Mao Tse-tung formulated the principle of New Democracy not merely for China but as a pattern for all semi-feudal and semi-colonial countries. The Eastern European countries have, since the second world war, exhibited similar tendencies of development as in China. These countries had been for long past like China in feudal agricultural economy, backward in industries and a fruitful soil for foreign intrigue. Since the war, all these countries coalition governments of several parties were installed with such names as Fatherland Front or United Front under the leadership of the Communist Party and with the active help of Soviet Russia.

The People's Democracy in Eastern Europe, although closely resembling the characteristics in China, has some distinctive features. Economically, the problem of the whole region is somewhat different from that of China; unlike China it stands in need of a vast investment of capital for the improvement of agriculture and industries. And if this development is to be rapid at all, the states must receive substantial help from abroad. In the absence of such help rapid development would be much harder for these countries than it is for China because they got better natural resources and necessary capital.

Further, the mobilization of home resources can be accomplished only by a really strong government, prepared to adopt a policy of taking away from the better-off peasants and the big bourgeois classes their surplus for reorganizing the country. Evidently it was such a hard task that Eastern European states had to depend on Soviet help both for political reasons and for economic prosperity. Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Albania, Romania and Hungary have, therefore, to fashion their policy under the guidance of Soviet Russia and have to follow the Russian line in the matter of purges and gradual drift towards one party rule. The Communists hold the key posts and important portfolios. Leadership of Soviet Russia and
international communism is, therefore, an essential element in new democratic theory. It is on this issue that Yugoslavia although communist-dominated and following the new democratic line has broken away from the Cominform and the Soviet camp and raised a storm of fury among USSR and Cominform circles. Tito claims that Yugoslavia made her own revolution without Russian support and that she can, therefore, refuse Russian dictation.

1. Political Structure

Inspite of the socio-political differences in Eastern European countries the communist methods were substantially the same in each country. The Communists from the beginning seized the levers of power. In every case they obtained the Ministry of the Interior and they had also the Ministry of Justice so as to interpret the law to the advantage of the Communist Party. In every country they systematically penetrated the army and obtained a stronghold over the radio. They either created or took over important mass organizations, such as trade unions, 'farmers' leagues', 'resistance associations', 'women's unions' and 'youth movements'.

The political system which emerges from this process is an imitation of the Soviet system. Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and Rumania are closely modelled on the Stalin Constitution of 1936 and others are also following the same course. Yugoslavia too was no exception. She had and still retains the same federal structure as the Soviet Union. The six 'people's republics' (Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro, Macedonia) have governments which are subordinate to the central government in Belgrade. A new constitution which was adopted in 1953 embodies a number of

1. The four major factors of People's Democracy have been given as, (1) the power of the working people under the leadership of the working class, (2) a transitional period on the way towards socialism, (3) collaboration with Soviet Union, (4) strengthening of the democratic anti-imperialist camp. Georgi Dimitrov: Fatherland Front and People's Democracy, Dec 19, 1948.
Changes, the most important of which are (a) the creation of the office of President of the Republic, combining the duties of head of state and Prime Minister and superseding the former office of President of the Presidium which is abolished; (b) the abolition of the Cabinet as such (involving the disappearance of the post of Prime Minister), and its supersession by a Federal Executive Council as the supreme executive organ of government; (c) the separation of the purely administrative functions of government from the political functions and their assignment to five new Secretaries of State; (d) the reconstitution of the National Assembly (the Federal Parliament), whereby that body would consist of the existing Federal Council and a Council of Producers, the latter being a new body replacing the former Council of Nationalities. In Checoslovakia which became a Communist state after the coup of February, 1948, there is a regional government and a regional elective assembly for Slovakia. The regional government is responsible in part to the Slovak Assembly and in part to the Czechoslovak Government. Bulgaria and Rumania, being unitary states, have a single Chamber. In all three local government consists, as in the Soviet Union, of a pyramid of soviets (people's councils).

In all three these Parliament has a Presidium possessing far-reaching powers. All three have a Public Prosecutor's Department whose purpose it is to intervene in the process of justice to make sure the government's wishes are carried out. Yugoslavia and Bulgaria have 'Control Commissions' modelled after the Soviet Ministry of State Control which have power to examine at any level the working of the administration and to order changes in the interest of efficiency.

Although these institutions are apparently vested with immense power, the real power lies not with the institutions but with the Party. The party operates not directly as in the Soviet Union but indirectly through a 'mass organization' which mobilizes the 'broad popular masses'.
2. Economic Structure

The economic policy of Eastern European countries is also conspicuous for nationalization of industries. After the communist coup d'état, an internal transformation of Poland's economic structure has taken place. The key industries have been nationalized or are under state control. In all branches of economy industry planned economy has been introduced. According to the law of Jan. 3, 1946, all industrial undertakings employing over fifty workers are placed under the control of Central Industrial Boards.

In Yugoslavia, as in Poland, the pre-war economic system was swept away by Tito's quick decision to solve the land problem and to increase Yugoslavia's economic resources. Thus the Agrarian Law of 1946 is based on the principle that "the land shall be owned by them who till it". In the distribution of land priority is given to landless peasants, ex-soldiers and partisans, the war-disabled and victims of fascism. Yugoslavia also passed a bill for the appropriation of private enterprises of public interest by the state or by any federal republic, affecting forty-two industries including mining, oil, coal processing, rolling stock, automobiles, machine tools, agricultural machinery, ship-building, metal industries, printing works, electrical supply, ammunition, chemical and pyrotechnical industries as well as all forms of transport. Nationalization also affected the newspapers which were taken "in the interest of correct information and for the better fulfilment of social and cultural tasks".

In Hungary private property, 'if it does not violate the public' and right of inheritance are guaranteed; but the chief means of production, natural resources and banking, transport, etc., are in the hands of the state or of the cooperatives. In 1946, the coal mines, electric power plants and the three biggest iron and steel works with their subsiding companies were nationalized. By the end of 1949, almost all the private industries and shops were taken by the state. In Bulgaria industry is not developed. The country is rich in coal but it is mostly situated in mountain districts difficult to exploit.
All mines have been nationalized. On Dec. 23, 1947, the whole of the country's industry was brought under national ownership and control, only foreign-owned enterprises and those belonging to cooperatives being excluded. All property belonging to private firms was transferred to the state.

The Czechs also had shown their capacity to plan for a large measure of nationalization with the retention of small-scale private enterprise and of peasant agriculture.

The measures adopted by the governments of Eastern Europe for economic recovery have undoubtedly speeded up the tempo of production. The following table will make it clear.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Recovery of East European Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1938 = 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949  1950  1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria  235  290  345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia  126  146  168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary  153  206  267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland  177  223  270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania  117  160  206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia  319  338  348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Relationship with the USSR

Most of the countries that belong to this region are indissolubly linked up with the USSR. Over Eastern Europe was brewing a social revolution which the Soviet Union could not afford to see fail. The world capitalist menace, together with the communistic axiom that the well-being of the peoples of the world depends on the victory of communism have led them to help the revolutionaries of these countries. The Eastern European countries have made their revolutions by accepting the leadership of the Soviet Union.

Not to speak of politics, in economic sphere also Soviet influence in these countries is conspicuous by the latter's refusal to accept the Marshal aid. Czechoslovakia at first accepted the invitation to Paris and was then abruptly pulled back by what amounted to a sharp command from the USSR. As some compensation for obedience, she got

from the USSR a new trade agreement guaranteeing additional supplies. Instead of joining Western Europe in the American aid plan, the governments developed their own pattern of economic organization for the entire Soviet-dominated region. The blue-print frequently labelled the New Molotov Plan for Eastern Europe, appears to centre round three major objectives: (1) rapid construction of Russian economy with the aid of her immediate neighbours, (2) regional self-sufficiency through industrialization of Danubian countries and particularly through a fuller increased use of the industrial potential of Czechoslovakia and Poland, and (3) the creation of a vast economic combination which will strive to equal or exceed the power of the capitalist countries.

Evidently, the Soviet Union is not moved purely by considerations of advantage to the people of these countries. She is eager to further her influence in the Eastern zone. Hence, Yugoslavia's desire to take the leadership of Balkan states and to design plans of industrial development with the purpose of increasing her own economic resources and influence in Southern Europe rather than to fit in with the Soviet scheme offended the USSR. Yugoslav communists were accused of retreat from Marxism-Leninism, of nationalism and Trotskyism and of hostility to the Soviet Union. Yugoslav foreign and internal policy was arraigned. She was accused of ignoring the class struggle. It was stated that instead of giving the Communist Party their proper position of exclusive leadership, Marshal Tito had chosen to keep power in the hands of a People's Front which included bourgeois and intellectual elements in positions of influence. The Yugoslav Communist Party was denounced as a bureaucracy devoid of internal democratic structure and practising shameful terroristic methods; it was called upon to purge itself of unsound elements and to instal a new leadership in opposition to Tito and his associates. Yugoslavia's refusal to obey the dictates of Moscow caused her expulsion from the Cominform.
4. Marxism and People's Democracy

The defection of Yugoslavia has thrown up also a theoretical controversy, i.e., whether new democracy is a "third road" between socialism and capitalism or whether it is a only a "long-lasting and difficult process" of proletarian dictatorship. The 'third road' view is denounced by communists as a rightwing and nationalist deviation, but the communists themselves are not clear and unanimous in their standpoints. Mao Tse-tung and the late Andrei Zhdanov regard new democracy as distinct from proletarian dictatorship and as a half-way course between capitalism and socialism. Stalin, on the contrary, was disposed to regard New Democracy as a form of proletarian dictatorship of the Communist Party and the Soviet Union and to believe that it "possesses all the traits of the proletarian socialist revolution". In view of the Sino-Soviet treaty of February 1950 and the close integration of the Soviet bloc this appears to be a difference of political verbiage rather than indicating any substantial difference in practical politics.

The facile conquest of the Slav countries by the Soviet system is due, in the first instance, to the presence of the Red Army, secondly, to the economic backwardness of the area and thirdly, to the absence of organized democratic parties, trade unions and professional bodies. Little is left of Marxist theory in the "Peoples' Democracy" of these countries. Communism no longer seeks its way through objective conditions prevailing in a country as defined by Marx. There is no 'proletarian revolution' made by a politically conscious working class. 'Parties of the proletariat' are formed where no proletariat exist, with intellectuals and peasants. The revolution

1. Hilary Minc: People's Democracy in Eastern Europe
2. The organ of the Cominform thus poses the difference: "State power in China is not the dictatorship of the proletariat and in this it differs from the state power in the European countries of People's Democracy where this democracy fulfills the function of the dictatorship of the proletariat." For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy, Sep.29,1950.
is made by a communist elite, through political manoeuvring or coups and with the help of the Soviet army.

5. Parliamentary Democracy and People's Democracy

A critical survey of parliamentary democracy and new democracy makes it clear that two different methods with identical aim have been adopted in present day international social democracy. As new democracy has shown the possibility of forming transitional government in alliance with several revolutionary classes the question has been raised about further revolutionary necessity. Lenin correctly emphasized that the necessity of revolution at any given period in a country is determined by the maturity of class relations in that country understood in the context of the capitalist order, in the context of class relations in the country in question. The internal conditions of China and of England prove the truth of this theory. The foreign imperialists and the feudal forces were the chief enemies of China. Unlike the bourgeoisie of England they were tough, skilled and inflexible. So, the Chinese working class and peasants had to take up a revolutionary course to overthrow them. In Eastern Europe the feudal forces were overthrown with the help of the USSR.

Moreover, low intelligence and low standard of living of working classes in China and the Slav countries made parliamentary democracy useless and even dangerous for them. The same may be said about USSR itself during the early years of the revolution. It is impossible to settle the fate of a country by free elections and party competition in the midst of a social revolution. The goal of a revolutionary party is to destroy the governing class which cannot be done by vote. They have to seize power by force and then rule by consent. The operation of the parliamentary system presupposes an underlying unity between rival parties. This is lacking in Cominform countries. In the Western democracies parties
have an underlying unity. The workers are less oppressed and hence they can use the party as a weapon and bring the ruling aristocracy to accept partially their demands for nationalization and social security. Such, e.g., has happened in the case of England. The workers of England are more conscious than the proletariat of any colonial and semi-colonial country.

The synthesis of democracy and socialism is working itself out into different patterns in the East and the West according to past traditions of the soil and the objective circumstances of the day. Neither New Democracy nor Democratic Socialism have as yet produced a system where individual freedom and social justice have received proper adjustment. But both have at least shown that democratic socialist synthesis is a decisive trend in political development and human thought as well as political organization are inevitably leading towards that consummation. What will be the specific form in which both these aspects will find an even balance remains yet to be seen. Obviously, it will not conform to a ready-made pattern, but will have to be forged out of a complex of social milieu where the traditions, intelligence, habits and genius of the country concerned will play a considerable part.