

broj osnovnih odluka (posebno u vezi sa nivoom proizvodnje i obimom radne snage) da bi odredili pravila ponašanja preduzeća. Iz analize u trećem odeljku može se zaključiti da, čak i uz prisustvo kontrole plata, maksimizacija prosečnog dohotka po radniku jeste, po svoj prilici, najosnovnije pravilo ponašanja. U kontekstu Zakona ovo pravilo se transformiše u maksimizaciju »privrednog viška« po radniku. Iz ovoga sledi da kratkoročne odluke o zapošljavanju neće biti remećene kontrolom plata. Osim toga, u svetlosti naše diskusije o reinvestiraju i o subjektivnoj ceni kapitala, može se tvrditi da kontrola cena i interesa neće uticati na dugoročne proporcije faktora ako ova kontrola utiče na relativnu cenu kapitala\*). Sve to dovodi do porasta nedostataka samofinansiranja u okviru peruanskog društvenog preduzeća. Ovaj problem se još više komplikuje donošenjem ad hoc rešenja koja ne zalaze u sferu odluka o odnosima zaposlenosti i proizvodnje u preduzeću, što se ne može činiti bez povrede principa samoupravljanja.

Zakon obezbeđuje jako naglašenu akumulaciju i stopu rasta u okviru sektora društvene imovine, mnogo veću od one koja sada postoji u peruanskoj industriji. Međutim, pitanje dominacije sektora društvene svojine u privredi ostaje u osnovi nerešeno, ono zavisi uglavnom od obima investicionih fondova koji su kanalisani prema njemu i od toga da li će se dozvoliti prelaz postojećih firma iz privatnog u društveni sektor. Ako se zadružni sektor integriše sa društvenim sektorom neophodna masa društvenog sektora će najverovatnije biti dobivena. Ali uspeh samoupravljanja će u najvećoj meri zavisiti od odziva na koji ova nova alternativa razvoja naiđe kod Peruanaca. Radnici u društvenom sektoru postaju najvažniji instrumenti razvojnog procesa koji zavisi od njihove spremnosti da odbace egoizam grupe i prihvate izazov akumulacije i porasta zaposlenosti.

## PROBLEMS OF REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN YUGOSLAV THEORY AND PRACTICE

Marta BAZLER-MADZAR\*

### Institutional Development

The post-war Yugoslavia inherited an underdeveloped economy with a highly heterogeneous regional structure. The northern and north-western parts of the country were considerably more developed than those in the south and the east. Owing to different historical conditions in the past, among which we can list the different directions of the spread of industrialization in Europe and different socio-economic systems of the empires ruling over the territories forming present-day Yugoslavia, and owing to the strong polarization of development between the two wars, two types of areas developed: those which were partly industrialized and others with traditional economic structure (1, pp. 14—16). While the more developed areas had the basic prerequisites for industrialization, conditions for the development of a modern economy were sadly lacking in the underdeveloped areas. As a result, the policy of development of underdeveloped areas was faced with a highly unfavorable dualist structure of the economy, having two substantially different types of areas whose development was to be synchronized.<sup>1)</sup>

Society's active involvement in the problems of development of the underdeveloped regions, as seen in the policies favouring an accelerated development of those areas, was one of the basic characteristics of the economic policy throughout the post-war period. In line with its basic aim — rapid development and overcoming of economic backwardness — accelerated development of the underdeveloped areas became an important element of development policy. As pointed out by R. Bićanin (2, pp. 182—184) four important reasons have determined this policy. To begin with, the purely humanitarian aspect of disparity strongly militated against impermissible differences in the living conditions of the population. Furthermore, the underdeveloped regions made a very large contribution to the country's liberation in the cour-

\*) Osim-kad se znatan deo reinvestiraju sprovodi preko novih početnih investicija.

\*) Researcher, Institute of Economic Studies, Beograd.

<sup>1)</sup> The per capita national income figures given in Table 1 are also indicative of the marked regional differences.

## PER CAPITA NATIONAL INCOME\*

	Per capita national income		Index of growth of per capita national income			
			1947-52		1947-71	
	1947	1952	1947-52	1952-60	1960-71	1947-71
1. Yugoslavia	1.682	1.908	113	175	180	358
2. Developed areas**	1.874	2.129	113	184	186	390
3. Underdeveloped areas	1.241	1.427	114	151	168	292
4. Bosnia and Hercegovina	1.380	1.673	121	145	156	276
5. Montenegro	1.332	1.302	97	153	202	304
6. Croatia	1.758	2.126	120	184	188	421
7. Macedonia	1.157	1.261	108	172	200	376
8. Slovenia	2.571	2.864	111	193	201	434
9. Serbia proper	1.668	1.876	112	177	179	358
10. Vojvodina	2.045	1.753	104	192	176	357
11. Kosovo	839	892	106	141	154	232

Source: SZS, Yugoslavia 1945-64, SZS, SGJ 1967 and 1973, and SZS, Statistika No. 45.

\* In calculating per capita national income the effect of exceptionally good or bad years in agricultural production was offset by taking the averages of the preceding and following years. The figures for 1947 had to be estimated since data on national income at 1966 prices are available from 1952 onwards only.

\*\* Developed areas: Croatia, Slovenia, Serbia proper and Vojvodina; underdeveloped areas: Bosnia and Hercegovina, Montenegro, Macedonia and Kosovo.

MARTA BAZLER-MADZAR

se of World War II. Later the 1963. Constitution obliged the more developed regions to help in their development. Yugoslavia being a multinational community, the principle of solidarity acquired an additional dimension: assistance to the nations living in the underdeveloped areas became a factor of national cohesion. From a general social point of view, the assistance to the underdeveloped areas provided for the principle of equal conditions for the development of all parts of the country. The accepted principle of transferring resources from the developed to the underdeveloped areas is, therefore, not opposed to the principle of remuneration according to performance, because it was designed to permit a faster development of the underdeveloped areas, in other words, to equalize conditions for the development of socialism. Helping the underdeveloped areas is justified from an economic aspect because on the long run it has a positive effect on the development of the more developed areas and because an economic policy is more easily conducted in a homogeneous and unified economy.

As regards the basic principles of financing the development of the underdeveloped areas, the following should be pointed out (3, p. 116):

Firstly, the adopted policy of helping the development of the underdeveloped areas has resulted in permanent aid being one of the basic characteristics of the policy of their development.

Secondly, a relatively large territory has been defined as underdeveloped area in which regions were represented by socio-political units. These units were defined on the basis of the federal structure of the country. It will be seen later that there have been many changes not only in selection of areas but also in terminology: the officially accepted term »undeveloped« was replaced by »insufficiently developed«.

Thirdly, industrialization was thought to be the quickest possible policy for developing these areas, and in accordance with it direct investments and some other types of material intervention have been the main means of financing development, with the result that other sectors have been considerably neglected.

Fourthly, indirect methods have also been used in order to lessen the inequalities in the sphere of public services through interventions in the secondary distribution of national income. Budgetary and other subsidies at all levels of the socio-political communities were designed to raise social consumption to a level higher than the level of economic development of these areas. In view of the constancy of these subsidies, this method of financing could also be regarded as direct (3, p. 116).

In line with the essential changes in the socio-economic system, the developmental policies for underdeveloped areas have undergone different stages of development; of these special consideration will be given to the period of centrally planned economy, the period of decentralization, and finally that of self-management socialism.<sup>2)</sup> Fi-

<sup>2)</sup> Classification given by B. Horvat (4).

nancing of the development of underdeveloped areas was made principally in accordance with the current system of financing social reproduction; in addition the federal government also used some special measures to ensure that part of the accumulation flowed into the underdeveloped areas (5, p. 117).

During the period of administrative control, allocations from centralized accumulation to different industries or different areas were made according to priorities defined under the First Five-Year Plan. Although the entire economy was regarded as underdeveloped, special attention was devoted to the less developed republics. In accordance with this, during the period 1947—1951 the underdeveloped republics Bosnia and Hercegovina, Montenegro and Macedonia were expected to have higher rate of investment and faster rate of development mainly in the basic industries and power generation. This so because owing to an insufficient accumulation at a time when it was necessary to build up the structure of the economy that would allow for a rapid development of the entire country, the underdeveloped areas could develop only inasmuch as they fitted into the general framework of the development.

The period of decentralization was characterized by the removal of investment from among the budget items, by the tendency of the republics to rely upon their own resources in financing the underdeveloped areas, and by a more precise definition of the underdeveloped areas. In terms of the characteristics of the development policies for underdeveloped areas it can be divided into two different subperiods.

In the subperiod 1953—1956, the policy of bringing the underdeveloped areas in pace with the general economic growth was similar to that in the administrative period. As the development of the economy was regulated by the annual plans, the measures providing for the development of the underdeveloped areas were not part of a comprehensive system. The system of financing retained certain characteristics of the centralized decision-making (credits for some precisely determined projects). As financing from investment funds was separated from budgetary investment, a distinction was introduced between credits and grants; new forms of financing included interest-free loans matching the amounts of deposited accumulation, investment credits at privileged interest rates, special global subsidies to investment funds, etc.

The system of investment was closely connected with the plans of the Federation and the republics. As pointed out by B. Srebrić (3, p. 116), federal investments were characterized by the following: (a) their amount was not fixed, (b) territorial allocation was made administratively and (c) distribution among different areas underwent several changes. Beside the Federation, the republics did some financing of investment in underdeveloped areas, but it was not of a permanent character. The inclusion of the republics in the financing of the development of the underdeveloped areas was in pursuance of the policy of increasing participation of the recipients, in accordance with the system of self-management. One way of achieving this end was to

waive installments on debts. The new system also demanded a more accurate definition of underdeveloped areas and, as a result priorities were granted to Bosnia and Hercegovina at the beginning, Montenegro and Macedonia throughout the period and certain regions of Serbia and Croatia occasionally.

The partial approach to the problems of underdeveloped areas, as well as the differences in the treatment of individual areas, brought about marked disparities in development level. It became necessary to find a much more efficient way of financing development. So in the second sub-period of the decentralization period some important changes took place: a long-term and more stable policy of development was created, the underdeveloped areas were firmly defined, participation of the resources of those areas was secured and a new relationship between the developed and underdeveloped areas was established. The Second Five-Year Plan made provision for a faster development of the underdeveloped areas and of those areas which lagged behind. It observed the following principles: (a) in financing investment the resources supplied by the underdeveloped were to be stressed; (b) not only federal but also republican, district and communal authorities were obliged to help develop the underdeveloped areas; (c) assistance to underdeveloped areas was not to jeopardize the development of the already developed regions (2, p. 187). The following areas were to be regarded as underdeveloped: Montenegro, Macedonia, Kosovo, the southern districts of Croatia, most of the districts of Bosnia and Hercegovina, and some districts of south-eastern Serbia (2, p. 184). As regards the definition of underdeveloped areas, there were discussions concerning the adequate criteria, but the latter were not applied in practice. All this resulted in the intervention political elements in the distribution of resources for investment of political elements in the distribution of resources for investment.

An important innovation in financing development was the so-called guaranteed investment. Under this programme, the investments in the economies of Montenegro, Macedonia and Kosovo were considerably larger than in the previous period. In addition to guaranteed investment, some other measures were applied. Such were the waiving of installments on loans, allowance of downpayment for investment, coverage of overstepped investment and priority in granting credits from the General Investment Fund provided all the criteria of profitability are met. However, because of a limited capacity of absorption, the underdeveloped areas were not able to use all the advantages of this system.

The system of guaranteed investment was a much more efficient method of assisting the development of underdeveloped areas, since (1) a certain volume of investment was undisputable and (2) it provided a comprehensive programme of development. And although the centralized decision-making with a well-defined purpose, structure and size of investment slowed down the rate of realization of this programme to some extent the important investment activity secured an initial acceleration of development (the building of facilities in power and basic industry, the development of communications, manufactur-

ing industries, agriculture and extraction of natural resources). Owing to its permanent and comprehensive character these investments constituted a turning point in the policy of development for underdeveloped areas (5, p. 121).

The Second Five-Year Plan having been fulfilled within less than four years, the period of self-managing socialism was entered with high hopes and ambition. Since the capabilities of the economy were increased, the Social Plan for 1961—65 could foresee an increased activity in accelerating the development of underdeveloped areas the resources of which were still insufficient (because of the price system, differential investment capacities of individual industries, and unfinished projects). The acceleration policies were laid down in relation to the previous period as well as in relation to the developed areas. Industrialization continued to represent the main method of development; in addition, special attention was paid to the development of the economic and social infrastructure. The plan provided for the establishment of a special Federal Fund for the development of underdeveloped areas, which was mainly to credit the development of the manufacturing industry. The most important change in the financing was the increased role of the republics not only in participation in the Fund loans but also in direct distribution of resources (the Fund's resources were distributed to the republics and they were to effect the direct allocation according to projects; the republics were also responsible for efficient utilization of resources). The following other measures were envisaged: termination of guaranteed and other current investments and priority in granting resources out of the General Investment Fund. The Fund's resources were distributed to the underdeveloped areas: Montenegro, Macedonia, Kosovo, and some areas of Serbia, Croatia and Bosnia and Hercegovina, on the basis of the following criteria: number of inhabitants, degree of development, the economic capacity and capability of the respective republics to accelerate the development of their underdeveloped areas independently, and other criteria. Although the plan was subsequently abandoned, the envisaged measures remained in force until 1965 (5, p. 125).

Under the new Constitution of 1963, an obligation was undertaken to assist the underdeveloped republics and areas, and in this sense provision was made for the establishment of the Fund for development of the underdeveloped areas with the purpose of ensuring a continuous source of financment in the form of loans. Accordingly, a law was passed in 1965 on the establishment of the Fund as an independent finance institution engaged in crediting development, giving technical aid and studying the possibilities and conditions of development in underdeveloped areas. Since the loans from the Fund, together with all other types of financing, were designed to ensure a faster development of the underdeveloped areas, during the period 1966—1970, as well as in the next mid-term period, the financing covered only those republics and areas which were not capable of independently ensuring a faster development. Under a special law Bo-

snia and Hercegovina, Montenegro, Macedonia, and Kosovo were defined as unsufficiently developed areas (the label »underdeveloped« was replaced by »insufficiently developed«). The underdeveloped areas elsewhere were to be aided by their respective republics.

The earlier practice of establishing a fixed amount in financing development, was replaced by a relative measure. During the period 1966—1970 1.85 per cent of the social product of the developed republics was to be earmarked for aid to unsufficiently developed areas. In the next five-year period this percentage was to be increased to 1.94 per cent, of which 0.09 per cent was to be allocated to Kosovo as the least developed area. Criteria were also established governing the distribution of the resources for a five-year period. For the period 1966—1970, these criteria were the degree of economic development reached, as established on the basis of per capita income, size and structure of basic production funds, degree and efficiency of their utilization and other indices important for the realization of the goals set by plans of the insufficiently developed areas. Thus the following distribution of funds was made: to Bosnia and Hercegovina 30.7 per cent, to Montenegro 13.1 per cent, to Macedonia 26.2 per cent and to Kosovo 30 per cent (5, p. 129).

For the period 1971—1975, a separate law provided for 0.09 per cent of the social product of the developed republics to be earmarked for Kosovo, while the remaining funds obtained on the basis of 1.85 per cent of the social product of the developed republics were distributed in the following manner: to Bosnia and Hercegovina 34 per cent, to Montenegro 12 per cent, to Macedonia 24 per cent, to Kosovo 30 per cent. In the period 1966—1970, there were also the same supplementary measures: additional funds from the budget for the development of social services, the funds released for the termination of the construction of certain major projects which were under way, exemption from downpayment for investments which are partly financed by the Federation, priority in utilizing loans from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and others.

#### The analysis of the underlying ideas

During the administrative period of the development of the socio-economic system, the problems of regional development failed to get sufficient attention (partly due to theoretical inadequacies). Yet, basic principles for subsequent elimination of regional differences were laid down. Boris Kidrič's 1946 statement on uneven development contained essential arguments against regional differences and for designing efforts to reduce them. »The uneven economic development is one of the difficulties of the present economic development of our country... It can be eliminated in two ways: (a) by a general leveling on the basis of the existing economic situation, or (b) through industrialization. Although aid to the underdeveloped and war-devastated republics has been the duty of the economically developed and less

distressed republics, the principle of general leveling on the basis of the existing state would be wrong. The proper way to do away with unevenness in the economic development of our republics is to industrialize. Industrialization will secure the intermittent progress of the economically developed republics and secure (under the plan) the other republics to catch up, in revolutionary jumps, and if necessary to surpass the more developed republics» (6, p. 172). Even development, as defined above, implies balanced economic growth and social equality (7, p. 38). Kidrič's statement was to become the official policy on development and was quoted in various resolutions by party congresses, in constitutions and programme documents.

Although the practical aspects of regional planning received only a partial and inadequate treatment several papers and monographs elaborating regional problems appeared during the period of decentralization. One of the essential practical questions, the definition of underdevelopment, was studied in 1954 by B. Kubović (8). Having analyzed the underdeveloped districts of Croatia, he ranked areas according to their level of development using per capita national income and some other criteria. In another paper the same author pleaded in favour of correcting the per capita national income, proposing a narrow and a broad list of indices for correction (9). In 1956, at a consultation in the Federal Planning Office agreement was achieved on national income being the basic criterion, while some other indices were listed as subsidiary criteria. That was the first time that use was to be made of the I — distance method based on discrimination analysis, and constructed by B. Ivanović (10). Districts were listed on the basis of seven indices. In considering the approach to a long-run development plan, R. Lang and D. Gorupić stressed the need to analyze the degree of development and the possibilities of area development. Having pointed out the inadequacy of national income as the exclusive criterion, they considered a number of indices and attempted to make a selection and categorization of areas (11).

Another problem which attracted the attention of the economists was selection of suitable locations for industries when funds were insufficient. I. Krešić analyzed the importance of transport costs (12). D. Gorupić pointed out the necessity of considering not only individual but also social effects in selecting a suitable location (13). In his analysis of the role of individual factors in the location of industries, B. Srebrić called for finding optimal locations from the standpoint of the national economy (14).

As decentralization and development of self-management entered all fields of social life, the significance of the development of backward areas was considerably enhanced. In 1962 the scientific section of the Union of Economists of Yugoslavia organized a consultation about the problems of regional economic development. On this occasion K. Mihailović stated that it was in a socialist society that regional development received its full scope, but that it must not receive a one-sided treatment by dealing only with the problem of backwardness (15). He also stressed the need for a faster development of the backward

areas, as did Radmila Stojanović, who stated that in the long-run there could never be economic aid because »aid implies something which is a loss for the one who offers it in favour of someone else« (16, p. 62). Pointing out that the regional aspects of development must not be limited to the development of the underdeveloped areas, B. Kubović analyzed the relationship between regional development and self-management and proposed a method for guiding regional development (17). Considering the industrialization of the backward areas, B. Čolanović, expressed the belief that without a comprehensive and long-term policy it would not be possible to eliminate regional differences and in this context stressed the role of the formation of areas for development, the role of gravitational centres and of methods for development financing (18). M. Mladenović defended the idea of creating long-term programmes of development and the need for defining economic regions on the basis of natural economic, geographic and historical factors (19). The assessments of national wealth according to republics, made by I. Vinski, revealed vast differences between the developed and underdeveloped areas, particularly expressed in some of the indices of wealth (20). By using a simplified inter-regional input-output analysis, B. Horvat concluded that increased final consumption in an underdeveloped area results in bigger production increase in a developed than in an underdeveloped area (21).

Already at this consultation there appeared to have been achieved a general consensus on the need for a faster development of underdeveloped areas with the purpose of reducing regional disparities. Much stress was placed on the economic justification for an accelerated development of the underdeveloped areas in which connection the following arguments were advanced: reduction of general social costs, better utilization of natural resources and other available factors of production, creation of increased demand for products from developed areas, transition from natural into market economy, greater indirect effects of investment in underdeveloped areas, contribution towards creating a uniform national economy, more efficient implementation of economic and political measures, etc (15, 16, 17, 22, 23). Yet, as pointed out by B. Horvat, the thesis that the backward areas should be developed more rapidly for economic reasons has never been accurately proved (24).

Even though a general agreement was achieved on the need for a faster development of backward areas, parity as a policy principle of development has not been sufficiently elaborated from a theoretical standpoint and creates problems in application, allowing even development to be treated arbitrarily. Furthermore, it takes no account of the stages of development and of the general level of development, has no respect for the individual possibilities of the regions, and essentially constitutes a static approach because it ignores the significance of migratory movements, polarization and a selective regional policy (22, pp. 69—71). As regards the time range when an equalization or reduction of regional differences could be achieved, K. Mihailović believes that Yugoslavia's present level of development is ripe

for this process to begin. The Federal Institute for Statistics has devised a method, based on the criterion of per capita national income, for gauging the number of years necessary for backward regions to arrive at the national average or at the level of the developed regions. However, the practical value of this method is relatively small because it is based on per capita national income only.

In connection with regional differences and levels of development of regions, mention should be made of the works which accentuate the theoretical and practical significance of the problem of measurements. For this purpose an analysis of the levels of development of the republics, provinces and districts, has been made in the Institute of Economic Studies (25). To classify the republics and provinces for 1952, 1957 and 1964 the method of I — distance was used. Measurements by means of per capita national income and another ten indices grouped under four headings have shown that in all the periods the differences were significant. An analysis for districts was made for the year 1964. Another project of the Institute makes measurements for 1966 through I — distance, using eleven indices (26). On the basis of the per capita national income analysis, it was shown that the gap between the developed and underdeveloped areas had widened during the period 1952—1966.

In addition to the analysis based, on the administrative-territorial units there have been efforts to examine economic development at the level of economic regions. Thus B. Kubović accentuated the need for defining the region before attempting to make measurements. According to his conception, the principles of homogeneity and gravitation cannot be used as criteria for forming economic regions in our conditions because a region should constitute an entity from the standpoint of economic development. In this sense he defined four categories of common perspectives of territorial development, through which 92 districts in the country were classified into 25 regions. By combining two criteria, the corrected values of production funds per active inhabitant, and the share of the socialist sector of the economy in the total corrected value of production fixed funds, a combined index of development was obtained which was used for classification. The analysis made for 1957 and 1965 have shown that notwithstanding a considerable progress, the differences in the levels of development are still considerable, greater in the sphere of the means of production than in other fields. An important conclusion to be drawn from this is that no republic as a whole constitutes an underdeveloped area, because the regions at the bottom of the list have made notable progress (27).

Results achieved in regional development have also been analyzed. In one of his papers B. Srebrić concludes that whereas the rates of growth of national income are fairly even, the movement of per capita national income indicates the increase of both relative and absolute differences between republics in the period between 1947 and 1966 (3). On the other hand, some positive changes have been registered in the structure of underdeveloped economies with regard to

decreased participation of agriculture and increased shares of other sectors. According to K. Mihailović, though all the regions have recorded an important progress, differences have not been reduced; the underdeveloped areas have lagged behind less relative to increase of fixed assets than to increase of income, and most of all in the increase of employment. Accordingly, the influence on increase of income and employment in underdeveloped areas is smaller than in developed ones (1, p. 97). Analyzing regional differences within republics and provinces, P. Sicherl (26) concludes that out of the eleven indices under consideration, the largest differences are in per capita national income and that this criterion overestimates the development of the developed regions and underestimates the level of development of the backward regions. Consequently, social intervention has helped achieve greater results than what has been represented by income analyses. Since differences in availability of fixed assets are smaller, differences in incomes can be explained by some other factors. Of these K. Mihailović (21) points out the inadequacy of the investment structure in the backward regions. Despite major investments into underdeveloped regions, there was unequal treatment within those as well as within developed areas. Montenegro and Macedonia had much larger per capita investment, whereas Bosnia and Hercegovina and Kosovo in particular, lagged behind. Even though a lot was invested since investments were made in raw material production mainly the underdeveloped areas did not achieve substantial development (terms of trade were unfavourable). Furthermore, the processing industry in these regions is of a traditional character (1, p. 48). Consequently, lower effectiveness of investment into underdeveloped regions is explained mainly, by their unfavourable structure, as well as by the lack of adequate infrastructure, production tradition, terms of trade, etc.

Because of the transition to market production, and because of the existence of price disparities, the correction of unfavourable terms of trade, i.e. compensation to underdeveloped areas for unfavourable market conditions, has become a question to which considerable thought has been given. Defined in the resolution of the Ninth Congress of the Yugoslav League of Communists (30): «The nations and the working people in the socialist republics must be entitled to control the results of their labour. Within a unified Yugoslav market, all the instruments of the economic system should be so elaborated as to ensure the realization of this principle. Should measures of economic policy infringe upon this principle, a system of compensation has to be provided to palliate the negative consequences of the effects of the unified instruments and measures of economic policy passed by the Federation», compensation has become a topical question of the economic system and economic policy. Provision has been made for the Fund for development of underdeveloped areas to use part of its resources to correct the unfavourable terms of trade.

However, as pointed by K. Mihailović, (1, p. 131), because of the vagueness of the concept and scope of compensation, different regions have been giving it different interpretations (to suit their interests).

There are different opinions on this subject (31). At a discussion (32) N. Uzunov pointed out that compensation should be made according to the principle of industries, H. Hadžiomerović wanted it to become a permanent institution, whereas K. Mihailović thought that it was an instrument of a provisional character because the remedy was elimination of the causes of unequitable trade. Compensation having appeared as a new instrument in the sphere of interventions in underdeveloped areas, there have been frequent disputes as to whether the underdeveloped areas have been gaining because of additional financing or losing because of worsened terms of trade. There were attempts to examine different measures of economic policy from the point of view of their influence on regional differences (33). In this sense D. Bjełogrić (32) stated that although it was not possible to make an accurate calculation of transfer of resources, the present contributions by the developed areas have not been so large as to threaten their own development.

As we have already pointed out, the different economic structures of the republics have been inherited from recent and not so recent past. As decentralization proceeded, the influence of the republics and provinces in interregional relations became stronger (7, p. 153). There appeared a theses on republican economies and on the existence of separate regional interests, which were frequently in contradiction particularly in connection with the allocation of investments, and in discussions during the adoption of institutional solutions. At a consultation on the integration of the Yugoslav economy held in 1969, H. Hadžiomerović (34) noted that owing to differences in the levels and structures of the economies of the republics their interests and possibilities were different. V. Rakić (33) also distinguished national economy and economy of the republics because the latter are not indifferent to what their development possibilities within the framework of the Yugoslav community are. In this sense, the separate nature of national economic interests is a fact. Despite all this on the basis of an analysis of regional cycles, B. Horvat (36), concluded that the Yugoslav economy was unified but the economies of the underdeveloped areas were less stable.

In practice, there has been an increased tendency to achieve a comprehensive economic structure within the republics. It was felt not only in the underdeveloped republics which wanted to extend their economic structures, but also in the developed regions which wanted to retain and complement theirs (32). Consequently, these cannot be tendencies termed simply autarkic. There were actually two versions of national economies: a positive one in the sense of increased diversification of development, and the autarkic one, which prefers integration within the republic to the integration of industries. The intensive assertion of regional interests in practice has resulted in a reorganization which while strengthening the status of the republics calls for an interregional coordination of sectors at the level of the entire economy through regional agreements (7).

Finally, a few words should be said about the assessment of the economic policy by economists (1, 3, 5, 22, 28, 29 and 38). a) Big efforts have been made to reduce regional disparities; b) Investment activity was important, so that throughout the period the share of investment in the national income was greater in the underdeveloped areas. For example, Montenegro had a share of nearly 100 per cent, and sometimes even higher (3, p. 125); in Kosovo and in Macedonia the share frequently exceeded 50 per cent, while Bosnia and Hercegovina had a favourable situation in this respect only in the early post-war years; c) Investments had started the process of economic development, but the lower growth of per capita investments and their unfavourable structure contributed to still greater regional disparities; d) An inadequate treatment of the problem of investments and lack of funds did not permit the creation of necessary conditions for achieving all the positive effects; e) Hence there was lower effectiveness of investments, which was also affected by an unfavourable economic structure, lack of tradition and inadequate organization of the economy; f) Institutional set up has more favoured the development of the developed areas, primarily because the price disparities which were protecting manufacturing industries and because of the system of import restrictions; g) Lack of long-term territorial division of labour and reduction of regional development to development of underdeveloped regions have also been impeding the development of the underdeveloped regions and consequently of the economy as a whole.

(Rad primljen oktobra 1974.)

#### REFERENCES

1. Mihailović, K., Eva Berković, *Razvoj i životni standard regiona Jugoslavije*, Ekonomski institut — Beograd, Beograd, 1970.
2. Bićanić, R., *Economic Policy in Socialist Yugoslavia*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, Mass, 1972.
3. Srebrić, B. »Policy, Methods and Basic Results of Developing the Underdeveloped Areas in Yugoslavia«, *Ekonomist (English, issue)*, 1969.
4. Horvat, B. »Yugoslav Economic Policy in the Post-War Period: Problems, Ideas, Institutional Developments«, *American Economic Review*, Suppl., June, 1971, vol. 61, No. 3, Part 2.
5. Mladenović, M. »Sistem dopunskog finansiranja razvoja privredno nedovoljno razvijenih republika i autonomnih pokrajina«, *Finansije*, No 3—4 1972.
6. Kidrič, B. »O nekim problemima naše industrijalizacije«, *Privredni problemi FNRJ*, Kultura, Beograd, 1950.
7. Mihailović, K., *Regionalni razvoj socijalističkih zemalja*, Upporedna studija, SANU, Beograd, 1972.

8. Kubović, B. »O privrednoj snazi naših kotara i gradova«, *Ekonomski pregled*, No 7, 1954.
9. Kubović, B. »Regionalni razvoj u društvenom planu perspektivnog privrednog razvoja Jugoslavije«, *Ekonomski pregled*, No 12, 1957.
10. Ivanović, B. *Diskriminaciona analiza sa primenom u ekonomskim istraživanjima*, Naučna knjiga, Beograd, 1963.
11. Lang, R., D. Gorupić, »Neka pitanja analize stepena i mogućnosti regionalnog privrednog razvoja«, *Ekonomski pregled*, No 8—9, 1956.
12. Krešić, I. »Značaj transportnih troškova u pitanju industrijskog smeštaja«, *Ekonomski pregled*, No 8, 1956.
13. Gorupić, D. »Prilog metodi ekonomske analize i izbora lokacija industrijskih objekata«, *Ekonomski pregled*, No 3, 1952.
14. Srebrić, D. »Neki načelni problemi lokacije industrije«, *Ekonomist*, No 1—2, 1957.
15. Mihailović, K. »Regionalni aspekt privrednog razvoja«, *Problemi regionalnog privrednog razvoja*, *Ekonomska biblioteka*, Beograd, 1962.
16. Stojanović, Radmila, »O potrebi potpunijeg uključivanja regionalnog aspekta pri planiranju dugoročnog privrednog razvoja«, *Problemi regionalnog privrednog razvoja*, *Ekonomska biblioteka*, Beograd, 1962.
17. Kubović, B. »Regionalni privredni razvoj i samoupravljanje«, *Problemi regionalnog privrednog razvoja*, *Ekonomska biblioteka*, 1962.
18. Colanović, D. »Organizacija industrijalizacije nerazvijenih područja«, *Problemi regionalnog privrednog razvoja*, *Ekonomska biblioteka*, 1962.
19. Mladenović, N. »Regionalni razvoj i ekonomska rejonizacija«, *Problemi regionalnog privrednog razvoja*, *Ekonomska biblioteka*, 1962.
20. Vinski, I. »Regionalna distribucija nacionalnog bogatstva u Jugoslaviji«, *Problemi regionalnog privrednog razvoja*, *Ekonomska biblioteka*, Beograd, 1962.
21. Horvat, B. »Međuregionalna međusektorska analiza«, *Problemi regionalnog privrednog razvoja*, *Ekonomska biblioteka*, Beograd, 1962.
22. Mihailović, K. »Nerazvijena područja Jugoslavije, Aktuelna pitanja«, *Ekonomski institut — Beograd*, Beograd, 1970.
23. Vukčević, R. »Brži razvoj privredno nedovoljno razvijenih područja kao uslov stabilizacije jugoslovenske privrede«, *Ekonomist*, No 1—4, 1966.
24. Horvat, B. »Struktura privrede i investicije«, *Ekonomist*, No. 1—2, 1967.
25. Bazler, Marta, »Analiza stepena razvijenosti jugoslovenskih područja«, *Ekonomska analiza*, No. 1—2, 1967.
26. Sicherl, P. »Analiza nekih elemenata za ocenu stepena razvijenosti republika i pokrajina«, *Ekonomska analiza*, No. 1—2, 1969.
27. Kubović, B. »Regionalni aspekt privrednog razvitka Jugoslavije«, *Biblioteka Ekonomskog pregleda*, Zagreb, 1961.
28. Bogoev, K. »Politika bržeg razvoja nerazvijenih republika i pokrajina«, *Ekonomist*, 2—3, 1970.
29. Sicherl, P. »Regional Aspects of Yugoslav Economic Development and Planning«, Separat 74, JIEI, Beograd, 1969.
30. DEVETI KONGRES SKJ, Kultura, Beograd, 1969.
31. Pešaković, M. »Međurepublički ekonomski odnosi«, *Finansije*, No. 3—4, 1971.
32. »Diskusija povodom knjige dr Koste Mihailovića«, *Ekonomska misao*, No. 2, 1970.

33. Goljanin, M. »Regionalni aspekt kreditno-monetarne politike«, *Ekonomiska misao*, No. 4/1970.
34. Hadžiomerović, H. »Pristup pitanju integracije jugoslovenske privrede«, *Ekonomist*, No. 2, 1969.
35. Rakić, V. »Integracija jugoslovenske privrede«, *Ekonomist*, No. 2, 1969.
36. Horvat, B. »Integriranost jugoslovenske privrede i samoupravno planiranje«, *Ekonomist*, No. 2, 1969.
37. Savetovanje o temi »Jedinstveno tržište, nacionalne ekonomije i jugoslovenska privreda«, *Gledišta*, No. 3, 1971.

ПРОБЛЕМЫ РЕГИОНАЛЬНОГО ХОЗЯЙСТВЕННОГО РАЗВИТИЯ  
В ТЕОРИИ И НА ПРАКТИКЕ ЮГОСЛАВИИ

Марта БАЗЛЕР-МАДЖАР

Резюме

В статье рассматриваются проблемы регионального хозяйственного развития в теории и на практике Югославии. Эти проблемы разбираются особо для трех характерных периодов нашего социально-экономического развития: централистически планируемое народное хозяйство, период децентрализации и самоуправленческий социализм.

Так как Югославия после второй мировой войны унаследовала весьма неблагоприятную дуалистическую народнохозяйственную структуру, политика регионального развития сталкивалась с большими трудностями. Активное отношение общества к проблемам экономически недостаточно развитых районов сказывается в политике их более быстрого развития, как одной из основных характеристик экономической политики во всем послевоенном периоде. Положение о необходимости сокращения региональных диспропорций наряду с гуманным аспектом этой проблемы создается и тем фактом, что речь идет о многонациональном содружестве, а также и общими общественными и экономическими соображениями. Основными характеристиками финансирования развития недостаточно развитых районов является постоянная помощь как выражение необходимости её оказания этим районам; относительно большая территория определенная как экономически недостаточно развитые районы, при чем в этом были большие изменения; индустриализация как основной метод развития при использовании в первую очередь целенаправленных капиталовложений; косвенные методы, используемые в целях устранения неравенств в области жизненного уровня отдельных республик и районов.

В административный период (1947—1962 гг.) размещение капиталовложений происходило по определенным приоритетам первого пятилетнего плана. Хотя и народное хозяйство в целом было недо-

статочны развитым, особое внимание уделялось республикам, находящимся на более низком уровне развития. Некоторые основные принципы, на которых будет основываться и последующая политика устранения региональных различий были поставлены уже тогда. В определении Б. Кидричем равномерности в развитии содержатся все аргументы в пользу неодолимости региональных различий в экономическом развитии при социализме, а также и принципы, из которых при их устранении надо исходить.

Период децентрализации характеризуется отделением капиталовложений от бюджетных средств республик и более четким определением районов признаваемых недостаточно развитыми. Его можно разделить на два подпериода (1953—1956 гг. и 1957—1961 гг.), если исходить из политики развития экономически недостаточно развитых районов. В первый подпериод не существовало разработанной системы мер для развития экономически недостаточно развитых республик и краев, поскольку развитие народного хозяйства утверждалось годовыми планами. Система финансирования, между тем, включала в себе и многие новые формы, хотя и сохраняла и некоторые характеристики централизованного принятия решений.

Во второй подпериод наступили существенные изменения в финансировании развития недостаточно развитых районов, сказавшиеся на более стабильной и более долгосрочной политике развития. Вторым пятилетним планом намечалось более быстрое развитие недостаточно развитых районов. Важнейшую новизну в финансировании развития представляли собой так называемые гарантированные капиталовложения, на основе которых гораздо большие средства вкладывались в хозяйство недостаточно развитых районов, при чем на основании четкой концепции развития. Гораздо действеннее прежней, эта система создала условия для существенного ускорения развития экономически недостаточно развитых районов.

В период децентрализации возникли первые работы, посвященные региональной проблематике, хотя этот период и характеризуется обособленным и частичным подходом к вопросам, касающимся в первую очередь практической стороны регионального развития. Одному из ключевых вопросов на практике, — определению и измерении отсталости — уделялось внимание и раньше. Другой актуальный вопрос — вопрос выбора мест размещения — также обращал на себя внимание теоретиков.

В ходе децентрализации и по мере развития самоуправления во всех областях общественной жизни значение дальнейшего развития недостаточно развитых районов значительно возросло. Был создан особый союзный фонд по развитию экономически недостаточно развитых районов в качестве самостоятельного кредитного учреждения. Специальным законом как недостаточно экономически развитые были признаны Босния и Герцеговина, Черногория, Македония и Косово. Изменения произошли не только в четком определении недостаточно развитых районов, но и в разработке критериев для распределения средств и особенно в повышении роли республик, не только в непосредственном распределении средств, но и в ответственности за их эффективное использование.

Уже в начале этого этапа развития появляется целый ряд работ по региональному развитию в форме докладов на одном совещании. Обсуждая весьма различные проблемы теоретического, методологического и эмпирического характера, доклады приводят к заключению о достигнутом согласии по вопросу более быстрого развития недостаточно развитых районов. В этой связи часто наряду с гуманными, национальными и общественными приводятся и экономические причины более быстрого развития экономически недостаточно развитых. Помимо этой и проблема измерения и определения уровня развития была предметом обсуждений, при чем отмечаются её теоретическое и практическое значение. Но, несмотря на то производились ли измерения на уровне административно-территориальных единиц или нарочито образованных областей, они приводили к констатации о значительных региональных диспропорциях в развитии.

При условиях рыночного хозяйствования и существовании диспаритетов цен вопрос изменения неблагоприятных условий обращения, т.е. вопрос компенсации недостаточно развитым районам имела место и в теоретических дискуссиях. Помимо других факторов и недостаточное определение понятия компенсации было причиной существования различных точек зрения. Другой, такой же важный вопрос — вопрос защиты и понимания региональных интересов — также был предметом размышлений. Речь шла о двух вариантах республиканских экономик, из которых положительным является вариант с тенденцией большей диверсификации развития и автаркичным тот, который предполагает интеграцию отраслей внутри отдельных Республик.

На основе достигнутых результатов в региональном развитии и работ, посвященных этому вопросу, можно сделать следующий вывод: хотя для всех районов характерен большой прогресс в их развитии, различия в степени развития не сократились. Между тем, часто используемый критерий душевой национальный доход переоценивает уровень развития более развитых, и недооценивает уровень развития недостаточно развитых, указывая при этом на факт, что путем общественного вмешательства достигнуты более значительные результаты, чем те о которых можно судить на основании дохода. Усиленная активность капиталных вложений подвинула вперед процесс экономического развития недостаточно развитых районов. Причины того, что региональная диспропорциональность в развитии еще не сократилась следующие: более низкий прирост капиталовложений на душу населения, неблагоприятные структуры капиталовложений, частичный подход к проблеме капиталных вложений, отсутствие традиций и неудовлетворительная организация труда, диспаритеты цен и системы мер, отсутствие долгосрочной концепции территориального разделения труда, и сведение регионального развития к развитию экономически недостаточно развитых районов.