Is self-management, as an all-embracing socio-political system within the relations of socialism, the pathway to new levels, new qualities and dimensions of democracy; to more human life-styles and to the resolution of the main contradictions leading to the alienation of man, or, at least, a reverse process of disalienation and satisfaction within the work-processes of modern society? Does the quarter-century of experience with self-management socialism in Yugoslavia provide us with most of our answers to these questions?

These are the issues raised and sometimes answered in the book _Self-Management - New Dimensions in Democracy_. The questions raised relate to the new Peru co-operative society experiments, to the experiences within some narrower frameworks of industrial democracy in five factories in Norway, in an examination and quite detailed analysis of the kibbutzim and moshavim systems in Israel and then the co-operative village systems - both for Jews and Palestinians - and those of the town and city workers of Israel, which were supposed to have transcended the bourgeois relations of production which the British firmly established and the Arabs and Jews reinforce.

The main body of material - history, description, theory, analysis, conclusions and projections on the future - relates, of course, to Yugoslavia's 25 years of development of self-management within a socialist society, developed within theoretical frameworks that say: These are the essentials of the direct democracy of socialism; the essentials that Marx, Lenin and Gramsci defined; these are the essentials that provide for not vanguards, not agents, elites or modern bureaucracies, but for the whole working class and the mass of producers to transform and transcend the relations of bourgeois society and, in the process, transform themselves so that new, democratic, self-management relations seep through every pore of the body of that society.

The eight main contributors, except inferentially in the paper by Edward Kardelj (Yugoslav vice-premier), do not move into the very complex question of international relations and the praxis of the Non-Aligned nations. These are viewed by Yugoslavs as corresponding internal-external processes; one transcending the bourgeois mode of production at home, the other transcending colonialism, imperialism, the unequal exchange and the virtual "freeze" of international relations, the nuclearisation of power situations and the continuance of present levels of armaments and the threats of war.

The book is the result of a round-table conference held in the Centre for the Study of Democratic Institutions in UCLA, Santa Barbara, California, 1971.

Since 1971, world events have raced on and given a supersedeance for other developments over those of co-operatives, worker participation and self-management in Peru, Norway, Algeria or Israel. North and South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos joined their statements on becoming part of the Non-Aligned nations with those that defined their socialist stances as for - Self-Management Socialism, which is, of course, the corresponding set of international relations to self-management within a nation. The Cuban Government, Party and leading "Fidelistas" lead the Cuban masses towards unique developments in self-management structures, first in the Matanzas Province in 1973/74 and then into plans for the similar power devolutions to organs of people's power in all the provinces of Cuba. From the very beginning of the April 1974 events in Lisbon, the development of people's power proceeded with the taking over of enterprises, land and service offices - banks, post offices, municipality offices, etc. - within structures that had to develop self-management principles. The MFA Code on self-management of industry, commerce and the agricultural establishments was an advanced concept of self-management method within a revolutionary process of change. Developing economies within the Non-Aligned nations appear to be turning increasingly to structures of self-management rather than centralised, state, bureaucratic controls and systems. It is a common experience, now, for reports of management and industrial relations conferences to deal, if one-sidedly, with questions of self-management. Some of the dilemmas facing the Dunstan government in South Australia centre on the programs decided upon by the ALP Conferences in 1974/75, the workers' and unions' demands, and the monopoly-capital pressures around Premier Dunstan not to give way to those demands. The present visit to Yugoslavia by Premier Dunstan reflects the increasing awareness of South Australians to these dilemmas. Again and again, the issues deeply imbedded in the ALP Conference - Dunstan government dilemmas came through the conflicts over content, method and the allocation of resources among theatre, music and dance groups in The Adelaide Festival of the Arts.

The same dilemma faced Premier Neville Wran immediately before the Labor Party's victory in the NSW elections. In one television interview, he appeared to say that the 35-hour week and worker-participation program from the 1974 Conference of the ALP had been traded away for .... something; a something not specified. These are the same dilemmas, again, which will face the next Labor government in Western Australia as a result of the very large program of workers' control studies soon to open in that State's union education system.

One of the conclusions of almost every participant in the Santa Barbara round-table conference was: We and every member of every other society - socialist, capitalist, under-developed - must progress to self-management structures and methods or regress to increased domination by technology, monopoly capital or state capital. Australian Marxists, academics and many union
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officials have reached a stage of moribundity in their theory and practice on economic and social relations where, like Dave Allen's hump-backed corpse at the wake, they are dead but can't be laid down! They recognise and combat so few of these problems and nothing of the most serious ones.

The editors of the book of the round-table conference - Professor Ichak Adizes and Elizabeth Mann Borgese - show a profound grasp of Yugoslavia's self-management socialist theory and practice. Adizes is an Assistant Professor of Management Studies and has lectured in Yugoslavia, Israel, Peru, Chile, Mexico and Sweden, whereas Borgese is a daughter of Thomas Mann and author of books on women's questions and of the changing situations and systems of what are termed "The Ocean Regimes".

The seven main contributions are first-class, but the one on industrial democracy in Norway has the same shortcomings that were to be seen in the inconsequential nibbles at similar issues by the Department of Labor bureaucrats under Labor Minister Clyde Cameron. The article, unintentionally, focuses a fairly harsh light on the industrial democracy experiments in Sweden and West Germany. The one corporation director included in the "round-table" appears to have thought those developments not worth his attention and moved, in his section of the Dialogue, to the consequences of self-management socialist relations for people within capitalist societies, or within society, full-stop!

The papers of the four Yugoslavs are a real delight. Vice-Premier Edward Kardelj's paper "The Integration of Labor and Social Capital Under Workers' Control" is an excellent introduction for the all-too-many not yet comprehending, that there is a new and important type of capital - social capital - which in self-managed socialism everyone owns and no-one owns, and which begins to throw up recognisably different social structures, as Marx forecast, on the correspondence between base and super-structure, in his brilliant formulations in the Introduction to the Critique of Political Economy. Kardelj's paper opens typically:

"During the first years following the victory of the socialist revolution in Yugoslavia, the concept of social property was held to be identical with that of state property, both from the legal point of view and with regard to the management of social resources. The only way for the revolution to change social relations was to nationalise the means of production, expropriate the capitalist owners, turn private capital into state property, and consolidate the new state property through adequate centralisation. Most countries on the road to socialism, especially economically underdeveloped ones, still go through a longer or shorter phase of state-property relations, and are likely to do so in the future.

"Even during the first years of socialist

construction in Yugoslavia, however, the state character of social property bore the seeds of basic social contradictions. These reflected themselves in the separation of the workers and their labor from the direct management of social capital and resulted in the alienation of "surplus value" which gradually fell under the control of a bureaucracy or technocracy. It became evident, not only in Yugoslavia, but also in other socialist countries, that under the centralisation of social capital, its management and control tended to be exercised in such a way that the workers were excluded from even the ordinary democratic supervision of the use of resources. In Yugoslavia it was soon recognised that this contradiction posed a socio-economic and political problem. The attempt to overcome this problem generated the idea and practice of socialist self-management in Yugoslavia. Thus self-management emerged as a natural reaction to the tendency of identifying social property with bureaucratic and technocratic monopoly exercised by the state and its economic apparatus. In other words, self-management was an attempt to prevent bureaucratic, technocratic and anti-democratic deformations in the development of socialist relations.

"The socio-historical significance of socialist self-management is that it creates forms of production-relations which are based on social property and in which appropriation is based only on labor. The worker appropriates directly on the basis of his work, freed from all forms of wage-labor relations between himself and the owner of capital, i.e. the state which acts as a collective owner of capital. The worker, however, does not do this autarchically, anarchically or as an owner in his own right, but in interdependence with, and fully responsible to, the equal rights of his fellow workers. By this fact alone social property ceases to express a relationship between the workers and the state. It articulates instead the relationship among working people themselves."

Kardelj's analysis of the importance placed by Marx on "surplus labor" or "surplus value" created by "living labor" and the manner of its appropriation by the capitalist owner of the means of production and, inferentially, by the state and bureaucratic owners of state capital in the other socialist systems posed the question on which there has been a lengthy silence: "Are there, under socialism no elements of economic relations and no problems of this kind at all?"

Papers by Anton Vrtusa, Deputy Prime Minister of Yugoslavia, by Dr. Najdan Paadic, of the Faculty of Political Science, Belgrade University and by Joze Pacek, Secretary of the Slovenian Parliament, all pose many questions which move well beyond the extent of a review. Pacek opened his paper with the kind of statement that can't be repeated often enough:

"In June 1950 the first law for industrial self-
management was adopted in Yugoslavia. Accepted under the banner of 'Factories to the Workers' the law ensured the rights of workers in the administration of most industries and business enterprises. By 1956 the self-management system had passed its organisational stage and was firmly established in the economic structure of the country. By 1971 when the Second Congress of Self-Managers was held, self-management had grown to include schools, hospitals, and housing developments. Nearly two-thirds of the total labor-force have been, in the past twenty years, elected to different kinds of self-management organs. This indicates that self-management began to serve as a mechanism for worker involvement in industrial management as well as a system of citizen participation and the foundation of the Yugoslav socio-political system."

Professor Aditze's analysis of the pure market economy, pure, centrally-planned economic systems, the regulated market system, the socialist market system and the ideal self-management market systems is an important contribution to the conference. His analysis of the differences between enterprise (he uses the description "enterprise" rather as we would "corporation") and community organisational types of structures results in a valid and useful table of comparisons. Elizabeth Mann Borgese's introduction on "The Promise of Self-Management" draws on her experiences in property

relations reaching their national limits at the shores and shelves of oceans and in the upper atmosphere and outer space. She poses the issues - With the growth of new nations and the identification of coast lines and air space: who does and who should own the resources under oceans and in the air and, moreover, within nations, who should own the oil and coal-beds reaching under cities and states?

Yugoslav theoretical material available in English is voluminous and, of course, the real treasure-house of post World War II socialist writing by Europeans, but the American contributions do add something to what comes forward regularly in English translations from Yugoslavia's Socialist Alliance of Working People, its League of Communists, Confederation of Yugoslav Trade Unions and the newsagency Tanjug. It adds up to a real rebuke to the English school of Yugoslav experts, who still rely on the very thin pamphlets of Tony Topham, Fred Singleton, Ken Coates and the Fabian Society; pamphlets which were mainly out of date and inadequate, or just plainly wrong, when produced mainly before 1963.

If you can buy the book it will leave you uncomfortably challenged; if you borrow it, you'll probably try, also, not to return it. It's one of those books, which any serious student of socialism should read. It's a book which is likely to turn the sceptic into a serious investigator of what's new and developing.

- J.S. Baker.


Cities for Sale is a well-researched and documented account of the failure of town planning in Australia.

Dr. Sandercock's thoughtful thesis poses questions which take town planning beyond the mere technique of guiding land use, and examines its historical growth under the influence of prevailing social, political and economic forces. She readily identifies the private sector's initiatives for development as the only ones to be considered valid and hence to receive the backing of state services in opposition to the principle of public participation; and the growth ideology versus conservation. Town planning thus becomes an essentially negative part of legitimising the development process.

Pronounced support for reform lacking, the conservative forces, using the usual tricks of land shortage, spurious advertising and speculation, have been able to have plans accepted as a fait accompli. Some juicy examples - Westernport, the Victorian Housing Commission and the Melbourne Underground railway - are classics of their blatant kind. Meantime, it was a device to allow the continuing transfer of the benefits of the wealthy at the expense of the poor.

The more fundamental questions she finds less clear; whether a marxist model provides a comprehensive explanation of the structure of Australian society; whether public involvement (and hence public support) versus more expert guidance would ensure a fairer redistribution of the benefits for human welfare from town planning, or would they still tend to serve middle class or elitist ends; and whether capitalism can be civilised.

The history of town planning is split into two clear parts, 1900-1945, and since World War II. The change which heralds the second is also fundamental. It is the period in which planning has been lifted to a national priority along with economics and resources regions, and considerations of population growth. Adelaide, Melbourne and Sydney are the cities whose developments in town planning are detailed.

In the early part, tribute is paid to the pioneers who saw the need and pressed for town planning reform which sprang from the appalling slums much as did the English town planning movements. Few saw it necessary to examine the social and political reasons for poverty. The early proposals were a pale imported version which used the additional recreational and health facilities of a garden city for background. They had no desire to change the