DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 293 CE 023 856

AUTHOR Delalic, Esref
TITLE Workers' Universities in Yugoslavia: An Adult Education Modality. Monographs on Comparative and Area Studies in Adult Education.
INSTITUTION British Columbia Univ., Vancouver. Center for Continuing Education.; International Council for Adult Education, Toronto (Ontario).
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 183p.
AVAILABLE FROM Centre for Continuing Education, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6T 1W5 ($7.50)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Basic Education; Adult Education; Cultural Awareness; Cultural Education; Cultural Enrichment; *Economic Education; *Educational Alternatives; Educational Needs; *General Education; Individual Needs; *Labor Education; Labor Force; Off the Job Training; Political Socialization; Progressive Education; School Industry Relationship; Social Development; Technical Education; *Universities; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Workers Universities (Yugoslavia); Yugoslavia

ABSTRACT

Conceived of as out-of-school institutions for complementary worker education, Workers' Universities (WU) specialize in socio-economic education and culture for workers. Their founding in 1950 coincides with legislation on workers' management which brought to the foreground educational needs of ill-educated workers expected to participate in self-management. Bases for the curriculum were general, socio-economic, and vocational emerged as institutions which adapted to workers' needs in program length, scheduling, location, and methods. From 1958-60 they received increasing recognition and support. Financing problems in a self-managing society were reflected in WUs dependence on the commune sociopolitical and worker in WUs dependent on the commune sociopolitical and worker organizations, and communities of education. A tendency to change the concept of WUs into schools or services reflecting the demands of the financiers that were to continue into the seventies resulted. The influence of liberal, nationalistic, and other anti-self-managing forces led to a difficult period (1969-72). Funding dried up: the union with worker organizations decayed. In the early seventies education of the population for defense was added to the curriculum. Basic adult education became one of the most important programs. WUs are currently undergoing transformation to continue to meet the educational, cultural, and social needs of adult workers. (YLB)

Workers' Universities in Yugoslavia:

An Adult Education Modality

Ešref Delalić

VANCOUVER 1979

MONOGRAPHS PUBLISHED IN THIS SERIES

VOCATIONAL TRAINING IN LATIN AMERICA: A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE by Oscar Corvalán V. (1977) $5.00

TRAINING OF ADULT EDUCATORS IN EAST EUROPE edited by Jindra Kulich (1977) $6.00

ADULT EDUCATION AS A FIELD OF STUDY AND PRACTICE by Duncan D. Campbell (1977) $5.00

VILLAGE LITERACY PROGRAMMING IN PAKISTAN: A COMPARATIVE ABE STUDY WITH GUIDELINES by Florence E. Hesser (1978) $7.50

Order from: Centre for Continuing Education
The University of British Columbia
Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6T 1W5

Price of this volume: $7.50
(mailing charges included)

Published 1979 in Vancouver by the Centre for Continuing Education,

The University of British Columbia, in co-operation with

the International Council for Adult Education

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data

Delalic, Esref.
Workers' universities in Yugoslavia
(Monographs on comparative and area studies in adult education)

ISBN 0-88843-112-0

1. Labor and laboring classes - Education - Yugoslavia. 2. Adult education - Yugoslavia. 3. Universities and colleges - Yugoslavia. I. University of British Columbia. Centre for Continuing Education. II. Title. III. Series.
LC5056.Y8D4 374.9'497 C79-091100-0

Order from: Centre for Continuing Education
The University of British Columbia
Vancouver, Canada
V6T 1W5

Price: $7.50 (mailing charges included)

FOREWORD

Interest in the comparative study of adult education has been growing in many parts of the world since the first conference on comparative adult education held at Exeter, U.S.A. in 1966. This interest was given further impetus by meetings held at Pugwash, Canada in 1970, Nordborg, Denmark in 1972, and Nairobi, Kenya in 1975.

A number of international organizations, among these Unesco, the International Bureau of Education, the International Congress of University Adult Education, the European Bureau of Adult Education, O.E.C.D., the European Centre for Leisure and Education, the Council of Europe, and the International Council for Adult Education have contributed their share.

A growing number of universities in all five continents established courses in comparative adult education. Many other universities encourage students to deal with comparative study or with the study of adult education abroad in major papers and theses. The literature in this area has increased considerably since the early 1960's both in support and as a result of this university activity. A number of valuable bibliographies were published, cataloguing the growing wealth of materials available in a number of languages.

Most of the literature available on adult education in various countries can still be found primarily in articles scattered throughout adult education and social science journals, while most of the truly comparative studies remain

unpublished master's theses or doctoral dissertations. There is no publisher enticing researchers to submit manuscripts of monographs dealing with comparative adult education and case studies of adult education in various countries, even though the need for such a publishing venture was stressed at a number of international meetings.

It is with the intent to provide such service to the discipline and the field of adult education that the Centre for Continuing Education at The University of British Columbia, in cooperation with the International Council for Adult Education, decided to publish a series of Monographs on Comparative and Area Studies in Adult Education. We are pleased to present Workers' Universities in Yugoslavia: An Adult Education Modality as a fifth volume in the series.

Jindra Kulich
General Editor

CONTENTS

TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Two people in particular have helped me with this monograph: Mrs. Smiljka Čubelić-Miller, teacher of English at Northern Illinois University, who is convinced of the need for better international understanding and communication, not only among scholars; and Dr. John McKinley, professor of adult education at Indiana University, who has given me scholarly advice in his elegant, unobtrusive manner. I am grateful to both of them.

E.D.

GLOSSARY*

Associated labour: the basic category of the socio-economic order of Yugoslavia, which covers social ownership of the means of production, the right to work with socially-owned means; the right of workers to manage production entirely, including decision-making on distribution; the right of workers to associate to achieve common economic goals; direct integration of the means of social reproduction; the inalienable right to self-management.

Basic organization of associated labour (BOAL): part of the work organization (enterprise or institution) which is an economic-technological entity and whose results of work (products or services) can be expressed in terms of value on the market or in the direct exchange of labour, effected either within the work organization itself or through the market. In the basic organization of associated labour, the working people, under the Constitution and laws, directly and equally regulate their mutual economic and other relations, manage the social means entrusted to them, decide on distribution of income acquired in the above-mentioned forms of exchange and which cannot be alienated from them. By virtue of its existence, BOAL precludes monopolistic centralization of resources, while enabling concentration of resources on a self-management basis.

Commune: the basic self-managed socio-political community which provides an organic link between all forms of the organization of the working class and working people along self-management lines. Government in the commune is controlled by the working people, who come together as self-managers at work and as self-managers in the satisfaction of their social, cultural and other requirements. The working people in the commune, which is an integral part of the unified social organism, participate by means of delegates in all forms of government at all levels in the community.

Communities of interest: a self-management based form for regularly integrating labour in material production with labour in education, science, culture, health,

---

* Source: "Socialist Thought and Practice," Vol. I (Beograd, 1974), in D. Savičević's Recurrent Education and the Transformation of the System of Education in Yugoslavia, 1976.

and other social and public services, in an organized manner and on terms of equality to discuss and agree on regulation of mutual relations, on the free exchange of their labour, on joint programming, on financing of common requirements, in line with the common interest and joint development policy.

Delegates, system of: the basis for the constitution of assemblies (in communes, autonomous provinces, republics, and at federal level) by collective delegations of work organizations, local communities, and socio-political organizations. In this manner, and in contrast to the classic bourgeois parliamentary system of deputies, the direct presence of the working people in assemblies is assured, the engineering of majorities by one category of the population, or one type of labour over others is avoided, and the functional synthesis of short-term and long-term interests of different parts as well as of the whole society, is guaranteed. Self-management and governmental power are merged through the system of delegates in a specific and institutionally novel fashion. This is the universal principle governing the entire socio-political system of Yugoslavia.

Local community: a form of self-management association of working people and citizens in the area of a settlement, part of a settlement, or several settlements joined together. In the local community, workers and citizens decide on the pursuit of their common interests and the satisfaction of their common needs. They do not exercise the functions of government and so differ from socio-political communities (communes, autonomous provinces, republics, and federation).

Organization of associated labour: denotes all forms of independent, self-managing organizations within which workers engage in economic or other social activities with socially-owned means; forms of association set up on the basis of integration of the labour of workers who work with socially owned means; in them, workers manage the labour and the business operations of the organization and the affairs and means of social reproduction; they regulate mutual labour relations, make decisions on the income realized through various forms of the association of labour and resources, and earn personal incomes. The concept of "organization of associated labour" is a general one which embodies the basic organization of associated labour. Organizations of associated labour were formerly designated by the words "enterprise" (applicable to the economy) and "institution" (applicable to non-economic activities).

Organs of workers' control: a form of direct self-management by the workers. The right and duty of workers to exercise

control is an integral part of total self-management rights and duties. It is the essential task of workers' control organs to protect the exercise of self-management rights and to ensure that vital personal and working interests of workers are linked to control of surplus labour and accumulation.

Organs of workers' self-management: the institutional organs of workers' self-management are the assembly of the working people, the workers' council, and its autonomous executive organs.

Self-management agreement: direct consultation in achieving agreement among basic organizations of associated labour, work organizations, and so on, undertaken to establish mutual economic and other relations in income distribution and personal income, joint capital investment and co-ordination of interests with the broader societal interests. The self-management agreement is binding on the organization of associated labour that concludes it or accedes to it later. This is, historically, a new form of the association and integration of workers, without the interference of political representatives who have no connection with them; it is a form of direct workers' democracy. In Yugoslavia, the self-management agreement represents the basic and principal form of regulation of economic and social relations between work organizations in the economic sphere and public and communal activities.

Self-management general acts: acts by which organizations of associated labour and other self-managed organizations and communities, on the basis of the constitution and laws, independently regulate, on self-management grounds, their mutual relations, co-ordinate their interests, or regulate matters of wider social significance. Self-management general acts include: social compacts, self-management relations, statutes, and other general acts of self-managed organizations and communities.

Self-managed organizations and communities: organizations of associated labour, organizations of business associations, banks, insurance communities, agriculture and other kinds of co-operatives, contractual organizations of associated labour, self-managed communities of interest, local communities, as well as work communities that work for state and other organs and organizations.

Social compact: a self-management act concluded on terms of equality by organizations of associated labour, chambers, self-managed communities of interest, organs of government, and socio-political organizations in which participants regulate socio-economic and other relations

of wider interest. Their purpose, as is the case with self-management agreements, is to replace the state's regulatory functions in resolution of social contradictions and to achieve co-operation and solidarity in the economy and other spheres of life. The social compact is binding only on the participants who conclude it or accede to it later. The parties of the compact establish measures for its implementation and their material and social responsibility with respect to the obligations jointly undertaken.

Social consciousness: though human consciousness is individual (the psychological ability of people to think, observe, and strive towards accomplishing certain goals in life), as Marxist thinkers admit, it is also social, they contend, because it is brought about by social interaction; it is a product of this interaction and as such affects people's activities in society. Social consciousness cannot be taken to mean a mechanical collection of individual consciousness; it is a reflection of the social being in the minds of people and results from the process in which individual consciousness is transformed into a higher quality. Thus religion, philosophy, morals, science, and art are special forms of social consciousness; they reflect social being in the consciousness of the people. Based on "Mali leksikon samoupravljača," Drugo izmenjeno i dopunjeno izdanje, Savremena administracija (Beograd 1976), p. 82.

Socio-political organization: a political organization of workers with a socialist program (the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, the Socialist Alliance of the Working People of Yugoslavia, the trade unions, the Veterans' Association, Youth League, and so on).

Social organization: a form of voluntary organization for the purpose of pursuing people's interests, managing certain social affairs and developing different activities of general social interest (social-humanitarian, cultural, scientific, professional, tourist, sports and other similar organizations).

Social plan: co-ordination of relations in socio-economic reproduction and guidance of development in self-management; joint development policies are not established by intermediation of the state but directly by all economic and social subjects (workers in the basic and other organizations of associated labour; organs of socio-political communities, chambers of the economy, trade unions, and other socio-political organizations on the basis of self-management agreements and social compacts.

System of consultation for the achievement of the social compact and self-management agreement: the integral system established by the constitution consisting of self-management compacts and agreements in work organizations; consultations for the achievement of compact and agreement among self-managed work organizations, communities, and associations; consultation for the achievement of compact and agreement within the frameworks of and also between socio-political communities (communes, republics, provinces, and the federation). The basis of the entire system is the inalienable right of the working people to self-management

Workers' Universities in Yugoslavia

INTRODUCTION

Yugoslavia is unique because of its social and political set-up, historical background, complex and diversified culture, and its search for new definitions. The major normative variable which has been maintained there since World War II is commitment to independence and self-reliance. The full significance of the ideological differences between the Yugoslavs and Russians is yet to be recognized.

Yugoslavia has been defining its own norms since the early 1950's, when it broke loose from Soviet-sponsored ideological categories. The country promulgated a new political doctrine of workers' self-management, which contributed to decentralization and left the task of norm enforcement to a variety of territorially based cultural and interest communities. It affirmed that workers' right to participate in government originated in the profit their work contributed to society. Though self-management as an evolutionary form has not yet achieved its potential, its adaptability to the varied economic circumstances in the country has been remarkable.

A law transferring ownership of state enterprises to the workers as representatives of society was introduced in 1950. This marked the beginning of a unique series of economic and social reforms in Yugoslavia. The Yugoslav commitment to workers' self-management was designed to place the worker at the centre of efforts to build socialism. Yugoslav leaders saw workers' self-management as the first stage in the Marxist vision of the withering away of the state.

They claimed that decentralized social ownership of the means of production was a purer form of Marxism than the centralized system practised in Soviet Russia.

Social pressures to carry out reforms necessitated extensive changes in all spheres of activity. Rapid transformation of Yugoslav life from rural to urban patterns became the rule, yet most of the working population lacked skills required to facilitate these changes. Thus, worker education became a primary political task, and adult education became the means of modernization.

Until 1950, the training of workers was the exclusive responsibility of trade unions. However, by establishing workers' self-management, the workers themselves became responsible for their education and training. As much as they were committed to the economic development of the country, they were equally committed to the new socialist morality expected of the new socialist man.

In terms of diagnostic theory, this was a situation concerned with social system needs. Discrepancies and deficiencies were noted between workers' performance and what was desired of them. Appropriate attitudes, knowledge, skills, and values were lacking. To meet the new educational needs resulting from social transformation, a new adult education institution had to be established. Workers needed systematic education to perform competently the functions of self-management. Mass education as practised by existing People's Universities was inadequate. (People's Universities are adult education institutions in Yugoslavia dating from well before World War I, based on the enlightenment concept of adult education and emphasizing general lecture activity.) New content, methods, and technologies were required in adult education in post-war Yugoslavia.

Originally, the basic task of the new Workers' Universities was to give workers social and economic education for their new role in the society. Workers' Universities were conceived

as an out-of-school institution for complementary worker education. They can be defined as adult education institutions in Yugoslavia which specialize in socio-economic education and culture for the workers engaged in self-management of industries and enterprises* as well as in non-industrial sectors of social life. From the beginning, an expanded, comprehensive conception of Workers' Universities was staunchly supported, as it was thought that they ought to be more general education than vocationally oriented. Worker education was viewed as an activity aimed at the total person, and was part of adult education. The working class was taken in its broadest sense to mean all the employed. With rapid industrialization of the country, worker education became an immediate requirement of production. The Workers' Universities were defined as part of enterprise, and their principal aim became to meet the needs of the enterprise as well as of communes and individuals. They began to apply research methodology, and by responding to society's needs, they expanded their activities and clientele. Complex, functional, and permanent education became a feature of programs and courses offered by WUs.** Soon they became specialized institutions integrating learning and work, theory and practice.

This study provides evidence that WUs in Yugoslavia during their approximately twenty-five years of existence have been flexible, dynamic, non-formal, non-didactic, innovative, and increasingly oriented to workers' life problems. They have developed many means and methods for dealing with the problem of educating adults. Furthermore, they are original in maintaining their autonomous status free from state control;

---

* Enterprise covers factories, workshops, all business -- any kind of organized work which is based on social ownership of the means of production, the workers' rights to manage production, including the right of decision-making about distribution, and their inalienable right to self-management.

** WUs is used from here on as an abbreviation for Workers' Universities.

in developing internal self-management to plan and finance their own production and expansion; in the power to elect their own management with a council as the organ of social management; and in their many activities and centres in different areas, educational activities carried out by part-time staff, close co-operation with adult learners, and research and evaluation orientation.

WUs fought to implement the progressive in education and culture. This practice served as a foundation for Yugoslav andragogical theory. In less than three decades, WUs have become modern European institutions of adult education, amalgamating culture and education. They have given the working population the education needed for individual, social and work functions, with a strong emphasis on the arts and culture as components of work, thus making a serious impact on the environment by raising the educational and cultural level of workers and citizens of Yugoslavia.

THE EARLY SETTING

The Central Planning Period, 1946-52

Immediately after the end of World War II, the Yugoslavs, "being without any experience in organizing a socialist economy," adopted the Russian system of centralized economic planning.[1] All businesses were nationalized, except for handicrafts and small retail shops. Large agricultural estates were taken over by the government, as were farms abandoned by the German population in Vojvodina. Prior to 1941, a large share of industry had been foreign-owned or nationalized and, during the war, the Germans had incorporated the firms into their own gigantic trusts. In this early post-war period, enterprise executives and production workers were government employees. Planning and administration were centralized in Belgrade. Federal plans were drawn up annually and plans had to be co-ordinated with them. Practically nothing was left to the initiative of the republics or of individuals. Comprehensive plans provided for specific input and output, including monetary output such as wages.[2]

The Soviet-modelled system was not successful. One reason why, as cited by D. Kalodjera, was that it created a complicated hierarchy of agencies at the federal, republic and local level.[3] Furthermore, excessive centralization led to irresponsible waste of state assets. Serious mistakes were made in planning amounts and kinds of goods needed for the home market. Factories piled up inventories of unwanted

products in the midst of terrible shortages of other goods; management and workers alike were unconcerned about efficiency. Productivity by workers was low; they were not stimulated to expend greater effort. Rigid egalitarianism prevented the flow of workers into jobs where they were most needed. A major difficulty was inadequate manpower. Industry and administration lacked trained and educated workers. Investments were badly planned and there was little concern for innovation and research. The period is remembered as a kind of nightmare.[4] Some desperately needed reconstruction was achieved, the country having been largely destroyed by war, but conditions were ideal for wholesale evasion of responsibility.[5]

From 1949 on, after the crisis with Stalin, the Yugoslavs openly contended that Stalin had no monopoly on Marx and that there were "many roads to socialism."[6] In 1950 it became apparent that the political crisis was passing. By then Yugoslav leaders had examined their Soviet-inspired system of government and its effects on political and economic life, and concluded that it tended to defeat its own aims. New ideas were evolving that would lead to a much less rigid approach to economic planning. The basic ideas were the same for economic and political life. Centralization and exercise of power from above had been proved inefficient, immoral, and an incorrect interpretation of Marxist-Leninism. The state as expression of the will of the people must, it was thought, allow individuals to take a full and responsible part in its institutions.[7]

Development With Decentralization

As of 1952, with the First Five-Year Plan a new system of economic planning was introduced, simultaneously with decentralization and reorganization of political life, but rapid industrial development remained the major economic objective. In economic life the new institutions were

the Chambers of Producers and, more important, a new system was introduced of workers' self-management of factories through elected workers' councils. A law transferring ownership of state enterprises to workers as representatives of society was introduced on 26 June 1950. This marked the beginning of a unique series of social and economic experiments which more than twenty years later is still active.[8] Workers' councils were to play an important part in Yugoslav economic life and were subjected to a number of changes in their powers and functions. New ideas on economic planning and organization brought tremendous changes. Detailed state planning and powers to put federal plans into effect were abandoned, the market was freed from most controls, and free play was allowed for supply and demand to determine the flow of goods. Enterprises could decide what to produce, how much to charge, how to distribute goods, and, in principle, planned their own exports.[9]

The Second Five-Year Plan was issued for 1957-61. It outlined the main economic problems: shortage of raw materials, electric power, agricultural produce and consumer goods. The general aim was to find means to produce more, especially more food and consumer goods so that imports could be cut down, and yet provide for steady improvement of the general standard of living. The immediate needs of ordinary people were to be catered to, as Phyllis Auty put it, for good quality household goods and clothes, even luxuries such as cosmetics, washing machines, refrigerators, and television sets.[10] All these things, though not specifically provided for, were made possible by the Second Five-Year Plan. There was a striking change in material conditions of life in Yugoslavia by the end of the decade. The plan was fulfilled, goods appeared in shops, there was more food, housing improved. As Auty observes, the purchasing power of wages, and the quality and quantity of things that could be bought improved, and Yugoslavs began to spend more and settle into a semblance of more comfortable, if not luxurious, life.[11]

Workers' Councils and Workers' Management

B. Horvat has discussed in detail the history of workers' councils during this period.[12] In 1949, in a number of factories, consultation between management -- mostly people who themselves took an active part in the revolution -- and workers was spontaneously introduced. In December 1949, the government and the trade unions jointly issued an instruction on the formation of workers' councils as advisory bodies. Councils were elected in 215 larger enterprises, but soon other enterprises requested the same privilege, and by mid-1950 there were 520 councils. In June 1950, the National Assembly passed a law by which councils were changed from advisory to managing bodies. The working collective of every enterprise elects a workers' council (Radnički savjet), which, as long as it has the confidence of electors, is the policy-making body in the enterprise. The council elects the executive, the managing board (Upravni odbor), which is concerned with day-to-day implementation of council policy and the routine co-ordination of those activities of the enterprise by the general manager and administrative and technical staff. This legislation did not immediately abolish the perennial management-worker opposition, but conditions were created, as Horvat pointed out, for it to be resolved.[13]

In his remarks, addressing the National Assembly in Belgrade on 26 June 1950, President Tito said:

> Perhaps some people believe this law to be premature, that the workers will not be able to master the complicated techniques of managing the factories and enterprises. Whoever they may be, they are mistaken...Shall we wait for all of workers to become equally smart and able to manage enterprises? Of course, we shall not...It is in the very process of management, the uninterrupted process of labour and management, that all workers will gain the necessary experience, and will get to know not only the process of labour

> itself, but all the problems of the enterprise. The workers will learn how to keep files only through practice, how much they can use and how much can be saved, they will get to know where their labour goes, i.e., where the surplus of their labour goes and what it is used for.[14]

Many Yugoslav authors have commented on this speech. The comments of D. Savičević and S. Tonković are relevant here. Savičević discusses dilemmas which arose concerning waiting for all workers to acquire a certain level of education and then to introduce self-management. "We could not wait," says Savičević, quoting Tito, "because in that case we should wait endlessly long."[15] Tonković, a trade union man, said that President Tito had not in the least underestimated education as an irreplaceable factor in the development of self-management; he had stressed that education is not the only way to train for self-management.[16]

Yugoslav leaders have never been advocates of the absolute supremacy of education and have not taken the preliminary raising of the level of culture and education as a precondition for the development of self-management. I think that the establishment of workers' management opened up wide opportunities for workers to get the learning experience and knowledge which would help them understand the conditions and changes taking place in Yugoslav society. Through serving on workers' councils, workers were to become educated and experienced in the "multifarious problems of management."[17] The management of labour is an intellectual function which has historically been separated from labour and the workers.[18] It was hoped that elimination of this separation would produce industrial harmony and break the cultural barrier that separated qualified educated managers from less educated, often ignorant workers whose skills and experience were limited to their particular jobs. It was also hoped that it would lead to greater productivity and higher profits for community, enterprise, and individual. According to Horvat, by 1950

it had already become clear that the introduction of workers' management had cleared the ground for the new social relations and the series of institutional changes that were to follow.[19]

No doubt it took some years before the system of workers' management could be organized so as to combine efficient management with workers' freedom and competance to decide about operations and finances of the industries in which they worked. Unsupervised, inexperienced, and without detailed instructions, workers' councils frequently made no provision in their accounts for depreciation or accumulation of capital for investment.[20] They were simply inexperienced as managers and decision-makers. Many councils tended to spend all disposable profits on extra wages, bonuses, and holidays for workers.

In 1954, new laws were introduced giving detailed instructions on how enterprises should distribute their income. Today workers' councils play a part in almost every kind of work, including schools, hospitals, and the civil service. Although financial regulations restricted the freedom of workers to dispose of the finances of their enterprises, other changes introduced during and since 1954 have given increased freedom of action in other fields. Workers' councils are now completely free to decide what their enterprise shall produce and in what quantities and free to sell where they like, and, within certain limitations, to fix their own prices.

After 1950, a new official attitude towards workers' wages and salaries came with decentralization. Two new principles were introduced: wage and salary scales were to be allowed a greater spread between maximum and minimum earnings; and monetary incentives were to encourage workers to do more productive, better work. Yet effective change came slowly. In 1955, there was still only a slight difference between wages received by skilled and unskilled workers.[21] The consequence among workers was lack of incentive. Only in 1957, after these conditions became obvious, was a system

for greater differentiation in wages introduced.[22]

The Role of Trade Unions

What was the role of trade unions in the course of these developments? Was there any function left for the trade unions in the Yugoslav economy, since so many institutions were playing a part in regulating conditions of work -- workers' councils, economic units, chambers of various industries, and republican and federal authorities? The answer is yes, but it was a different role from that of trade unions in Great Britain, the United States, and other capitalist countries. Since all Yugoslav industries, and most economic enterprises, belong to the people, in theory there should be no conflict of interest between management and labour because the aim of the organizational changes in economic life from 1950 to the present, as conceptualized by Yugoslav leaders, has been to make workers identify themselves with management. "Nobody strikes against himself," wrote Deleon in 1956.[23] In Yugoslavia, wage and salary questions since 1950 have been settled by workers themselves.* In an article titled "Are there any strikes in Yugoslavia?," M. Slani has written that there is no reason why wage questions should not be settled to the advantage and satisfaction of the workers since there is no basic contradiction between "job-givers" and "job-takers." Of course, there can be friction, Slani added, along with lively discussions, for the worker himself intervenes in fixing both his own and his workmates' wages.[24]

One must keep in mind that the government is of the working class and working people in general. In 1952, I. Božičević

* In Yugoslavia, there are no legal or other provisions prohibiting strikes. When they occur, they are called "work stoppages" and are considered a symptom of inadequate participation by the workers in self-management, as the president of the Yugoslav trade unions, M. Špiljak, commented in a television interview on 9 November 1977.

wrote that the government in Yugoslavia was gradually being decentralized and its functions being transferred to social agencies. Bodies of management were being formed made up of workers, office employees, and other citizens. They were taking over more and more functions in this process of "withering away" of the state.[25] Since the 1950s, the trend has been gradually to reduce the role of federal agencies. As Božičević put it:

> The trade unions are not controlled by the government but rather government bodies are controlled by the working class and the people in general (the Yugoslav government is an agency of the majority of the people), which also means that they are controlled by the trade unions and other social organizations. What do the trade unions do actually? They take part in the drawing up and adoption of all laws, they offer their observations on them, propose and demand changes and the adoption of new legal provisions that they deem necessary. This does not mean that differences never arise between the government and trade unions, that government and social agencies do not adopt decisions with which the trade unions do not agree. When differences do arise and if there are varying conceptions of things, they cannot relate to the fundamental goal but only to various problems and methods. This has existed in the past and will exist in the future just as differences of opinion arise inside the trade unions and government agencies.[26]

Slani and Božičević stressed the political, social and economic function of the trade unions; they did not discuss their educational role. However, it is known that after the end of the war, trade unions undertook social work, building homes and sanatoria, and organized workers' education, especially in the early years, as well as literacy programs and elementary technical training. Their vital and continuing interest in education for workers' management started in the early 1950s, a factor dealt with in subsequent

chapters of this study.

After the introduction of new economic policy, the official aim was to get more workers to take part in management, to know and exercise their rights. This basically educational task was not easy. M. David is right when he stresses that workers cannot succeed in this effort without a complementary enormous and persevering educational effort.[27] When Kukoleca pointed out in 1968 that "the working man is his own boss now," he probably meant that the worker had to learn the Marxian principle that man's relation to the means of production determines his consciousness.[28] It was a new, complex relationship, through which the worker had to learn how to manage his factory or enterprise without owning it. Therefore, helping workers acquire this political know-how became one of the most important tasks of the unions. In 1957, Tito talked about workers' participation in self-management as the "gigantic school" which had engaged one-third of the employed workers, that is, over 600,000 workers and employees in the country.[29]

There were serious criticisms, especially at the beginning, of the effectiveness of workers' councils. It was reported that meetings were held less frequently than required, that agendas prepared by directors and executive committees controlled what would be discussed at council meetings. Workers' representatives appeared to be too submissive to their executives. Many subjects brought before councils were highly technical matters of planning and finance. For these, ordinary workers did not have the knowledge or experience necessary to question, criticize or suggest alternatives to proposals. As well, bureaucratic forces were strong; powerful groups in the enterprises who did not like decentralization often ruled self-management bodies. Criticism has often been made that certain directors controlled all decisions in their etnerprises. At the first congress of workers' councils in June 1957, Tito talked about directors who deprived workers' councils of their

rights, and workers who gave in easily to such a "wrong treatment of the workers' councils."[30]

These weaknesses would not be unnatural even in countries where industrial workers are more educated and have longer experience. With rapid urbanization in Yugoslavia, masses of rural labourers were entering the urban economy, all untrained and uneducated. Both peasants and workers had to become familiar with modern technology. This problem was more than that of mastering new technologies in industry; there were also the social and economic changes taking place for which peasants and workers were equally unprepared. With Yugoslavia's historical background and existing conditions, these weaknesses were to be expected and were anticipated. They are often found in trade union institutions in Great Britain, for example.[31] The Yugoslavs did not have a model to follow, so, as Dirlam observed, they "set sail on uncharted seas."[32]

It was in this socio-political climate in the early 1950s that the need for new institutions for workers' education emerged; it was a Yugoslav manifestation of social system needs. Modern adult education theory defines social system needs in terms of an actual set of circumstances in which people find themselves. In the diagnostic theory of Professor J. McKinley of Indiana University, it is a condition of human inadequacy.[33] Discrepancies, deficiencies, and inabilities were noted between the performance of the workers -- the client system -- and that which was desired and expected of them. In the language of adult education practice, attitudes, knowledge, skills, and values (educational needs) were lacking in and required by the client system to enable it to attain a more desirable condition.

Workers' Universities

It was logical to assume that the founding of new educational institutions for the workers would coincide with new legislation

on worker's management in 1950. These new institutions were Workers' Universities. Both D. Savičević and M. David have explored why WUs were established. David wrote his evaluation in 1957, and Savičević's book came out eleven years later, in 1968.[34]

With regard to the Yugoslav situation, Savičević wrote about the tens of thousands of workers who became members of self-managing boards and thus were in a position to determine policies and means of production. For example, in Zagreb, the capital of Croatia, 40,000 workers were elected to workers' councils during the first three years of workers' management. Pointing to the strong and still prevailing influence of trade unions on workers' education, Savičević noted that in the first two years of workers' management, educational activities consisted of explaining to workers the responsibilities they had acquired with taking over management of industries. These activities were mostly initiated by trade unions and were political and propagandistic in nature.[35] However, Savičević pointed out, quite rightly, that workers needed more systematic education and required the necessary knowledge and skills to perform more efficiently and intelligently the hiterhto unfamiliar functions of self-management. He also discussed briefly the scope and the method of the new education for workers. Members of the worker's councils had to familiarize themselves with the problems of their enterprise and the progress of work in the factory. Since they were responsible for management, they had to make decisions concerning the organization of production, marketing, manpower training, and export and import procedures. Savičević failed to include other important functions of workers' councils such as distribution of income and creation of employment, dismissal, and work safety policies. He found that mass forms of education used by People's Universities at that time were inadequate and insufficient. To meet the new educational needs resulting from social transformation in the country, new educational institutions had to be organized.

Originally, as Savicevic observed, the initial task of the WUs was to give workers, and in particular members of the councils, the social and economic education needed for their new role in society.[36]

Self-management of the producers was extended beyond the immediate workplace by establishing for all representative organs, from local councils up to the Federal Assembly, a second chamber: the Council of Producers. In 1953, the constitution was changed to take account of the new social institutions. Workers' management had become part of the establishment and WUs developed simultaneously with the spread of self-management.[37] S. Tonkovic credits WUs for spreading the education for self-management in non-industrial sectors of social life, such as health services, insurance, and education.[38]

The Unesco researcher, M. David, tried to establish the raison d'être of the new institutions for the education of workers in Yugoslavia. The position he took on this issue was that of a trade union man, of an arbiter who judges and decides on somebody's needs, and in this process he appears to utilize the "felt-need theory." He was preoccupied with the role of trade unions in the changing Yugoslav society. The creation of a separate entity had the advantage of widening the financial basis by making it possible for local district administrative bodies and for the enterprises to participate in workers' education.[39] David noted that until about 1950 the training of workers was the exclusive responsibility of the trade unions and was organically integrated with them. By this, one assumes David is implying that the trade unions provided training and education for the working class and paid for it. But by 1950, the situation had almost totally changed: by establishing workers' management, the workers themselves became responsible for their education -- its content, method, and financing. So, of necessity, the role of trade unions changed considerably; they became partners and co-financers. David failed to see this. In his evaluation

he does not take proper account of the new role of workers in society. He continues to talk, with nostalgia, about the diminishing role of the trade unions and insists that the influence of the trade unions on workers' education has not decreased, only their financial contribution. He also points out, rightly it seems, that it is necessary to take account of the encouragement the trade unions continue to give to the cultural and artistic aspects of workers' education.[40] This, of course, has not been disputed; trade unions have these noble efforts to their credit. David also talks about the desire to stop giving all workers education inside the enterprise, as another reason for promoting the establishment of the WUs. If the factory were to be the setting of practically all educational activities, the workers would be in danger of having their horizons narrowly confined to their own homes. Apparently David sympathizes with factory sociologists who advocate humanizing and democratizing the workplace, both in capitalist and socialist societies. An American author, I. Bluestone, writes in this connection:

> In a society that prides itself on its democratic system of freedom for the individual and rejection of dictatorial rule, the workplace still stands as an island of authoritarianism. The organizational mold of business, especially big business, and the material objective of maximising profits serve to obstruct, or at least deter, the fulfillment of democracy in the workplace. In fact, the workplace is probably the most authoritarian environment in which the adult finds himself in a free society.[41]

The socialist ideal of the "New Man," a free person and a worker not alienated from capital and the means of production, implies wide exposure to scientific advances, education, and culture. Under worker management, factory and enterprise become learning places where workers serving on self-management bodies gain direct experience of socialism. However, for cultural activities, it was thought that workers should be removed

from the enterprise. Holding some educational activities at WUs seemed to have the advantage of avoiding the mental saturation which might result from an existence centered on the enterprise.[42] Additionally, it was recognized that a WU was a suitable place to facilitate the mingling of workers from different factories and enterprises, which would help them to appreciate the various aspects of workers' solidarity.

3

THE DEVELOPMENT OF WORKERS' UNIVERSITIES, 1952-56

The Concept

After World War II, the Yugoslav working class was young and stratified; hundreds of thousands of new workers entered its ranks. These were mostly peasant men and women who brought with them their old customs and ways of thinking. The working class of Yugoslavia lacked general and technical culture, especially some strata such as construction workers, loggers, and miners, many of whom were illiterate. According to the 1953 census statistics, there were 475,218 unskilled workers in the country.[1] Clerical staff and employees were not much better off educationally. The whole population was quite backward. Many workers and employees had not had access to training and education as well, expectations from the new Yugoslav society were great, especially from the working class. They had to be helped to get rid of their backwardness and become culturally emancipated. Systematic planning and organization were needed to tackle this problem. It was necessary to help workers understand social changes, management, and economics.

Through the initiative of the Yugoslav trade unions, the development of Workers' Universities began in large industrial centres. Except for a few evening schools for workers, no other institutions for worker education existed in the

early 1950s. The first WU was established in Belgrade in November 1952. This was followed by WUs in Novi Sad, Zagreb, Sarajevo, Tuzla, Skopje, Rijeka, Zenica, Split, Subotica, Niš, and other places.

Many issues related to the emerging WUs were discussed in this early period. Thus, D. Pavlović wrote about the problem of inertia and physical fatigue of the workers and observed that workers' need to expand their knowledge was less in those not yet "awakened."[2] The same phenomenon was later observed and dealt with at greater length by the American author McMahon. Pavlović talked in terms of needs, while McMahon looked at the phenomenon from the adult participation point of view.[3]

How could WUs help these people best? Pavlović insisted that WUs must develop flexible forms of education so that all kinds of workers would be attracted to them. The flexibility of forms would enable workers to enrol in those that would best suit their needs, interests, educational background, and level of culture. Most important, WUs must provide learning opportunities for workers regardless of educational background. Only in this manner could WUs become centres and strongholds of worker education, he said.[4]

About the difficult issue of diplomas that WUs were expected to issue to workers, Pavlović commented in 1955:

> We should try to give as much knowledge as we can so that workers can fulfil their needs for learning and finding out new truths. A certificate is just an indication that somebody wants to work on self-education.[5]

To me, the second part of Pavlović's statement sounds too idealistic and naive, a kind of thinking which is not based on knowing the psychology of the people. Maybe Pavlović thought that WUs could help workers rid themselves of their "diploma" complex. I shall refer to this pertinent issue in subsequent chapters.

WUs were thought of as the kind of institutions that would provide complementary general education through courses and seminars, but would not provide a position or anything leading to a job. It was thought that the economy of the country and the system of payments would develop in such a way as to alleviate the haste and need to obtain diplomas and qualifications, which had been the only means of obtaining salary raises. The future payment system would require capability above all, which was to be a foundation stone in worker remuneration,[6] another pertinent and perennial issue associated with WUs.

Although this was just the beginning of WUs, and there were only fifteen in the country,[7] hundreds and thousands of workers were coming to the WUs to satisfy their thirst for knowledge. There were three major areas of this thirst: for general education, for economic education, and for vocational education.[8] This constituted the basis for the WUs' curriculum, presented in a problem-oriented way. There was one thing in particular that WUs were expected to bring about -- participation in worker education by the intelligentsia. It was anticipated that the intelligentsia would help the working class both with the management of the economy and direction of the cultural facilities.

Serious discussions began early concerning the concept and nature of the new institutions for worker education. A. Deleon was the principle architect of the concept. He defined the WU as an out-of-school institution for complementary worker education, which is different from a People's University. Deleon supported the idea of worker education in its entirety. In his view, courses in general, economic and vocational education were not enough, so he argued for an expanded concept. He felt that worker education in Yugoslavia ought to have a very broad concept.[9] He stated that worker education in the world up to this point had been either the professional or labour union type, or pragmatic in that it helped workers in everyday routine

work. However, in a country like Yugoslavia, where socialist democracy was being developed, "we have an opportunity to set up this kind of education in its broadest sense."[10] Vocational education and training should be excluded from WUs; it was only a temporary feature of their programs. The WU was an institution for complementary education; when the educational system of the country was reformed, which was to happen in the near future, WUs would leave the establishment of schools for skilled and semi-skilled workers to the school and apprenticeship system, enterprises, and chambers of commerce. Under the circumstances, and because no one else wanted to take up this responsibility, WUs assumed it in order to help production workers get ready for upgrading exams. This was useful, no doubt, but Deleon thought it was a temporary activity and that WUs should not deal with it. He stressed that WUs ought to be more oriented towards general education and pay more attention to workers' cultural problems and their participation in the life of their community.[11]

Both S. Tonković and Deleon stressed that Marxist education in the WUs was unsatisfactory.[12] Deleon mentioned apathy and stagnation. Earlier, he said, Marxism was cherished much more, "no matter how dogmatic we were then and how forced it was on us." Apparently, there was no desire for a dogmatic approach, people wanted freedom of choice. And yet, "we have very little ideological education today," which he saw as one of the greatest failures of WUs.[13]

Among other shortcomings, Deleon mentioned lecturing as a method. According to Deleon, a mass lecture attracted 500 people and concentrated on a heavy topic. What was the benefit? In his evaluation, lectures did nothing to test how much was learned from them. It would be reported that 200-300 people came to a lecture because they were interested in it. Deleon called this an illusion, because "we know that people often came because they were misinformed." He warned that mass lectures were overestimated in WUs and to continue them would just promote self-content. Lectures

in WUs were all right if they were not mass lectures.[14]

About the mushrooming of the WUs throughout the country, Deleon said he would be happy "if we could have twenty WUs of the kind we want, that is, the institution of worker education in its totality." Furthermore, he said that because WUs did not know how to build up their own staffs, they had a "reduced degree of thirst" for knowledge as compared to the situation in the years immediately after World War II. This was an issue of "pedagogy of adults," he maintained.* He stressed the need for new methods: "We must leave classrooms and avoid school methods, we must go to enterprises if we want to work with adults!" Sources of new cadres must be sought in pedagogic associations, among students of teacher's colleges, teacher-training institutes, arts students, in order to create a nucleus of pedagogy for adults. These students would have to go to industries and enterprises, where the working class was to be found, to make scientific analyses. Deleon was concerned about research and evaluation: "We have talked for five years about economic education and nobody has come up with an analysis to show us what has been accomplished."[15]

As to whether directors of WUs should be volunteers or paid, Deleon said that this kind of work should no longer be considered voluntary. There was a life occupation called education of children. For systematic education of adult workers, it was necessary, Deleon thought, to rely on people willing to do this kind of job and to pay them for it.[16]

At the Second Yugoslav Conference on Workers' Universities in 1956, the place and role of WUs in the system of worker education was discussed. In WUs "we have got a new, vital educational institution that fits in new conditions of expanded needs for worker education" and satisfies their increased

---

* "Pedagogy of adults," which is a contradiction in terms, was used by Deleon and other Yugoslav authors throughout the 1950s; only in the late fifties and early sixties was the term andragogy introduced.

desire for new knowledge.[17] At the conference, Deleon said in part that WUs were ongoing institutions for complementary out-of-school education, that they coincided with the development of worker self-management, not because of some mechanistic connection between them or because they solved pragmatic problems, but because new educational institutions corresponded to the new position and role of the producer and the working class as a whole. Through self-management the working class was freeing itself from all restraints.[18]

The conference concluded that WUs did not become popular through inclusion of most of the working class or because large numbers of workers had already been educated in them; what was significant was that WUs had brought a new quality of worker education and adult education in general. The conference also pointed out the enthusiasm of WU leaders, organizers, and lecturers who courageously attacked previously unsolvable educational problems. Without these people it would have been impossible to have such institutions.[19]

Adult education in Yugoslavia was looked upon as a voluntary and useful social activity, the conference emphasized. In other words, adult education had not yet become part of the educational system or of educational policy. Nevertheless, this marginal activity continued to develop, often all by itself and for itself. As time passed, things began to change. As Deleon observed, because the educational system in a socialist country could not limit itself to educating children and youth, it had to include people of all ages, in all phases of development and social activity, because "it was their right and their internal need, and there was no progress in socialism without this."[20] Deleon refused to see adult education as temporary, to him it was a permanent task and not a product of backwardness, an unavoidable companion of man in all societies, undeveloped or not.[21] Furthermore, he told the conference that if this was the prevailing attitude, if people were to draw practical conclusions for everyday life, then WUs as new institutions and adult education

as a new policy must be free of dilettantism and improvisation; he thought that only through a new orientation would adult education cease to be a marginal activity, and become established with permanent institutions and staff. With respect to the socialist character of Yugoslav society, worker education was viewed as simply part of adult education in general, with no basic distinctions between them. Since the working class of Yugoslavia was considered its society's leading force, worker education ought to comprise education of the total person. This implied a complex system of education in many different areas: general, political, ideological, vocational, technical, economic, social, ethical, aesthetic, and cultural. It is for these reasons that Deleon qualified Yugoslav concept of worker education as "the most comprehensive."[22]

Deleon further stated that worker education did not imply only education of manual labourers; the working class was taken in its broadest sense to mean all the employed, from the illiterate to the intellectual workers.[23] This concept offered great opportunities to a producer and a working man in general for his growth and development and for bridging the gap between intellectual and manual labour, between working and lettered men.

Two possibilities for development of WUs were discussed at the same conference. The first was that WUs were institutions of continuing education with a system of interrelated seminars or other forms for workers who wanted complementary education in various areas, like some kind of schools that employed flexible and modern methods; the second was that WUs were institutions of fragmented complementary education where every working man regardless of his educational background could meet his inner needs in scientific, political, and social information, or new knowledge from any area.

Experience so far has shown that development of WUs should go in both directions. There is no need to pit one concept against another, and the best thing is to synthesize all kinds of needs. In terms of practical implications,

it was assumed that WUs might skilfully combine both kinds of education. In methods, there would be no danger of having lectures for informing people en masse as an absolute method, nor would seminars and courses, feasible forms for attaining continuous and systematic education, become "absolutistic." It was thought that a democratic society must not disregard the basic principle of social activization of large numbers of people, workers in particular. It was equally important to know that the basic right of every citizen was to education and culture. The conference considered WUs as the most developed adult education institutions designed to satisfy the needs of the leading force.[24]

The broad concept of these institutions was reflected in their broad curricula:

(1) The WU was to provide, through different forms, information regarding political and social events, international and domestic problems, science and technology;

(2) Through more permanent forms, courses and seminars in particular, the WU was to fill a gap in general (implying cultural, too) and vocational education, thus giving workers an opportunity to round off their education using more modern techniques other than those used in schools, and also to continue their education through regular or part-time schooling;

(3) The WU would, in time, through permanent forms (some of which can find their way into schools), provide a complete education on different levels which would establish a firm relation between WUs and secondary schools.[25]

It was thought that an employed person did not fulfill his aspiration for education simply by being employed. In the WU he had an institution that offered continuity of education not through outdated classical schooling but through a new, flexible, easily accessible system.

Finally, WUs included possibilities for training and education of workers and other adults in the universities, meaning that they enabled those who had not completed secondary school but had good experience to enrol in regular universities, and would have the opportunity to earn technical and arts degrees.

The curriculum pattern of WUs required adequate methods. It was maintained that (1) group work (courses, clubs, and seminars) was essential for some purposes because it guaranteed the continuity and quality of education; also, group work was considered good for activating participants and helping them become independent learners; (2) individual work was the least cultivated method in WUs. At the time of the 1956 WU conference, few attempts had been made to help individuals directly through consultations, counselling, or talks with experts; (3) popular, or "disliked," as they were sometimes labelled in WU circles, mass forms (lectures) were also taken into account as having "equal rights." Different views were expressed, such as that mass forms were outmoded and had no place in WUs; or that group work restricted the number of participants and so did not suit the character of education in the new Yugoslavia.[26] An intelligent combination of the three methods in WUs would be best, it seemed, because each had merits. D. Filipovic discussed this problem in more detail in a separate article referred to later in this chapter.[27]

The question of levels of instruction in WUs was also discussed at the conference. Practice had revealed an unsatisfactory situation in which levels of teaching were not differentiated; there was no teaching on all levels, as was desired. This was particularly evident on the lowest level. As mentioned earlier, the working class of Yugoslavia was rather backward and its general education poor or lacking. Unhappily, in practice, it seemed that WUs were insufficiently low level worker oriented. Consequently, in most cases, workers found their teaching and instruction incomprehensible.

In addition, there was no literature or other means to help the more backward. On the other hand, it was common knowledge that teaching workers to manage industries and enterprises, increase productivity, and enhance their personal lives could not be accomplished unless adequate methods and techniques were found to suit all kinds of workers. Socialism could not be built with one part of the working class, a politician rightly observed.[28] Déleon declared that helping lagging workers was a serious task, a new kind of job which required persistence and creativity.[29]

In this connection, D. Filipović stressed the problem of methods. He declared that there was a "poverty of methods" for adults and talked about their predominant school character. Verbal presentation by teachers was a dominant method, and modern methods designed to activate participants were not used. Courses organized to help workers prepare for vocational exams suffered from the verbal, formal, school type of instruction. What workers were doing in seminars was still on the school level, said Filipović.[30] Experience has shown that adult participants gladly accepted opportunities to talk with a teacher, and reacted negatively when a teacher lectures without involving them in discussion on matters they are often familiar with as they feel underestimated by the teacher.[31] In this connection, in a separate article Filipović discussed the problem of dropouts.[32] In his analysis of this undesirable situation, Filipović said that weaknesses in existing methods were unavoidable and resulted from insufficient study of modern adult education methods. Among other causes, he mentioned not treating a student as an adult and mature person, a strict, inflexible attitude towards complex contents, non-possession and therefore non-application of teaching aids, and, finally, difficulties caused by participants themselves, especially those with little education. According to Filipović, an adult person in the teaching learning process constitutes a "basis and a condition" for a choice of method.[33] Chances were that

many WUs took no notice of the fact that instead of dealing with children they were dealing with adults. Filipović re-emphasized that an adult is a psycho-physically formed person who does not want to be looked upon as ignorant, and an adult participant was a socially, politically, and economically active citizen, and as such carried on his shoulders the building up of socialism.[34]

However, the most developed WUs in Yugoslavia had already applied some good methods. For instance, the WUs of Zagreb and Belgrade required the writing of essays. These were creative works by the participants. The seminar-participants, or club members, were requested to write on particular topics. Thus in the WU of Zagreb, at the beginning of the seminar, participants wrote anonymously about their lives, what drew them to a particular club or seminar, and so on. These writings, in particular those with educational value, were later read in class by the teacher. Every year, the WU of Belgrade rewarded the best works. There was a scarcity of teaching aids, and, as Filipović pointed out, lack of most of these. This was considered the most important reason why instruction in WUs at that time was performed verbally, with no practical demonstrations.

Experience had shown, Filipović stressed, that it was possible to use some so far known methods in "adult pedagogy," on the condition that they were adapted to adult psychology. He pointed out that practice in adult education teaches us to seek new, active methods; with the further development of WUs demands for further practice would increase. The aim was clear: to turn passive students into active participants everywhere.[35]

Deleon strongly supported the idea that education in WUs be scientifically founded. He feared that program emphasis was on giving vocational-technical and other specialized knowledge. WUs were institutions where workers must be given a scientific view of life and the world, develop a socialist consciousness, a class consciousness, and learn Marxist-Leninist

doctrine. He warned against coming under the influence of non-Marxist, pessimistic, or nihilistic views.[36]

Regarding social education, S. Tonković reported that only a few WUs could be satisfied with their accomplishments.[37] The majority were about to start systematically with this kind of education. Regarding political education, only one WU had a Marxist section in 1956, and only a few had organized seminars on Marxist education. Political economy, scientific socialism, and the history of the labour movement were the areas largely studied at WUs. Exceptions were those WUs where dialectic materialism, the history of philosophy, ethics, psychology, and the history of the Yugoslav revolution were taught. Fewer WUs emphasized the dialectic view of the world through seminars in general education, biology, astronomy, or history of the church and religion. Some WUs organized seminars in social science, others organized elementary seminars in science. Tonković pessimistically observed that in WUs, as a rule, the attendance in foreign-language courses was several times larger than that of all seminars in Marxist education. The WU of Zagreb program on the influence of religion, in particular the Roman Catholic religion, was said to be a success. Recently, the WU of Belgrade had started seminars in ethics. Ethics as an issue was represented in some programs in 1956 only through individual topics in seminars in social science and economic education. However, in economic education, much more was accomplished.* Tonković mentioned forty WUs which had been surveyed by the trade unions and continued to have at least one program in economic education.[38] There were, first of all, seminars in the economy of enterprise, and the organization of labour and

---

* At the 1956 conference, a new term was coined for this area, "socio-economic education." As a concept, socio-economic education recognized the integrity of the theoretical social sciences disciplines (dialectic materialism, scientific socialism), categories of political and economic system (the constitution, other basic laws), and the contents of the concrete practice of self-management in enterprises. See Teorija i praksa samoupravljanja (Beograd, 1972), pp. 991-92.

management, especially programs for industry, agriculture, commerce, handicrafts, and restaurant management. Some WUs taught techniques of management (the WU of Zagreb), the physiology and psychology of work (the WU of Belgrade), while the majority organized seminars in remuneration, labour laws, health care, financial and commercial dealings of an enterprise, and so on. The example set by the WUs of Belgrade and Zagreb was expected to be followed by other WUs in the country.

Most of Tonkovic's criticism was about the lack of study of industrial psychology, mental hygiene, active resting, human relations, workers' families, conditions of life outside the factory, housing, nutrition, and so on. Tonkovic was to expand the curriculum substantially, so that programs could reach not only workers but also their families. According to him, social education must be based on study of the problems of management, not only in enterprises but in health, insurance, cultural, scientific, and educational institutions.[39]

While the first Yugoslav theorists of WUs -- Deleon, Filipovic, Tonkovic, Pavlovic -- were dealing with concepts, teachers in WUs were solving practical problems of adult education as best they could, which was fine because theory without the test of practice was likely to be sterile, as M. Knowles had observed.[40] Some teachers were experimenting, especially those who had the intellectual courage to plow new fields. Thus I. Švarc from Celje, Slovenia, reported to the conference:

> We tried topics from dialectic materialism but success did not come immediately. The next year we decided to do things differently: we took topics in biology, physics, etc. After this we passed to dialectic materialism and philosophy. In this way students' interest was secured. Lectures were followed by film shows, and this contributed to better success.[41]

V. Velčić of the WU of Zagreb pointed out that there was a tendency to underestimate workers when it came to aesthetic education, and that workers could be educated aesthetically by organized, systematic effort. If it was possible for workers to master complicated production and the technology of self-management, they were capable of understanding aesthetic ideas. Experience showed that workers were often more sensitive toward aesthetic things than many intellectuals. Velčić mentioned film as the kind of medium workers could catch up from. He also referred to books as a very suitable medium for workers. On one occasion, associates of the WU of Zagreb invited the author to talk with workers about his book. He came and had a friendly conversation with a group of workers. He did not take an intellectual approach at all. The workers were excited and happy over this. A female worker commented: "I must admit you opened up a new world to us." This was exactly what aesthetic education was all about. The author himself said: "Comrades, nowhere else did I talk so sincerely!"[42]

On Human and Material Resources

WUs in 1956 were new institutions. They were based on a good and broad concept, but the issue of who they belonged to, who was supposed to secure cadres and provide funds and other material resources, certainly was in question. This issue will be dealt with at greater length in the next chapter. Smaller WUs were predominant and few distinguished themselves in power and influence. They did have human and material resources. The WUs of Zagreb, Belgrade, and Skopje by the very fact that they functioned in large industrial centres (Zagreb is the largest industrial city in Yugoslavia), could get good teachers and plenty of lecturers, co-operate with scholarly institutions, and get funds with no problem. Thus the WU of Zagreb was subsidized through grants by the People's Committee of the city of Zagreb. This university

already had twelve teachers, all university graduates, working on a full-time basis. They decided to stay in the new profession. Small WUs on the other hand had only a director as full-time staff and were trying hard to hire part-time teachers, complained of lack of funds, equipment, and aids. The WUs of Zagreb and Belgrade had already set up a nucleus of full-time staff, while at the same time they continued to utilize the services of part-time lecturers and teachers. In 1956, the WU of Zagreb had been given financial means to construct new buildings for the university. M. Krstinić, then directress of the WU of Zagreb, suggested that WUs should get financial resources from funds allocated for senior staff training with chambers of commerce since WUs educated and trained producers. Her point was that it was normal to expect enterprises to take an interest in financing WUs.[43]

Small WUs received grants mostly from People's committees and trade unions. They also hoped to get subsidies from industries and enterprises they worked for. Meanwhile, there was much talk about enterprises understanding the difficulties of WUs, but not having resources to allocate. In prevailing conditions, teaching and lecturing was carried out largely by part-time staffs, which later became a policy. In view of the fact that WUs were expected to experiment with new forms and methods of adult education, the need for full-time staffs who could take up this assignment was strongly emphasized.

Deleon, the leading spokesman for the trade unions, maintained that adult education was a concern of society, an integral part of the educational system. Therefore, securing funds for WUs must, in principle, be settled in the same way, through budgets, as was the case with education in general, schools, institutes, and universities. To seek other solutions, according to Deleon, would be a deviation from the principle that worker education was an integral part of the educational system and educational policy and only a temporary solution.[44]

Some Accomplishments

Tonkovic wrote that the number of participants in educational activities ranged from 200 to 10,000 per WU.[45] Data he gathered were related to some WUs in the country. Table 1 shows the number of participants who completed one seminar or course.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS COMPLETING ONE SEMINAR OR COURSE

WU of	1955-56	Up to now
Belgrade	10,128	18,921 (in the 4-year period since it was established)
Zagreb	5,719	11,352 (in 3 years)
Skopje	4,450	
Rijeka	3,117	6,635 (in 3 years)
Tuzla	2,660	7,286 (in 3 years)
Split	1,029	

Source: S. Tonković, "Radnički univerziteti," Jugoslovenski pregled, 2 (1957): 95.

In 1955-56, in the eighty-three WUs in the country, 65,600 workers and employees completed seminars and courses.* According to Tonković, attendance at public lectures, discussions, performances, and films exceeded several times that at courses and seminars.[46] Table 2 shows some of the data he gathered.

* In an article written in 1972, S. Tonković gave more detailed data related to programs in socio-economic education at the end of 1956. Thus he talked about a total of thirty-five different programs in socio-economic education which were disseminated through 884 seminars with 41,842 participants in the eighty-three WUs in the country. See Teorija i praksa samoupravljanja (Beograd, 1972), p. 992.

TABLE 2

LECTURES AND ATTENDANCE, 1955-56

WU	Number of lectures	Number of participants
Sarajevo	451	90,019
Tuzla	167	43,509
Pancevo	43	8,422
Kumanovo	42	6,269
Karlovac	60	5,000
Titov Veles	13	3,940
Leskovac	9	3,227

Source: S. Tonković, "Radnički univerziteti," Jugoslovenski pregled, 2 (1957): 95.

Workers' Universities versus People's Universities

The subject of WUs versus PUs would require a special study because the two adult education institutions are so similar and yet so different.* PUs in Yugoslavia have had a long tradition, dating back to before World War I. D. Savičević tried to establish some links between PUs and the working class. He wrote about the social democrats in Serbia who had recommended in the first decade of this century that PUs should meet the needs and interests of the working class.[47]

PUs continued to function in the old Yugoslavia as a "modern form of general and cultural education."[48] In most cases, they were organized symbiotically with cultural societies, as sections of them. Some PUs operated as workers' clubs where discussions were held on current socio-political issues and cultural and scientific events in the country and

* Like WUs, PUs is used in this study as an abbreviation for People's Universities.

abroad.

According to Petrović, PUs played a significant role in the War of National Liberation. After liberation, they carried on a literacy campaign, health education, and information centres. Later, PUs became centres for youth education. Weekly lectures for youth evolved into youth clubs and forums. Until 1952, PUs were the only adult education institutions in the country. With industrialization and the change in structure of the work force PUs began gradually to change.[49] Statistics showed there were 840 PUs in 1953, whereas the total number of WUs that year was only fifteen.[50]

D. Filipović was critical of PUs. He wrote in 1958 that after liberation, most PUs eked out a bare existence through the old tradition of lecturing.[51] Deleon tried to clear up some misconceptions regarding WUs versus PUs. Some people thought WUs were meant for workers and PUs for the rest of the population, that because of different audiences there ought to be different contents, and so on. Deleon maintained that it was a question of two different methods, two ways of approaching adult education, not a question of two different contents being required. Largely, PUs were lecturing centres employing basically classical methods. As such they had their role, and were still useful. On the other hand, WUs developed gradually into institutions with steady audiences, which gave systematic, continuing education and employed more flexible, modern methods. According to Deleon, PUs could develop along similar lines, which would be all right from the point of view of getting more out-of-school education institutions. As some PUs were in the process of transformation, there was no need for antagonism. Regarding the problem of "division of responsibility," Deleon noted that WUs engaged in vocational and economic education, thus influencing formation of the working class; PUs dealt with general problems and wider educational issues. The so-called "division of audience," according to which WUs educated physical workers and PUs dealt with the intelligentsia and youth, Deleon evaluated as "harmful" talk.[52]

Professor B. Samolovčev of Belgrade University claimed that the appearance of WUs on the Yugoslav adult education scene marked a turning point. He stressed that WUs had shown a "methodological path," founded adult education methodology; that was their historical merit and an important contribution to andragogy.[53]

S. Elaković saw most PUs as centres of general lecture activity without systematic forms such as courses, seminars, and discussions clubs. The monologue method which lecturers employed was still dominant at PUs. They lectured on politics, medicine, arts, and culture, in a broader sense; on the other hand, themes from economic, vocational, technical, natural science, and Marxist education were little represented. If there were a WU and a PU in the same town, the WU was usually more industry-oriented, whereas the PU gravitated towards other citizens. PUs should engage much more in adult education in the country because the prospect for building socialism among the peasantry was good, Elaković concluded.[54]

In 1961, D. Filipović qualified PUs as weak and poorly organized; he wrote that they lagged behind WUs in many respects. Their program policy was unclear; their organizational framework was inadequate as were their cadres, and their material resources were poor. He gave statistics showing the decrease in the number of PUs over the years: in 1953 there were 840 PUs, in 1957, 714; in 1959, 599; and in 1960, 432.[55] He also stressed that they could engage more in helping rural people. In 1969, Filipović called PUs "the oldest specialized institutions for adult education," which along with educational centres in business organizations "most resemble" workers' universities. The number of lectures and attendance in WUs and PUs was approximately the same, but the number of those attending regular forms of education (seminars, courses, schools) was on the average three times bigger at WUs.[56]

In 1968, trade unions contended that "the activities of WUs and PUs were the same: by their social function,

content, and methods and that they should be equally treated. They admitted that "certain differences exist," but only regarding the orientation toward certain social structures.[57]

In 1972, S. Tonković explained that "under the influence of the WUs, PUs were gradually changing their program-orientation."[58] It should be noted that communal PUs, such as those functioning in Belgrade and Zagreb, are different. M. Mestrović wrote about them as institutions dealing with socio-economic education and mass culture.[59] Perhaps it was these that trade unions thought equally important. A comprehensive 1976 report by the town committee of Belgrade, however, stated that "there was much more collision, disloyal competition and doubling of activities between WUs and PUs in the city of Belgrade than co-operation and co-ordination of programs."[60]

The fact that in Yugoslav andragogical literature WUs and PUs have been dealt with concurrently in most cases indicates that these two institutions continued to co-exist. This was natural as needs for both were so great, and adult education facilities were not prolific. Both PUs and WUs were needed, especially in industrial centres and large cities.

PUs, which once were the "expression of the inherited enlightenment-type of conception in adult education," as S. Tonković observed, have adapted to the socialist structure of the new Yugoslavia and accepted the new ideas and ideology of the working class.[61] It is also true that WUs have served as models for them, especially with respect to methods used in dealing with adults. If trade unions assert that PUs were equally important, it does not mean that they have contributed equally towards development of andragogical theory and practice in Yugoslavia. I therefore believe that testing the hypothesis that WUs have contributed more than PUs would be worthwhile.

4

WORKERS' UNIVERSITIES, 1957-64

Organization and Forms

A number of conferences and meetings have been held to discuss activities of WUs in Yugoslavia since their establishment. Two conferences were particularly significant: the First and the Second Yugoslav Conference of the representatives of WUs, in June 1954 and May 1956, respectively. Among the issues discussed was the organization of WUs. It was said that the organization was adjusted to the needs and possibilities of learners. Learners were expected to enrol in any form of instruction or any level of a course, with no obligation to pass the preceding lower level. However, learners were to progress from a lower to a higher level. In this manner, they could study an area of education systematically. A vertical system was introduced to enable learners to progress gradually. It was meant to be a bridge for learners to enable them to progress to the highest levels of learning and education.[1]

Seminars, courses, and clubs were types of learning groups in WUs. They were adapted to specific requirements of workers in terms of duration, scheduling (once or twice a week), location (courses were held both in the WUs and in enterprises and factories), and methods (that take into account learners' experience and work practice). In addition to so-called intensive forms of instruction (courses, clubs, seminars),

which required a permanent teacher, though not necessarily a full-time staff member, WUs engaged in extensive forms of mass education -- lectures, public discussions, performances, and evenings dedicated to an event. Most lectures dealt with issues in foreign affairs and policy. These sessions were always interesting and drew the largest crowds. In less developed WUs, public lectures were less frequent.

As Tonkovic reported, the basic principles on which WUs were founded had not been applied everywhere up to then.[2] For instance, lack of funds and shortage of staff seriously affected the activities of a WU; also, specific local conditions were mentioned as a reason why some WUs used public lecturing as the only form of activity. A remarkable statement, almost prophetic, was made by R. Colakovic concerning specific local conditions and their impact on WUs. He said that the meaning and significance of a WU in a certain locality was determined by the degree of concern and understanding all those responsible held for the new educational institution. Because of a lack of concern and understanding in some places, the institution barely existed, at other places it was engaged in doing everything, and in others, WUs had become known as very appropriate forms of worker education.[3]

At larger, more developed WUs, activities were carried out through centres. From the educational point of view, centres were considered the most developed, self-contained units. In this period, the more developed WUs already had centres of general education, of socio-economic education, and of vocational education; some WUs had centres for senior staff training for the economy (such as the WUs of Belgrade and Sarajevo), for metalworkers (such as the WU of Zagreb), and for work-productivity (such as the WU of Sarajevo). Centres were administered by professional councils and heads of centres who were full-time staff members.[4]

Centres were composed of sections, smaller units that covered one subject or a group of subjects discussed and taught within the context of a particular centre (e.g., there

would be a section for political economy or artistic education). At less developed WUs, which had no centres, sections were the only educational units.

Basic teaching-learning occurred in pre-seminars, seminars, courses, laboratories, study groups, and clubs. Methodologically, these forms were differentiated according to the learner's previous knowledge as well as the level and contents of the program. Thus, for instance, pre-seminars gave workers and employees basic knowledge from all areas in preparation for a seminar. Seminars were of higher standard. They were organized on three levels: elementary, intermediate, and advanced. Seminars and courses were considered the major educational activities at WUs. Seminars and courses differed in size and duration of program.

Laboratories were used for workers to experiment and develop practical skills in particular for the study of science, and for vocational and technical training.

Study groups were basically autonomous learning teams, though they were assisted by a teacher. They studied certain problems and drew their own conclusions.

Clubs had current, changing educational programs of the highest level. Basic to clubs was free-wheeling discussion and the exchange of views. Some fine arts clubs had studios; film clubs had their own studios, too.

According to Tonković, the administration and management of WUs which should not be regarded as the same thing, was not uniform. Usually, WUs were directed (administered) by boards, called secretariats or professional councils. Management of WUs was in the hands of councils, elected bodies of representatives, which were organs of social management.[5]

Programs

A survey of programs of WUs during 1957-64 shows a great diversity. They were designed to meet different needs of

adult workers and so usually had different levels. They were practical, flexible, and adapted to both personal and socio-economic system needs.

Programs of general education included: basic general education; social sciences: scientific socialism, Marxist philosophy, ethics, history of the labour movement, political economy, religion, psychology, health education; science and technical education: biology, physics, chemistry, mathematics, geography, astronomy, technology, industry, nuclear physics; aesthetic education: literature, music, theatre, fine arts, film, Serbo-Croation language, rhetoric, industrial aesthetics.

Programs of socio-economic education included: basic economic education; economic branches: political economy, the economy of FNRJ (Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia), economic geography, enterprise economics; social management and worker self-management: seminars for members of workers' councils, for the economic education of workers, for administrators and managers in enterprises, for social management, on the communal system, on work relations, and on leadership training. Special programs were organized in the following areas: work organization with a special emphasis on the problems of productivity, the psycho-physiology of work, work safety, and occupational health.

Programs of vocational-technical education included: professional upgrading for semi-skilled, skilled, and highly-skilled jobs in accordance with state regulations; technical education programs aimed at raising workers' general technical level. These were in specialized fields and advanced technologies.[6] Table 3 shows the number and diversity of programs at some Yugoslav WUs. Table 3 does not include foreign language courses, club programs, lecture series, public discussions, or films.[7]

Table 3 shows that the WU of Zagreb led in the total number of educational programs; the same university was also strong in vocational and socio-economic education. It was

followed by the WUs of Belgrade, Subotica, Rijeka, and Sombor. Interestingly, it seems that only one WU gave programs in health education in 1956-57. Apparently the above data are not very specific; for example, it is not clear whether the seventeen programs in general education at WU Skopje means seventeen different courses or seminars in this area, or seventeen programs with the same content.

TABLE 3

NUMBER AND DIVERSITY OF PROGRAMS, 1956-57

Place	Gen.	Health	Soc-econ.	Tech.	Vocational	Total
Skopje	17	-	16	2	13	48
Split	6	5	10	-	8	29
Tuzla	12	-	12	7	-	31
Sombor	8	-	4	-	16	28
Rijeka	10		7		20	37
Subotica	19		25	8	8	60
Zagreb	22		26		33	81
Beograd	20		20		22	62

Source: S. Tonković, "Radnički univerziteti," Jugoslovenski pregled, 2 (1957), 94.

Duration of Programs, Age, and Participants' Level of Education

Depending on the scope of the program, courses lasted three to six months. Courses in vocational training and education took nine to twenty-four months. Attendance was voluntary and free. Courses began on October 1 and lasted until May 31. In some WUs the teaching-learning system was organized by semester. On the average, a participant was a worker or employee with lower education (a semi-skilled

worker).* His average age was twenty-five to thirty-five years.

Major difficulties encountered in the courses and seminars during this period were the heterogeneous composition of classes, the lack of learning habits on the part of the participants, and some objective circumstances such as the distance of classes from participants and the need to organize classes after work.

More developed WUs in this period had their own professional staffs consisting usually of young teachers, instructors, engineers, and economists. There was a tendency to build up full-time specialist associate staffs, people who chose adult education as their professional field. However, because of the broad scope of activities, the territorial diffusion of centres, and the large number of participants, most teaching staff were part-time experts in various fields, public figures, and cultural and political workers.[8]

In 1957, the Workers' Councils' Congress was held, which stressed the need to strengthen and advance WUs. Workers took the floor and talked about their education, asserting that they liked to learn. The workers, being practical people, recognized the benefit of this kind of institution, from the point of view of their personal development, professional upgrading, and affirmation in their collectives, according to R. Colakovic.[9]

Early Experiments

Years of operation and experiment have helped WUs to crystalize certain practical principles of adult education. For example, the WU of Skopje found out that respecting what they called "the possibilities of participants" was an important principle for organizing educational activities

* In Yugoslavia the term "workers" is used in different ways: to differentiate those who do physical jobs from white-collar workers; to refer to all employees, including top personnel, and in a still wider sense, all civil servants are also included in the term.

which guaranteed success. This WU was the first to arrange for participants in seminars, particularly the seminars in general education and socio-economic education seminars, to have shorter hours of work. The assumption was that they would progress better in classes if they were not exhausted by work.

Also, the WUs of Mostar and Skopje, almost simultaneously, found out that it was best to engage one instructor, or at most two, in a seminar, instead of having one instructor per topic. Experiments showed that this arrangement brought about a better quality of learning. Later, as knowledge of adult psychology grew, WUs began to call this relationship of the participants to the instructor "emotional binding," to indicate their respect for this aspect of the teaching-learning situation. Further experiences at these universities indicated that shorter seminars were preferable and that a nine-month seminar was too long and became dull. Polls conducted on course completion indicated that workers were interested in and wished to attend special courses, such as ones dealing with modern work organization, finances, and industrial psychology.

WUs ought to study the problems and needs of every work organization, J. Sinadinovski pointed out.[10] He also insisted that the development of each participant be followed up by the respective WU, and that help should be extended to them all after completion of seminars and courses. This had not been done yet, Sinadinovski maintained. According to him, workers' councils in Skopje did not keep records on how many workers finished and what kinds of seminars had been completed, nor did they have any idea of what kind of benefit enterprises and work organizations received from the newly acquired knowledge and skills of their workers. This kind of thinking marked the beginning of recognition of the need for evaluation of WUs.

While Sinadinovski, an able thinker, was simply signalling the need for evaluation and special courses, his colleagues of the WU of Mostar came up with programs of special seminars

and the basics of evaluation. S. Markovic, a very capable directress of the WU of Mostar, explained how they had come up with special seminars in economic education.[11] Members of workers' councils came and took five or six which they qualified as elementary in economic education; they wanted more serious seminars. The WU of Mostar staff were faced with a dilemma: should participants be made specialists? The answer was no. It was not necessary for a member of the workers' council to become a specialist; what he needed was the knowledge that would enable him to understand and follow up effectively the investment policy of the enterprise he worked for.

How were these seminars made functional, adapted to the needs of a particular enterprise? The following research procedures were employed: first, the instructors were asked to visit the enterprise or factory before the commencement of the seminar; instructors then gathered data concerning the dealings of the mine over a period of time and this information they built into the seminar. Lectures were followed by discussions with the participants. Their teaching-learning principle was that the seminar must deal with the functionality of the particular work organization. That making a seminar functional provided stronger motivation for the participants was one finding of the WU of Mostar. The participants were then required to present written reports. It was easier to get them to write about the concrete problems of their businesses than to deal with theoretical considerations, according to S. Markovic.

The WU of Mostar applied evaluation techniques, they referred to as "analysis of educational results." Anonymous polls were taken among the participants. However, "we cannot be happy with an appraisal which says that a seminar was a success, if things in the enterprise continue to be in bad shape," concluded the directress of the WU of Mostar.[12]

In view of the fact that socio-political education in that period was politically fashionable and in great demand,

since it was thought that socio-economic education represented a happy combination of individual and social needs, the design, construction, and carrying out of special seminars in this area were highly desirable. The way the Mostar team reacted to these needs so promptly and studiously was admirable, and their efforts with respect to evaluation and research were equally remarkable for the late 1950s.

New Trends

In this era, new trends began to be evident in adult worker education. Some WUs such as those of Zagreb, Mostar, and Skopje began to survey the needs and interests of some groups of workers; they also began to specialize. As well, it was thought that positive experiences and practices at more developed universities ought to be shared. Regarding "specialization," M. Krstinić made a strong demand.[13] She supported the idea of setting up a "whole series of specialized institutions and schools" to speed up the process of educating self-managing workers, emphasizing that training and education of workers for self-management required, at that historic moment, institutions and schools of the highest standard, which implied top-quality teachers and programs as well as the involvement of society. In other words, "specialized institutions of out-of-school-education," as she defined WUs, should have no place for the "most backward workers."

According to Krstinić, WUs must be reserved for workers already actively involved in self-management, or workers about to be trained for these functions through recommendations from workers' councils. Under existing conditions in Yugoslavia then, with large numbers of illiterate and semi-literate workers, her argument sounded very unreal, to say the least! 1953 census statistics showed that of the population over ten years old, 3,404,429 people were illiterate.[14] Krstinić tended to overemphasize the "specialized" feature of WUs, and over stressed professionalism. Her attitudes were not in

harmony with the broad concept of WUs that guaranteed flexibility of admission, the principle Deleon had so clearly described.[15] Fortunately, it seems, Krstinić's views did not gain acceptance.

The Workers' University of Zagreb

The prevailing situation in 1957 was that a great number of WUs in Yugoslavia were far from well off. They were still in the first stage of development. More developed WUs were busy building their systems of education and internal structures. Thus, in 1957 the WU of Zagreb (since 1957, this WU has had a new name, the Workers' University, "Moša Pijade") began to support two systems of worker education in the belief that that gave workers a fair choice. The systems were the free seminar system and the permanent system of education.

The free system of seminars aimed to enable every worker to enrol in a course or seminar he found most suitable to his level of understanding. The assumption was that this availability would correspond to different workers' interests. Seminars included socio-political seminars on three levels -- elementary, intermediate, and advanced -- plus clubs for discussion; natural science seminars on three levels, plus clubs; aesthetic education seminars, on three levels, including clubs; a foreign language school with elementary, intermediate, and advanced courses; these first four types of seminars were called general education within the context of the free system. Seminars in socio-economic education, on three levels, plus clubs, conferences and consultations on current socio-economic problems were also included.

It is worthwhile to cite topics discussed in aesthetic education seminars (literature, music, film): modern fiction, contemporary fine arts, how to listen to a piece of music, twenty-four great film directors, music of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Also, there were discussions about movies, such as East of Eden and Fanfane la tulipe, about

Chaplin and about movies seen at the Cannes festival, and so on. Discussions were organized about the beginnings of TV in Yugoslavia, radio drama, and modern theatre. These data show how avant-garde the clubs were at the time.

Duration of the seminars of the free system was three and a half to four months. What were its major features? First of all, workers were free to choose and decide on seminars; enrolment was also free -- a worker could choose the level he thought best. Moving within the system was his free choice, too; finally, he could drop out at any time, or leave the system when he thought he had met his needs, interests, or wishes. Data given by the director of the WU of Zagreb showed that in one four-year period the system included 14,187 students in 707 different seminars based on fourty-two programs. (This figure does not include 4,476 participants in 211 seminars in vocational education.)[16]

Among other features of the free system: it did not require a heavy commitment on the part of workers, nor tie them down to a longer period of time. It did not aim at higher educational objectives; it assumed that workers were sufficiently motivated to enrol in seminars in their free time. A comradely and collaborative atmosphere existed in the seminars and clubs. Working in small groups of eight to fifteen people where workers could feel free and close to each other was an additional asset. The system included possibilities for organizing special seminars or courses on request; for example, if workers needed further education in regular schools, seminars could be organized for them to study such subjects as math, physics, speech, and writing.

By their nature, seminars and courses of the free system could be interrelated or completely independent, each being complete in itself.

The permanent system of education aimed at higher and more complex educational objectives than the free seminar system, and therefore it involved the student in acquiring solid knowledge and skills. The system was best represented

by Workers's College. In 1956, one of the most dynamic WUs, the WU of Zagreb, set up its own advanced school for workers within the university. The full course comprised four semesters. The methods and curriculum of the Workers' College are of great interest.

The curriculum included courses in the following areas: study of the factory (enterprise): economy of the factory (enterprise); industrial psychology; labour law; economic geography; the economy and structure of Yugoslavia; social and political science; nineteenth- and twentieth-century history; the Yugoslav Revolution; current political issues; the theory and practice of socialism: the mechanism of socialist democracy; the position of the social movement in the world; ethics and philosophy: Marxist philosophy; natural sciences and mathematics: mathematics; physics; chemistry; biology; geography; the mother tongue: speech and writing; aesthetic education: in literature; fine arts; filming; designing.[17] Interestingly, the course in speech and writing was spread over three semesters. It is beyond doubt that this particular training was designed to enhance students' linguistic abilities.

This system is far from the classical school type of curriculum. It is more a problem-oriented curriculum design, an andragogical design. One can see that much of the workers' education was based on the study of actual practices of factories or enterprises, and students had to write research papers relating to the problems of their own factories. This practical experience, combined with theory, enabled the worker to learn about the nature of his factory, human relations and material factors, the basics of the economic process, and general conditions affecting factories.[18]

As the Workers' College was intended for experienced members of self-management bodies, candidates had to meet certain requirements for admission. Their socio-political activity in the factory had to have been demonstrated, the factory had to agree to their shortened work hours (during

training they were expected to work only four hours), they had to be skilled workers, which implies they had acquired the basics of math, reading and comprehension.

Workers attending the College continued to receive full pay, although they worked only half-time. The school enroled about eighty new students every year and hoped to raise this figure to 250 when new buildings were completed, M. David reported.[19]

The promoters of the College aimed to widen their worker-students' knowledge in the socio-economic field in order to make them more effective members of management bodies in the factory and more socially and politically active in their community as well as to help them qualify later for ordinary higher education. Their concern was to develop the worker's personality through introduction to a diversity of education and constant testing of theory against practice. In their view, as David observed, integration of this school with the WU rather than with the academic university had the advantage of not cutting off worker-students from their comrades. David was struck by the enthusiasm of V. Velčić, director of the first Workers' College. Velčić talked of the new renaissance and the humanization of the individual that this training and education must bring about.[20]

WUs and Vocational Training and Education

Most WUs in Yugoslavia, including that of Zagreb, continued to prepare workers who wished to take qualifying examinations. Yugoslav industries lacked specialized workers, and there were few institutions to help with the problem. Courses had been given at evening classes, lasting six to eighteen months, by WU vocational centres. Some WUs also set up vocational centres specializing in training of managerial staff for the economy (managers and organizers of production in industries and enterprises).

In androgogical circles, opinions differed on this issue.

Some thought WUs were incapable of creating a system of vocational education for workers.* M. Krstinić said that even the most developed WUs in the country could not meet the needs of vocational education and training unless they had facilities such as workshops, experimental classes, adequate programs, and staff to work with adult workers in industries and enterprises.[21]

Two basic suggestions were made. One was that this area of worker education should be left to regular vocational schools, where apprenticeship training traditionally was required, as is the case in many industrial countries. In principle, this was acceptable, but there was a basic contradiction: to implement this idea would imply having classes in regular professional schools with a teaching staff that is specialized in dealing with adult workers, which schools did not have.

A second suggestion was that this kind of education should be carried out by industries and enterprises. Efforts were made at some places to put this idea more or less into practice. WUs were willing to tackle this problem in conjunction with industries. Where co-operation was already established, the industry secured facilities and specialist teaching staff. For their part, WUs provided the andragogical component, a new experience for them. According to Krstinić, WUs were the only institutions which dealt with vocational education seriously.[22]

As time went on, vocational education in WUs became very wide, though with many contradictions; and it was also a big source of revenue. However, V. Čeklić blamed WUs for shortcomings in the vocational education of workers.[23] He thought it was positive to help workers get better qualifications,

---

* "Vocational education" is the preferred term by Yugoslav authors because of their socialist concern with complete self-realization of workers; in their opinion, it could be harmful to concentrate on training only for economic output.

but that qualification was often a mere formality. His major criticism was that courses in vocational education dealt seriously with the theoretical aspect only, and in most cases neglected the more important vocational part, the practical aspect. Čeklić stressed that there was a need for solid analysis to reveal the real impact that the new qualifications had on workers' jobs.[24]

Research Efforts of the WU of Zagreb

Now that the WU of Zagreb had developed a solid system of adult workers' education, it decided to go a step further in co-operating with industries. It had defined itself as "part of the enterprise" and hypothesized that "in modern industry, worker education becomes an integral part of production." To test this hypothesis, the WU of Zagreb conducted research into educational needs of Zagreb area industries. Teams of researchers went to factories and observed workers performing. They talked with them, asked questions, and listened. Research included questions such as how long does it take a worker to master the operation of a machine? Is that training enough, or should the worker look upon it as a part of a permanent ongoing process? How important is a particular work post? What is the relation between the factory and the community?

The research conducted in 142 factories of the Zagreb area showed two things: that it was unclear to workers and their supervisors that they ought to be trained in new technologies, and that there was no evidence of the commencement of systematic training and education for the new era of automatization of industry to come. Another very important finding of the research was that the work place itself and a particular manufacturing process could be the most practical school for workers. Furthermore, workers' councils were shown to be the most valuable schools of self-management. The conclusion was obvious: special seminars and study courses

were needed to train workers for a particular work place as well as seminars and courses for managers and organizers of production. Again, the need for special seminars for members of workers' councils was stressed.

The WU of Zagreb admitted it could not resolve these problems alone. It insisted that industry and enterprises should assume the major load. However, they responded slowly to this challenge, though their response was positive in sending workers to the WU to prepare for professional exams. The WU itself was aware of a serious drawback: no matter how strong it was on the theory of vocational education, it did not have the facilities for practical training.

Soon, however, industries began to organize specialized seminars on their premises, and asked for the assistance of the WU of Zagreb. They needed help with teaching methods and curricula, and the WU had those skills. This was the beginning of a new role as instructor for the WU of Zagreb, and later of the other WUs in the country. This role became particularly important in the subsequent period in which industry and enterprises set up their own vocational training centres.[25]

With equal enthusiasm, the WU of Zagreb plunged into research related to workers' cultural needs, which included research on conditions required for a more cultured life for workers in the factories; free time; organizing the work day; the family; cultural habits; interests; hobbies; material conditions; and so on. Without doubt, the WU of Zagreb pioneered in this area, too.

Andragogical Cycle

In 1958, the WU of Zagreb came up with a new concept of the "closed process," later called the "andragogical cycle." Actually, it was a procedure of designing and conducting an educational program, and had five phases: surveying educational needs, designing of program(s), training

of teachers and instructors, conducting the program(s) and analysis of results (evaluation). Each phase will be discussed briefly below.

Surveying of educational needs took place in the manufacturing unit of a factory or enterprise. A team of specialists studied certain kinds of work and determined the related needs and deficiencies. Specialists from the factory played an important role in this phase. They were engineers, economists, technicians, and members of workers' management. This kind of expertise required thorough observation of the problems that had to be translated into educational needs. The whole cycle depended on this phase, simply because only after needs are determined can educational programs be planned to meet them.

Designing of programs: When basic data had been gathered during phase 1 as to who the workers were that needed training and education, their educational level, what kind of job training was needed for, where, and the means to be used, they served as a foundation for the program the WU planned in conjunction with experts from the factory or enterprise.

Training of teachers: With respect to the fact that many teachers were recruited from industry, it was logical to assume that these people needed special training in methods and procedures of adult education so they could handle adult workers in the teaching-learning process.

Phases 1 to 3 were preparation for the most important phase, phase 4, realization of the program itself.

Program realization, or, organization of the teaching plan as it was sometimes called, took place in a group or seminar of eight to twenty people. The seminar was organized by the vocational centre under direct supervision by the head of the centre. Each seminar had an instructor and a leader both of whom assumed responsibility for the

seminar.*

Analysis of results (evaluation): By definition, this activity meant the summing up of experience. It also indicated further needs and pointed to weaknesses of the seminar program. The analysis, as the last phase in the cycle, led to the next program. In this manner, the andragogical cycle was closed.

In designing this method, the WU of Zagreb took the enterprise itself as a model.[26] Though the method assumed final form in 1958, its application by WUs throughout Yugoslavia took longer. More advanced WUs started applying the method in part, or fully, only in the 1960s.

The Staff

The basic principle of the WU of Zagreb was to have a nucleus of full-time specialist staff who assumed key positions in the university: director, heads of centres, and several full-time associates. The rest of the staff, the seminar leaders, instructors, and most teaching staff, were all hired part-time, the so-called part-time associates. In principle, they applied practice to test the theory from industry.

In her report, Krstinić emphasized the strong support the WU of Zagreb had had during the later 1950s from the People's Committee of Zagreb in terms of funds and responsibilities assumed by the Committee regarding construction of the new WU building.[27] In the monograph on the WU of Zagreb, the income for 1957 was listed as 71,528,000 dinars and the proportion of grants to receipts was sixty-five per cent

---

* The leader of the educational group has become a part of educational practice in the WU of Zagreb, and in other more advanced WUs since early seminars. He had to cope with all of the problems of educational groups ("living organisms") such as getting along, integration of participants, group cohesion, different levels of education, different interests, and conflicts.

to thirty-five per cent.[28] The figures are impressive. Compared to 1956, the grants seem less, but they still amounted to a large sum.

Taking everything into consideration, one is apt to conclude that in 1957 the WU of Zagreb was already a well-established institution of worker education with major features of the curriculum pattern well developed in three basic areas of education: socio-economic, vocational, and cultural, and with a solid budget. Though it was not definite or complete in terms of internal organization and curriculum, it certainly had succeeded, in a five-year period in establishing a system of adult education, building up a teaching staff, becoming research-oriented, and serving as a model institution in the country.

The Workers' University of Belgrade

Like its counterpart in Zagreb, the WU of Belgrade worked under more favourable conditions than other WUs, according to G. Jovanić.[29] Belgrade, the capital of Yugoslavia and a political, economic, and cultural centre, offered great opportunities for education, culture, and entertainment. With its network of schools, institutions, the university, scientific associations, and many cultural institutions, Belgrade was an inexhaustible storehouse of opportunity. The Belgrade economy was very strong; the city accounted for twenty-three per cent of the economy of the People's Republic of Serbia. About 160,000 industrial workers with good qualifications were employed in the city's industries. All these facilities ought to be exploited for worker education. With the introduction of self-management, worker education had become a primary political task, Jovanić stressed.

Large projects to reconstruct industries and introduce modern technologies and organization were under way. New workers needed to be trained and old workers retrained so

that they could take up new jobs; all needed new knowledge and skills. Also, more than 14,000 workers, many of them young adults, were elected to workers' councils in 1958. They needed self-management know-how.

There was no institution in Belgrade to deal with the systematic economic training and education of management staff. Fourteen different organizations tackled this problem in an unco-ordinated and partial way, leading Jovanić to conclude that enterprises in Belgrade did not pay attention to personnel needs.[30] Jovanić observed a changing situation:

> A couple of years back we went to enterprises to give lengthy briefings and explanations on the need for their workers, foremen, and managers to enrol in our seminars and courses (on general, economic, and vocational education). Also, we were ready to organize the same kind of courses in their enterprises without any remuneration. We were not met with good reception everywhere. We continued to talk to them persistently. Today, the situation has changed greatly; the relationship has changed, and they have more confidence in us. Earlier, we demanded more from them, today they demand more and more from us. We cannot respond to all of their requests....[31]

Jovanić's account is characteristic and interesting for two reasons: it indicates one attitude to adult education; and it also indicates the tough methods WUs applied to convince the enterprises and their workers.

Jovanić talked about other aspects of the changed situation. Before, the enterprises had been happy with the lecturers and instructors from the WU of Belgrade no matter how ill trained, poorly prepared and inexperienced they were. But by the late 1950s, their criteria had changed; much more was expected from the instructors now. Workers and employees reacted to improvisations and weaknesses in the programs. Instead of just dry information delivered monotonously from a distant platform, students expected a lively, clear,

well-prepared talk, and an atmosphere for free speech and discussion.

The general trend, as strongly manifested in the Belgrade area, was for enterprises, workers' councils, socio-political organizations, and trade unions in particular, to organize different kinds of systematic forms of worker education.* Also, they were expected to set up special services and centres, but in co-operation with WUs and other institutions for training "cadres for the economy".** Educating and training cadres for the economy subsequently became very popular!

It was assumed that industries and enterprises were committed and economically interested in providing better conditions for systematic upgrading of vocational and other skills of their cadres. The other assumption was that enterprises themselves were the best schools for cadres. In reality, the situation was different. In enterprises' budgets and financial plans one could rarely find allowance for worker education or training of cadres.[32]

Like the WU of Zagreb, the WU of Belgrade supported the idea of setting up well organized personnel departments in industries which would have andragogues, psychologists, instructors, and specialists to take care of admission, training, and education of workers and managers. The time had come for these to become part of the system of adult education in the country. While the WU of Zagreb emphasized more the specialization of the institution, the WU of Belgrade

---

* "Socio-political organizations" refers to political organizations of working people with a socialist program (the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, The Socialist Alliance of the Working People of Yugoslavia, the trade unions, the Veterans Association, Youth League). See glossary in Socialist Thought and Practice, 1 (Beograd, 1974).

** In the late 1950s, a new term was introduced by the Yugoslav authors -- cadres for the economy -- as a substitute for "workers and employees."

stressed more the commitments of enterprises.

Jovanić admitted that the WU of Belgrade did not manage to evaluate educational results from its program. It appears to have operated with too large a scope of activities and to have neglected measurements and evaluation almost completely. Nevertheless, they did make surveys and consulted with the participants to discover whether they had done a good job.[33]

Introduction of a free system of seminars and courses, similar to that of the WU of Zagreb, was under consideration. Considering the fact that the turn-over of the WU of Belgrade was 8,000 people per year with prospects in the future for a larger number of participants, something ought to have been done to ensure that "quality education" was given. One thing was certain, the number of full-time staff needed to be increased. Their training was no less significant: they needed, it was thought, to go abroad to specialize in adult education methods and techniques.

Although the activities of the WU of Belgrade were flourishing, Jovanić thought that administration and management did not follow the same rate of growth. Improvements were needed, especially elaboration of the instruments of internal organization.[34] Although Jovanić did not elaborate, he meant regulations related to the social management of the institution were needed.

Less Advanced Workers' Universities

The WUs of Zagreb and Belgrade were thriving by 1957. However, smaller, less developed WUs were not. S. Eraković, J. Sinadinovski, and V. Ćeklić described their difficulties.[35] Sinadinovski, although he was from one of the larger universities, the WU of Skopje, seems to have understood the problems that burdened smaller WUs. Again he raised the question of cadres and finances in WUs, and cited the Resolution of the First Congress of the Workers' Councils of Yugoslavia to strengthen WUs. How could they do a better

job if cadres and finances were not provided, he asked. Was it possible to work with one or two full-time staff members, who, in most cases, had no adequate qualifications and training on systematic education of workers? Was it not unbecoming to have an institution of worker education that attracted thousands of adult learners but employed only one full-time professional?[36]

Čeklić analyzed some factors influencing policy decisions with respect to WUs. He supported Co-ordination Committee's position that WUs could be financed in more than one way depending on individual commune's conditions, possibilities, and needs, and listed the following sources of finance: grants from People's Committees of communes and districts, subsidies from trade unions, subsidies from the Socialist Alliance, contributions from enterprises, receipts from WUs, and funds for senior staff.[37] Čeklić produced data on the financial situation for twelve WUs in Croatia in 1957 (Slavonski Brod, Vinkovci, Rijeka, Šibenik, Čakovec, Varaždin, Nova Gradiška, Sisak, Pula, Virovitica, Osijek, Vukovar). The sum of financial resources for these WUs, exclusive of contributions from enterprises, amounted to 32,175,000 din, which was almost 15 million less than the budget of the WUs of Zagreb or Belgrade, or, only 5 million din larger than the budget of the WU of Subotica. Čeklić remarked with logic and humour: "Taking into consideration that Rijeka, which is a more developed industrial centre than Subotica, has a budget almost four times smaller, we can see that the situation regarding the finances is not particularly good."[38]

Since finances for WUs to 1957, from different sources, were unreliable in most cases, it was necessary for communes to secure funds for worker education, Sinadinovski declared.[39] This was the pledge of the social community anyway, as Deleon had pointed out.

S. Elakovič, himself probably unhappy over this kind of status of WUs, suggested a new policy, or rather "orientation,"

as he called it. He said that WUs must provide part of their financial means themselves.[40]

Čeklić restricted his analyses to the situation in Croatia, with some comparisons to financial situations elsewhere. He criticized those WUs that relied mostly on trade union support and pointed out that trade union councils in communes and districts provided the most support to WUs, but that the trade unions in enterprises remained passive. Some WUs did get strong financial support from enterprises such as the WUs of Zagreb, Osijek, and Split. Financial arrangements seemed best organized where WUs had support from sources such as People's Committees, district trade unions, and the League of Communists, as was the case in Zagreb, Split, Slavonski Brod, Varaždin, and Rijeka.[41]

Educating Women in Workers' Universities

According to the report to the Parliament of Croatia presented by Čeklić in December 1957, there was no specialized education for employed women. Neither were existing programs adapted to women's needs. Women enrolled in seminars and courses were treated like other workers, and were a minority. Their enrolment was strongest in economics seminars, in particular those for the members of workers' councils and management boards. In 1956-57, in Zagreb, these seminars were attended by 728 women, which was only thirty-five per cent of the total number of students.[42] Čeklić uses the same statistics to indicate women's participation in workers' councils.*

The WU of Split held seminars in health education for

* The 1953 data shows that 2,506,475 females, as compared to 897,954 males, in the population group older than ten, were illiterate (Savezni Zavod za statistiku, Beograd 1960, Knjiga 9, p. 2), thus indicating the heavy burden from the past when female children had been kept out of school. Now, women in Yugoslavia are significantly represented at all levels of the labour force.

workers; a relatively large number of women participated (five seminars with ninety students). The same university organized seminars in health education for young female workers. Women's interest in these seminars induced organizers to set up a centre for health education with the WU of Split. The WU of Labin also held lectures and some seminars for women.

Some of the Workers' Universities Problems

S. Tonković of the Central Council of the Yugoslav Trade Unions gave an overview of Yugoslav WUs.[43] His data were shocking: only 250 professional people (directors, associates, teachers-organizers) were employed during this period in 100 WUs;* only a few in the entire country had their own buildings; total resources amounted to 300 million dinars, one-third of which were used by the three most developed universities -- Zagreb, Belgrade, and Sarajevo. Most WUs had one or two full-time people; one-quarter were operated by volunteers; grants from people's committees to some WUs sometimes amounted to only a mere token of 30,000-100,000 dinars which often was their only source of revenue. It is easy to understand the moral pointed out by Tonković: most WUs worked under very unfavourable conditions. With respect to the number of specialist staff and grants they received, the WUs stood lowest on the scale of educational institutions. By way of comparison, Tonković stated that in 1957 and 1958 all WUs together were granted only 2.5 per cent of available funds whereas regular schools received 91.6 per cent; practical training and apprenticeship schools received grants of 2.5 billion that year, while WUs got only 300 million.[44]

* In fact the total number of WUs in the whole of Yugoslavia was 97 in 1958 according to the Statistical Bulletin of the Federal Institute of Statistics, No. 206 (Belgrade, 1961), p. 73.

Theoretical Considerations

Tonković tried to go deeper into the causes of such a situation. Indisputably, one of the causes could have been the process and the phenomenon of growth and development of the WUs as new institutions. Basically, they were set up to counteract improvised, propagandistic, disjointed institutions; yet they could not suddenly rid themselves of the same kinds of weakness. Furthermore, the constant growth of educational needs, slow development of other educational institutions, and certain degree of de-engagement on the part of the socio-political organizations pushed WUs into a wide field which absorbed all their energy and held them back.

Among other factors which affected the growth of WUs were the scarcity of material resources in communes and districts that could be used to help WUs either through grants, in construction of buildings, or in hiring staff. As well, the general lack of specialists and the non-existence of an institution to train specialists, held back growth. The Faculty of Philosophy and Teachers' College did not have departments for adult education at this time.

People's perception of the role and tasks of WUs was a crucial factor in their growth, which explains why some industrial centres and communes which had similar resources approached WUs in different ways. If they considered WUs and adult education to be temporary phenomena which functioned only because there were not enough schools, nobody included in a commune or district development plan items such as construction of a workers' hall, adult education classrooms, or fellowships. That WUs were not established by decree -- "education can be attained in schools only," so it was thought -- and that their role and tasks were not defined by law gave rise to this misconception.

Nevertheless, Tonković at least was not pessimistic; he was future-oriented. With the economic and social development of the country, adult education could only grow, for various reasons. First, recruitment of a labour force from among

the peasantry was continuing -- vocational schools supplied only one-third of the skilled workers -- they entered industries with minimum education or no education, which normally slows down the progress of the working class; second, ongoing modernization of industry and the economy in general required modern training and education for workers, in contrast to training in traditional crafts; third, workers' responsibilities under self-management grew daily, and so did their rights. This was best reflected in the part of the budget they handled at the time. Worker's councils handled twenty-five per cent, while 26.7 per cent was handled by communes and districts. The new (1957) regulation of the Federal Executi[redacted]ncil enabled every worker, regardless of education [redacted], to enrol in the ordinary university, on the conditi[redacted]at he pass entrance examination. This was a great step forward, and it promised new opportunities for the working class.

Tonković hoped that the attitude towards adult education and WUs had begun to change. Today it is the relationship between enterprises and WUs that is important. Tonković tried to put this relationship into a historical perspective. Three stages of development could be distinguished: in the period of Yugoslav reconstruction, the industrial principle was applied to education; educational activities predominantly took place in the enterprise. In other words, worker education was in the hands of trade unions. Later, in order to avoid one-sided education, it was removed from enterprise and put on a territorial base -- WUs and other educational institutions were set up. As a consequence, enterprises became very passive. Now, Yugoslavia is in a position to carry out educational activities both within the enterprise and outside it.

What is gained by combining the industrial and territorial principle? With respect to the commune, not only was it committed to worker education, it was also economically interested in raising the workers' educational standard and

upgrading their skills and qualifications. An enterprise, on the other hand, was interested in advancing the workers' vocational know-how, in training and educating members of workers' councils, informing and educating the entire work force, and in the commune itself, in particular, its cultural and educational institutions.

Until recently, enterprises have engaged relatively little in worker education, and have not shown much interest in WU services. However, recently, the situation has changed considerably. First, the effects of WUs' efforts in vocational and socio-economic education were being felt more and more in enterprises; second, action had been taken to set up vocational training centres in enterprises; third, thirty to fourty per cent of the funds for senior staff came from enterprises whereby the financial resources for education of cadres were provided. Enterprises had taken a new role; they had become permanently involved in education. Their role in vocational education and training had become specific: they specialized in training and advancement for a particular work place. The former exclusively school-type of vocational training was being supplemented by out-of-school training.[45]

Workers' Universities vs. Enterprises

What was the relation of WUs and enterprises? Basically, they were not and could not be strictly separate factors; they could act only as complementary forces, "carriers" of education for the same workers. In this preparatory stage, it was understandable that more advanced WUs would be able to help set up vocational centres in large enterprises or industries. Close co-operation between the centres and WUs was anticipated. With smaller enterprises, the relationship would be somewhat different, as these would be unable to organize vocational training. The Federal Executive Council's regulation provided for enterprises to utilize

the services of other institutions, in the first place those of WUs and vocational schools. By the same regulation, WUs could set up centres of their own. In relation to enterprise, WUs assumed an instructor or andragogical role by assisting enterprises to develop programs and set up centres. Considering that, out of the 26,000 enterprises that existed in 1957, only a few hundred could afford to set up vocational training centres the role of WUs had become and was going to be very important.

Of course, WU activities cannot be reduced to vocational education only. There was a whole series of educational needs, which perhaps could only be met by organized efforts by large enterprises, but not by all of them. The first need was for managerial staff: foremen, chiefs, section managers, presidents of workers' councils, work safety officers, and so on. Second, there were many areas of socio-economic, ideological, and general education to be dealt with by WUs. Worker education throughout Yugoslavia had many complexities; there could be no favouring of some educational areas over others. Neglecting any would cause undesirable consequences.

Over and over again, Tonkovic stressed that education for workers' self-management was needed; it was common knowledge that WUs did not include all members of self-management organs; and that education must be expanded to include a large number of workers regardless of whether they were self-management or not. WUs were also expected to specialize in educating members of various commissions of workers' councils. Further, their greater involvement was anticipated in education for members of social management organs, above all in social insurance, health care, and vocational schools, where decentralization had been considerably slower.*

---

* In 1959, the WU of Sarajevo came up with interesting programs, such as "Self-Management in Social Insurance," and "Social Management in Health Service and Schools". See Teorija i praksa samoupravljanja (Belgrade, 1972), p. 994.

In ideological education, the role of WUs was large, too. Fulfilment of these tasks began only when WUs moved into this field along with People's Universities (PUs) and political schools, which can be included with WUs. WUs had to demonstrate their professional and andragogical skills to adapt programs to adults and also to reflect in them the problems of work collectives and the territory in which they functioned. In addition, WUs were expected to go beyond the basic programs about society; they were to study the theory and practice of socialism, the mechanism of social democracy in Yugoslavia, and the history of the labour movement.

So far, one category of workers or employees had been neglected -- the technical intelligentsia: employees, managers, experts. Their perception of the socio-political problems in the country was not something to which WUs could be indifferent. Often the functioning of the whole system of self-management depended on the views and perceptions of these people. With further differentiation of educational programs, opportunities had to be provided to include this group in them. It was an opportune moment for WUs to take an interest in helping workers prepare for higher education, especially because the universities themselves did not show much initiative in this respect.

With regard to helping adult workers with the organization of their free time, views had not yet been crystallized and the problem not dealt with scientifically. But the Culture Centre of the WU of Zagreb made notable efforts to understand the factors affecting workers' happiness. Tonković believed that socio-political organizations still did not understand the essence and the goals of WUs. He talked about the need to make WUs more respectable educational institutions and stressed a radical need for stabilization of what the Yugoslav experience had already provided. Through norms, guidelines and internal regulations, arbitrary interpretations, and subjective influence and viewpoints

could be avoided. Instead, minimum security, perspective and freedom could be guaranteed to those working in this field. Administration and management of WUs needed to be differentiated. This did not mean that WUs were to become a closed system. On the contrary, WUs were to become more open institutions, individualistic, flexible centres for all kinds of professionals, experts, and activists.[46]

Workers' Universities and Other Educational Institutions

Tonković touched upon other delicate issues, such as the relationship of WUs to other educational institutions, particularly People's Universities. WUs and PUs should complement each other in meeting local educational needs. The relationship between WUs and formal institutions was somewhat different. This was so especially in relationship to universities. So far they had co-operated only through individuals, in that university teachers had been hired as part-time associates by WUs or participated in their management organs. However, the aspiration to unify the entire educational system (school and out-of-school) required far more co-operation. Actually, WUs had already co-operated with universities through study courses organized in preparation for entrance exams. Tonković was absolutely right in his assertion that the experiences of WUs in dealing with adult learners would probably help the universities a lot. It was important that the relationship between WUs and other educational institutions be between institutions which had the same objectives but different specific functions. Tonković urged that the tasks of WUs should be looked at dialectically because they were constantly developing, adapting, being integrated into new situations, and were anti-schematic, informal, flexible, and dynamic.[47]

Appraisal by Trade Unions

In 1957 and 1958, a lively discussion was going on; conferences were held in Belgrade, Zagreb, and Sarajevo to discuss the "boom" period of some WUs. Again, the concept and nature of these institutions was discussed, particularly the impact of the seven-year existence of these relatively new institutions. Theoretically, WUs appeared to have established themselves in the Yugoslav educational system in general and the adult education system in particular and to have raised the standard of education. Tonkovic thought it crucial that WUs had evolved as institutions for the systematic out-of-school education of workers. It was also crucial that WUs had been established as an indispensable part of the broad, modern system of education in general, and significant that WUs had constantly been expanding, above all by adapting themselves to the needs of society and to economic life. They had provided a new type of education which was dynamic and flexible.

To illustrate this point, Tonkovic pointed out in 1956, for example, eighty-four WUs had a total attendance of 86,859; of this total, 41,842 students participated in socio-economic seminars, and 20,960 in vocational seminars; in 1958, ninety-seven WUs offered socio-economic seminars to 50,317 students and vocational seminars to 31,120, the total attendance being 150,148.[48] The development and growth of WUs in this period is best reflected in the provision of socio-economic education, managerial staff trained in economics, vocational-technical education, preparation for higher schools, and in general culture.

The most developed WUs had up to eighty-five different programs in 1958, and deserved special credit for their contribution over the last few years to the advancement of worker management and development of social relations in general, and to the lessening of the disproportion between specialist training for workers and the needs of the work

place. In 1957, 35,429 workers were enrolled in courses for skilled and highly skilled workers. Since ninety per cent passed the exams, WUs provided two-thirds of the qualified cadres, and the vocational schools one-third. WUs had also introduced the scientific method to solve the theoretical problems of adult education.

The relatively rapid growth of WUs had created a series of contradictions. Aspirations and possibilities, reality, and ideals conflicted. These institutions did not have the human or material resources to assume ever more difficult and more complex tasks. Different WUs found different solutions for different conditions. It was not surprising that some WUs reached a crisis* during the boom period. It did not result only from rapid internal growth or from the fact that the adult education system was not developed. Other factors were the low level of interest in education by workers, especially in some areas, poor learning habits, motivation, and inability to profit from free time, and poor attendance. Tonković remarks that these problems were a very clear indication that WUs have moved into a new phase which can be called the "phase of constitution" (constitutionalizing). The preceding period could be called the "affirmation phase."[49]

The Uniqueness of Workers' Universities

The novelty of WUs in educational practice was their natural integration into the local situation; their reflection of the needs of the territory in which they worked gave them a unique character. In spite of their dissimilarity, WUs had some common features and functions. These were: to survey educational needs, to implement programs, to educate workers, to help the economy and trade union organizations.

---

* From available evidence, it is unclear which WUs were affected by the crisis Tonković referred to.

The first function deserves to be analyzed in detail. Some thought that even if there were a specialized organization to survey educational needs, expectations could not be fulfiled because needs were so great. Others thought that part of the program could be standardized so that there was not a great need to survey educational needs. However, if the uniqueness of the WUs is thought to be their meeting of concrete needs resulting from social, economic, and technological development, then this survey function must be developed.

The social system in Yugoslavia today, with its communal organization, requires a local communal education policy. The vertical system of establishing educational needs must be supplemented by local efforts to identify specific needs. The function of direct education was not in dispute. By interpreting the role of WUs in terms of direct education, an attempt was made to redefine the framework of activities, the content, organization, staff, and material resources. This must be done, it was thought, in order to change the image of WUs in the minds of the people, so that they could develop more radically and attain educational results that would establish quality as the basic criterion for educational activity in contrast to quantity, the former criterion. Generally speaking, WUs were still at a relatively low level of development in quality. WUs were also just in the stage of finding the most appropriate solutions to educational problems, to avoid tendencies towards classical uniformity and exclusiveness.[50]

Considerations Related to Program Areas and Content

The backbone of the WU system was the content of education, which, again, was a reflection of the concrete needs of the people and society. Very detailed course of studies cannot successfully be prescribed from above. What needed to be established, in principle, were that WUs were unique institutions

for systematic and complex out-of-school education, and that WUs were institutions established for the sake of learning and not for the sake of the functionaries (za funkcije, ne za funkcionere). Here Ponkovic was playing with words to stress the socialist non-elitist character of the institution, in that programs and forms were to be available to every worker. Furthermore, the more significant areas of education had to be established which would help develop many dimensions of WUs' activities, and make the notion of "complex education" more concrete. So far, Yugoslav experience and general needs had shown that the following basic areas of education could be covered by WUs:

- general education, to enable workers to get basic knowledge preliminary to socio-economic, vocational, aesthetic, health, family, technical education, and personal culture;
- socio-economic education, which comprised basic socio-economic education for workers' self-management and social management, for communal and other social functions;
- socio-political or ideological education: socialist theory and practice, the history of the workers' movement, contemporary problems of the workers' movement, international relations, dialectic materialism, ethics, the state and religion, and so on;
- education of the managerial staff for the economy, intended for directors, plant managers, and so on;
- vocational education: accelerated vocational education and training in conjunction with enterprises, advanced training, and technical information, preparations for the exams of skilled and highly skilled workers, and preparatory courses for workers taking entrance exams in the universities.

The attempt to define these areas is not also an attempt to define the educational content of the system. The system needed to adjust its content to meet long-term needs (continuity) and action needs (new needs resulting from certain conditions and priority tasks), and to meet the

principles of vertical gradation and horizontal complexity. That is, the system had to enable study and educational advancement relative to positions and responsibilities of working people.[51]

On the New Function of WUs

The instructional role or function of the WUs had not been developed by 1957; it was conditioned and restricted by the levels of development. This new function was emphasized because society's immediate task was to provide the entire working class with basic general, socio-economic, and vocational education and because WUs had maintained close ties with local territorial organizations in economy and trade unions, so were in a favourable position to initiate co-operation between institutions, as well as concentrate staff and material resources. Under prevailing conditions, WUs organized various forms of education and culture in enterprises, so that later they could help them with their teaching methods and curricula and organize training courses for technicians who acted as teachers in enterprises.

Workers' Universities in Slovenia

Publications in 1960 for the first time mention WUs in Slovenia. Before 1959 there had been no specialized institutions there for socio-economic worker education. There had been a network of People's Universities, though, In 1958, no less than 144 PUs were functioning.[52] There is evidence, also, that some PUs had been engaged in educating for self-management. One may well inquire why such an industrially developed republic had waited since 1952 to set up WUs.

I. Tavčar of Ljubljana wrote that: "It seemed useful to call some of our institutions for adult education Workers' Universities, because in the past many People's Universities

in Slovenia paid too little attention to the education of producer-managers." Does this mean that they decided arbitrarily to give PUs a new name and function? Tavčar further comments that: "The experience of others and our own practice have convinced us that in adult education also we must establish special institutions with professional staffs..."[53] He mentions sixty-three WUs and PUs in Slovenia at the end of 1959. Of these, forty-eight were WUs.

In 1969, D. Filipović wrote about "a switch in policy" when PUs in Slovenia in 1959 began to pay increasing attention to the education of industrial staff and changed their name to Workers' Universities.[54] He provided data on the decreasing number of PUs, indicating that none was left by 1963/64.

Apparently evidence is insufficient in available literature to permit any conclusions why WUs in Slovenia were not established in 1952 or 1953. It is true that both in Slovenia and Croatia, Peoples' Universities had been long established. However, in Croatia, PUs existed along with WUs, while in Slovenia, PUs ceased to exist in 1963. It is also true that Slovenia had had a long industrial tradition. There had long been an institute at Kranj specializing in vocational education for workers. Perhaps the Slovenes did not like to experiment with new institutions and therefore took a cautious approach. A special study is needed to explore the reasons for this difference.

Tavčar surveyed the situation in Slovenia: WUs and PUs together had 47,372,000 dinars at their disposal in 1959.[55] Of this, the WU of Ljubljana (the largest) received 17,475,000 which means that each other university received an average of less than half a million. With respect to the staff, all of the universities together had seventy-seven full-time people (twenty-one of these working at the WU of Ljubljana); twelve universities did not yet have a single full-time staff member. Tavčar recommended that WUs use revenues from their own activities and insisted that rich resources

could be materialized through services that WUs could extend to enterprises. He provided interesting statistics related to the composition of management boards in WUs, and explored the participation of productive workers in these bodies.

In the fifty-nine WUs surveyed there were 684 citizens serving as board members. Of these, there were 106 production workers, 321 employees, 194 teachers, 6 farmers, and 57 others.[56] Tavčar commented that these statistics were unsatisfactory because the influence of workers ought to be stronger in management bodies.[57]

The Situation of Workers' Universities Improves

The years 1958-60 were ones in which WUs received increased recognition from society. They were establishing themselves and generally enjoyed increased support. The 1958 General Law on Education recognized WUs as part of the system of education in Yugoslavia.[58] As well, the 1960 Regulation of the Federal Executive Council authorized WUs to set up vocational training and education centres.[59] Thus the scope of activities expanded considerably. At the turn of the decade, WU students included other citizens besides workers, such as youth and farmers. With the creation of a network of training centres in enterprises, WUs were acquiring an additional role as instructors and organizers by helping industries and enterprises to form centres for large-scale vocational training. Some WUs improved their financial and material resources considerably and increased their professional staffs. In 1959, with the inclusion of the WUs in Slovenia, the Yugoslav network covered all the republics and the total number of WUs reached 173.

In relation to wage-earners, it was in Montenegro that the concentration of WUs was most dense, with one WU for 5,300 wage-earners; next came Slovenia with one for 7,300; then Macedonia, one for 8,000; Bosnia and Herzegovina, one for 11,300; Serbia one for 20,000; and Croatia, one for

26,700.[60]

The differences in numbers of WUs in different republics were due to differences in the size of the service areas. Some WUs served a whole district, whereas others, in Slovenia, for example, limited their sphere of action to the commune. In districts or cities, both WUs and PUs were found.

Advanced schools for workers -- the Workers' Colleges -- were now run by four WUs in Croatia. As pointed out earlier, in 1956 the WU of Zagreb was the first to undertake this task, and was followed in 1959 by Rijeka, Split, and Osijek. The total number of worker-students at the four advanced schools in 1959-60 was 500.[61]

In Slovenia (at Ljubljana, Celje, Maribor, Koper), boarding schools for workers were opened with study courses which lasted from one to three weeks and dealt with problems of social managmenet. Some WUs organized secondary level evening classes at the School of Economics to help workers prepare for the exams there.

Ideological-political education began to take on a more important role. In 1957-58, there were 8,694 participants in ideological political seminars at fourty-three WUs, and in 1958-59 there were 40,524.[62] Forums became regular forms of providing collective information and education. For example, there was the "Political Forum" at the Workers' University of Zagreb, the "Monday Night" at the Workers' University of Sarajevo, and the "Wednesday Talks" at the Workers' University of Belgrade. At thirty-nine WUs, political evening schools were opened. The courses were six to nine months long. In 1957-58, these schools were attended by 846 students, and in 1958-59, by 3,552.[63] The curriculum of the political evening schools comprised the Basics of Marxist Philosophy, Political Economy, Sociology, System of Socialist Democracy, Economic System, and Economic Geography.

Special training courses for trade union activists were organized at thirty-nine WUs in 1958-59. Programs included topics for economics, economic policy, and different aspects

of trade union socio-political and cultural activities.

About eighty WUs gave vocational training in various forms: 643 seminars were given to 26,369 participants in 1957-58; and 897 seminars were given to 41,650 participants in 1958-59.[64]

With continuing emphasis on centres in factories and businesses, WUs helped perfect their teaching methods and curricula. In particular, they provided study courses for technicians who acted as teachers in enterprises. More advanced WUs, such as that of Zagreb, set up their own centres to educate vocational training instructors at enterprises and industries. The WU of Zagreb set up a school for personnel officers. The WUs of Zagreb, Subotica, Sarajevo, Mostar, Split, and Rijeka, in conjunction with enterprises and industries, conducted research on personnel problems and vocational training requirements. At some places, Zagreb and Belgrade in particular, WUs engaged forcefully in a new activity, the training of managerial staff for the economy. The Federal Centre at Zagreb was the most specialized institution for this type of training. A managerial section of training was also formed in the WU of Belgrade in 1959 which gave courses and seminars for managers of industrial and commercial enterprises dealing with management problems and the determination of production norms.[65]

Tonković distinguishes two types of general education: (a) basic general education with literacy courses for workers, courses for workers lacking knowledge normally acquired in elementary school, courses to prepare candidates for examinations, courses preliminary to examinations in gymnasium (the European equivalent of the high school), foreign language courses, and so on; and (b) courses of supplementary general education for workers needing to increase their knowledge though not preparing for any particular examination.[66] The latter were in such subjects as mathematics, physics, chemistry, geography, electronics, family education (seminars or schools for parents), health

education, aesthetic education (literature, fine arts, music, film); also clubs, such as Friends of Music, Friends of Film, and Friends of Books; meetings and talks with scholars, politicians, and activists; lectures in culture and the arts; and, finally, teaching courses in preparation for university entrance. In big cities, WUs supported theatre performances and concerts and organized visits to galleries, expositions, museums, and the like. Some WUs had their own movie theatres where selected movies were shown with commentary and discussion afterwards.

Remarkable efforts were made by the WU of Tuzla in Bosnia. For example, it sponsored a series of public lectures with topics such as the crisis and collapse of colonialism, the appearance of new independent states, citizens and the commune, different routes to socialism, and policy in rural areas. The current issues discussed could hold the interest of the audiences. In addition to programs in vocational education for the miners of the Tuzla basin, the "What do you think" forum became a meeting place for people, mostly intellectuals, who were eager to exchange views and ideas on current problems in culture, arts, and science. There were no lectures; after a brief introduction to the problem, discussion occurred. In preparation for this discussion the forum staff would deliver hand-outs to interested members. During two years of work, the forum presented such topics as the Role and Significance of Theatre for the Social Environment, the Modern Yugoslav Novel, the Petit Bourgeois Today, Man and Technology, and Snobbishness.[67]

Cultural centres of the WU of Belgrade, Zagreb, and Sarajevo, were very active. In 1959, WUs for the first time surveyed the need for culture in a number of work collectives. The findings of the survey provided the foundation on which programs were based. The cultural centre of the WU of Zagreb was the first to organize seminars for the instructors of culture and recreation in enterprises. Behind these endeavours there was the humanistic idea to

enable masses of workers to have access to all cultural facilities; not to wait for them to come, but to go to them, meet them in factory halls, workers' settlements and cafeterias, parks, and plazas, and to get the workers to understand that aesthetic education is serious. Serious things usually do not attract large crowds. The workers had to be "conquered," but care had to be taken concerning how and with what they were conquered, as was pointed out by an associate of the WU of Sarajevo.[68]

Participants in courses and seminars at WUs were predominantly workers ranging from semi-skilled to highly skilled, and white collar employees, with a considerable number of members of workers' councils and management boards. The number of female participants, especially among the workers, was considerably smaller compared to the number of male participants. With regard to the staff, there were some indications that the situation was improving. Teaching staffs were expanding fairly rapidly, their main job being teaching although occasionally they also dealt with organizational problems. The key people were the specialist staff, including heads of centres, heads of sections, and associates, who studied andragogical problems. Their number was still inadequate. Thus in 1959 there were about 6,000 people employed at WUs, full-time and part-time. Almost half the full-time staff were administrators and technical people. Most staff worked at the ten largest WUs.[69]

According to Tonković, during the previous two years there had been a rapid improvement in the material and financial situation, yet the survey of ninety-three WUs at the end of 1959 showed that only ten of them had their own buildings; these had ninety-three rooms, thirty-six of which were classrooms. In addition, fifty-six classrooms were permanently used in other buildings, and 184 other classrooms were used occasionally. The other eighty-three WUs used 445 rooms in their centre, and 758 outside it. In 1958, several WUs constructed new buildings or remodelled

existing ones. In 1959 there were thirteen such projects in progress. Funds for these buildings were secured by voluntary services of the workers, contributions from enterprises, grants from people's committees in districts and executive councils of republics, and subsidies from funds allocated for senior staff training.

Financial means appear to have increased consistently. Data given by Tonkovic show that in 1957-58, WU resources totalled 442,672,000 dinars; in 1958-59, a total of 701,248,000 dinars shows a more than fifty per cent increase. Receipts to WUs and grants made to them by people's committees are the most substantial part of the resources. However, these means were not equally distributed and varied considerably, depending on the scope of a WUs' activities (from 50,000 to 90,000,000 dinars). The four WUs of Zagreb, Belgrade, Sarajevo, and Skopje alone had 269 million dinars at their disposal.[70]

Institutional Structure

WUs' institutional structure continued to develop slowly. The following three types of WUs can be differentiated according to their degree of development: WUs which had established themselves as "complete institutions" that gave all kinds of systematic adult education; WUs which had some stable features but because of their unsteady financial base and staff shortage could not offer all kinds of systematic adult education; and amateur WUs which had lecture centres with limited programs and activities.

As regards the forms or approaches to learning, it seems that the repertoire of the WUs had increased: in addition to seminars, courses, clubs, etc., there were now residential seminars and workers' colleges.

Management of Workers' Universities

In the early years, WUs were directed by management boards. The executive body of the institution was composed of the administrators and the professional council or collegium. This body included the director and his full-time immediate staff who were particularly concerned with various WU activities -- the heads of centres and sections. Centres could have their own professional councils made up of the associates (specialist full-time staff).

However, with the development of self-management in industries and social management in non-industrial sectors, councils became the supreme policy-making bodies in WUs. Because of the significance of a WU to the economy in a given area (the WU was defined as part of the enterprise) and to adult worker education as well, it was logical to have worker representatives in the council, the organ of social management, from all parts of society, such as people from enterprises and factories, trade unions, the League of Communists, professional associations, and the Ministry of Education. There were also representatives from participants in courses and seminars held at WUs, leaders, and professional staff. It was thought that only a body made up of these representatives could be duly responsible for the policies and decisions of the institution. Basically, the council approved annual reports and proposals related to the introduction of new educational activities.[71]

Up to 1960 it was maintained that WUs were the institutions of the trade unions, which influenced their programming, appointed the director, and confirmed the choice of management board members and councils. WUs did not yet have uniform status. Some were "financially autonomous," some were dependent financially and received grants, and some were still social organizations.[72]

It is not clear what Tonkovic meant by "financially autonomous." Was any WU independent of grants in 1960?

There is insufficient evidence to support his statement. On the contrary, there is strong evidence that the most developed WU in the country, the WU of Zagreb, was given grants amounting to fifty-eight per cent of its budget in the same year, 1960, when the statement by Tonković was written.[73]

The large number of WUs (173 in 1959) needed an organization to bind them together, so republic federations of WUs and PUs were set up for the purpose of co-ordinating their efforts, exchanging experiences, and giving mutual help.

The Quality of Work

Throughout Yugoslavia, discussions and meetings continued to be held during the later 1950s and early 1960s on the "quality of work," meaning the quality of adult education and financing of programs. In his survey of the situation in Slovenia, Tavčar criticized the "founders," thinking probably of trade unions, because of their insufficient concern for WUs and PUs.[74] Their indifference was especially reflected in the functioning of the management boards; they did not show concern for fundamental things such as funds and premises. Tavčar warned of the danger of "complete commercialization." With financial pressure and a shortage of funds, the founders wished to rid themselves of worry and would say, "make money yourselves!"[75] Tavčar's point was that, to have the basic activities of the WUs, a regular, continuous flow of funds must be secured.

The discussion was taken up by S. Elaković of the Federation of WUs of Bosnia and Herzegovina.[76] The grants WUs had been receiving so far had not been steady, which caused insecurity, he said. In the new system of financing, he thought WUs should be told specifically what funds they could get from the social sources, along with schools, and what funds they ought to secure themselves. Elaković modified Tavčar's formula: the basic activities of WUs ought to be financed

from social sources; non-basic activities ought to be charged as services rendered to industries, enterprises and individuals. What basic and non-basic activities were should be decided by social-management units in WUs. A social management unit in conjunction with specialist staff and in agreement with WU founders should define and determine which activities of [redacted] an of Operation, were considered [redacted] part of the plan has a broader meaning, it ought to be financed from social sources. In view of the fact that WUs ought not to limit themselves to basic activities, they could, Elaković thought, expand their activities and extend their services to enterprises and individuals. Through expanded activities WUs should be able to materialize funds as revenues for non-basic activities.

The next question was how to define criteria for granting funds for basic activities. Which criterion to use -- costs per participant or costs per hour of instruction? Elaković maintained that costs per hour of instruction would be more realistic, as it would ensure more variety of programs in terms of content, level, and method, as well as in terms of duration of programs. If this criterion were accepted, it would be more stimulating for WUs to organize more seminars, courses, and other activities; also, in this manner WUs could have more participants. Elaković supported the idea that salaries and expenditures, in addition to the basic activities, be financed from social sources. He also added that revenues ought to be equally substantial. For this purpose, he felt that WUs should make contracts with enterprises, social organizations, and individuals.[72]

In June 1960, as mentioned earlier, the Federal People's Assembly passed a resolution to train professional cadres. As a consequence, an array of new institutions emerged: vocational training centres in enterprises, personnel departments, school centres; even education by correspondence. Undoubtedly, training centres in industry were satisfying the needs of their workers so their popularity grew, especially

through radio, TV, press, and film. WUs were in an awkward position. Two things were certain, though: that suddenly adult education institutions had greatly expanded and that the resolution adopted by the Assembly had given vocational centres in industry a powerful stimulus.

The new five-year plan provided for the doubling of production and an increase in national income. The development of modern industrial agriculture was emphasized. A new system of remuneration was introduced according to which an individual's earnings were directly dependent on the success (output) of his economic unit and economic organization (enterprise). All this was reflected in the new need for adult education. Socio-economic education broke the record in 1961, there were 200,000 students in WUs and PUs.[78]

The 1958 law on financing schools was expected to help WUs become legally and financially autonomous. They were to become an integral part of the school system. Also, in accordance with the principle of self-management in the economy, WUs had to change from being "budgetary institutions" to being financially autonomous, responsible for generating income to make their expenditures. In this connection, T. Blaha of Ljubljana (Slovenia) stressed that the relationship bewteen WUs and those who expected their services was changing. A new principle was introduced: that educational needs, like any other social need, reflect the realization of citizens that for their political, social, and professional activities, they needed certain kinds of education. Since a good education is expensive, some financial means must be provided for by the people most interested in it, such as founders of WUs, political, social, economic organizations, and individuals.[79] Blaha also talked about a new strategy some WUs applied. Often they were compelled to commercialize a more profitable educational activity that was in greatest demand. In some cases, for example, the price for vocational training covered in them the cost of political education, or popular technical education. Until now, this strategy had

been justified as a "solution in time of need," but would be impossible in the future.[80] WUs would now have to compete with other educational institutions. However, the new situation did contribute to WUs becoming more autonomous. With the development of the social management system, the founder could not interfere with the internal organization of the WUs, nor with the admission of the new staff. These became matters for the management boards and work collectives.

As WUs no longer monopolized adult education, they were compelled to maintain their reputation solely by giving good quality education. Instead of relying on the good will of some political leaders or the personal relations of a director, there was now an entirely new situation, Blaha concluded.[81]

This is how A. Deleon saw this situation:

> Dynamic development of the society and technology which set new rights and give new duties to every individual for which he could not prepare during his regular school days no matter how long they lasted has an effect on the affirmation of the principles of permanent education and turns adult education into an irreplaceable, unseparable and functional component of the entire system of education. This is the framework in which WUs assume broader functions and get more favourable conditions to understand and meet (according to their abilities) the real needs, consolidate their position, enjoy society's recognition, and obtain the means. Conditions are being created in which the attitude and recognition of the user become a basis for the formation of material means to each institution including WUs.[82]

Deleon saw WUs again in a broad, comprehensive, but qualitatively new context. The laws of the market economy began to be felt in Yugoslavia.

From society's point of view it was profitable to invest money in institutions such as WUs, in the construction of

modern classrooms and the like. Worker education and adult education in general deserved to be specialized institutions with special staffs. Seen in this light, the task of selecting and training of specialist staff became extremely important. A new profession requires people with new competencies and abilities.[83]

The Workers' Universities of Zagreb and Belgrade

The two most advanced and largest WUs in the country were at Zagreb and Belgrade. The WU of Zagreb has emphasized its loyalty to the principles embodied in complex (the worker as the producer and the socio-political factor) and permanent education (education as a continuous process so long as the worker is employed).[84] Yet the development of this university continued its strong emphasis on vocational education. The best indication of this is its number of vocational centres, which increased to seven, and the plan of the university for 1961-62, which provided for training and education for 2,000 workers to be carried out in 122 seminars.[85] Special seminars in on-the-job training and professional specialization of workers were expanded; new seminars for members of management boards and workers' councils in different sections were opened; special seminars in economic education were developed on distribution of income, remuneration according to work output; and in the area of culture, programs in fine arts and industrial design were expanded. As pointed out earlier, the WU of Zagreb had defined itself as a "part of industry," and its role as "meeting the needs of industry in the Zagreb area" above all. It now planned extensive research on the training requirements of lower and middle-level supervisory staff, a job which so far had been approached without the WU[86]

V. Velčić referred to the programs as subject to continuous modification and adaptation.[87] This changeability was not in contradiction with their permanence, he asserted; it was

their positive feature. S. Aralica gave statistics related to the number and category of staff: there were sixty-five full-time and up to 800 part-time educators and 150 group leaders employed by the WU of Zagreb in 1960-61.[88] In the prevailing conditions of the country, this proportion was excellent. Staff size certainly made the WU of Zagreb the strongest adult education institution in the country. Aralica also provided data related to participants' composition and activities and the budget of the same WU, as shown in Tables 4, 5, and 6 respectively.

TABLE 4

PARTICIPANTS BY PROFESSION AND FUNCTION AT THE WU OF ZAGREB

Profession	Function
skilled workers	personnel officers
highly skilled workers	education officers
foremen	instructors
work-group members	heads of education centres
section managers	members of workers' councils, management boards, councils of producers
semi-skilled workers	
unskilled workers	trade union members

Source: S. Aralica, "Radničko sveučilište 'Moša Pijade'" Kulturni život, No. 3-4 (1961), p. 299.

The figures in Table 5 show that 37,724 people participated in 2135 seminars organized by the WU of Zagreb over the seven-year period. The figures also indicate a constant growth in the number of seminars and participants. The proportion of men vs. women's participation is 68% : 32%.

TABLE 5

SEMINARS AND ATTENDANCE AT THE WU OF ZAGREB, 1953-60

Year	Seminars held	Hours of instruction	Seminars completed by men	women	total
1953-54	139	16,056	1,891	723	2,614
1954-55	188	18,626	2,313	1,645	3,958
1955-56	262	26,242	3,846	1,873	5,719
1956-57	387	34,892	4.639	2,101	6,740
1957-58	274	41,996	3,060	1,545	4,605
1958-59	363	44,850	4,663	1,706	6,369
1959-60	522	71,454	5,473	2,246	7,719
Totals	2,135	254,116	25,885 (68%)	11,839 (32%)	37;724

Source: S. Aralica, "Radničko sveučilište 'Moša Pijade'" Kulturni zivot, No. 3-4 (1961), p. 303.

As had Krstinić, Aralica admitted that the WU of Zagreb had always had full support from business organizations, from the community and all of the political factors, in particular those of the city of Zagreb. Thus the WU of Zagreb "could accumulate great experience and accomplish a lot especially in some areas of education," she pointed out.[89]

In 1964, the WU of Zagreb published a monograph which is a comprehensive report on this institution and has convincing data related to the income of the WU of Zagreb for the ten-year period 1953-63. In 1960, the grants made to the WU of Zagreb were fifty-eight per cent of its income and receipts only fourty-two per cent. The WU of Zagreb obviously still had generous grants from social sources, which were "intended for the advancement of the entire activity of the university, in the first place for the training of the specialist staff and the development of

research."[90] Therefore it is not surprising that the WU of Zagreb was much more research oriented than any other in the country. It was also the strongest in staff. There is little research without adequate money and expertise.

Table 6 lists the financial resources of the WU of Zagreb for 1953-63.

TABLE 6

RESOURCES OF THE WU OF ZAGREB, 1953-63
(in 000 din)

Year	Grants	(%)	Receipts	(%)	Total Income
1953	3,000	100.0	-	-	3,000
1954	7,960	100.0	-	-	7,960
1955	17,350	94.5	1,030	5.5	18,350
1956	37,200	92.5	3,018	7.5	40,218
1957	46,654	65.0	24,874	35.0	71,528
1958	48,605	64.0	27,177	36.0	75,782
1959	73,720	64.0	41,348	36.0	115,068
1960	101,500	58.0	73,373	42.0	167,873
1961	99,500	43.0	131,665	57.0	231,165
1962	155,500	50.0	154,983	50.0	310,483
1963	155,000	49.0	160,153	51.0	315,153

Source: Radničko sveučilište u obrazovanju kadrova iz privrede (Zagreb 1964), p. 261.

On close examination, Table 6 shows that for two years in the early period 100% grants were made to the WU of Zagreb and that was its only income; over the years the percentage of grants decreased; in 1963, after ten years, this university still received almost fifty per cent of its income from grants; total income continued to increase; in ten years it had increased 100 times; receipts rose slowly; a sudden jump of thirty-five per cent was made only in 1957 with regard to receipts; in 1963, the percentage of receipts was slightly stronger than that of grants.

Table 7 shows the financial resources of the WU of Belgrade for 1959-60.

TABLE 7

RESOURCES OF THE WU OF BELGRADE, 1959-60

Receipts	
from industry, enterprises, and private individuals	60%
Grants	
from the People's Committee of Belgrade	37%
City Council of Trade Unions	3%
Miscellaneous	0
Total	100%

Source: Jugoslovenski pregled, 4 (1961), p. 176.

Unfortunately, no further particulars related to the income of the WU of Belgrade were made available to this writer. However, Table 7 shows that sixty per cent of the income was realized in 1959-60 through educational services to industry, enterprises, and private individuals. A little more than one-third of its income was from grants. The trade unions' percentage was token. The article in Jugoslovenski pregled of 1961 indicates that sixty per cent of the income was from payments made by enterprises on behalf of courses in vocational, economic, and general education.[91] Because of economic output, businesses were generous in paying for vocational training. Grants covered the costs of the political school, seminars in Marxist education, cultural and arts activities, and part of the socio-economic education.[92]

In 1959-60, WU of Belgrade had 10,917 students. Table 8 lists its staff in 1960.

TABLE 8

NUMBER AND CATEGORY OF STAFF AT THE WU OF BELGRADE, 1960

Staff		Full-time
Teachers		14
Economists		8
Engineers		3
Jurists		2
Writers		1
Technicians		1
	Total	29
		Part-time
Experts from industry and business		106
Experts from institutes and social organizations		107
University teachers		28
Public speakers		100
	Total	341

Source: Jugoslovenski pregled, 4 (1961), p. 176.

It is regrettable that no hard data concerning income, staff, participants, and so on of the WU of Sarajevo for this period was made available to this writer. Research on Yugoslav andragogical literature has shown that statistics for this WU did not appear throughout the fifties and early sixties.

Workers' Universities' Progress

In 1962 interesting conferences were held. In February there was the fourth meeting of representatives of WUs

throughout Yugoslavia, organized by the Central Council of Trade Unions in Belgrade. An analysis was presented related to the structure of WUs' adult education programs. The analysis showed that socio-economic education* accounted for twenty-six per cent and ideological-political education accounted for fourty-six per cent of adult education programs.[93] It was reported that under the new circumstances the primary task was education for the new economic measures such as distribution of income, enterprise economy, work relations, economic units,** and self-management in education and health. These issues were now of greatest interest to producers and the development of society, and WUs became interpreters of new economic measures. Programs for members of management organs were now seen as their secondary task.

The WU of Mostar reported on an original experiment they had made: how to determine the contents of education in economic units. First they surveyed educational needs in two economic units (a coal mine and a metal industry) and determined the level of education of workers and how much knowledge they had. The analysis of their knowledge and motivation from the perspective of desired level of productivity and self-managing relations helped the authors determine an educational program.

Participants in the Belgrade conference thought this method was "too slow" and required engagement, that WUs did not have the cadres or means for such an undertaking and so on. It was plain that the WU of Mostar did not have

---

* Up to 1960, there was a separation in education between ideological-political education, which was directed and often organized by the League of Communists, and socio-economic education, which had been directed by trade unions. Participants at this conference, however, concluded that the difference between the two was gradually diminishing. See Teorija i praksa samoupravlijanja (Beograd, 1972), p. 994.

** An economic unit was defined as a basic manufacturing and educational unit.

the cadres or means either. What they did have were a few enthusiasts and experts, research-oriented people headed by an able director. Their research efforts were too far-fetched in the eyes of other, less developed WUs. While the most developed WUs in the country followed the andragogical cycle in carrying out their educational tasks (first they surveyed needs and then came up with programs), most of them still used the deductive method.

The WU of Ljubljana reported on their experience in educating school boards, teachers, and parents (education for life), an area in which this university was successful. They also discussed their requirements for part-time associates. A part-time teacher was requested to participate in talks with the full-time teachers once a week. He was contracted to study business problems, read current literature, and submit reports.

The WU of Skopje surveyed teachers in that city. Forty-eight per cent did not know about the expanded rights of schools provided by the new law on schools; sixty-eight per cent of them did not know about the regulation concerning income distribution. These findings served as a basis of a seminar program worked out by the WU and the teachers' branch of the trade unions. The topics of the seminar included income and distribution, the financing of schools, and the planning of income.

The WU of Niš (Serbia) ventured into a delicate field, health. They investigated the willingness of health workers to learn something new and found conservatism and fear. Health workers were trying to keep old relations in an atmosphere of talks and discussions concerning the free choice of doctors and free selection of medical centres, and the morals and humanism of medical doctors. It was reported that the subject was extremely delicate and that extreme flexibility was needed in selection of educational methods and approaches for these audiences.[94]

At the same meeting, Yugoslav TV showed interest in co-operating with WUs. The meeting stressed two things in

particular: that the WU of Mostar had provided a model of programming in adult education as applied to socio-economic education in economic units based on research; and that surveying of educational needs had been accepted as an efficient method in adult education. In other words, the meeting stressed that programs in socio-economic education should not be based only on generally accepted directions, principles, and norms set up in accord with the programs of the socio-political organizations, law, and the regulation of assemblies and executive councils, but on the analysis of concrete cases and facts, that is, on the practices of workers' councils and the diagnosis of production needs and deficiencies in certain catetories of staffs.[95]

In the early 1960s, income and income distribution in WUs was a complex issue, the analysis of which would require special study. Attempts were made by WUs to introduce some standards and measures which could be applied to intellectual work. The model of income distribution presented at the conference of WUs and PUs in Zagreb in 1962 was considered a success. Its author was S. Salahović, director of the WU of Mostar.* For the purpose of demonstrating practical applications of this model, I will give a brief account of my own experience with Salahović. In the fall of 1962, the Confederation of the WUs of Bosnia and Herzegovina asked the director of the WU of Mostar to discuss her model with the participants of an adult education seminar held at Jahorina, near Sarajevo. Mrs. Salahović explained that according to a principle she had applied to the model, it was possible for a director of a WU to receive less money than the associates he or she worked with -- remuneration according to work output, a principle adopted in the economic policies. All participants were impressed by the model's novelty, but most participants had the traditional view that a director must always receive the most pay. It had occurred several times, Mrs. Salahović said, that the director of the WU of Mostar received less than

* The same author appears in this study under two names: S. Marković and S. Salahović.

some of her staff members. She insisted that the model be fully applied. She was not just formulating hypotheses; as M. Knowles has said, the best teaching is done by the example of your own behaviour.[96]

Both Elaković and Tavčar were concerned about the future of WUs in the new economic situation. Elaković talked about the ten-year road that WUs had walked to become institutions with "status," make their own money, and be equal to regular schools.[97] He pointed out that WUs in Bosnia and Herzegovina had realized over fifty per cent of their financial means through receipts and that reliance on their own strengths was the "healthiest and most realistic orientation WUs can take." There were serious problems in financing regular schools, considering the limited funds available. To the question "Will there be enough work to do for the WUs in the future?" Elaković responded that what made WUs vital was their "outstanding orientation toward socio-economic and cultural events and problems and their quick reaction to these problems."[98]

The law on financing schools offered a chance to regular schools to make stronger claims to reach working adults. Thus, regular schools opened adult education classes. However, Tavčar said, they applied pedagogical methods that discouraged adult students. He did not see any reason for the fear that schools and centres in enterprises would endanger the existence and functioning of WUs. On the contrary, he was optimistic; since, for example, WUs in Slovenia had increased their incomes from 131 to 203 million dinars, whereby payments by adult students grew from sixty to ninety-nine million. According to Tavčar, it would be ridiculous to confront the "three forms" of adult education, as he called them, in the new situation -- WUs, centres, and adult classes in schools -- because actually they complemented each other.[99] The same attitude was taken in Sarajevo by D. Petrović and S. Elaković.[100] Although the number of factors and adult education institutions was increasing,

the rate of increase in the need for education was incomparable, Elaković stressed.

Although only sporadic news came from Montenegro, the report delivered at the Second Conference of the Confederation of WUs and PUs of Montenegro was alarming: in this republic, basic adult education was neglected, as was education and training of agricultural producers. In theory, education for illiterate and semi-literate populations was an important objective of both WUs and PUs.[101] With a twenty-four per cent illiteracy rate, "Why is our literacy action delayed?" Šahović asked. There was some good news though: the financial situation of WUs in Montenegro had changed drastically. In 1958, their funds had totalled four million dinars, but in 1962 the amount had increased by six times. In the same period, the number of full-time staff had increased ten times.[102] In 1962 and 1963 almost fifty per cent of WUs' programs was dedicated to income distribution and the working out of the statutes of work organizations and economic units.[103]

Workers' Universities and Permanent Education

At the European Conference on Adult Education, held in Hamburg in 1962, Deleon talked about the contradictions between general culture and vocational education. Some people in adult education separate themselves from vocational education and restrict themselves to humanistic or liberal education. According to Deleon, this separation has deep roots. So long as there is the inner contradiction between the producer-function and the social-function of man, so long as the two functions -- of manufacturing and of managing -- remain disintegrated, there will be the contradiction between the two areas of education. So long as the worker just obeys the orders of others and his role is restricted to economic output, his interests and needs will inevitably be limited to vocational training and education. Under these conditions, there will be no "complete individual," and the "full integration of man" will not be possible.[104]

In the society in which the working man makes decisions regarding the economy, economic education becomes an indispensable component of his general education; the more the working man participates directly in public affairs, the more knowledge of politics and political education become elements of his general culture. As life requires more technical, vocational, and professional know-how, adult education without technical culture and without permanent spreading of vocational knowledge is inefficient.

Deleon talked about WUs in the context of permanent education and the integration of learning and work. More than 250 WUs located in all the industrial centres of Yugoslavia gave the working population the general, economic, and vocational education needed for individual, social, and work functions.[105]

Tavčar's Criticism

In 1964, I. Tavčar wrote about the shockingly low number of professional people in the WUs, 3.3 being the Yugoslav average, and 1.4 the average for Slovenia. WUs must stop feeling insignificant, he stressed. To him, the problem was political: how political organizations conceived of their role and how the policy of workers' councils and commune assemblies could be directed. The person who gave self-management true meaning would be the subject of politics, not its object; the training of workers and citizens for self-management had to involve the building up of institutions which would have this as their permanent task. At that time, after the new constitution of 1963 had been adopted, deprofessionalization in politics began to take place; also, the concept of rotation in management organs affirmed in the constitution, in that no one could hold office for more than two terms, began to be accepted as a constitutional principle.

Furthermore, Tavčar warned of some methodological problems in WUs. In working with adults, he said, "we do more explanation

of principles than analysis of circumstances in which workers and citizens live." He favoured research into true needs for knowledge and problems of work organizations and communes. He talked about seminars which used concepts workers were unfamiliar with and about how "we care little to adapt things to the participants' level; we have our general platform but we do not get into the opinions and standpoints of the people. We should induce people to think and analyze their own circumstances so that they can change them"[106] What P. Freire has said in the seventies, Tavčar had said in the sixties.

Basically, Tavčar talked about matters in Slovenia, and his criticism could have been clouded by the specific situation of WUs in that republic. However, further developments affecting the WUs in Yugoslavia show that his judgments regarding the problems of worker education and his criticism, particularly of WUs' methodologies, were justified.

The Fifth Congress and Other Conferences

Up to the beginning of the second decade of self-management, there had been a strict division between vocational education dealt with by enterprises, vocational schools, and WUs, and socio-economic education, which had been organized by WUs and trade unions. A federal conference in Belgrade in 1963, however, showed that participants in socio-economic education made up thirty-five per cent of the total number of workers trained in vocational centres in work organizations in 1961.[107]

By the end of 1963, the Central Council of Yugoslav trade unions and the WUs undertook a comparative-study at six work organizations in Zagreb, Belgrade, Sarajevo, and Maribor. They combined five research techniques: a questionnaire, a test, an analysis of the minutes of workers' councils, group interviews, and an analysis of basic data concerning work organizations. The study showed that an average knowledge of self-management reached fifty per cent

among the workers at worker organizations, and up to 70 per cent among the members of the workers' councils. Before this study, it was known that the level of knowledge in socio-economic education depended on the level of general and vocational education of workers as well as the length of their service. However, study has shown that the knowledge in socio-economic education of workers is almost equally affected by other factors such as the level of development of self-management and remuneration according to the output of work in a particular organization.[108]

The Fifth Congress of the Yugoslav Trade Unions of 1964 produced evidence that the results of socio-economic education lagged behind the need for development of self-management; only twenty per cent of the members of self-management organs were included in socio-economic education, which was unsatisfactory.[109] The Fifth Congress developed some fundamental propositions, such as that the system of education had to be changed and improved so that the working class could be trained more speedily for the every greater complexity of self-management. A phase had been reached in the process of social development when decision-making regarding socio-economic education had to be assumed by workers themselves. It was to be part of their right and duty, an integral part of the development policy and remuneration, and of personal and educational policy. The Congress also defined the place of socio-economic education. It became "the third sphere of education" -- general education being the first, and vocational education second -- the self-management component in the program for education of youth and adults. In other words, it was to be integrated in the total system of education, from the elementary to university level.[110]

Models of programming were also threshed out at the Congress. The model based on social directives, ideological and political postulates, law, and so on, which provided for the so-called "bringing in of knowledge from outside" and which identified individual needs and interests

with those of the society and so made social consciousness an absolute, was to be abandoned.[111] Statements by leading political activists concerning the content of education still were a basis for socio-economic education programming. However, a new model was emerging and becoming dominant, one based on investigated objective problems and self-management needs, needs of participants themselves as revealed in actual situations and where the level of participants' education was a particular consideration. As the Congress stressed, this model would be more difficult and require new cadres of program officers, sociologists, and such, as well as more substantial funds. But it also promised a far greater involvement of the participants.[112] The Congress had made a solid contribution to the process of democratization of worker education, freeing it from political dogmas, and had given a new push towards making worker education at WUs more scientifically founded.

Illiterate Workers Visit Art Galleries

Marx said that if a person wanted to enjoy art, he must be artistically educated.[113] V. Deleon of the WU of Belgrade was enthusiastic about having illiterate and semi-literate workers visit expositions and art galleries at WUs. Workers who had recently been peasants, she wrote, experience a painting as a fascinating novelty which they must often reject because of knowing nothing about it. However, when the difficulties of the first contact have been overcome through education, working with these people brings about the purest results, as they possess "virginity for a painting" and have no preconceived artistic biases.[114]

5

WORKERS' UNIVERSITIES, 1965-69

Economic Reform and Workers' Universities

In June 1965, the Federal Assembly passed twenty-five laws, two decisions, and two recommendations initiating economic and social reform. The purpose of reform was to create the necessary conditions for the faster growth of productivity and for the rational division of labour, modernization of the economy, co-operation, integration, more purposeful involvement in the international division of labour, and the improvement of living standards of workers. The reform also introduced important changes in the management and disposal of social resources and strengthened the position and rights of the workers on the basis of the principles of self-management.

The growing needs of the economy demanded expert workers, good managers, and able leaders. With economic reform, the society expected WUs to pay increasing attention to broadly organized permanent education, the further education and retraining of cadres of all kinds and at all levels of skills, and training for self-management. Quality, currency, and contemporarity of education, strong emphasis on culture, and intensified action in rural areas became major characteristics of WUs in this peiod. Launching of economic reform caused tendencies towards integration of cultural and adult education institutions. WUs and PUs, culture halls and libraries, and cinemas, were integrated. The Yugoslav economy and

industry stressed the need for professional assistance in diagnosis of need, program development and realization, and evaluation. Modern industrial organization demanded that managerial staff from foremen to directors, acquire knowledge and skills so they could successfully apply new technologies.

Thus, in the 1965 program of the WU of Sarajevo, functionality, contemporarity, and adaptability to the needs of worker organizations and the interests of individuals were offered. Here, for example, is the program of Seminar 11 from the series "Our Social Development." It is titled "Social Self-Management in SFRY" (Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia). The seminar discussed self-management and the withering away of the state; self-management organs and state management; self-management and the distribution of income according to work output; self-management and the principle of rotation; causes and forms of deterioration in self-management organs.[2] No data on the length of the seminar are given.

Another seminar, No. 14 on "Human Relations," offered the following topics: work organizations as social groups of freely associated producers; factors influencing the development of human relations in production; workers self-management as a factor in building up socialist relations among people; relations created by the participation of producers in income distribution; contradictions between personal, group, and social interests; the socio-economic and political importance of building socialist relations among people; and suggestions by students.[3] It was considered good practice to leave room and time for suggestions by students.

In June 1966, the centre for training and education of the managerial staff of the WU of Sarajevo celebrated its tenth anniversary. This centre was set up in 1956 and played a pioneering role in setting up and helping training centres in worker organizations throughout the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Thus the associates of the centre participated

directly in the formation of training centres in the steel and iron works at Zenica, a coal mine at Banovići, the iron works at Ilijas, and many other places. In ten years' time the centre had carried out 1,079 activities through its vocational, self-management, adult technical school programs with a total of 34,859 participants. The major objectives of the centre, as defined by director K. Ljuhar, had been to train and educate managerial staffs where complementary education for managers had been conceived of as a permanent task. With respect to methods used, the centre had focussed on seminars and courses and less on mass activities.[4]

From 1956 to 1966, centres for vocational training in factories were a novelty; so it was necessary, as mentioned by I. Baković, a former associate of the centre, to fight prejudices in the factory and to convince people that investing funds in education did not mean a sacrifice for the work collective. The centre not only gave seminars on the basics of andragogy -- the contents of education in factories, selection of teaching aids and techniques, determination of sources of funds for education -- but also organized special seminars such as those on educational needs, on-the-job training, leadership training, conducting meetings, and case studies.[5] This centre made a fine contribution to the practice and theory of adult education in factory centres.

A conference jointly organized by trade unions and the 1966 Conference of PUs and WUs in Belgrade stressed that education for self-management could not be identified as political work, and therefore could not be the responsibility of trade unions only. It was seen as a professional activity needing scientific back-up and its own science. It was stressed that self-management could not be learned at school or in courses because it is a production relation, and depending on this relation, or rather on the degree of its development, a worker could have more or less information, experience, and knowledge about it. Furthermore, it was

said that the "theory of learning through errors," of learning only through practice, should not be accepted, because it was irrational and slowed down the process of freeing labour. In other words, workers needed broader economic, technical, and vocational knowledge so they could develop a perspective on the technological revolution, modernization, integration, and long-term development. The conference emphasized that the major objective of socio-economic education was animating workers to their own position and the factors that conditioned it, to diagnose problems and their causes, and to change this position. Also the hierarchical and scholarly attitudes which throttled creative initiative by self-managers were pointed out.[6]

More on the WU of Sarajevo

"Education and culture are integral parts of production and management, complex conditions in which democratization of relations is taking place...income distribution, and modern production in work organizations demand an educated man...."[7] This broad statement contains basic assumptions incorporated into the doctrine of the WU of Sarajevo. The "Đuro Đaković" of Sarajevo (its full name) became a specialized institution in Sarajevo and the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina for permanent and complex education of adults, a "happy amalgamation" of culture and education. As the director of the university commented, "One learns only through practical activities that it is difficult to separate these two spheres."[8]

Economic reform pointed out some facts related to the unsatisfactory situation of workers: over fifty per cent of workers employed in Bosnia and Herzegovina had not completed elementary (eight years) education; a little less than fifty per cent had no qualifications. With these facts in mind, the WU of Sarajevo could have fully occupied itself with basic and vocational education. However, it instead engaged equally in cultural activities, spreading cultural facilities

to work organizations, factory halls, and cafeterias because that was a "precondition for workers' fuller and happier personal life."[9]

This WU also deserves attention from the point of view of governance and finance and how these two systems were developed within the framework of an adult education institution. There were no dilemmas for the WU of Sarajevo concerning whether financial resources should be secured through grants or self-financing. In 1968, ninety per cent of the total income was earned through educational and cultural services; only ten per cent was financed by the socio-political community, by contract. As stated in the director's report, the facts have shown that it is possible to survive financially from educational and cultural activities, but "only if the needs and opinions of those to whom they were intended were respected." More could have been done if socio-political members of worker organizations and assemblies had paid more attention to these tasks, and if "workers were given a chance to express these kinds of needs themselves."[10]

This criticism is refreshing and sensible. Chances were that some activities of the WU of Sarajevo, such as aesthetic education, general culture, and education for self-management, were often curbed simply because funds from the socio-political community were smaller every year. Somebody on city council would decide that an activity was "not socially justified," "not of interest to the city, therefore, it should not be financed...."[11]

By 1968, the WU of Sarajevo had applied for five years the principle of operating on its income. It was said this had gradually stimulated an improvement in the standard of living of its workers through improved housing, buying of teaching aids and AV technologies, and so on. However, workers were not well off in salaries; for example, aesthetic education and mobile libraries continued to be carried out as important programs, although financial assistance from the socio-political community was lacking.

However, the system of income creation strengthened even more the self-managing relations within the university. Direct self-management as a policy was realized in all vital matters such as dealing with job applicants, internal income distribution, securing funds for vacation, allocating funds for the education of the employees, housing. It functioned well because care was taken, as the director stressed in her report, that all workers were well informed about current problems and that their opinions and views were expressed in meetings and decision-making.[12] The ways in which self-management was manifested were the assembly of work community, the council of work community, the council, and the management board. Also, through the council, which acted as a bridge between society and the work collective, it was possible for the socio-economic community to have an impact on the WU of Sarajevo. Of course, there were problems and misunderstandings, simply because self-management was an on-going, evolving process.

The situation of the WU of Sarajevo regarding governance and finance was almost identical to that in industry and business organizations: income was made in the same manner, personal incomes* were earned according to work output.

The WU of Sarajevo has been a characteristic institution in many ways. First, as explained earlier, it developed systems of finance and governance early and well. Second, it became one of the major means of culture in Sarajevo. An overview of clubs of painters, writers, and sculptors which attracted young and talented workers and citizens and encouraged them to create their own art, shows that some known artists in the city were and in some cases still are members of such clubs as Popovac, Ešpek, Lubardić, Čorović, and Ljubović. Only someone who has been directly involved in spreading culture in worker organizations could write such a beautiful and meaningful story as "Culture," by

---

* In contrast to fixed salaries, personal incomes vary, which is in line with the principle that work is the basic criterion of income.

Jovan Lubardić. Mučibabić and Slijepčević complete the list.

Third, the attitude of the socio-political community toward the perennial problem of this university -- the problem of the building had been contemplated and planned, but regrettably, to this day, the project has not been materialized. It is hard to understand why Sarajevo, which is such a large centre of workers, and the capital of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, has not improved the basic conditions for worker education at the WU.

Yugoslav Situation

WUs during the late 1960s earned an international reputation as a new type of adult education institution. Thus J.A. Simpson wrote in Today and Tomorrow in European Adult Education that WUs in Yugoslavia had come into their own, run by workers themselves and having a curriculum that dealt with the major features and problems of productivity and life.[13]

D. Filipović provided evidence on the material growth of WUs. Data he supplied cover the period 1959-67, during which the revenue and expenditure of WUs increased almost tenfold. With respect to the revenue in that period, the proportion of receipts from their own activities rose steadily, while the share of allocations from budgets and social funds decreased. In 1967, receipts from their own work contributed eighty-nine per cent of the total revenue of WUs, as against 35.7 per cent in 1959. The principal sources of such receipts were charges paid by enterprises and individuals concerned and receipts from the sale of tickets for various performances. There was an increasing tendency to charge those benefiting from educational services.[14]

The material costs of WUs more or less matched their outlays on wages and salaries. Investment in new buidlings and reconstruction and redecoration was negligible. Investors were mainly socio-political communities and trade unions. Investment in equipment was also negligible, Filipović stressed. (See Table 9)

TABLE 9

REVENUES AND EXPENDITURE OF WUs, 1959-67
(in million dinars)

	1959	1961	1963	1967
Revenue	11.90	29.25	48.25	111.61
Subsidies	7.22	12.73	20.34	12.29
Own activities	4.25	14.85	25.15	99.32
Balance from previous year	0.43	1.68	2.74	-
Expenditure	10.51	24.60	42.56	112.16
Wages and salaries	3.93	13.77	22.61	53.66
Material costs	6.58	10.83	19.96	45.66
Investment	2.66	2.0	2.75	-

Data: Statistički bilten, 233, 282, and 371, Federal Statistical Office, and Kompleksni godisnji izvestaji radnih organizacija neprivrednih delatnosti za 1968, godinu (Aggregate Annual Reports of Non-Economic Organizations, 1968), Federal Statistical Office.

Source: D. Filipović, "Workers' Universities, 1959-1968," in Yugoslav Survey, Vol. 10, No. 4 (1969), p. 127.

Facilities

From 1959 to 1968, accommodation facilities in WUs improved considerably. The number of rooms with enough seats constantly used increased twofold. The number of classrooms nearly quadrupled, and the number of other rooms trebled (see Table 10).[15]

Filipović pointed out that between 1959 and 1968, many WUs had obtained modern buildings (for example, those at Zagreb, Skopje, Sarajevo, Novi Sad, Niš, Kragujevac, Mostar, Pristina, and Velenje). He included the WU of Sarajevo, but in fact, it was given in 1966 a reconstructed Jewish temple to serve as a culture hall with a stage and seating arrangement for 900 people. No doubt this improved the cultural facilities of this university for expositions, shows, and films, but no building for educational activities such as seminars, courses, and schools has ever been given.

Filipović further commented quite justly that in spite of improvements, the construction of new premises and redecoration of existing ones, and provision of equipment and other facilities had not been consistent with expansion of activities and growing adult education requirements.

TABLE 10

PREMISES OF WUs, 1959-60 to 1967-68

	1959-60	1963-64	1967-68
Premises in permanent use			
Rooms	124	216	230
Number of seats	24,575	51,931	54,878
Classrooms	289	834	1,242
Other premises	479	1,094	1,226
Premises occasionally used			
Rooms	323	411	282
Number of seats	71,328	72,578	63,567
Classrooms	1,357	1,263	877
Other premises	328	132	120

Data: Statistički bilten, 233, 371, and for 1967-68 preliminary data, Federal Statistical Office.

Source: D. Filipović, in Yugoslav Survey, Vol. 10 No. 4 (1969) p. 127.

In instruction given at WUs, considerable use is made of tape recorders, film projectors, and slides while other technical instructional aids are used much less. Significant improvements had been made in WUs' equipment. Nevertheless, WUs were still insufficiently equipped, Filipović concluded.[16]

Number and Composition of Staff

According to Filipović, in 1967-68 WUs employed a total staff of 15,806 (2,508 permanent and 13,298 part-time), as compared to 5,228 in 1959-60 (969 permanent and 4,259 part-time).[17] Most staff at WUs had permanent jobs in other educational institutions as well -- they were university teachers and

lecturers and teachers at colleges and advanced vocational schools, enterprises, and industry. Also, public figures, artists, and directors were all engaged as part-time teachers. Filipovic failed to explain the reasons for this practice. In principle, full-time employment of teachers had been avoided, mainly because when workers were taught by teachers who had come from all walks of life, there was a high degree of variety of programs; and because this also made possible an integration of learning and work, practice and theory, one of the basic principles of worker education. In regular schools with extended instruction, which functioned in association with WUs, full-time teachers could be employed.

Raising the Educational and Cultural Level

A paper issued in 1968 by the Central Council of Yugoslav trade unions in Belgrade stressed that the social significance of WUs was reflected particularly through their efforts at developing self-management and raising citizens' educational and cultural level, that of workers in particular,[18] as illustrated by the data presented in Tables 11 and 12 as provided by the Yugoslav Survey (Education, Science and Culture).

The impact of WUs on building up the overall system of education in Yugoslavia was as important as their impact on the educational and cultural level of citizens. WUs were qualified carriers of revolutionary efforts to change the system of education from within, a revolution which is still going on. They have struggled to relate to the interests of the working class, not those of state socialism or some abstract society. It is not surprising, the trade unions asserted, that WUs above all other educational institutions pioneered in becoming self-managing organizations operating on the principle of creating and distributing income according to work output, and thus established themselves in the social community.[19]

TABLE 11

NUMBER OF AND ATTENDANCE AT WU PUBLIC LECTURES, 1963-64 to 1967-68

Year	Number of lectures	Attendance (in thousands)	Indices	
			No. of lectures	Attendance
1963-64	17,216	920	100	100
1964-65	17,852	1,487	104	77
1965-66	17,881	1,511	100	102
1966-67	16,771	1,419	94	94
1967-68	20,465	2,019	122	142

Data: Statistički godišnjak Jugoslavije 1969 (Yugoslav Statistical Yearbook 1969) and Saopštenje (Communication), No. 285, Federal Statistical Office.

Source: Yugoslav Survey, Vol. 10, No. 4 (November 1969), p. 125.

In all these activities intended to help workers get basic education, vocational skills, professional upgrading, keep abreast of advanced technologies, get socio-economic and political education, and general culture, WUs carried on without taking workers away from production. In addition to the educational function in this period, research and instructor's role of the WUs became more significant. Research methods were used to investigate educational needs in worker organizations, and to decide on the most appropriate forms and content of adult education programs for particular organizations.

In 1961, the Summer School of Yugoslav Andragogues at Poreč was set up to become a training centre for adult educators across the country. In 1966, a useful book, Osnovi andragogije, was published for all those who had been practising andragogy for years and had had no andragogical theory. Textbooks on basic adult education began to appear at WUs and some were published by them; these have all contributed to the growth and development of activities and programs at WUs.

TABLE 12

CULTURAL EVENTS AND ATTENDANCE AT WUs, 1959-60 to 1967-68

Year	Events	Attendance
1959-60	11,455	2,374,751
1961-62	10,125	2,216,438
1963-64	9,994	2,931,927
1965-66	7,727	2,130,967
1967-68	7,345	2,095,000

Data: Same as for Table 11.

The largest audiences were for film performances, although their number has been steadily declining (in 1959-60--8,918 films were seen by 1,448,000; in 1961-62--7,026 and 1,140,000; 1963-64--4,419 and 418,000; 1965-66--2,611 and 414,000; and 1967-68--3,013 and 342,000).

The number of theatrical performances is much smaller but has remained constant (588 to 877 performances a year with an audience of 241,000 to 280,000.

WUs also arrange concerts, which are steadily increasing in number. In 1967-68, they organized 790 concerts attended by over 340,000, compared to 240 concerts and an audience of about 95,000 in 1959-60.

The number of art exhibitions staged by WUs is growing steadily: in 1959-60 there were 239 such exhibitions seen by 167,000 persons, compared to 304 and 357,000 respectively in 1967-68.

The number of discussion meetings has fluctuated but steadily increased.

Source: Yugoslav Survey, Vol. 10, No. 4 (1969), p. 125.

Adult education at worker organizations was becoming more popular. There was also increased degree of adaptability by some WUs to meet the needs of worker organizations more fully. This trend was reflected in a definition of WUs given by D. Filipović: "Workers' Universities are independent self-managing organizations whose principal aim is to meet educational requirements of enterprises [my italics], communes, and individuals."[20]

The network of WUs (and PUs) covered the whole country. As a rule, there was a WU or PU in every commune in Yugoslavia; in larger, more developed centres there were several. Trade unions reported 476 as the total in the country, of which 240 were WUs.[21] The same report pointed out that the number was oscillating, indicating a decrease which showed that the process of "stabilization of these institutions was not finished."[22] According to Filipović, Counsellor in the Federal Assembly's Chamber of Education and Culture, the process of stabilization of WUs had "in the main been terminated" and their number was not expected to rise, since they already existed in every industrially developed town.[23] The number of WUs by constituent republic is shown in Table 13.

Filipović and the trade unions were right in predicting that the number of WUs would stabilize. Data provided in the trade union's 1976 report showed 231 WUs in 1969, which declined to 209 in 1973.[24] Some negative observations have been made about WUs, the trade union conference stressed. For example, one-third of them remained underdeveloped. With their modest material and personal resources and the reduced size of their programs, it was said that the WUs were incapable of making any serious impact in raising the educational and cultural level of workers and other citizens. Also, co-operation among WUs was poor, in particular between small and advanced WUs.*

* In this respect, perhaps the WU of Sarajevo was an exception because it had been actively helping smaller WUs throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina; in the late sixties this university began to develop good relations with foreign partners to further develop this relationship into an extension of the WU of Sarajevo in West Germany in the early seventies.

TABLE 13

NUMBER OF WUs BY CONSTITUENT REPUBLIC, 1959-60 to 1967-68

Constituent Republic	1959-60	1961-62	1963-64	1965-66	1967-68
Yugoslavia	212	246	247	251	236
Bosnia and Herzegovina	35	43	40	42	40
Croatia	26	31	26	21	20
Macedonia	17	21	24	27	25
Montenegro	7	8	8	9	8
Serbia	68	87	93	92	90
Serbia proper	36	51	57	56	54
Kosovo	7	7	7	7	7
Vojvodina	25	29	29	29	29
Slovenia	59	56	61	60	53

Data: Statistički bilten (Statistical Bulletin), 234, 282, 371, 431, and 494; for 1967-68 preliminary data, Federal Statistical Office.

Source: Yugoslav Survey, Vol. 10, No. 4 (1969), p. 121.

Further, some tendencies towards deviating from meeting the needs of worker organizations and adult workers in particular began to be felt, especially after 1965. Actually, quite a few WUs turned their attention to so-called "school forms" and youth activities which were immediately marketable, thus losing their basic feature. These WUs became extensions of formal secondary and post-secondary schools. They opened their own certified and uncertified schools and organized courses and schools for professions and trades which were unacceptable in the economic system of the country.

The major reasons for this commercialization most frequently expressed were the WUs' "struggle for bare existence," heavy demands and pressures on the part of citizens for these kinds of activities, and the prevailing principle of

self-financing and the necessity to secure revenues in "marketable" ways in order to finance basic activities. There may have been something rational in this negative trend if it were brief, a forced measure done for the workers' benefit in the final analysis. But expansion of this phenomenon could not be justified and could only intensify contradictions in the society such as the spread of education without a basis in society's needs, duplicating ordinary schools' work and thus damaging the prestige of WUs.

Further, problems related to the financing of basic WU activities, misunderstandings and misconceptions, such as considering financing from old, state socialist positions and demanding that "society ought to secure the means" thus supporting the notion of centralized funds and grants, also contributed to this negative trend.

On the other hand, the consistent orientation of WUs to work organization -- the factory education, providing complex, functional, and permanent education -- did not go smoothly either. The process ought to have gone much faster, but did not because there were misunderstandings and resistance in worker organizations themselves. Actually, they were not ready to accept this challenge, particularly by forming cadres to work in them who would realize the importance and encourage learning in worker organizations.[25]

Cadres at Workers' Universities

We must get back to the issue of cadres at WUs, a problem as old as WUs themselves. Although the situation of cadres had been considerably improved, as illustrated earlier, it was still far from satisfactory. At the trade unions' conference in Belgrade in 1968 it was stressed that filling WUs with professional cadres was poorly planned and unsystematic. There was an unfavourable proportion of associates and teachers to technical and administrative staff. Though the conference did not provide hard data on this proportion, it was implied

that the administrative staff at WUs were getting much larger. Furthermore, the excessive fluctuations of professional people were pointed out, also that advanced training and permanent education for professional staff were inadequate. In addition, for years there had been a tendency to place in WUs those cadres for whom it was hard to find a more suitable position in the commune. It was also admitted at the conference that this practice had been accomplished through "various influences from outside."[26]

To the malady of fluctuating cadres in WUs, I would add that of fluctuating directors. For example, it is known that the WU of Zagreb had only two directors in its history (M. Krstinić and S. Aralica), whereas the WU of Sarajevo, and to some degree the WU of Belgrade, has had many directors. Frequent changes of the top administrators affect the life of the institution. In my experience in working with two directors during a ten-year period, each director takes years to penetrate the problems of worker education. Also, it is bad practice to appoint a director of a WU for political reasons. It is even worse if somebody is appointed director of a WU only until another, more appropriate position can be found for him or her. As suggested by M. Veličković of the Confederation of PUs and WUs of Serbia in Belgrade, this policy has harmed WUs. Regarding part-time associates at WUs, there was a serious handicap in that they did not have enough andragogical skills, and because of their large number and their busyness, it was almost impossible to approach them with any kind of systematic adult education training and education.

On Unequal Status

The 1968 trade unions' conference produced ample evidence that adult education had had unequal treatment in relation to education of children and youth in the regular school system. This was reflected in the irregular financing of

basic adult education and also in the absence of a more favourable climate for massive inclusion of working people in various forms of vocational, socio-economic, and political education. Social and political factors were far more concerned with the education of youth, and adult education was reduced more or less to the "private concern" of an individual who had to make self-sacrifices to satisfy his "passion." It was forgotten that adult education was permanent education. Trade unions stressed that private contributions towards the costs for vocational and basic education of adults far exceeded contributions by the worker organizations and socio-political communities. Regrettably, trade unions did not give any hard data on this proportion.

There was a discrepancy between the theoretical acceptance of adult education as an integral part of the system of education and upbringing* and willingness to provide a sound financial basis. This was evaluated by the trade unions' conference as the major characteristic and essential cause for the decline in WUs.[27]

The law on financing education did not produce nearly as many effective results in adult education as intended. Its major concern was financing of children's and youth's

---

* In the Yugoslav literature on education, the terms education and upbringing are concurrent. This is explained as follows: upbringing and education are two sides of one unique process in which education shows itself as the carrier and the subject of the process, whereas upbringing is a dominant leader and the objective of the process. It is thought that education without a dose of upbringing is insufficient, without an end. Also, to accept upbringing because of its meaning and keep it in the herbarium of educational practice would not be a way towards desired effects. See Drugi Kongres Andragoga Jugoslavije, Budva 1973, by Savez Andragoških društava Jugoslavije, p. 194.

education. Communities of education* became headquarters specializing in the techniques of distribution of financial means secured by law.[28] The composition of communities of education at that time was such that any serious influence from outside on distribution of financial resources was impossible, especially on people who contributed to funds for education by allocating part of their income to it. There was no difference in the character of the community from the earlier state budgetary ways of financing education. In addition, WUs had been excluded from the financial system operated by communities of education.

It was wrong and unfortuante not to take adult education into account in establishing education needs. Only children and youth were considered to have educational needs; those who did not get a chance to enrol or who dropped out or workers already employed were left out.

Furthermore, a serious drawback in further development of WUs were the prevalent views that the role of WUs was basically fulfilled in providing the kind of education that made up for missed opportunities in regular education. Some facts should not be overlooked. They speak for themselves: only one-third of the generation fifteen to eighteen years of age in regular schools qualified for their job. One conclusion is that adult education for a long time will continue to be seen as a compensating function in spite of all attempts to change this and to have adult education

---

* Communities of education were set up in late sixties as self-managed bodies comprising representatives of worker organizations, educational institutions, and territorial administrative organs. People from worker organizations, it was thought, penetrate not only the general assessment of the importance of education for success in their work, but also the concretization of the type of knowledge required and the kind of cadres anticipated from the educational system. See S. Salahović, International Seminar on Scientific, Technical and Technological Development and Tendencies in Women's Education in Yugoslavia (Beograd, 1971), pp. 29-30.

recognized as a system that helps in professional advancement and also in socio-economic relations.

Certainly, it was not possible all at once to secure financial means for all education needs from funds available from compulsory fees. Yet one could have asked why funds for adult education were not provided through legislation.

Trade unions thought that only some adult education needs could be met through funds secured from the budget; they did not advocate funds to cover adult education institutions in totality. This situation is reminiscent of Deleon's position in the 1950s on the same issue when he advocated that financing WUs and adult education be done from the same sources as regular schools. If this had been done, many of the negative things in the WUs that had occurred in the period after 1965 may have been avoided.

This was a delicate situation, on the one hand there was a separation of work and education and almost complete indifference by regular schools to economic needs and the destiny of their students after they left schools;* on the other hand, there were WUs which were vital, dynamic, and problem-oriented institutions sensitive to the needs of worker organizations. With the best intentions WUs zealously organized some school methods including courses for the students who failed, and often carried things too far. By then it was too late to realize that they had become involved in something that basically was not their business.

Trade unions stressed the need to differentiate schools and WUs. Documents issued by the Central Committee of the LCY (League of Communists of Yugoslavia), the Socialist Alliance of the Working People of Yugoslavia, and the Central Council of the Yugoslav Trade Unions had underlined the importance of adult education, education by work in particular.

---

* In the 1970s there has been a strong tendency within the context of on-going reform of the educational system in Yugoslavia to straighten this out.

It was expected that the future congresses of trade unions and the LCY, along with the efforts of adult educators might rectify things. It was thought that WUs ought to preserve the nature and function that had been planned for them when they were set up in the early fifties. However, because of changed social conditions and more complex tasks resulting from these changes, it was logical to expect that WUs' function would be different from that originally planned. The trade unions' conference stressed that WUs ought to remain adult education institutions dealing with basic adult education and vocational, socio-economic, and political education and culture for workers, direct producers in particular.[29]

In other words, it seemed necessary to fight tendencies to turn WUs into schools or services or to meddle in managerial businesses, doing all kinds of services that would have an immediate effect but in reality have nothing to do with education and culture. It was necessary to save something that was once a good educational concept but began to be exploited in a non-educational manner. Social action was the only way for them to keep their specific nature and stay as a revolutionary component in the system of education in the country. Unfortunately, some deviations in the concept of WUs continued into the seventies.

Financing of Workers' Universities

This is not only the vital but also the most complicated issue for WUs. It is complicated because all the contradictions, search for new methods, and dilemmas concerning the financing of education, science, and culture in a self-managing society have been reflected in WUs. Since they deviated furthest from the old state-budgeted system of finance, the dilemmas and contradictions have been more strongly reflected in them. In theory, the program of a WU is financed, not the institution as such, service(s) rendered by a WU is determined by the

system of income creation, and realization of the service is based on the contract signed between two parties -- the user and the provider of the service. As a rule, the users are organs of the socio-political community (the commune), socio-political organizations, worker organizations, communities of education, or individuals. Some of these work-organizations and socio-political communities can and should help finance all spheres of education, while others should contribute to only some. This solution was thought the most appropriate in this phase of the development of the society (in the ongoing process of social and economic reform) and all of the universities were expected to support it. To insist on centralization of funds and financing of the total adult education program from one source would mean going back to the old practice. However, in actual practice, as the conference stressed, this solution had great difficulties, and WUs could not be blamed for this kind of situation, although some did slow down this process through their policies, unadaptability, and the immaturity of their cadres.[30]

Unfortunately, worker organizations were still insufficiently interested in the education of their workers and showed no keeness for financing it; in particular, their interest was lacking in education for self-management, as D. Filipović has illustrated. As shown in Table 14, attendance at courses and seminars in socio-economic education markedly declined, while that of seminars and courses providing general and vocational education increased slightly.[31] Filipović pointed out that comparable data for general, vocational, and socio-economic education in WUs had been collected only since 1963-64. He further stated that the number of students completing vocational education seminars and courses had been fairly even, while the number completing courses in socio-economic and general education had fluctuated.[32] He also provided data on the composition of students completing courses in adult education at WUs, as shown in Table 15.

TABLE 14

NUMBER OF AND ATTENDANCE AT SEMINARS AND COURSES BY KIND OF EDUCATION, 1963-64 TO 1967-68

	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68
Seminars and Courses					
General education	3,122	3,712	3,799	4,119	4,116
Vocational education	2,524	2,614	2,457	2,382	2,635
Socio-economic education	2,486	4,518	2,942	3,023	2,571
Students Completing Seminars and Courses					
General education	95,368	102,437	120,320	108,554	108,775
Vocational education	75,162	75,984	76,441	71,546	78,263
Socio-economic education	157,973	134,792	108,171	121,435	91,394

Data: Statistički bilten, 540; for 1967-68 preliminary data, Federal Statistical Office.

Source: Workers' Universities 1959-68, in Yugoslav Survey, Vol. 10, No. 4(1969), p. 123.

As can be seen in Table 15, the interest of various categories of adults in particular kinds of education varied considerably. Blue- and white-collar workers were most interested in socio-economic education, followed by vocational and general education, and farmers were interested in vocational and general education.

Communities of education were not too willing to accept funding of basic adult education and sometimes vocational education. The conference stressed that socio-political organizations allocated funds in an unorganized way, to some extent, with the exception of the LCY and the trade unions.[33] It was thought that synchronized efforts from the Federation down to worker organization would help finance WU activities.

TABLE 15

PERCENTAGE COMPOSITION OF THOSE COMPLETING SEMINARS AND COURSES AT WUs BY KIND OF EDUCATION, 1963-64 TO 1967-68

	General education	Vocational education	Socio-economic education
1963-64			
Blue- and white-collar workers	55.2	69.4	82.3
Farmers	11.0	21.1	8.8
Others	33.8	9.5	8.9
1965-66			
Blue- and white-collar workers	47.8	63.1	79.6
Farmers	10.1	27.8	8.4
Others	42.1	9.1	12.0
1967-68			
Blue-and white-collar workers	50.8	64.3	71.7
Farmers	14.1	26.6	11.6
Others	35.1	9.1	16.7

Data: Statistički bilten, 371 and 494, and for 1967-68 preliminary data, Federal Statistical Office.

Source: Workers' Universities 1959-1968, p. 124.

This situation was bound up with the general attitude towards adult education in Yugoslavia, which was unsatisfactory to say the least. The then Secretary of Culture and Education of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina thought that:

> In our system of education, which is still burdened with the recidivisms of bourgeois thinking and the classic division of labour, in the system which is emancipating itself convulsively under the conditions of a new self-managing society, adult education has not been sufficiently objectively understood, although it has been declared a necessity of modern times.[34]

Maybe the "necessity of modern times" would have had more self-respect if it had been more flashy and more attractive. Nevertheless, the development of WUs was certainly challenging and rewarding.

6

THE PERIOD OF RECESSION, 1969-72

Developments after 1965 were the subject of discussion and dispute at meetings of the Central Council of the Yugoslav Trade Unions in 1968 and 1976, and also at the meeting of representatives of WUs and PUs at Crikvenica in 1975. In a report of the Commission for Education, Science, and Culture of the Central Council of the trade unions, it was said that after 1965 "many of the most capable workers left the material production, changed their qualifications at WUs," switching to so-called clerical jobs (administrative, economic, stenotypist, organizations, and the like). It would be useful to have data on the number of workers who left material production in this period, but none were available for this study.

Vocational education largely became a marketable commodity. Tuition fees became one of the more significant motivations to provide such education and a basic source of funds at WUs. Individual workers paid for this kind of education and qualifications. Often their motivation was simply to get some qualification, which neither met the basic needs of material production nor advanced productivity. This was a reflection of a social situation in which relations between the accumulation and distribution of income were undeveloped, and remuneration according to work output was not yet dominant. Also, the economic position of workers in non-industrial sectors was relatively better compared to that of the workers

in material production. Consequently, permanent and non-formal education were disappearing at WUs.

The period 1969-72 was difficult for WUs. According to the assessment of the Commission of Culture and Education of the Central Council of trade unions, this was a time when the influence of liberal, nationalistic, and other anti-self-managing forces was felt in all spheres of life. WUs were left to themselves in this period. One of the basic activities or programs, that of political education, in many WUs was lowest in popularity. A change occurred in the relationships between almost all the social organizations and WUs reflected particularly in the former's attitude toward the basic programs for training and educating the workers in self-management and politics. Many organizations of the LCY and trade unions in communes and worker organizations ceased to give aid to WUs. Comparable data provided by trade unions tell about the "narrowing" of political education in the last few years: in 1960-61 there were 7,234 seminars and courses with 299,060 participants; in 1968-69 there were 2,716 courses with 136,138 participants.[1] S. Tonković[2] provided data related to socio-economic education, as shown in Table 16.

TABLE 16

STATISTICS ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC EDUCATION, 1958-69

Year	No. of Seminars	Attendance
1958-59	2,140	83,837
1964-65	5,337	177,843
1968-69	2,716	140,879

Source: Teorija i praksa samoupravljanja (Beograd, 1972), p. 997.

At meetings of representatives of WUs it was stressed that only the trade unions did not change their attitude

towards WUs in this period. However, even trade unions have been inconsistent. The trade unions' commission indicated that trade unions have not been the kind of social force which could withstand current trends. However, trade unions alone tried to get WUs back to their basic self-management and political education programs and prevent the commercialization of adult education. According to the Commission, the essence of the problem lay in the abandoning of action on the part of the socio-political organizations to secure basic material and socio-political assumptions for the self-management education of workers.

When old sources of funding dried up, WUs began to offer their programs to work organizations and socio-political organizations which showed interest in them on a service purchase basis. As social action got weaker, the "buying of programs" became symbolic. Under those conditions, many worker organizations began to neglect completely the needs of workers for self-management and Marxist education.[3]

When educational programs thus became a merchandise, learning became unpopular, while getting diplomas became very fashionable. The climate for education and culture was unfavourable, as reported at the Fifth Annual Assembly of the Confederation of WUs and PUs of Serbia:

> The value of knowledge has dropped very low; diplomas are more appreciated. Large numbers of people believe that other kinds of criteria (not the knowledge) prevail in the instance of getting a job or determining somebody's pay, such as acquaintances, connections. Therefore, nobody rushes in education. Some individuals are ashamed to say they study something, especially if what they are studying is not directly related to their jobs.[4]

A comprehensive report on WUs in Belgrade also examined human and psychological factors. It said: "When a person studies something, he or she wishes this be recognized by a diploma...."[5] This comment was written in 1976 and seems reasonable, being reminiscent of a time, some twenty years

earlier, when D. Pavlovic showed a tendency to overlook this factor.

What was basic, from society's point of view, that the union between WUs and worker organizations was decaying; the union was reduced to a buying and selling relationship and was realized to a large degree through the leading people in worker organizations.

For years, WUs had not received sufficient funds for basic adult education, so fees had to be paid by workers themselves. The Commission of Culture and Education of the trade unions initiated a debate in the Constitutional Court of Yugoslavia against tuition for the basic education of workers. In 1972 this Court decided that tuition for basic adult education was unlawful. Although the Commission's appraisal was that WUs had made a fine contribution to the vocational training of workers and also affirmed the need for permanent education of workers, it asserted that the activities of these institutions in vocational education and training had had a certain negative impact on education for self-management. Inasmuch as they were extending their activities in vocational education, many WUs decreased activities in political education for workers and finally abolished them. WUs opened the same kinds of vocational schools that had existed in communes. Large-scale courses for typists became an excellent source of income for WUs, but they also caused a social problem. For example, in 1974 in Serbia, there were 2,633 typists without a job, and only 339 job openings. As already stressed, getting a certificate seems to have been the only motivation for most workers, and worker organizations in many cases abstained from paying fees simply because these certificates did not reflect production needs. Most workers could not get a job. As a result, the list of temporary, unemployed workers grew, along with the illusion that they were well trained and qualified. What WUs needed badly was action and effort by society at large, not by local administration, because it would be

irresponsible and dangerous to surrender adult education to market dynamics.

The crisis over basic programs and activities in WUs and the negative trend that started after 1965 and was manifested in the diminishing interest for political and self-management education, lasted until the twenty-first Session of the Presidency of the LCY in 1972. An organized action that started after the seventh Congress of the Yugoslav Trade Unions and was followed by republican congresses and trade unions conferences was to bring WUs back to their basic program of training and education of workers for self-management. Especially after the tenth Congress of the LCY in 1974, WUs and society in general began to change. Commercialization, lowering of program standrads, and other negative factors began to be rectified. One should keep in mind that Yugoslavia is the kind of society that researches her socio-political structure and changes at its core. Thus in 1973, the situation was changed significantly for the better: two-thirds of the WUs in the country again offered programs in self-management education. Comparable data provided by trade unions read as follows: in 1968-69 the number of participants in courses in political education was 136,138. In 1972-73, their number was 267,000 and in 1974-75, their number reached 500,000.[6]

A noted Yugoslav andragogue and social psychologist, Professor M. Zvonarević of Zagreb University, pointed out the prevalent views expressed recently that there is no such thing as special education for self-management and that instead, a manager should get throughout his entire education that educational content necessary for self-management. According to Zvonarević, it is perhaps this isolation of self-management education from overall educational process that has caused a number of weaknesses and a certain degrading of its reputation in the eyes of self-managers themselves.[7]

S. Tonković wrote in 1972 that the negative trend in socio-economic education manifested by WUs and PUs had not

been seriously analyzed. He mentioned as possible reasons: the greater contribution by the practice of self-management as a medium for acquiring knowledge during the two decades, and the role of TV and other means of communication, especially papers issued by worker organizations.[8] Tonkovic indirectly stressed the need for more research studies in this area of adult education.

Research in Culture

M. Dedic wrote about "cultural emancipation" in worker organizations and the ever greater presence of culture in production. Modernization of production and democratization of human relations, it was believed, could not be accomplished without modern technology and professional people, but the cultural life of the producers self-managers was also necessary. According to Dedic, aesthetic education in worker organizations was a complex and permanent process.

Aesthetic education at the WU of Belgrade has had a fine tradition and the university itself has enjoyed the reputation of having the best amateur clubs in the country for talented workers and citizens. At the beginning, this education covered only five areas: literature, fine arts, theatre, music, and film. Film has been dominant in the programs and was largely a means of entertainment. In the early 1970s, aesthetic education included twenty different fields, in addition to the five mentioned, elementary creation, synthesized programs, exhibitions, activities related to spreading interest for book-reading, forums, visits to cultural sites, and so on. Group seminars were also very popular. It is interesting to note that sixty per cent of the total activity was realized at worker organizations and fourty per cent outside them.

The research undertaken by the WU of Belgrade in 1970-72 produced interesting findings related to changes in the affinity of workers under the influence of the cultural and

educational programs (that is, of workers who were exposed to the programs): first, previous affinities were retained; for instance, folk music still held first place; second, broader and more important interests were opening up in other spheres such as the motion picture, basically home movies, comedy, Yugoslav prose literature, documentaries; and drama. A breakthrough in this group of widening interests was made with the introduction of fine arts and pop music. Another group that left workers largely indifferent was serious music, cartoons, tragedy, sculpture, architecture, and poetry.

Dedić also stressed that the effects of aesthetic education could be followed through changes in the way workers spent their free time. Here it is not the interest in culture and artistic values that matter so much, but the objective factors such as living standard, time, and habits. The fact that one-third to one-half the workers were involved in extra work* explains that passive activities such as resting and sleeping are determined by existing possibilities.[9]

Due to the integration between WUs and PUs, the number of WUs in 1973 totalled 209. Many PUs which operated in communes where both PUs and WUs had been at work integrated with WUs.[10]

---

* "The worker is not stimulated to work well and make enough money at his work place, because we have not worked out sufficiently the principle of income distribution according to work output. Therefore, productivity at work places is lower than it should be, and the worker is engaged in extra work. But if we add the results he achieves at his work place to those at extra work, the analysis will clearly show that the Yugoslav worker works more than anybody else in Europe." The statement was made by M. Špiljak, President of the Yugoslav Trade Unions at the Trade Unions' conference in Belgrade in January 1978. See Politika, January 31, 1978, p. 7.

7

RECOVERY AND TRANSFORMATION: WORKERS' UNIVERSITIES, 1972-78

> Man's happiness cannot be brought about by the state, or the system, or the political party. The happiness of man can be created by him only. Therefore, the avant-garde forces of socialism and the socialist society can have one objective only: according to the possibilities of the given historical moment, create conditions for man to feel free in his personal expression and creation so that he can on the basis of the social ownership of the means of production act freely and create things for his happiness. That is self-management.
>
> Edvard Kardelj, 1977[1]

Some researchers have pointed out that we should consider Yugoslavia a country occupying a unique position in today's world. J. Kolaja noted that this has come about not only as a result of the country's policy of non-alignment in the political struggle between West and East, but also as a consequence of certain internal developments that have taken place in Yugoslavia since 1950.[2]

In this connection, Professor A. Tanović of the University of Sarajevo is even more helpful. He has stressed some basic principles or values of Yugoslav society: the revolution has determined the Yugoslav present and future, its socialist self-management, the federal system, national equality, the

brotherhood of peoples and national minorities, the country's independence, non-alignment and struggle for world peace, the inalienable income and the inalienable freedom of man and people.[3]

At this point, it will be useful to draw the major co-ordinates of the present educational system in Yugoslavia because this will be helpful in describing the new position of WUs and show modern Yugoslav society in relation to major world tendencies. In this connection, the writings of Professor M. Pečujlić of Belgrade University are useful. Pečujlić wrote about the scientific-technological revolution and the transformation of self-management from partial into integral as the central theme of the Yugoslav future. The world situation today, as he defined it, is not just a prolongation of the preceding one; it is largely a qualitatively new situation. Mankind is at the crossroads of civilization and of a new material world and epoch-making changes. "New mighty production forces are being created and new human needs are maturing," he stressed.[4]

The Yugoslav conception of education is based on these ideas: permanent education; flexibility of forms, with horizontal and vertical connections between all levels of education from pre-school to university; equality of forms of education at schools and extra-curricular institutions; youth and adult education; the acquisition of educational values from work; and rationalization and modernization of education and teaching techniques.

In his article in Adult Leadership of 1977, S. Farmerie listed the principles of adult education in Yugoslavia as given in Savičević's book The System of Adult Education in Yugoslavia: permanence: dialectic materialism holds that all things are in constant process of change; thus, education must be a continuous process; democracy: statutory entitlement makes all forms of education available to all citizens; decentralization: control and operation are under the auspices of local districts, communes, and worker organizations;

unity: adult education is closely interwoven with regular education; diversity and dynamism: the concept of multiple programs; and voluntarism: the lack of legal compulsion. The entire approach, which combines the above principles, is unique and provides room for modernization, Farmerie concluded.[5] The system is also based on the new socio-economic position of education in society, namely one in which worker organizations and educational institutions co-operate [my italics] in establishing educational policy and the means to realize it.[6]

The on-going reform of the educational system in Yugoslavia was described by S. Salahović as the "strategy of change" within education. Basically, it means adapting and functionalizing education, increasing its effectiveness and productivity and integrating it more closely with self-management.[7]

Pečujlić considers reform of education an integral part of the scientific-technological revolution. The basic orientation of this penetrating reform, "which is nearing a real cultural revolution," is an integral linking up of the educational-scientific and the work process. Change has become a way of life. Legions of workers trained in the Industrial Revolution will have to be reorientated. The fact that thirty-three years is the average age of the work force means that million-men armies will be working actively for two and a half or three more decades. However, what is striking is the data showing that about half a million workers and employees occupy positions beyond their qualifications; also, the structure of the managerial staff is somewhat ossified. According to Pečujlić, a solution to this problem cannot be found outside the complementary education of large groups of workers.[8] The need for vocational retraining is becoming a fact of life.

In the early seventies, a new program was added to WUs' curriculum -- education of the population for defence. The program is not designed for the operation of defence technologies only; its ideological and patriotic components

are equally important. There are thus the following subsystems in the WUs' curriculum structure: general education, socio-economic education, vocational education, self-defence, and culture. This structure is supposed to guarantee a variety of educational and cultural programs. The major concerns appear to be transfer of knowledge and skills, the teaching of cultural values in order to help people change their way of life and work, the helping of people to define their objectives and determine means to achieve them, and to increase productivity and income.

Since 1972, basic adult education, now subsidized by the Community of Basic Education, has become one of the most important WU programs in Yugoslavia. According to the trade unions' evaluation, WUs give excellent results in this area. In relation to the total number of the people who have completed basic education, that is eight years of schooling, in the non-formal education system, over ninety per cent of these have attained basic education at WUs.[9] This is remarkable for two reasons: first, no working person is expected to pay for his basic education, and second, considering that Yugoslavia still has illiterate and semi-literate people, every worker must attain functional literacy as a foundation for further training and education.

V. Andrilovic of the WU of Zagreb wrote in Convergence in 1974 that society pressures individuals to learn but gives them little opportunity to learn effectively. Therefore, new means of learning are being sought: different forms of consultation, tutorials and distance education, utilization of radio and TV, film, computers, and specially-prepared textbooks for independent learners. In particular, he stressed programmed instruction as an aspect of modernization on the operational level; it is a more humanized educational procedure which respects individual differences, which is beginning to be used in Yugoslavia on a large scale.[10] A major role in programmed instruction is played by the WU of Zagreb, which has a special Department for Programmed

Instruction. According to Andrilović, the total number of programmed instruction periods by different educational forms such as schools, courses, and seminars within the WU of Zagreb in 1974 was about 2,000.[11]

Nevertheless, WUs were still under attack by trade unions for being slow to utilize the new common policy adopted after the 1969-72 crisis by all the republics and autonomous provinces, that is, the policy of bringing education for self-management back into focus at WUs. A decision was made to set up additional institutions -- Self-managers' Clubs* -- by trade unions, and Marxist centres by the LCY. The clubs were defined as an "aiding organism" of leading social forces. There were about eighty clubs at work in 1976. Both clubs and centres were designed to work within the WUs and outside them.[12]

Recently, WUs started to help Yugoslav migrant workers with temporary jobs in West Germany. These workers have been faced with the problems of training and education. One report said that about seventy per cent of them have not completed basic education and many have no qualifications at all. In addition, they cannot speak German, so cannot take advantage of facilities in Germany. The Yugoslav government has decided they must be helped by education and training as it is hoped that their return will contribute to a skilled labour pool in Yugoslavia. The same report stated that three Yugoslav WUs have been involved in this mission -- the WUs of Sarajevo and New Belgrade and the School Centre of Nikšić. The adult education extension of the WU of Sarajevo began to function in Hannover, West Germany, in September 1974.[13]

Statistics show that, in 1975-76, WUs in Yugoslavia offered 13,526 courses and seminars attended by 569,000 persons and and 22,194 public lectures attended by 1,409,000 persons.[14]

J. Lowe of the Organization for Economic Co-operation

---

* Setting up of first clubs dates back to 1955; since 1971 there has been more emphasis on establishing new clubs, especially after the Second Congress of self-managers and the Tenth Congress of the LCY.

and Development (OECD) in Paris, described WUs in Yugoslavia in 1975 as "among the most original of adult education institutions."* He also remarked that they have not yet received the international recognition they deserve.[15]

However, WUs have been going through a serious crisis. Over the years problems have accumulated and so have weaknesses. I. Cecić of Zagreb wrote that WUs must be reformed and largely redefined. He insisted that the starting point in this transformation was in social relations, above all in the reaffirmation and redefinition of the position and role of the working class in Yugoslavia. His thesis is that the transformation ought to be accomplished in the spirit of the socialist transformation of associated labour and society in general; in the new relations being created through introduction of the system of delegates and communities of interest; also in the reaffirmation of the ideological capability of socio-political organizations, the LCY, the Socialist Alliance of the Working People of Yugoslavia, and the trade unions.** Briefly, according to Cecić, WUs as andragogical institutions in their more permanent orientation will have to be directed towards associated labour in its broadest sense, first of all the associated labour in production, on the level of the basic organization of

---

* Their originality lies in the high degree of workers' control, the stress upon relating course content to needs of the learners, the variety of teaching methods used, the training of all teachers specifically to deal with adults, and maintenance of close rapport between teachers and learners, as well as regular programs of research into workers' education and teaching methods, courses continually analyzed and assessed, and, above all, the location of premises in worker organizations. See Lowe's The Education of Adults: A World Perspective, OISE, Toronto; UNESCO Press, 1975, pp. 85-86.

** Some of the new terms and categories, in particular those introduced in the 1974 Constitution of the SFRY, ought to be qualified; thus, associated labour, system of delegates, communities of interest, and the Basic Organization of Associated Labour (BOAL) are all defined in the glossary at the beginning of this study.

associated labour, the system of delegates, self-managing communities of interest, and the political structures such as the LCY, trade unions, and the Socialist Alliance of the Working People.[16]

E. Kardelj discussed two closed educational systems in Yugoslavia: one is the classical school system, which is "closed and separated from social work," in which educated people are educated outside the system of associated labour, and the other, which is found in associated labour, that is, in the organizations of associated labour, WUs, and similar out-of-school institutions, and is mainly closed in itself and undeveloped. Kardelj has argued for integration of the two systems.[17]

In November 1975, eighty-five representatives of PUs and WUs gathered at a symposium at Crikvenica to discuss the grim situation in which they found themselves. The dominating questions were how to keep respect for and how to realize plans for WUs, how to enhance and advance the institutions by better, more efficient methods, organizational methods, and programs for working people; how to rid the institutions from anything alien and unsuitable; basically, how to reassert the true meaning of WUs. The symposium stressed that the attitudes of the LCY and trade unions had created a favourable climate and that WUs should take advantage of it; furthermore, that major forces for their transformation ought to be found in the institutions themselves.

The meeting also discussed WUs' "diseases," such as their being unable to impose new concepts of education by work and education from work (see Appendix II); their being pushed into the market game. The Congresses in republics of the LCY have pointed to what may be the only way out: WUs ought to qualify for creative inclusion into the reform of the total system of education in the country.* Concerning

* The goal of the present reform is to create a social framework in which education will not depend on the economic and social position of the individual. The reform is based on permanence and the concept of alternating labour and education.

the trend towards integration that came about in the late sixties and early seventies, there has been no real integration in terms of integrated teams and expertise and experience, means and resources, programs to enable people to deal with complex problems of education and culture. Repeatedly, the argument was made for a strong material and financial base for WUs, as it was maintained that their own resources were insufficient.

New efforts were made to regulate the social status of WUs.[18] Thus in the Socialist Republic of Croatia a self-managing community of interest was set up to encourage socio-economic education. In the Socialist Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina and that of Macedonia, legislation was passed to settle the issue of financing self-management education through a community of interest. The first steps were made towards establishing WUs on the basis of the new Constitution of 1974.* More developed WUs were organized according to the model of work organization, that is, they set up basic organizations of associated labour, while less developed WUs followed the pattern of the organization of associated labour without setting up basic organizations.

The fact remains that transofmration was moving slowly. The Report of the Commission of the Yugoslav Trade Unions stated: "There is not enough activity still towards a thorough transformation of the total social position of the WUs on the basis of establishing new self-management relations between the WUs and organizations of associated labour in material production and other parts of associated labour."[19] The problem has been stressed as one of the most crucial to

---

* Constitutional regulations pertaining to the right to education, linking education with associated labour, and alternating labour with education, are fully set out in the Resolutions of the Tenth Congress of the LCY. This is based on Dr. Savičević's Recurrent Education and the Transformation of the System of Education in Yugoslavia (University of Belgrade, December 1976), pp. 10-14.

be solved.* Why? Who is accountable for the slowness and inefficiency in transformation? These are questions for a separate study. The answers can be found in the context of the general transformation of society to self-management.** As the trade unions' report stressed, the problem of further self-managing organization of WUs is the key question in the efforts towards their radical transformation.[20]

In July 1977 in Zagreb I interviewed Aleksandar Kovačić, the late President of the Confederation of the WUs and PUs of Croatia, editor-in-chief of Andragogija, founder of the Yugoslav Summer School of Andragogues, and a distinguished andragogue. From the point of view of years of experience in dealing with WUs, he talked about the current situation. He said that WUs were not in a financial crisis; that they

---

* At present, it seems, the success of the transformation in the country depends on the efficient realization of the conceptual determinations drafted in the Constitution of SFRY, the Constitutions of the Republics and Provinces, the Resolutions of the Tenth Congress of LCY (1974), and the Basic Law on Associated Labour (1976). See Savičević's Recurrent Education and the Transformation... (Belgrade, 1976), p. 19.

** Economically, Yugoslavia has reached a point in her development where she is assuming all the characteristics of a developed economy: the national per capita is close to U.S. $2,000, Yugoslav self-management is viewed increasingly as a system rather than an experiment, "capable of resolving complex problems and overcoming contradictions in the very complex international economic conditions." See an interview given by K. Gligorov, President of the Federal Assembly, to Politika, the Belgrade daily, January 20, 1978, p. 7. On the other hand, modern Yugoslavia is a society with many contradictions -- of a class, national, economic, and cultural nature; substantial transformations are underway and reflected in the way of life of the people, their value and belief systems; class conflicts have different forms, such as conflicts between self-management and nationalism, bureaucracy, technocracy, the radical left, and anarchism. Nevertheless, self-management has been victorious and is constantly growing. See interview with Tanović in Politika, January 12, 1978.

were as big and well equipped as business concerns and made money. Kovačic said that earlier, trade unions, republic governments, and Yugoslav theorists took pride in WUs and tried to develop them according to the best concept. But today, WUs have the clientele, and workers pay well for WU education, but WUs have no more patrons. Kovačić also stressed as indicative of the situation that demand for the andragogical literature had diminished considerably.

If existing confederations and communities had been more active, WUs probably would have been more efficient in resolving vital questions of their survival. According to the trade unions, the confederations are not sufficiently linked to the self-managing community of interest for education and culture on the level of republics and autonomous provinces.[21] They do not act together in making educational policy. Therefore, both confederations and communities will have to be transformed on the basis of the Constitution and Law on Associated Labour.

WUs have suffered from two serious crises: the crisis of the program conception and the crisis of the professional cadres. Andragogy as a science has been conceptualized to play a decisive role in the program policy of WUs. In the mutually compatible relationship of andragogical practice and theory, WU activities have been a foundation for the development of andragogical theory. However, in recent years, instead of developing new methodologies and technologies, WUs have alienated themselves from the scientific base of andragogy. There must be a revolution of cadres in WUs because the crisis of faster mastering of new technologies is largely the crisis of cadres. The considerable fluctuation in professional staff, which brought about the employment of insufficiently trained and inexperienced personnel, is a serious problem in the effective further development of WUs. With the increasing number of clerical staff, WUs now have an extra-heavy financial burden, while in many cases major projects are still being designed and carried out by part-time associates.

It seems clear that WUs alone are not to blame for becoming what they once would never have considered becoming. Once they fought and struggled for the new and progressive in education and culture, and put it into practice. This practice was the foundation for Yugoslav andragogical theory. Also, this very practice has earned a good reputation both at home and abroad. There are still progressive tendencies at WUs, but little or no enthusiasm although WUs are much stronger now in size of staff and material resources.

The theory of andragogy seems to be separate from practice at WUs; there is little mutual respect or interest between them. Consequently, development of both practice and theory is lagging and so room is made for conservative, traditional models and institutional consciousness. Therefore, serious efforts are needed to restore andragogical theory and practice.

It is time numerous part-time associates and participants were involved in reform through the self-management agreements for the purpose of helping WUs to enhance their reputation and status. Part-time associates, who once stood as pillars in WUs, influence these institutions less and less or are less responsible for them. Participants, who continue to attend classes and lectures in large numbers, seem to have taken the role of humble examination candidates, fighters for diplomas only; few exercise their self-management rights and behave like adult learners.

The inclusion of WUs in associated labour and their co-operation with socio-political organizations will no doubt make it possible for programs to reflect the true needs and wishes of adult workers for education, culture, and the general progress of society. With their flexible and unbureaucratic nature, they can accommodate the new social situation, but they must not lose sight of their original purpose. With the new organization of WUs which favours basic organization of the associated labour model, though it seems to guarantee that nobody from outside will interfere with income created and distributed in the basic organizations,

there may be a danger that the basic organizations, simply by thinking too much about their income, overlook the goals and interests of WUs as a whole. I hope that WUs will be strong enough from within to resist this tendency.

The complexity of present programs demands their modernization and that they be continuously evaluated. Competent specialists will be required to make such evaluations. Finally, it will take time and co-operation to find solutions for WUs that will provide the impetus needed for ongoing reform of the educational system in Yugoslavia. One thing ought to be kept in mind: WUs were set up to meet new educational needs resulting from the social transformation in Yugoslavia that took place in the 1950s; it is imperative that the social transformation of the 1970s benefit them now.

In conclusion, I think that in today's world educational community, which is still characterized by traditional methods of education, WUs have been very useful adult education institutions and that there is still need for them. Social planners cannot easily replace them. In Yugoslavia, they have synthesized the best theory and practice in adult education. All workers can learn to produce more efficiently; better quality of their products can be achieved; each product can be made more efficient; communication among individuals and collectives can be made more fruitful; relationships among people can be made more humane; all in all, life itself can be enhanced by new interests, information, and cultural values.

I believe that WUs can contribute to removing what hinders genuine communication and responsible relationships between individuals and society at large. WUs can be the means of integration of education and culture, and can become centres of inquiry where lifelong opportunities for learning are available.

NOTES

Chapter 2: The Early Setting

1 S. Kukoleća, "Review of Movements in Yugoslav Economy Toward Decentralization," Economic Concentration, Part 7A, U.S. Senate Antitrust Subcommittee, 90th Congress, 2nd Session 1968, pp. 4490-4506.

2 J.B. Dirlam, J.L. Plummer, An Introduction to the Yugoslav Economy, (Columbus, Ohio: University of Rhode Island and United States Agency for International Development, Charles Merrill Co., 1973), p. 21.

3 D. Kalodjera, The Development and Characteristics of the Social Organization of Yugoslav Industry, United Nations Industrial Development Organization, ID/Conf. I/G. 20, 1967.

4 Dirlam, Plummer, An Introduction to the Yugoslav Economy, p. 22.

5 Kukoleća, "Review of Movements in Yugoslav Economy toward Decentralization."

6 Dirlam, Plummer, An Introduction to the Yugoslav Economy, p. 8.

7 P. Auty, Yugoslavia (New York: Walker and Co., 1965), p. 137.

8 Yugoslavia: Development with Decentralization, World Bank Report (Baltimore-London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975), p. 29.

9 "Enterprise" is used in this study to cover all business, factories, workshops, any organized work for profit based on the social ownership and management of the means of production.

10 Auty, Yugoslavia, p. 141.

11 Ibid., p. 142.

12 B. Horvat, Self-Governing Socialism, Vol. I (White Plains, N.Y.: IASP, 1975), p. 48.

13 Ibid.

14 J.B. Tito, "Fabrike radnicima" (Factories to the Workers), in Marksizam savremena misao epohe, Vol. III (Beograd, 1976), pp. 279-83.

15 D. Savičević, Recurrent Education and the Transformation of the System of Education in Yugoslavia (Beograd, 1976), p. 2 (English text).

16 S. Tonković, "Samoupravna kultura i obrazovanje," Teorija i praksa samoupravljanja (Beograd, 1972), p. 988.

17 Tito, "Fabrike radnicima".

18 Savičević, Recurrent Education and the Transformation of the System of Education in Yugoslavia, p. 3.

19 Horvat, Self-Governing Socialism, p. 49.

20 Auty, Yugoslavia, p. 148.

21 R. Bičanić, National Income Distribution in Yugoslavia (Zagreb, 1955), p. 14.

22 "Workers' Management in Yugoslavia," Journal of Political Economy, Vol. LXVII, No. 2, (April 1959), pp. 197-98.

23 A. Deleon, "33 Questions - 33 Answers on Workers' Self-Management in Yugoslavia 1956," in J. Kolaja's Workers' Councils - The Yugoslav Experience (New York: 1966, F. Praeger Publications), p. 7.

24 M. Slani, "Are There Any Strikes in Yugoslavia?", Yugoslav Trade Unions, No. 2 (Beograd, 1952), pp. 11-12 (English text).

25 I. Božičević, "Trade Unions and the Socialist State," Yugoslav Trade Unions, No. 3 (Beograd, 1952), pp. 19-20 (English text).

26 Ibid.

27 M. David, Adult Education in Yugoslavia (Paris: 1962, UNESCO), p. 16.

28 Kukoleča, "Review of Movements in Yugoslav Economy toward Decentralization," p. 4495; Inkeles and Smith, Becoming Modern (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974), p. 10.

29 Prvi Kongres Radničkih Saveta (RAD Beograd, 1957), p. 14.

30 Ibid., p. 18.

31 Auty, Yugoslavia, p. 158.

32 Dirlam, Plummer, An Introduction to the Yugoslav Economy, p. 20.

33 J. McKinley, "Perspectives on Diagnostics in Adult Education," Viewpoints, School of Education, Indiana University, Vol. 49, No. 5 (1973), p. 75.

34 David, Adult Education in Yugoslavia, pp. 85-153; D. Savičević, The System of Adult Education in Yugoslavia (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1968).

35 Ibid., p. 24.

36 Ibid.

37 Horvat, Self-Governing Socialism, p. 50.

38 Tonković, "Samoupravljačka kultura i obrazovanje," p. 994.

39 David, Adult Education in Yugoslavia, p. 86.

40 Ibid.

41 I. Bluestone, "Workers' Participation in Decision Making," in P. Fairfield, Humanizing the Workplace (New York: Prometheus Books, 1974) p. 51.

42 David, Adult Education in Yugoslavia, p. 87.

Chapter 3: Workers' Universities, 1952-56

1 Federal Office of Statistics, Belgrade 1960, Book 6, p. 2.

2 D. Pavlović, "Referat o problemima Radničkih universiteta," Bilten Radničkog univerziteta Novi Sad (1955), pp. 5-9.

3 E. McMahon, "The Needs of People and the Needs of Their Communities," in Priorities in Adult Education (New York: 1972), p. 33.

4 Pavlović, "Referat o problemima Radničkih universiteta," p. 8.

5 Ibid.

6 Ibid., p. 7.

7 Savezni Zavod za Statistiku (Federal Institute of Statistics), Bilten No. 206 (Beograd, Juni 1961), p. 73.

8 Pavlović, "Referat o problemima Radničkih universiteta," pp. 4-5.

9 A. Deleon, "O karakteru Radničkih univerziteta," Bilten Radničkog univerziteta Novi Sad(1955), p. 10.

10 Ibid.

11 Ibid.

12 S. Tonković, "O društveno-ekonomskom obrazovanju," Bilten Radničkog univerziteta Novi Sad, No. 5 (1956), pp. 50-56; Deleon, "O karakteru Radničkih univerziteta," p. 11.

13 Ibid.

14 Ibid.

15 Ibid., p. 13.

16 Ibid.

17 A. Deleon, "Mesto i uloga Radničkih univerziteta u sistemu radničkog obrazovanja," Bilten Radničkog univerziteta Novi Sad, No. 5 (1956), pp. 4-15.

18 Ibid., p. 4.

19 Ibid., p. 5.

20 Ibid., p. 6.

21 Ibid., p. 7.

22 Ibid.

23 Ibid., p. 8.

24 Ibid., p. 11

25 Ibid., pp. 11-12.

26 Ibid., p. 13.

27 D. Filipović, "Problemi nastavnih metoda na Radničkim univerzitetima," Narodno Sveučilište, Zagreb (1956), pp. 344-54.

28 Deleon, "Mesto i uloga Radničkih univerziteta u sistemu radničkog obrazovanja," p. 13.

29 Ibid.

30 Filipović,"Problemi nastavnih metoda na Radničkim univerzitetima," p. 344.

31 Ibid., p. 346

32 D. Filipović, "O nekim problemima nastave na Radničkim univerzitetima," Bilten Radničkog univerziteta Novi Sad, No. 5(1956), p. 27.

33 Filipović, "Problemi nastavnih metoda na Radničkim univerzitetima," p. 345.

34 Ibid., loc. cit.

35 Ibid., p. 354.

36 Deleon, "Mesto i uloga Radničkih univerziteta u sistemu radničkog obrazovanja," p. 14.

37 Tonković, "O društveno-ekonomskom obrazovanju," p. 51.

38 Ibid., p. 53.

39 Ibid., loc. cit.

40 M.S. Knowles, A Theory of Christian Adult Education Methodology (Boston, 1972).

41 I. Švarc, "Izvodi iz diskusije po referatu o društveno-ekonomskom obrazovanju," Drugo jugoslavensko savetovanje o Radničkim univerzitetima, Bilten Radničkog univerziteta Novi Sad, No. 5 (1956), p. 57.

42 Veseljko Velčić, "Izvodi iz diskusije po referatu o umetničkem obrazovanju radnicka," Drugo jugoslovensko savetovanje Radničkih univerziteta, Bilten Radničkog univerziteta Novi Sad, No. 5 (1956), pp. 49-50.

43 M. Krstinić, "Diskusija na Kongresu Radničkih saveta Jugoslavije," RAD (Beograd, 1957), p. 629.

44 Deleon, "Mesto i uloga Radničkih univerziteta u sistemu radničkog obrazovanja," p. 15.

45 S. Tonković, "Radnički Univerziteti," Jugoslovenski pregled, No. 2 (1957), p. 95.

46 Ibid.

47 D. Savičević, "Ideje o obrazovanju odraslih u mislima i delima srpskih socijal-demodrata," Obrazovanje odraslih, No. 7-8 (Zagreb, 1962), p. 45.

48 D. Petrović, "Razvojni put Narodnih i Radničkih univerziteta, njihova fizionomija, juče, danas i sutra," Obrazovanje Odraslih, No. 5 (Zagreb, 1963), p. 21.

49 Ibid., p. 21.

50 "Savezni Zavod za Statistiku" (Federal Institute of Statistics), Bilten, No. 206 (Beograd, 1961), p. 73.

51 D. Filipović, "O spremanju nastavnih kadrva za rad s odraslim," Narodno Sveučilište, No. 1 (Zagreb, 1958), p. 15.

52 Deleon, "Mesto i uloga Radničkih univerziteta u sistemu radničkog obrazovanja," pp. 8-9.

53 B. Samolovčev, "Karakter, uloga i programsko-metodska orijentacija Narodnih i Radničkih univerziteta," Narodno Sveučilište, No. 1 (Zagreb, 1958), p. 32.

54 S. Elaković, "O nekim aktuelnim pitanjima Radničkih i Narodnih univerziteta," Narodno Sveučilište, No. 4 (1958), p. 15.

55 D. Filipović, "O potrebi formiranja jugoslovenskog koordinacionog tela Radničkih i Narodnih univerziteta," Obrazovanje odraslih, No. 7-8 (Zagreb, 1961), pp. 12-13.

56 D. Filipović, "Workers Universities, 1959-1968" in Yugoslav Survey (published in English), Vol. 10, No. 4 (November 1969) pp. 119-20.

57 Centralno Veće Saveza Sindikata Jugoslavije (The Central Council of the Yugoslav Trade Unions), Konferencija Radničkih i Narodnih univerziteta Jugoslavije, 27, marta 1968, Beograd, Radnički i Narodni univerziteti u uslovima sprovođenja društvene i privredne reforme, p. 4.

58 S. Tonković, "Samoupravljačka kultura i obrazovanje," in Teoriji i praksi samoupravljanja (Beograd, 1972), p. 991

59 M. Meštrović, S. Ižaković, "Djelatnesti Radničkih i Narodnih univerziteta u SFRJ" Sarajevo (December 1972), pp. 8-9.

60 Gradski Komitet Beograd, Društveni položaj, sadržaji rada i pravci razvoja Radničkih i Narodnih univerziteta u Beogradu (June, 1976), p. 26.

61 Tonković, "Samoupravljačka kultura i obrazovanje," p. 990.

Chapter 4: Workers' Universities, 1957-64

1 S. Tonković, "Radnički univerziteti," Jugoslovenski pregled, No. 2 (1957), p. 94.

2 Ibid.

3 R. Čolaković, "Diskusija" na Kongresu Radničkih Saveta Jugoslavije," RAD (Beograd, 1957), p. 620.

4 D. Filipović calls them "departments," which may be confusing, as the term suggests divisions of an ordinary university. See Yugoslav Survey, Education, Science, Culture, Vol. 10, No. 4 (1969), p. 121, English text.

5 Tonković, "Radnički univerziteti," p. 94.

6 Ibid., pp. 94-95.

7 Ibid., p. 94.

8 Ibid., p. 95.

9 Čolaković, Kongres Radničkih Saveta Jugoslavije, p. 621.

10 J. Sinadinovski, "Diskusija," Kongres Radničkih saveta Jugoslavije, RAD (Beograd, 1957), pp. 610-12.

11 S. Marković, "Specijalni ekonomski seminari," Obrazovanje odraslih, Zagreb, No. 9-10 (1959), pp. 55-58.

12 Ibid., p. 58.

13 M. Krstinić, "Diskusija," Kongres Radničkih saveta Jugoslavije, RAD (Beograd, 1957), pp. 627-29.

14 See Savezni Zavod za statistiku, Knjiga 9 (Beograd, 1960), p. 2.

15 A. Deleon, "Obrazovanje odraslih," u Zaključcima, Narodno sveučilište, No. 7-8 (1957), p. 448.

16 M. Krstinić, "Kako izgraditi Radničko sveučilište kao instituciju za obrazovanje radnika," Obrazovanje radnika, No. 1 (1957), p. 8.

17 Ibid., pp. 8-9.

18 Teorija i praksa samoupravljanja (Beograd, 1972), pp. 993-94.

19 M. David, Adult Education in Yugoslavia (Paris: UNESCO 1962), p. 99.

20 Ibid., p. 140.

21 Krstinić, "Kako izgraditi Radničko sveučilište kao instituciju za obrazovanje radnika," p. 11.

22 Ibid.

23 V. Čeklić, "Obrazovanje radnika u Hrvatsko," Narodno sveučilište, No. 1 (1958), p. 11.

24 Ibid., pp. 11-12.

25 M. Kratinić, "Radničko sveučilište 'Moša Pijade'," Obrazovanje radnika, (Zagreb, 1958), p. 57.

26 Ibid., p. 66.

27 Ibid., p. 83.

28 V. Veličić, V. Marković, and V.L. Veličić, Radničko sveučilište u obrazovanju kadrova iz privrede, Radničko sveučilište 'Moša Pijade', (Zagreb, 1964), p. 261.

29 G. Jovanić, "Iskuštva u dosadšnjem radu i pitanje unapredenja delatnosti Radničkog univerziteta 'Duro Salaj' u Beogradu," Narodno sveučilište, No. 10 (Zagreb, 1958), p. 30.

30 Ibid., p. 31.

31 Ibid., p. 32.

32 Ibid., p. 33.

33 Ibid., p. 35.

34 Ibid., p. 36.

35 S. Elaković, "O nekim aktuelnim pitanjima Radničkih i Narodnih univerziteta," Narodno sveučilište, No. 4 (1958), pp. 12-16; J. Sinadinovski, "Kadrovske mogućnosti Radničkih univerziteta i perspektive njihovog daljeg razvitka," Narodno sveučilište, No. 1 (1958), pp. 38-42; Čeklić, "Obrazovanje radnika u Hrvatskoj," pp. 3-13.

36 Sinadinovski, "Kadrovske mogućnosti Radničkih univerziteta i perspektive njihovog daljnjeg razvitka," p. 41.

37 Čeklić, "Obrazovanje radnika u Hrvatskoj," p. 9.

38 Ibid., p. 10.

39 Sinadinovski, "Kadrovske mogućnosti Radničkih univerziteta i perspektive njihovog daljnjeg razvitka," p. 40.

40 Elaković, "O nekim aktuelnim pitanjima Radničkih i Narodnih univerziteta," p. 16.

41 Čeklić, "Obrazovanje radnika u Hrvatskoj," p. 7.

42 Ibid., p. 8.

43 S. Tonković, "Radnički univerziteti danas," Naša stvarnost, No. 9, (Beograd, 1959), p. 231.

44 Ibid.

45 Ibid., p. 235.

46 Ibid., pp. 236-40.

47 Ibid., p. 241.

48 S. Tonković, "O nekim pitanjima razvitka Radničkih univerziteta," Obrazovanje odraslih, No. 5-6 (Zagreb, 1959), p. 14.

49 Ibid., pp. 14-17.

50 Ibid., p. 20.

51 Ibid., p. 21.

52 I. Tavčar, "Radnička i Narodna sveučilišta u Sloveniji," Obrazovanje odraslih, No. 2-3 (Zagreb, 1960), p. 14.

53 Ibid., p. 16.

54 D. Filipović, "Workers' Universities, 1959-1968," Yugoslav Survey, Vol. 10, No. 4 (1969), p. 120.

55 Tavčar, "Radnička i narodna sveučilišta u Sloveniji," pp. 19-20.

56 I. Tavčar, "Radnicki i Narodni univerziteti u Slovenji," Obrazovanje odraslib, No. 2-3 (1960), p. 21.

57 Ibid., p. 21.

58 Službeni list FNRJ, No. 28 (1958).

59 Službeni list FNRJ, No. 39 (1959).

60 S. Tonković, "Radnički univerziteti 1957-1959," Jugoslovenski pregled, No. 1 (1960), p. 29.

61 David, Adult Education in Yugoslavia, p. 97.

62 S. Tonković, "Radnički univerziteti 1957-1959," Jugoslovenski pregled, No. 1 (1960), p. 30.

63 Tonković, "Radnički univerziteti 1957-1959," p. 29.

64 Ibid., p. 30.

65 G. Jovanić, "O programskoj strukturi Narodnih i Radničkih univerziteta," Obrazovanje odraslih, No. 5-6 (1960, p. 13.

66 Tonković, "Radnički univerziteti 1957-1959," p. 30.

67 J. Molović, "Pred novim zadacima," Obrazovanje odraslih, No. 2-3 (1960), pp. 83-86.

68 T. Ladan, "Estatsko osjećanje i estetsko obrazovanje," Radnički Univerzitet (Informativni bilten Radničkog univerziteta Sarajevo), No. 1 (1960), p. 13.

69 Tonković, "Radnički univerziteti 1957-1959," p. 31.

70 Ibid.

71 Krstinić, "Radničko sveučilište 'Moša Pijade'," pp. 78-80.

72 Tonković, "Radnički univerziteti 1957-1959," p. 32.

73 Velčić, et al, Radničko sveučilište u obrazovanju kadrova iz privrede, p. 261.

74 I. Tavčar, "Radnička i Narodna sveučilište Slovenije u godini 1960," in Obrazovanje odraslih, No. 1-2 (1961) pp. 53-57.

75 Ibid., p. 57.

76 S. Elaković, "Finansiranje Radničkih i Narodnih univerziteta," Obrazovanje odraslih, No. 3-4 (1961), pp. 19-29.

77 Ibid., p. 29.

78 Teorija i praksa samoupravljanja, (Beograd, 1972), p. 993.

79 T. Blaha, "Neki problemi daljnjeg razvitka Radničkih i Narodnih univerziteta," Kulturni život, No. 7-8 (1961), p. 605.

80 Ibid., p. 606.

81 Ibid., p. 607.

82 A. Deleon, "I za danas i za sutra," Borba (Belgrade daily), September 24, 1961.

83 Ibid.

84 S. Aralica, "Radničko sveučilište 'Moša Pijade'," Kulturni život, No. 3-4 (1961), pp. 301-2.

85 V. Velčić, "Programska struktura Radničkog sveučilišta u Zagrebu," Obrazovanje odraslih, No. 9-10 (1961), p. 27.

86 Ibid., p. 28.

87 Ibid., p. 35.

88 Aralica, "Radničko sveučilište Moša Pijade," p. 305.

89 Ibid., p. 306.

90 Velčic, et al, Radničko sveučilište u obrazovanju kadrova iz privrede, p. 260.

91 M.Z. "Radnički univerzitet Đuro Šalaj u Beogradu, Jugoslovenski pregled, No. 4 (1961), p. 176.

92 Ibid.

93 S. Tonković, "Savetovanje u Centralnom Veću SSJ predstavnika Radničkih univerziteta o uticaju novih privrednih mera i principa dohotka na društveno-ekonomsko obrazovanje," in Obrazovanje odraslih, No. 3 (1962), p. 42.

94 Ibid., p. 48.

95 S. Tonković, "Samoupravna kultura i obrazovanje," in Teorija i praksa samoupravilijanja (Beograd, 1972), p. 993.

96 M. Knowles, The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species, (Houston, Texas: Gulf Publishing Company, 1973), p. 85.

97 S. Elaković, "Perspektive daljnjeg razvoja Radničkih i Narodnih univerziteta," Obrazovanje odraslih, No. 4-5 (1962), p. 28.

98 Ibid., p. 24.

99 I. Tavčar, "Daljnje jačanje Radničkih i Narodnih univerziteta u NR Sloveniji," Obrazovanje odraslih, No. 4-5 (1962), pp. 36-37.

100 D. Petrović, "Razvojni put Narodnih i Radničkih univerziteta i njihova fizionomija juče, danas i sutra," Obrazovanje odraslih, No. 5 (1963), p. 20; Elaković, "Perspektive daljnjeg razvoja Radničkih i Narodnih univerziteta," p. 23.

101 O. Šabović, "Druga skupština Saveza Narodnih i Radnickih univerziteta Crne Gore," Obrazovanje odraslih, No. 1-2 (1962), pp. 113-14.

102 Ibid., p. 114.

103 "Peti Kongres Saveza Sindikata Jugoslavije," RAD (Beograd, 1964), p. 709.

104 A. Deleon, "Prividne i prolazne protivrečnosti u obrazovanju odraslih," Obrazovanje odraslih, No. 3-4 (1963), pp. 8-9.

105 Ibid., p. 9.

106 I. Tavčar, "Aktuelni problemi Radničkih učilišta u Sloveniji," Obrazovanje odraslih, No. 9-10 (1964), p. 17.

107 "Teorija i praksa samoupravljanja," p. 994.

108 Ibid., p. 995.

109 Ibid.

110 "Peti Kongres Saveza Sindikata Jugoslavije," p. 705.

111 "Teorija i praksa samoupravljanja," p. 996.

112 "Peti Kongres Saveza Sindikata Jugoslavije," p. 710.

113 M. Jeftic, "Klasni koncept kulture u našem samoupravnom društvu," Socijalizam, No. 2 (1973), p. 184.

114 V. Deleon, "Likovno obrazovanje odraslih na Radničkom univerzitetu," Obrazovanje odraslih, No. 2-3 (1964), pp. 43-46.

Chapter 5: Workers' Universities, 1965-69

1 Glossary in Socialist Thought and Practice, Vol. I (Beograd, 1974).

2 "Radnički univerzitet 'Đuro Đaković' Sarajevo," Program rada 1965 (January 1965), p. 20.

3 Ibid., p. 22.

4 "Radnički univerzitet 'Đuro Đaković' Sarajevo," Rad i Obrazovanje, (a publication dedicated to the ten-year anniversary of the centre for training of managerial staff in economy), No. 3 (1966), pp. 9-23.

5 Ibid., pp. 50-57.

6 Teorija i praksa samoupravljanja (Beograd, 1972), pp. 996-97.

7 M. Meštrović, "Uz petnaestogodišnjicu," in Rad i Obrazovanje, No. 5 (1968), pp. 5-6.

8 Ibid., p. 7.

9 Ibid.

10 Ibid., p. 8.

11 M. Meštrović and S. Ižaković, "Petnaest godina," Rad i Obrazovanje, No. 5 (1968), p. 33.

12 Meštrović, "Uz petnaestogodišnjicu," p. 9.

13 J.A. Simpson, Today and Tomorrow in European Adult Education, (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1972), p. 56.

14 D. Filipović, "Workers' Universities, 1959-1968," in Yugoslav Survey, Vol. 10, No. 4 (1969), p. 126.

15 Ibid., p. 127.

16 Ibid., pp. 127-28.

17 Ibid., p. 126.

18 Centralno veće Saveza sindikata Jugoslavije (Konferencija Radničkih i Narodnih univerziteta Jugoslavije), Radnički i Narodni univerziteti u uslovima sprovodenja društvene i privredne reforme (27 Marta 1968), p. 5.

19 Ibid.

20 Filipović, "Workers' Universities, 1959-1968," p. 121.

21 Centralno veće Saveza sindikata Jugoslavije, Radnički i Narodni univerziteti u uslovima sprovodenja društvene i privredne reforme, p. 9.

22 Ibid., p. 10.

23 Filipović, "Workers' Universities, 1959-1968," p. 120.

24 Komisija Predsednistva Veća SSJ za obrazovanje, nauku, kulturu i informativno-propagandnu aktivnost: Obrazovanje i osposobljavanje za rad i samoupravljanje i mest i uloga Radničkih i Narodnih uhiverziteta i klubova samoupravljaca, Beograd (novembra 1976), p. 3.

25 Radnički i Narodni univerziteti u uslovima sprovodenja društvene i privredene reforme, op. cit., pp. 10-12.

26 Ibid., p. 13.

27 Ibid., pp. 14-18.

28 Centralno veće Saveza sindikata Jugoslavije, Radnički i Narodni univerziteti u uslovima sprovodenja društvene i privredne reforme, p. 17.

29 Ibid., pp. 16-23.

30 Ibid., p. 27.

31 Filipović, "Workers' Universities, 1959-1968," p. 123.

32 Ibid., p. 124

33 Centralno Veće Saveza sindikata Jugoslavije, Radnički i Narodni univerziteti u uslovima sprovodenja društvene i privredne reforme, p. 27.

34 Meštrović and Ižaković, "Petnaest godina," p. 11.

Chapter 6: Recession, 1969-72

1 Komisija Presedništva Veća SSJ za obrazovanje, nauku i kulturu i informativno-propagandnu delatnost, Obrazovanje i osposobljavanje radnika za rad i samoupravljanje i mesto i uloga Radničkih i Narodnih univerziteta i klubova samoupravljača, Beograd (novembra 1976), pp. 5-13.

2 S. Tonković, "Savoupravljačka kultura i obrazovanje," in Teorija i praksa samoupravljanja (Beograd, 1972), p. 997.

3 Komisija Presedništva Veća SSJ za obrasovanje, nauku i kulturu i informativno-propagandnu delatnost, Obrazovanje i osposobljavanje radnika za rad i samoupravljanje i mesto i uloga Radničkih i Narodnih univerziteta i klubova samoupravljača, Beograd (novembra 1976), pp. 5-6.

4 Savez Narodnih i Radničkih univerziteta Srbije, Peta Redovna skupština, (Beograd, juni 1972), p. 4.

5 Gradski komitet Saveza komunista Beograd, Društveni položaj, sadržaji rada i pravci razvoja Radničkih i Narodnih univerziteta u Beogradu (juni 1976), p. 29.

6 Obrazovanje i osposobljavanje radnika za rad i samouprvaljanje i mesto i uloga Radničkih i Narodnih univerziteta i klubova samoupravljača, pp. 7-11.

7 M. Zvonarević, "Socijalno-psihološki aspekti samoupravljanja," in Teorija i praksa samoupravljanja (Beograd, 1972), p. 968.

8 Tonković, "Samoupravljačka kultura i obrazovanje," p. 997.

9 M. Dedić, "Prilog daljem razvijanju kulturno estetskog obrazovanja u radnim organizacijama," in Drugi kongres andragoga Jugoslavije (Budva 1973), pp. 365-67.

10 Obrazovanje i osposobljavanje radnika za rad i samouprvaljanje i mesto i uloga Radničkih i Narodnih univerziteta i klubova samoupravljača, p. 3.

Chapter 7: Recovery and Transformation: Workers' Universities, 1972-78.

1 E. Kardelj, Pravci razvoja političkog sistema socijalističkog samoupravljanja (Beograd, 1977), p. 10.

2 J. Kolaja, Workers' Councils: The Yugoslav Experience, (New York, Washington: Praeger, 1965), p. ix.

3 Politika (Belgrade daily), January 12, 1978.

4 M. Pečujlić, "Naučno-tehnološka revolucija i integralno samoupravljanje," in Teorija i praksa samoupravljanja (Beograd, 1972), p. 912.

5 S.A. Farmerie, "Educational Modernization in Yugoslavia: The Case of Adult Education," in Adult Leadership, Vol. 25, No. 6 (1977), pp. 173-74.

6 S. Salahović, International Seminar on Scientific, Technical and Technological Development and Tendencies in Women's Education in Yugoslavia (Beograd, 1971), p. 31.

7 Ibid., p. 26.

8 Pečujlić, "Naucno-tehnološka revolucija i integralno samoupravljanje," p. 914.

9 .Komisija Predsedništva Veća SSJ za obrazovanje, nauku, kulturu i informativno-propagandnu delatnost, Obrazovanje i osposobljavanje radnika za rad i samoupravljanje i mesto i uloga Radničkih i Narodnih univerziteta i klubova samoupravljača (Beograd, 1976), p. 14.

10 V. Andrilović, Adult Education and Programmed Learning, in Convergence Vol. VII, No. 2 (1974), p. 6.

11 Ibid., p. 9.

12 Komisija Predsedništva Obrazovanje i osposobljavanje radnika za rad..." p. 22.

13 Radnički univerzitet "Đuro Đjaković" Sarajevo, Izvještaj o radu u 1974 godini, pp. 41-45.

14 Statistički godišnjak Jugoslavije (Statistical Yearbook of Yugoslavia), (Beograd, 1977), p. 346.

15 J. Lowe, The Education of Adults: A World Perspective, (OISE, Toronto: The UNESCO Press, 1975), p. 85.

16 I. Cecić, "Samoupravno i dugoročno definiranje društvene funkcije andragoške teorije i prakse u djelatnosti Radničkih i Narodnih sveučilišta," in Andragogija, Zagreb, No. 9-10 (1974), pp. 37-44.

17 E. Kardelj, "Revolucionarna praksa i marksističko obrazovanje," in Društveni položaj, sadržaji rada i pravci razvoja Radničkih i Narodnih univerziteta u Beogradu (Beograd, 1976), p. 7.

18 A. Kovačić, "Suvremene tendencije u razvoju Narodnih i Radničkih sveučilišta u Jugoslaviji," in Andragogija, No. 1-3 (1976), pp. 1-7.

19 Komisija Presednistva Obrazovanje i osposobljavanje radnika za rad i samoupravljanje i mesto i uloga Radničkih i Narodnih univerziteta i klubova samoupravljača, p. 18.

20 Ibid., p. 19.

21 Ibid., pp. 19-20.

APPENDIX I

The appendix outlines the organizational structure of the worker self-management and its major components.

The Council

The Council is the organ of social management of a WU. At the WU of Zagreb, the Council in 1964 had thirty-seven members.* Nineteen members of the Council are elected by members of the work community of the WU by direct vote: the remaining eighteen members are delegated by other work organizations (enterprises, socio-political organizations, and professional organizations). The President and the Vice-President of the Council are elected by members of the Council from among themselves at the first session.

The basic tasks, duties, and rights of the Council are:

(1) to consider and decide all vital questions related to the activities and development of the institution;

(2) to decide on the prospective development of the institution; in particular to make decisions regarding the annual plan of the WU;

(3) to analyze and approve the realization of the semi-annual and annual plans; to be concerned with basic material and social conditions regarding fulfillment of the institute's tasks;

---

* These are 1964 statistics and are based on the monograph published by the WU of Zagreb under the title Radničko sveučilište u obrazovanju kadrova iz privrede (Zagreb 1964), by V. Veličić et al.

(4) to discuss and approve the draft annual financial plan (revenues and expenditures plan); to analyze realization of the same and to decide on the final balance sheet;

(5) to consider and approve basic orientation of the personnel policy of the institution; to approve realization of the personnel policy with a view towards application of rules and regulations pertaining to the area; to resolve applications and grievances submitted by members of the collective;

(6) to decide on the internal organization and systematization of work places;

(7) to introduce the statute and the rules and regulations of the WU governed by the statute.

Meetings of the Council are held regularly and according to need. Based on the practices of the WU of Zagreb, meetings are held once a month. Methods and planning are discussed at the beginning of each year. Members of the Council can attend all meetings of other management units of the institution and meetings of the professional bodies and socio-political organizations in the institution. In this manner, members of the Council get to know the problems of the institution, and this knowledge, it is assumed, helps in decision-making within their jurisdiction. Any member of the work collective can attend any session of the Council, participate in discussions, and has a right to advise Council. (See monograph of the WU of Zagreb, pp. 262-63.)

The Management Board

The Management Board (MB) is the central unit of self-management, whose particular concern is to get as much direct participation as possible from members of the work collective in activities of the Management Board. Members of the MB are elected by members of the collective by secret vote. Political preparation and organization of the election is dealt with by the trade unions branch and the basic organization of the LCY. The Director-General of the WU, by virtue of his position, is a member of the MB. The President and the Vice-President of the MB are elected by the members of the MB from among themselves at the first session.

The list of basic duties of the MB includes:

(1) building of shared attitudes regarding the policies of the institution. All work units participate in the building of these attitudes, and so does the trade unions branch and the LCY organization -- in other words, all members of the collective.

(2) sets up a general framework and basic tasks of the institution for a definite planned period of three to five years. It introduces goals and directives for the annual plan of the institution and decides on the final proposal for the annual plan, which must be approved by the council.

(3) analyzes realization of the plan of operation, within the context of the semi-annual and annual plan period. With regard to realization of the three-month plan, the MB analyzes the concrete problems that slow down efficient materialization of planned operations. In view of the fact that these analyses are directly concerned with the success or failure of each work unit, the MB includes in these discussions all members of a given work unit when their plan of operation is being scrutinized. In this manner, the MB strengthens co-ordination between work units and permanent improvement of the quality of work.

(4) determines [redacted]c policy of income distribution for the annual [redacted]. It co-ordinates financial plans of work units [redacted] the goals and tasks of the institution; it decides on the final proposal of the annual financial plan, that is, the revenues and expenditure plan, which is approved by council.

(5) analyzes realization of the quarterly financial plan and decides on the quarterly balance sheet. It takes special care to determine all possibilities for financial reserves and savings.

(6) is concerned with planning, analyzing, and evaluating the plan of operations and the financial plan; it determines unique indicators for planning and evaluation; it is concerned with improving programming methodology. For this purpose, the MB issues basic directives to professional services in charge of these businesses;

The MB decides on the institution's research policy; it also determines the program and publishing policy of the institution;

(7) determines basic attitudes regarding personnel policy and makes decisions related to all vital questions such as admission of new members of the collective, termination of work relations, advanced professional training and specialization, personal income distribution, and development of a system of remuneration for individuals;

(8) is concerned with internal organization of the institution and makes decisions regarding permanent improvement thereof;

(9) is concerned with the constant improvement of the quality of education and research; the MB decides on the setting up of specialized professional and research groups;

(10) determines basic attitudes for the development of the self-management system in the institution; in addition to the MB, all other units of management including trade unions and the LCY, participate in the elaboration of self-management documents.

Based on discussions, suggestions, and proposals submitted by members of the collective, the MB decides on the draft statute of the institution, statues of schools, and rules and regulations concerning other units of the institution. The final decision on the basic documents pertaining to the instituttion is made by the collective of the work organization at the Assembly of Working People, that is, the Council of the WU;

(11) is concerned with the improvement of internal regulations, in particular with the statute, as well as the rules and regulations and statutes of the organizational (work) units;

(12) resolves all significant questions and problems initiated by individual work units, professional groups, the socio-political organization, the Council, and the Director of the WU;

(13) is responsible to the collective of the institution. At the Assembly of Working People, the MB submits the annual report on results.

Meetings of the MB are held regularly and according to need. These meetings can be attended by members of some work units, or professional groups, or representatives of socio-political organizations; they have the right to participate in discussions, to give suggestions and to advise. See the monograph of the WU of Zagreb, pp. 263-67.

Director-General

Within the conditions of development of self-management, the role of Director-General is becoming more and more complex. The Director-General of the WU has freedom of action in carrying out decisions of the work collective as a whole. He acts in close co-operation with all units of management and is an integral part of the system of self-management in the institution. By definition, the Director-General is the chief administrator and executive; he carries out decisions of the management units, represents the institution, is personally responsible to management organs, the work collective (employees), and the social community.

The Director-General is expected to guard against bureaucratic, anarchistic, and similar tendencies which are anticipated to arise as a concomitant of his power. His efficiency in fighting these dangers, it is thought,

depends on his personal integrity, his general culture, the level of his political and professional know-how, the level of political knowledge among members of the collective, especially its most consious members in socio-political organizations, as well as the level of professional know-how of all members of the work collective. The scope of activities and leadership of the Director-General is basically made up of the tasks resulting from Council decisions, the Management Board, and the Assembly of Working People, and the tasks designated to him by the statute and other rules and regulations of the institution. Thus, by virtue of his position, the Director-General participates in decision-making by the Council and the MB because he is a member of these units of management.

The Collegium

To increase co-ordination of all work units in carrying out management decisions in everyday work, the Professional Council, Collegium, is formed. In principle, it is made up of directors of centres (basic units in the WUs) and the Director-General. However, according to needs, other leaders such as heads of schools, sections, specialized services, and administration can be included.

Meetings of the Professional Council are held according to the need to resolve problems and difficulties. The Director-General organizes and conducts these meetings.

The work of the Collegium includes: problems related to the realization of the annual plan and the plan of operation, the revenues and expenditures plan, personnel problems, organization, and strengthening of integration of all work units. The Director-General is obligated to bring to the attention of the MB the problems which because of their complexity, cannot be resolved by the Collegium.

The Director-General finds key questions relating to development and enhancement of overall activities of the institution. He is obliged to provide all professional and material conditions for the improvement of the quality of educational programs, research activities, the general performance of co-ordinated efforts by all work units. Within the context of the key tasks, it is his duty to encourage self-management in the institution.

The Director-General is appointed by the Council of the WU following a proposal by the Commission of the City of Zagreb (job opportunities are publicly advertised). He is appointed for the time allotted by law; by the same token, he can be renominated. The Assembly of the City of Zagreb, following the proposal of the Council, accepts his resignation

or fires him. See the monograph of the WU of Zagreb, pp. 267-70.

Assembly of the Working People

The Assembly of the Working People (AWP) is the most significant unit of self-management in the institution; if organization and methods of work are built so that they enable direct participation by every individual in the work collective. Therefore, the work of the AWP is not exhausted in plenary meetings. It is necessary to organize work meetings of the people in each unit and other smaller groups within which more people can participate in decision-making, express their opinions, and give suggestions leading towards shared attitudes, thus arriving at final decisions. For these reasons, the functioning of the AWP must always begin in an earlier process of decision-making, not only in the final phase when its role can be reduced to simple acceptance or rejection of a proposed decision. It is essential to ensure full participation of every member of the collective in decision-making. In the first place, participation by every individual undoubtedly contributes to more qualitative and realistic decisions; decisions become conscious actions of all working people, which contributes to their better performance in everyday life and work because, psychologically, participants are likely to feel more involved and more motivated to invest energy in activities they have helped to plan than in those planned for them. Furthermore, the responsibility of an individual for failing to carry out decisions of the collective is larger compared to the responsibility towards a single management body or its leader. Finally, participation by all members of the work collective in decision-making on vital issues concerning the institution impedes tendencies towards reducing the activities of self-management units.

These are the basic tasks of the AWP and how it functions:

(1) the AWP decides on the statute of the institution; discussions of the draft statute are held before, at the meetings of each unit; elaboration of suggestions from all units is done by the commission for the statute; the MB deals with suggestions and proposals from the collective, reconciliation of attitudes, and conclusions regarding the final decision. The AWP participates in the final discussion on the draft statute and provides addenda to the draft statute to be approved by the Council of the institution.

(2) the AWP participates in decision-making regarding rules and statutes for all units. Based on the statute of

the WU, members of the work collective in each unit (centre, school, or section) draft statutes and rules for their own unit.

Reconciliation of draft statutes with the statute of the institution is done by the Statute Commission. Final addenda to these documents are made by the AWP. The final decision on each statute is brought up by the council of the centre or school and the MB. Decision on rules pertaining to centres and sections is brought up by the MB. The Council of the institution familiarizes itself with all the documents and comments on a particular statute or rules if they are not fully in accord with the statute of the institution.

(3) One of the most important tasks of the AWP is to make rules regulating income distribution and personal income distribution and to perfect the system of distribution. For this purpose, special meetings are held in units at which each member directly participates in all phases, in particular in making rules on personal income distribution. The Council confirms the rules on income distribution and rules on personal income distribution.

(4) The AWP elaborates and makes decisions related to the plan of operation of the institution for a period of time. At the meetings of work units, each member of the collective is obliged to give his suggestions and criticisms of the text pertaining to instructions for the annual plan and the methodology of planning. Also, every member participates in making an annual and semi-annual plan for his unit, which is an integral part of the plan of the institution.

(5) The same procedure is applied when the AWP participates in decision-making regarding the financial plan, that is, annual revenues and expenditures. Preliminary meetings in each unit have special significance. Their objective is to get each collective member to contribute in finding the best and most realistic relations regarding income distribution in the institution.

(6) The AWP participates in the evaluation of the finahcial plan of the institution, decides on modifications thereof and addenda and measures to be taken towards improvement of the organization and other actions related to the whole institution. In addition, twice a year, members of the collective participate in the meeting of the [redacted] that is, when discussing semi and annual reports of sin[redacted] units. According to need, a meeting for all AWP member[redacted] can be held.

(7) The AWP deals with the annual report of the MB and other units of management in the institution. After discussion, the AWP delivers conclusions regarding improvements in the work of management units, especially conc[redacted]ions related to enhancement of self-management in the

institution. Meetings of the AWP are most frequently held in the units; meetings of the whole collective are held according to need. General meetings are conducted by the presidency, which is elected by public vote at the AWP. See the monograph of the WU of Zagreb, pp. 270-72.

APPENDIX II

Recent Thinking Concerning Educational Reform in Yugoslavia

According to Savičević, alternating labour and education appear in contemporary conditions of development of the Yugoslav society in a new light because the need to transform education and especially link it to labour is much greater. Previously used terms, as well as new ones, acquire wider dimensions and a new context. Thus, in Yugoslav sources two very similar, if not identical terms are used: education by work and education from work (recurrent education). The term "education by work" was created by Yugoslav practice and, according to Savičević, is not used in foreign theory and practice. A term closely related to it is "on-the-job training," which is used in industrially developed countries. It indicates the acquisition of acquired skills and knowledge through performing work functions, but under the expert supervision of teachers or older and more experienced workers. Therefore, this is more a form of labour and learning than an educational concept.

Education by work is defined by Yugoslav authors in a much broader sense. Some authors include in this term all educational activities related to the organization of associated labour or in whose financing the organizations of associated labour participate including regular education, that is, acquiring post-secondary schooling. According to Savičević, Yugoslav authors understand education by work within the context of adult education. He also maintains that the term is imprecise because it suggests that part of professional education which is acquired in the course of performing work functions when certain skills, habits, and work operations are learned. However, in Yugoslav practice, education by work is organized in spare time, or as part of working hours, or as a paid leave of absence. In Yugoslavia, education by work is not only connected with performance of work; in a wider framework, it means that a person in associated labour has the right to work, and to professional, cultural, socio-political, and

other education enabling him to better fulfil accepted work functions. How the necessary context will be organized is a practical question, but the possibilities are various. It is important to emphasize, according to Savicevic, that efforts are being made in Yugoslavia and that the best possible solutions are being sought for linking education and labour.

Savicevic contends that the term "recurrent education" is inappropriate, that it loses part of its meaning when translated into Serbo-Croatian. That is why in Yugoslav sources, especially where strategic direction of development of society is marked, the terms "education by work" and "education from work" are used. This confusion emphasizes certain terminological difficulties and the necessity for terminological equalization. However, the conceptual basis adopted at the Tenth Congress of the LCY, which relates to the global Yugoslav society, in connection with linking labour and education and alternating labour with education, is perfectly clear, Savicevic concludes...

Juxtaposing "education by work" conceived in its broader sense, and "education from work," whose essence is in alternating labour and education, does not have a social basis or a scientific meaning. The definition of "recurrent education," Savicevic maintains, is close to the definition accepted by the Centre for Pedagogic Research and Innovations of OECD. Recurrent education is not a special educational system, but only a strategy, a possibility, a manner, or a way of conceiving permanent education. Recurrent education does not replace permanent education. Recurrent education does not eliminate adult education, but as a strategy contributes to fuller integration of the forms of adult education. Recurrent education essentially supports the alternation of labour and education, a combination of labour and education, and, in Yugoslavia, integration of education and associated labour. Recurrent education does not aim only to integrate the forms of adult education into the existing educational system for youth; it seeks transformation and reconstruction of an existing educational system for both youth and adults, and especially a change in the organization and content of the system, especially certain parts of it. Thus, recurrent education relates indirectly or directly to the educational system of Yugoslavia as a whole, although most of the students in the adult category are included in recurrent education.

Recurrent education expressed in the integration of education and associated labour, as conceived by Savicevic, is not an act of reform which has a time limit. It is the way education should go, including changes necessary for education to be linked with labour; at certain intervals it should alternate with labour and be acquired during a person's lifetime.

Based on D. Savicevic's Recurrent Education and the Transformation of the System of Education in Yugoslavia (Belgrade, 1976), pp. 10-12.