



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Summaries in English

N.A.

Citation

Summaries in English. (1977). Summaries in English. *Acta Politica*, 12: 1977(1), 158-159. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3451831>

Version: Publisher's Version
License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)
Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3451831>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Summaries

Decentralisation of the policy-formation in Yugoslavia (1970-75)

by R. Boonzajer Flaes

The article deals with the relationship between *decentralisation* and *democratisation* in Yugoslav selfmanaged enterprises. The former is defined as a lowering in the level of decision making, the latter as the effective use that is made of the decision making power.

Decentralisation has been, from the 1950's onwards, the main propulsive force behind the development of selfmanagement in Yugoslavia. This to such an extent that it is still very common among Yugoslav theoreticians to consider decentralisation and democratisation as synonymous.

The period considered in the article is mainly 1965–1966. In 1965 a major economic and social reform took place; the main objective was improvement of the economic efficiency in the Yugoslav economy. As a result the decentralisation process – started in the 1950's and accelerating in the early 1960's – came to an end rather abruptly. Centralisation of economic power became essential to such an extent that further decentralisation in the decision making process became infeasible.

All legislative measures taken from 1965 to 1971 with respect to the organisational changes within enterprises resulted in greater centralisation.

From 1971 onwards several measures were taken in order to ensure a further decentralisation in the decision making process. The main part of these measures is the formation of *Basic Organisations of Associated Labour*: sections of an enterprise that perform a measurable economic function, having a great deal of economic discretion. These Basic Organisations form the main economic subject in Yugoslavia from 1974 onwards. Enterprises are considered primarily cooperations of these independent Basic Organisations. Although the measures taken were primarily conceived as an inducement to further democratisation within enterprises, their impact has so far been negligible in this respect. On the other hand, the measures have entailed a process of external reorganisation of the economy. Thus decentralisation had no important effects on democratisation, although acknowledgeable results were obtained in terms of overall economic efficiency. The reason for this rather curious 'effect displacement' seems to be, that in 1971 the external relationships between enterprises formed a crucial bottleneck in the economic system. Thus a very selective use was made of the new possibilities that were opened by the effect that contributed to the elimination of these bottlenecks. This could prove that decentralisation leads to democratisation only if no great external pressure exists. If pressure does exist, the measures taken in order to ensure further democratisation 'leak away' as contributions to the elimination of bottlenecks in the external system.

Summaries

John Rawls's Theory of Justice (II)

by Percy B. Lehning and R. J. van der Veen

In this second part of a critical review essay on 'A Theory of Justice' by John Rawls three topics are treated: just institutions, the derivation of the maximin-rule and civil disobedience.

First two ambiguities in the theory of just institutions are explored. If the 'fair value of political liberty' is given the weight Rawls claims it should be given, an *egalitarian* interpretation of justice as fairness emerges. In that case the lexical ordering of the two principles of justice is impaired; restrictions in the total system of liberties may be needed to maintain the fair value of political liberty. The difference principle is shown to have two interpretations: the familiar maximin rule and a principle of 'compensating inequalities', which we derive from Rawls's contribution curve analysis. We argue that this is the principle Rawls is in fact using in his theory of just institutions. However, it is the maximin rule that Rawls seeks to derive from the original position.

Secondly this derivation is shown to be deficient, owing to Rawls's unconvincing argument for an 'as-if' risk aversion of rational contractors. The authors demonstrate that given different 'as-if' risk preferences one can arrive at an utilitarian contract, *within* the framework of Rawls's original position.

Finally the relation between justice as fairness and Rawls's account of civil disobedience is analysed. Rawls uses the lexical priority rules to decide when civil disobedience is justified, and excludes infractions of the difference principle. It is argued that this exclusion, while possibly convincing in a strictly egalitarian interpretation of justice as fairness, cannot successfully be defended.