GOSLAVIA	179
<i>Dragiša Stijović</i> : REPLIQUE	195
CONSEIL DU CENTRE UNIVERSITAIRE INTERNATIONAL DES SCIENCES SOCIALES	197
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS	199



Naslov na srpskohrvatskom jeziku
SOCIJALIZAM U JUGOSLOVENSKOJ TEORIJI I PRAKSI

Za izdavača: DRAGISA STIJOVIĆ
Korektura: Nadežda Verešan-Krstić

**IZDANJE UNIVERZITETA U BEOGRADU
MEĐUNARODNI UNIVERZITETSKI CENTAR ZA DRUŠTVENE NAUKE
Beograd, Studentski trg 1**

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY
540 EAST 57TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

EMAR - EASDALE
EMEK ARASTIRMALARI
VAKFI KITAPLIĞI
2 0 1 5

