

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

RAMIZ ALIA

OUR ENVER

THE INSTITUTE OF MARXIST-LENINIST
STUDIES AT THE CC OF THE PLA

2nd NEPH ed.
ISBN: 978-1-4583-2844-1

Publisher's Note — MELS

This edition of *Our Enver* by Ramiz Alia was originally published by the Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin Institute and was based on the English edition published by the “8 Nëntori” Publishing House, Tirana.

Front cover: “Portrait of Comrade ENVER HOXHA”, by People’s Painter, Vilson Kilica.

MARX, ENGELS, LENIN, STALIN INSTITUTE
TORONTO 1989

THE NOVEMBER 8TH PUBLISHING HOUSE
OTTAWA 2023

CONTENTS

By Way of An Introduction	1
Son of the Revolution	5
First Encounters	39
A Close Friend and A Great Educator of the Youth.....	81
On our New School and Its Revolutionization	115
More Culture for the People	147
A Great Patriot and Ardent Internationalist	183
Strategist of the Socialist Construction.....	257
Architect of the People’s State Power	319
“Party-Enver, We are Ready Any Time!”	355

The idea of writing about the figure of Enver Hoxha, of putting down on paper those indelible impressions and recollections of this outstanding man of the Albanian nation, of our beloved teacher, which are ever in my heart and mind, has always seemed to me a very difficult task.

He was a great leader who was engaged in extremely intensive, uninterrupted political and social activity which extended over more than half a century, who authored theoretical works in many fields and had an acute mind, which he put totally in the service of the revolution. With such a man of action and knowledge, it is not always easy to find the words that best bring out the distinctive features from so many outstanding qualities and merits.

For more than four decades I had the privilege of working beside him, of going through major events of our recent history, as well as commonplace happenings of everyday life, together with him. We first met in the heat of the war, when he was leading the people in the great epic of national liberation. I consider myself especially fortunate because, right from the first day of freedom, I had

direct social and working contacts with him, and from 1960, for 25 years on end, as a member of the Secretariat of the Central Committee and one of his close collaborators, I found the daily contacts with Enver to be a real school for me.

In all these years of struggle, work, successes and difficulties, I have seen him in the most varied states of mind: happy and enthused over every victory achieved; indignant and severe towards any weakness or injustice, especially towards any enemy or hostile activity; sympathetic and concerned towards rank-and-file people and comrades; unyielding in the face of difficulties; optimistic and clear-minded in any situation. All these I recall with veneration and emotion, because, for me, besides being a leader and teacher, Comrade Enver Hoxha was also an irreplaceable comrade and friend.

In the sorrowful moments after the grievous events of April 1985, as well as in the days that followed, in various meetings and speeches, I have spoken many times about the life and work of Enver Hoxha and have tried to define and assess his historic place and role as the founder of the new Albania, by looking at all the socialist developments of the Homeland. I have done this under the weight of that great sorrow which made it difficult even to concentrate my thoughts, let alone analyse and synthesize the rare moral and social qualities of this leader so dearly beloved by the Party and the people, this man with whom the struggle and work for the socialist construction had linked me for life.

All that the Party has ever said about our un-

forgettable leader is correct. However, a great deal still remains to be said about his figure. Therefore, although conscious, as I have said, of the difficulties involved in writing a book about this outstanding man of revolutionary thought and action, I undertook this work with great optimism and desire.

But it was not just my desire that prompted me in this direction. I consider it a great obligation to the people, to the Party and to the memory of Comrade Enver himself to present my feelings and thoughts about him, perhaps somewhat incomplete, but always with respect, affection and profound gratitude.

Of course, my intention here is not at all to write biographical notes, or reminiscences covering all the fields of Enver Hoxha's activity, which is so rich and wide-ranging. In these notes of mine, his incomparable contribution, his exemplary qualities and features are only touched upon, merely pointed out. However, the reader himself, with his own impressions, memories and meditations, will be able to give more vitality to the image that arises from reading these notes. And if these lines stimulate reflection and revive impressions and memories, then this will be a special satisfaction for me.

July 1988

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Enver Hoxha', with a large, sweeping flourish extending from the end of the name.

Son of the Revolution

In the difficult wartime conditions, when the party press operated in complete illegality and the means of information were totally in the hands of the enemy, propaganda to popularize the leader of the movement and the commander of the partisan army was almost impossible. In fact, the first photograph of him published in the party press belongs to the period after the Congress of Përmet. But the partisans and the people had long heard about Enver. Deeds speak for themselves, the saying goes. Enver's name and pseudonyms were passed from mouth to mouth, from south to north, all over the country. The legendary figure of "Shpati" very quickly won a place in the people's imagination as a symbol of the new heroism and patriotism.

A song which was composed and spread quickly in the last months of the war went:

*We warriors of Enver
With our ideal in our hearts
Will strike a blow at Hitler
Smash him to smithereens.*

This must have been one of the first songs, if

not the first, in which Enver Hoxha is directly mentioned.

I, personally, became “acquainted” with Comrade Enver for the first time in the great anti-fascist demonstration of October 28, 1941. As we know, he was the leader of that demonstration. I did not meet him that day, but only caught a glimpse of him. It was precisely at the moment when the demonstrators were attacked by the fascist police and carabinieri in the square in front of City Hall, today’s Skanderbeg Square. In the ensuing scuffle between the demonstrators and the fascists, we saw a tall comrade seize the officer in command of the carabinieri with both hands and strike him down with one powerful blow. I can say that this courageous fellow, whose name we did not learn till later, won the hearts of all of us youth of that time.

It was not by chance that most of the participants in the movement saw Comrade Enver for the first time precisely in manifestations and demonstrations, in militant activities in general. As a leader of the new type, Enver Hoxha was a man of action. He led both through the political line he mapped out and through his direct participation in the struggle to implement it.

In those turbulent times, revolutionary action was of decisive importance to orient the masses correctly and arouse them to struggle. In the beginning of the war there were many who paraded their patriotic feelings and great “theoretical” knowledge, but actions were the touchstone. Anyone who shirked them exposed himself as a demagogue. Enver Hoxha, however, threw himself into

the struggle from the very outset. This is precisely what enabled him to gather around him the soundest forces of the communist groups, those most determined to fight and win and, together with them, to form the Communist Party and unite a whole people around it.

So the demonstration of October 1941 may be considered my first “introduction” to Enver. I have often recalled this important moment in the history of the anti-fascist struggle of our people and of my own life. I have recalled it in happy days and in difficult times. And it has always aroused great emotions in me. But I was filled with very different emotions on that day in April 1985, when we gathered in Skanderbeg Square to accompany Comrade Enver to his last resting place.

“On this square where we have gathered for our last meeting with Enver,” I said in opening the speech I delivered at the funeral ceremony, “forty-four years ago he led the great anti-fascist demonstration and called on the people to rise against the occupiers and traitors. And from that day to the end of his life, he remained at the head of the Party and the people as the legendary commander of the National Liberation War and the heroic leader of the construction of socialism.”

And while I spoke, the square packed to capacity, I returned in my imagination to that unforgettable day of October 28, 1941. There where we had “met” for the first time, I gave Enver his last farewell. That square, which about half a century earlier had echoed to the shouts of the youth and working people of Tirana against fascism and the occupation, echoed that day to the monumental

slogan “Party-Enver, we are ready any time!”

Who is Enver Hoxha? What does he represent for our people? What role did he play and what is his place in the present and future of socialist Albania?

During the Anti-Fascist Second World War, a number of great personalities and outstanding leaders emerged from the ranks of the peoples. Some of them are still remembered with respect, while with the passage of time others have been left behind and lost their value. Enver Hoxha is one of those figures whose stature increases as time goes by.

Men such as he emerge from revolutions and belong as much to the future as to the time in which they live. Hence, everything related to Enver is dear and precious to us. Our people are proud that whenever the name of this glorious son of theirs is mentioned anywhere in the world, Albania, socialism and communism, and genuine social and national freedom and independence are implied.

His name is linked with our whole contemporary history. The liberation of the Homeland, the profound cultural and economic transformations, our internal and foreign policy, every action or event of modern times worth recording in history, are linked directly with the contribution and role of Enver Hoxha. Not simply as the commander, but as a militant revolutionary who is guided by lofty interests and noble aims, as a popular leader with a high sense of responsibility about the role which the people and the Party have entrusted to him, in every situation, at every step of the revolu-

tion and socialist construction, he acted to the advantage of the progress of the Homeland, the prosperity of the country and the ceaseless improvement of the life of the people.

The figure of Enver Hoxha symbolizes ardent patriotism and revolutionary militancy, the wisdom of the people and the enlightened mind of a man of rare qualities cultivated in the school of the revolution, the modest son of the people and the talented leader of the Party and state. His work has been poured into all the solid foundations on which today's Albania has been built. His thinking has illuminated all the heights to which our society has been raised, and his wise and ardent words have warmed the hearts of all our people.

With his struggle, his stands and his example, Comrade Enver Hoxha played the main role in tempering our Party of Labour as a revolutionary party; in forging the unity of the people as the basic factor of every success and victory; in strengthening the National Liberation Army as a people's army and a weapon of the revolution; and in implanting the confidence and strengthening the conviction of the working masses that the common people themselves can and must choose the road of the future development of the Homeland.

The National Liberation War is the most brilliant page in our national history. Enver Hoxha was the leader of that war. In those difficult years, he led the newly-founded party of Albanian communists with rare wisdom, just as he commanded the partisan army with the talent of a great strategist to achieve the two-fold historic victory: the liberation of the country and the establishment of the

state power of the working people. He did not lead the war from offices and safe refuges, but in the midst of the people, at the head of the partisans, from battle to battle, in daily struggle, using the rifle, the pen and debate, having a clear view of things when others were blinded, instilling courage and determination when enemies and traitors sowed fear and defeatism, and coping courageously and wisely with the intrigues of reaction, the Balli Kombëtar, the Legaliteti and the Anglo-Americans, when some people became confused, or wavered and lost their bearings.

The socialist construction in Albania has been an extremely difficult struggle — not only because the plots of internal and external enemies continued after the victory over fascism, but also because the grave backwardness inherited from the past had to be overcome within a very short time. Colossal social, economic and cultural transformations had to be carried out, poverty and disease had to be combatted, and above all, the forces of production had to be developed, the old relations of production had to be changed and new socialist relations established.

To lead Albania from the wooden plough to modern agriculture, from the primitive forge to metallurgy, from the oil lamp to the complete electrification of the country, from illiteracy to the University and the Academy of Sciences, was an undertaking which, apart from other things, called for knowledge, courage, determination and persistence. It required unshakeable faith and conviction in the future and revolutionary optimism. Enver Hoxha put these lofty qualities which he possessed

in the service of the Party and the people, mapping out the plans and projects of the socialist development of the country, personally verifying in practice the correctness of the line pursued and listening to the most advanced opinion in the ranks of the working class, the working peasantry and the people's intelligentsia.

With the Party at the head, Albania will forge ahead non-stop. Its economy and culture will be raised to higher levels. Without doubt, the future victories will be beyond any comparison with the previous achievements. This is the dialectic of socialist development. But what our Party has done for Albania in the time of Enver Hoxha and under his leadership is unparalleled and will be remembered with profound respect, generation after generation. The people's state power will be strengthened and democratized ceaselessly, but it will always remain a fact of history that the people became masters of their own destiny for the first time in the epoch which is linked with the name of the Party and Enver. As such, this epoch has and will have no equal. It is the foundation of all foundations. Our future is built on this solid and durable basis.

The coming generations will honour the Party and Enver Hoxha, who have thought and worked day and night to build the impregnable Albanian socialist citadel. The revolution and the transformations that have been accomplished under their leadership have lightened the burdens and tasks for the present and future generations. This epoch has left no debts for the future.

The loss which the Party and the people suffered on April 11, 1985 is irreparable. However, it cannot even be imagined what a catastrophe it would have been for our Albania had there not been the Communist Party and a leader of Comrade Enver Hoxha's stature to cope with the historic revolutionary moments created in our country at the beginning of the Second World War and thereafter.

The fascist occupation of April 7, 1939 created the most tragic situation for Albania in this century, bringing the complete loss of our national independence, as well as the threat of our extinction as a nation. Only such a man as Enver Hoxha, with a solid patriotic and revolutionary formation, could have fully appreciated the historic importance of the moment, could have understood what the people were really seeking and what had to be done to fulfill their aspirations. Only such a man could have determined how to save the Homeland. It is his merit that, precisely in this grave situation, relying on the people's patriotism and love of freedom, making skillful use of the circumstances, together with and at the head of the Albanian communists, he founded the Party, raised the people's army and led the country towards the final victory, liberation from the fascist occupiers and the heavy yoke of feudal and bourgeois oppression.

Enver Hoxha was not only an active participant in the great turning-points of the most recent history of our people but also exercised a direct influence on their course as an inspirer, ideologist, organizer and leader. In his person he embodied the most precious virtues of our ancient people, that

militant and noble character, that generous and rebellious spirit, those brilliant traditions which have been forged and tempered through centuries of striving for freedom and independence, for light and knowledge, for bread and land.

Neither November 8, 1941 nor any of the culminating moments of our recent history can be separated from the decisive activity and contribution of Enver Hoxha. And if this history shows that, at certain times, decisions vital to the future of the Homeland and the people were taken, the credit for this belongs to him first of all. He was able to analyse the gravest, most complicated and most unfavorable situations correctly and with a critical eye, to turn them to the advantage of the people's war and work, and make them serve the Homeland and progress. In the maelstrom of the war, it was no light matter to turn the rifle against the Balli Kombëtar or to force the British troops to withdraw when they landed at Saranda. It was no light matter for a young party at the head of a small people, like our Party, to take the decision to denounce Titoite, Khrushchevite or Chinese modern revisionism, to expel the Soviet fleet from the Vlora base or to denounce the Warsaw Treaty. But when faced with such complicated situations and dangers, Enver Hoxha had no doubts or vacillations and never hesitated.

In Enver Hoxha, courage and caution always went hand in hand, in full accord and harmony. This is what made him coolheaded even at moments when he could very easily have lost his temper, even when enemies were looking for "trouble" and stepped up their provocations. At such times,

at moments of danger, he reacted with all the force of his wisdom and coinage.

Dedication to the cause of the people and the Homeland, loyalty to the Party and consistency towards Marxism-Leninism were the most important factors which engendered in Comrade Enver his profound thought and sound judgement, his foresight, his wisdom and patience in general, his boldness and courage where required, as well as his severity when severity was needed.

Comrade Enver Hoxha's whole conscious life was a life of struggle — struggle for the freedom of the Homeland, struggle for the construction of socialism, struggle for the emancipation of the people and struggle against external and internal enemies who sought to take us back to the slavery of the past.

Enver Hoxha was both a revolutionary leader and military commander, an outstanding statesman, a great diplomat and an accomplished organizer, an ideologist with the spirit of a revolutionary innovator and a shrewd politician, a reformer of social life and an architect of our socialist construction. But there is one quality especially which characterized his whole being: his love for the people. Enver Hoxha was not born a statesman — his love for the people and the Homeland made him that. He went through no school of diplomacy — his obligation to Albania made him a diplomat. He was not an ideologist and thinker from the halls of universities — his dedication to the cause of the revolution armed him with these qualities. He gained his schooling as a communist organizer in the actions of the partisan war for the freedom and inde-

pendence of the Homeland and in the great battles of the work for the new people's Albania.

The socialist construction in Albania is a revolutionary process with not a few solutions which are new, original, and indeed, unique. The major acts of our revolution — from the nationalizations and expropriations to the establishment of the socialist relations of production in the city and the countryside — are not a simple, mechanical transplantation of Marxist-Leninist principles to Albanian soil, but are vividly creative. In all these innovative processes, Comrade Enver Hoxha's ideas have been decisive. Every task he set before the Party and the people, every idea he advocated for the emancipation and revolutionization of society, and every transformation he mapped out for the beautification and prosperity of the Homeland responded to the concrete requirements and conditions of our country.

The strength of Enver Hoxha's mind is brilliantly displayed in the fact that he was able to determine the main directions and to make the major moves which ensured and strengthened the freedom and independence of the Homeland and gave a powerful impetus to the all-round development and progress of the country.

We have caught up centuries in just four decades. The socialist industrialization has been carried out and agriculture collectivized; the exploitation of man by man has been eliminated and life expectancy doubled; culture, education and science have advanced at a rapid pace and our society has been emancipated in all directions. These transformations are due to our Marxist-Leninist

Party, headed by Enver Hoxha.

Comrade Enver had the ability to find “the link that holds the entire chain together” and grasp it firmly. This enabled him to provide theoretical explanations and practical solutions to the problems of our socialist construction and to determine the strategy for future development with confidence. It would have been extremely difficult, if not impossible, for us to advance so successfully on the road of socialism, to achieve all these victories which we enjoy today, with no infringement of our national freedom and sovereignty, had we not applied the principle of self-reliance on Enver’s insistence. But this principle would have remained a worthless slogan had it not been for his courageous ideas about giving priority to the development of the energy supply, without which there would have been no advance of the productive forces; about paying special attention to the modernization of agriculture, without which we would have been dependent on others even for our daily bread; and about focusing our attention on the training of specialists and cadres, without whom we would have been obliged to beg the aid of foreigners for every new project or design.

Our socialist society is a pure society with a high esteem for human values, which prizes the good things of life. Of course we do not eat with golden spoons. Indeed, we are aware that our advance does not proceed without difficulties. Still we are proud that everything we have created is ours, that every project we have built is a result of the work, toil and sweat of our people. We know that we are not wallowing in plenty, but we feel

happy, because we are free and owe nothing to anybody, because in the new Albania there is no poverty or unemployment, no drug-addiction, no anxiety or insecurity about the future. We are sure that the future will be better and the life of our people will improve and become more prosperous. The basis for this optimism is the work of Comrade Enver Hoxha and the innovative thinking of our Party.

Enver left us many blessings and great advances. In the radical changes and great achievements we see the work of the Party, the work of Enver. Throughout his life he dedicated himself to ensuring that he left us no troubles. The only sorrow, the only grief he brought us was his death.

Foresight was a fundamental characteristic of Enver Hoxha's thinking. But he did not dream up his prognoses, did not base his forecasts simply on wishful thinking. No, his foresight had a profound content. He knew what the future would require of society, and made timely forecasts for transformations and programs, so that the coming years would not find our country unprepared. He knew how to prepare for the future, to rise above the interests of the moment and determine for what it was worth making sacrifices. The far-sightedness of his thinking is shown by his ability to decide the order in which everything had to be built or created, so that we would not face our future unprepared or be obliged to turn back and correct things done wrongly; it is shown by his ability to work for and not merely dream about the future. He was amply endowed with that special acumen which is needed to find that optimal order in which every-

thing should be done, so that nobody, not even the coming generations, can reproach us by saying: This should have been done long ago.

When, in the first years, Comrade Enver launched the meaningful slogan, "More bread and more culture for the people," this may have seemed premature and mere propaganda to many. At that time, when the wounds of the war were still bleeding, when hunger and ignorance prevailed all over the country, even to dream about more knowledge and culture for the masses and, what is more, to put them on the same plane as bread, took courage.

Culture, science and art are weapons that Enver used in all their effectiveness, always evaluating them in connection with life and in the service of the progress of socialism. During the National Liberation War and thereafter, he applied a wise, patient and careful policy towards people of culture, scholars, writers, intellectuals and those engaged in creative activities in general. This stand and concern of his not only reflects his clear Marxist conception of the role of culture, but also expresses his own love for culture, his broad spiritual outlook and high level of education.

All our victories are based on and inspired by Enver Hoxha's Marxist-Leninist ideas. They are ideas which guide us towards new, higher developments; they are ideas that make us look to the future and help us advance towards it confidently.

Comrade Enver Hoxha did not learn scientific communism from books alone. The centuries of struggles of the Albanian people to emerge in the light of freedom gave birth to and developed him as a revolutionary communist; the class battles of

the world proletariat for social justice and progress moulded him. Communism and Marxist-Leninist science found in him a man prepared and endowed with the necessary qualities and virtues to propagate them, defend them, and apply them with consistency in the Albanian reality.

Enver Hoxha had a special ability to sum things up, and he drew very important conclusions from even a simple action of the revolutionary practice of the masses. He knew how to combine defence of principles with the revolutionary courage to take a new course and to find the solutions most appropriate to the existing conditions. He was an enemy of formulas, stereotyped practices and methods which life has overtaken and which hinder its advance.

His mind was always in motion. While observing and studying the development of the contemporary revolutionary movement, the international situation and the dialectical process of the advance of Albanian society, he dealt with a series of capital problems of the world revolution and the socialist construction in Albania with complete scientific competence. His Marxist thinking is the keystone of the line and theoretical views of our Party on questions of philosophy and politics, ideology and the economy, culture and art, military and international problems.

Socialist Albania, with its revolutionary policy, is an inspiring example for the peoples struggling to defend their freedom and national independence. Enver Hoxha is the founder of this policy of the Party and our socialist state. All the courageous stands of principle by socialist Albania on

international events and problems, its determined struggle against imperialism and reaction, its irreconcilable opposition to revisionism and political and ideological opportunism in general, and its unreserved support for the peoples fighting for freedom and independence have their source in the teachings of this ardent patriot and consistent internationalist, in the ideas of this outstanding Marxist-Leninist thinker.

The versatility of Enver Hoxha is known to all. He was a theoretician of socialism with a penetrating mind, a consistent, loyal and indomitable fighter for the implementation of the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism. As a master of materialist dialectics, he developed and further enriched the Marxist-Leninist theory and implemented it in a creative manner in the concrete conditions of Albania and the complicated international circumstances that were created after the Second World War.

Enver Hoxha distinguished himself, as nobody else did, for his courageous, principled struggle against today's extremely dangerous falsifiers of Marxism-Leninism, the modern revisionists. He was a politician of the new type, the true proletarian type. His qualities as a Marxist-Leninist theoretician and a proletarian politician were combined into one in his ceaseless revolutionary activities, in his harmonized and unified activity in the field of Marxist-Leninist theory and practice.

Enver Hoxha was an ardent patriot. He was imbued with the outstanding patriotic traditions of our small, long-suffering country. With unmatched heroism he fought with weapons, with knowledge,

and with all his being to defend our socialist Homeland, its independence and sovereignty, its national rights, the dignity of our people and socialist state against any kind of enemy, no matter how great or powerful, that sought to encroach upon them. And he always waged this struggle for the good of Albania from the positions of an exemplary and consistent internationalist.

These outstanding features made him a true tribune of the people, a man linked with and ardently loved by the entire Albanian people. His links with the masses were indissoluble links of comradeship. Just as he advised the cadres, intellectuals and creative artists, he set the example of how one should communicate with the people, how one should sit and talk with them directly, how one should share their joys and sorrows.

Enver Hoxha's word went deep into the minds and hearts of the people. He was an orator of rare ability and a brilliant publicist. His writings and speeches are the clearest evidence of this. In fact, many of them signalled and prompted the start of great revolutionary movements, indeed, of changes of historic importance on the road of our socialist development.

Enver Hoxha had the gift to adapt himself to the people with whom he dealt. He could converse with scholars and scientists with profound competence, just as he could chat quite freely with old highlanders. He communicated easily both with elderly women and with school pupils, pioneers and younger children. As a sensitive psychologist, he delved into the social psychology of different social strata and groups, studied and got to know not only

their feelings and aspirations, but also their state of mind. He had a profound knowledge of the national psychology of the Albanians.

Enver Hoxha was an intellectual with wide-ranging knowledge, a man with a passion for study, a true Marxist scientist. His interest in learning was immense and his knowledge like an inexhaustible spring, being continually renewed and enriched. He had a very extensive knowledge of the humanities, but he was also competent in the natural sciences. He was very well acquainted not only with our national culture, but also with the fundamental values of world culture. He was very well versed in and kept himself up to date both on the culture of the past and on that of the present, on classic literature and on the “modern” and modernist trends of contemporary art, on the cultural heritage of the Illyrians and early Albanians and on the present-day development of our literature and art of socialist realism. His good memory helped him to use all the enormous wealth of culture he possessed with full effectiveness and precisely where it was needed.

Enver Hoxha’s capacity for work and his output were truly astounding. To prove this, we need only to refer to his activity in the last decade of his life, when he was no longer young and had begun to be afflicted by successive grave illnesses. Suffice it to recall his writings of this period: a series of theoretical works of a high scientific level about today’s complicated international developments, books of exceptional value about the history of our Party and the National Liberation War, numerous reminiscences, the many volumes from his Political Di-

ary, not to mention many other speeches and articles, from the hand of a man who, at the same time, was actively engaged, day by day, in the most diverse affairs of an operative character of the Party and the state.

We, his contemporaries, remember many things about Enver Hoxha. However, we cannot fail to single out his human aspect, which is so astonishingly rich.

His figure represents an organic blend of human virtues. In him the nobility of the ideas for which he fought was combined to perfection with his sensitive feelings and spiritual beauty. His heart and the whole of his being responded with profound humanity to all the sentiments and worries of the life of the people. He rejoiced and was happy both over the commissioning of a giant combine and over the birth of a new citizen of the Republic, both over the production of the first batch of superphosphate and over the performance of a new song. He thought, planned and worked for the future of the Homeland, just as he was concerned about the living conditions of a pensioner or in an orphanage. He worried about any shortcoming, weakness or carelessness that hindered the work, but might spend a sleepless night worrying about the health of a comrade. His major preoccupations about the fate of the Homeland and socialism and his humane concern about the problems of the ordinary working people were merged into one in his person.

Enver Hoxha became a great popular leader because he loved the people from whom he emerged

with all the strength of his spirit, because he put all his revolutionary activity in the service of the happiness of the masses and the progress of Albania. He had boundless faith in the strength of the masses of the people. He attached special importance to consultation with workers and peasants, intellectuals, women, the youth and soldiers; he dedicated himself unreservedly to the struggle for their well-being and their happy future.

He left no district or zone of the country unvisited. It is a fine and very significant thing that today the anniversaries of these visits are commemorated and celebrated everywhere as “Enver’s days.” On these occasions, meetings and talks are organized to pay homage to his life and work, but they are also proclaimed days of intensive action to fulfill and overfulfill the planned objectives. Although many years may have elapsed since the time of these visits, the people say naturally:

“We are struggling to carry out the instructions Comrade Enver left when he visited us.”

Time does not make his instructions outdated...

His very rich correspondence provides a brilliant example of Enver Hoxha’s spiritual links with the people. Not only did he receive thousands of letters, but he also sent replies, acknowledgements and greetings to many people inside and outside the country. His letters are a great school for the cadres of the Party.

Like all letters, those he dispatched have a concrete address, with the name of the collective or citizen to whom they are addressed. In most cases, however, in essence they are not sent just to one

person. Behind the name of the addressee there is, almost always, a whole category of working people. In this sense, his letters have served as messages of the Party to the people, an open dialogue between them. It is not by chance that many of these letters have also been published in the press. The signature "Yours, Enver," so dear to the people, aroused their hearts, alleviated their grief and stirred their emotions. It expressed his total dedication to the people.

As I said earlier, Comrade Enver had an exceptional memory. He remembered the names of many working people after meeting them only once. And often when he met them again after many years had elapsed, he addressed them by name, even though they might have changed in appearance, grown to manhood or grown old. This came about because his wholehearted love for people added to his memory.

Enver Hoxha drew great strength from contacts with the people and was inspired by people's advanced opinions which, in most cases, comprised the essence of the important ideas which he formulated about the socialist transformation of the country. There was nothing formal, official or ceremonial about his conversations, only communist preoccupation and a comradely attitude. These conversations were the continuation of his work as a leader. With him, politeness was not something artificial, a means to communicate with people, but a natural gift; it was not just a product of education but, first of all, an expression of his liking and respect for people. Everything about him was in order. He stood out above the others even in simple

matters.

Regardless of how long may have elapsed, many of those who have met and talked with Comrade Enver remember his smiling face, his ardent, penetrating eyes expressive of a great wealth of feelings and emotions, his lofty noble brow, his warmth and concern, his valuable advice and instructions, as well as his outward appearance, always dignified, neat and in good taste. In those minutes when he was talking with the worker or the young man, the patriot or the cooperativist, the specialist or the leader, he placed himself, body and soul, at their disposal. At those moments his mind worked at maximum intensity in order to gain and learn as much as possible from these contacts and, especially, to give the persons he was talking to the most valuable assistance he could.

His meetings with the people were something thrilling and festive for Enver. He went to people not just for the sake of some principle, but because he became very uneasy in the full sense of the term if a long time went by without meeting them. Not infrequently, especially in the last years of his life, many comrades heard him complain that his many tasks and advanced age did not allow him to go out to talk with the workers and peasants, to see for himself the economic growth and all-round development of the country and to enjoy the beauties of the Homeland.

Everybody knows Enver's great love for Gjirokastra, not only because he was born there, but also because he knew and admired the cultural and architectural values of the city. He loved it especially because he had many friends of his child-

hood there with whom he maintained close friendship and was linked with indelible memories. Just imagine how he longed to go there.

“Many a time I have wanted to come back to our beloved city,” he told a meeting of his fellow citizens in 1978. “And why have you not come, you ask. Well, you see...”

Enver did not go into explanations. Perhaps neither his age, his failing health, nor his ever-increasing work seemed convincing reasons to him.

With special pleasure and great nostalgia, we see him now in May Day chronicles on the TV screen. There we see how warmly he greets the veterans or miners, how happily he waves to the youth and the pioneers, the dancers and the soldiers. It seems as if Enver Hoxha is in the parade, together with the people and among them. He communicated with the people with his whole being: with his words, his eyes and his hands.

Everybody remembers the celebration of the inauguration of the water supply system at Postriba of Mbishkodra in 1974, in which Comrade Enver took part. Indeed, the people have composed a song about this. But no sooner do you recall the celebration than the details of everything Enver did on that occasion come to mind: he approached the new fountain with his calm, firm step, rolled up his sleeves like a traveller weary and hot after a long journey, dashed a handful of water over his eyes and face and proposed a quite original toast, a toast with fresh water. How simple, how beautiful, how human! Not only Enver's ideas, but even his ordinary actions were unique.

In every man's life there are, of course, major

and minor events as well as ordinary moments. With Enver, however, the most commonplace things assumed special importance and great meaning, and became moving. What can one do, let us say, before a monument? One can give the clenched-fist salute, lay a bunch of flowers, pay homage or do something else of the sort. But Enver's emotions prompted him to original actions on such occasions.

I will never forget the moment when, during his visit to Gjirokastra, he laid a wreath on the monument to the fighters at Mashkullora. There was nothing ceremonial in his actions, although to stand before a monument in itself has something to do with ceremony. How moving those moments were! Enver Hoxha reached out to touch the heads of the fighters gently, as though they were alive, caressed them fondly and slowly withdrew with his clenched fist raised in salute.

Enver's inner world was bursting with feelings and thoughts. He lived events with his whole being, was optimistic, rejoiced and enthused over achievements and victories, just as he became angry and stern when the interests of socialism were damaged.

His concern was always to make things better. He was not dissatisfied with what Albania had attained in forty years of socialism and freedom. On the contrary, he was happy at the progress made, and the completely transformed appearance of the Homeland was pleasing to his eyes. But while feeling satisfaction at what had been done, he was a relentless fighter against self-satisfaction. Always seeking and struggling for more rational solutions,

giving his all for the people and socialism — that was Enver Hoxha.

When any disaster occurred, Enver Hoxha was greatly disturbed, was tormented and could not sleep. He went personally to visit the people of Dibra in their homes in mid-winter 1967, when the earthquake caused heavy damage and casualties in that district.

In April 1979 another earthquake struck Shkodra, Lezha and other zones of North Albania, and many people were killed or injured. Less than five minutes had gone by since we learned of this catastrophe when he summoned me and instructed me to go immediately to Shkodra and other places to meet the people, to convey condolences on behalf of the Party and to assure them that quickly, very quickly, all the measures would be taken to build new homes for the afflicted and re-establish normal life. When I came back from Shkodra, I reported to him in detail about everything. He listened to me attentively.

“Now not a second must be lost,” he said. “We must take comprehensive measures, organize a great action involving all districts, so that everything will be completed within 5-6 months. Winter must find the people in their new homes.”

It was clear that he had considered this matter at length and thought out every detail of the action.

“We have done things badly with some new settlements,” he said. “Therefore the sites where the new villages will be built should be chosen carefully, so that they have water, shelter from the wind and sunshine in the houses. Special attention must be paid to Bahçallëk which is at the entrance to

Shkodra. The architects should think about it and find the best possible solutions.”

I was aware of the urgent need to undertake a national-scale action to overcome the consequences of the earthquake. But at those moments when the immediate problem was to find shelter for tens and tens of thousands of homeless people, it took a mind like Enver’s, a concern like his, to think about the aesthetic values of the new houses as well.

“All the houses must be well built, not makeshift shelters,” he said. “The new homes should look better and be more comfortable than those damaged by the earthquake.”

In October of that same year, Comrade Enver, who attended the celebration organized in Shkodra on the occasion of the completion of the action for the liquidation of the consequences of the earthquake, was pleased with what had been done and wholeheartedly congratulated the builders of the new houses, who, despite the short time, had done a fine, praiseworthy job.

Enver Hoxha was a man of great intellectual and physical energies. With his ability as an accomplished psychologist, he knew how to penetrate into people’s souls, to free them from any kind of shyness and to create the conditions which are necessary to encourage those he talked with to express their opinions. He repeated, over and over again, that to open the way to people’s rational ideas, you must first of all respect their opinions. It was his custom, immediately after meetings he had with specialists and cadres, to sit and jot down on paper

impressions, considerations, ideas and recommendations.

Unity of profound thinking with simplicity of expression is characteristic of all Enver Hoxha's work. This is a quality of great importance, not only because it enables working people of all categories to assimilate his work, not only because it reflects his well-known modesty in all his relations with people, but also because it shows clearly that his erudition had a solid basis. He never wrote to display culture and erudition as an aim in itself. On the contrary, he placed his all-sided culture in the service of the people, in order to solve the problems of society.

He dealt competently with every problem, every issue, in whatever field, although not as a narrow specialist. He ceaselessly studied both history and philosophy, economics and technology. He was always informed about the latest achievements in different sciences. Every good new book made him happy. Had he participated in a competition for the title "Friend of Books" he would certainly have taken first place.

Enver had one great passion which, we can say, dominated him: reading. He read many kinds of literature, from various sources, in different languages. He read always with a critical mind. He had the ability to determine the essential connections between the different items of knowledge he acquired. His knowledge was profound, not shallow and superficial. He used specialized terminology sparingly, and not as an aim in itself, or in order to pose as an expert in the given field. Even in his last years, when failing eyesight troubled him

greatly, he did not give up books. The members of his family patiently read him the new books and he listened with the greatest attention.

In our free meetings it was his habit to tell us about what he had read recently. In this way, he not only informed us about particular problems, but also encouraged us to read. Today he would speak about history, tomorrow about geology; one day about ethnography and another day about ancient medicine; sometimes about the Hussites, at other times about the history of the Bible or Islam; on one occasion about radioactivity, on another about the birth of different alphabets; at one meeting about the nutritional value of vegetables, or the need for macro-economic studies, and at another about currency and exchange rate problems.

Comrade Enver Hoxha's method of study and his special passion for reading are a great and impelling example for all our people. Study, knowledge of technical and technological progress, and continuous following up of different events and new developments in science are permanent requirements without which we cannot cope with the tasks to which socialist construction gives rise in all fields. Marxist-Leninist philosophy and ideology cannot advance and explain the revolutionary processes of the time if they do not follow the new developments, on both the internal and the external planes. Any theory which does not keep pace with, indeed, does not keep ahead of the time, becomes powerless to respond to problems that arise. The socialist construction and defence of the Homeland cannot be ensured if the phenomena which they display are not studied and interpreted

correctly, if various types of information, knowledge and culture are not constantly enriched.

With his revolutionary work, with everything he has done for the people and the Homeland, Enver Hoxha has won the love and respect of the whole Albanian people — workers and peasants, women and youth, intellectuals and militarymen. This love has grown out of the friendship born in the struggle for the great cause of socialism. It is the expression of a pure feeling created in the course of the work, full of self-denial and sacrifice, for the construction of the new life. It is not, and cannot be, the product of a personality cult, as the enemies of Albania and socialism slanderously allege. No, Enver Hoxha detested the idea of such a cult and never fostered it. The love of the people and the communists for him is an expression of the gratitude which every Albanian feels for the man who dedicated the whole of his life to the happiness and well-being of his people. To every Albanian, Enver Hoxha is a comrade and a brother, because each of them sees his life, his joys, his present and future closely linked with the name of the Party and its great founder and leader.

Our road and Enver's road are one and indivisible. We follow this road not to do honour to his name or for sentimental reasons. We follow this road, and will continue to do so, because it responds to the interests of the people and the socialist development of the country, because it shows us how to work better for the defence of the freedom and independence of the Homeland, for the successful construction of socialism and the prosper-

ous future of the people. If the road he foresaw is the tested and most correct road for us today, that is the merit of Enver Hoxha.

The words and thinking of Comrade Enver Hoxha and the directives and programs he formulated represent the synthesis of the collective thinking of the Party. In his speeches and contributions to discussions he simply restated to the Party and the people their own ideas, which had been sought and expressed in the most democratic and direct ways, and which he brought together in generalized form. The unity in thought and action of the Party around its leader, Comrade Enver Hoxha, stemmed from this permanent connection, which was part of his method of work. Just as the people and the Party listened attentively to what he said and went on the offensive and into action to put it into practice, so he persistently sought the ideas and opinions of his comrades at working meetings and in casual contacts.

The communists, cadres and all our people must learn not only from Enver Hoxha's theoretical work, but also from his practical activity as a leader, and from his life and figure as a man. They must learn how to love the people and live with them, and how to understand and solve their problems. They must learn how to love and defend the Homeland, how to struggle for its happiness and progress, and how to safeguard and constantly develop the revolutionary and internationalist spirit.

All of us must learn to be fearless in the face of any difficulty, just as Enver Hoxha was; to find our bearings correctly and unerringly in any situation, just as he did; to organize and guide affairs with

knowledge and culture, just as he did; to be progressive and always fight for the new, just as he did; to be innovative, vigilant and always on the offensive against class enemies. Our hearts must beat for the Homeland and communism all through our lives, just as Enver's did.

First Encounters

Following the founding of the Party, the Albanian people's National Liberation War caught fire and extended rapidly. The communists emerged in the forefront everywhere as organizers, propagandists and fighters. Very quickly the people linked themselves with the Party, in which they saw the sole leading force in the struggle for liberation.

With the expansion of the movement all over the country, the name of Enver Hoxha became known as the leader of the Party, the Political Commissar of the army and the legendary commander of the brave partisans. The people recognized his bravery and patriotism in Peza, with the partisans of Myslim Peza and at the historic Conference of 1942. They saw him stern and resolute for the purity of the ideal when he went to Vlora to smash the anti-party faction. They admired him for his confidence and optimism in Skrapar and Shpat, Mokra and Çermenika. They hailed him in Vithkuq when he took part in the inauguration of the 1st Brigade. They met him and heard about him in Labinot and inside Tirana, where he guided the Albanian people's heroic National Liberation War with wisdom and courage. Wherever the fighting

raged, there, amongst the people and the partisans, was Enver Hoxha.

In the winter of 1943-1944, the German nazis and the local traitors launched a major operation intended to wipe out the movement and destroy the partisan army. This was the most difficult period in our National Liberation War. All over the country, in every region from North to South, the enemy launched annihilating offensives, but encountered the heroic resistance of the partisans and the people.

In exceptionally difficult conditions, the various partisan detachments fought off the enemy attacks, manoeuvred skilfully and, especially in Southern Albania and in the zone of Peza, kept their fighting capacity and readiness intact. Of course there were losses, indeed very heavy losses, especially in some partisan detachments in Central and Northern Albania. Everywhere the enemies killed and massacred unarmed people, men and women alike, burnt and laid waste whole villages and zones, from Tropoja to Gjirokastra, from Peza to Korça, but they were unable to wipe out the movement and liquidate the partisans. The Party, the National Liberation Army, the national liberation councils and the entire insurgent people emerged from this operation more tempered and prepared for the future battles which would lead to the complete liberation of the Homeland.

In the Winter Operation, Enver Hoxha found himself in the "eye of the cyclone." The Germans and Ballists made many efforts to liquidate the leadership of the National Liberation War, the Central Committee of the Party and the General

Staff headed by Comrade Enver Hoxha, which at that time was located in Central Albania, in Labi-not of Elbasan and in the surrounding zone. However, the enemies were unsuccessful. The people bravely protected the Staff of the War. With rare heroism and extraordinary skill, Comrade Enver Hoxha succeeded in breaking through encirclement after encirclement and, together with his comrades, marched from Central Albania to arrive safe and sound in the south of the country.

It was precisely at that time, immediately after the enemy's Winter Operation, that I met Comrade Enver and talked to him for the first time. This occurred in March 1944, in the village of Panarit, district of Korça, where the first theoretical course for Party cadres was being conducted. This time I was introduced to him, shook hands with him, saw him as a partisan leader and commander, but I also came to know him and listened to him as a teacher. And this is what he remained for me to the end — my most beloved and learned teacher.

I would like to emphasize the fact that Comrade Enver did not delay even one day. As soon as he broke out of the enemy encirclement and reached the liberated zone, along with other major questions of running the war, he involved himself in the organization and holding of the course at Panarit. This shows what great importance he and the Party gave to the ideological training of cadres, the teaching of the Marxist-Leninist theory, and the all-round qualification of communists.

Before going to Panarit, I was in Skrapar. At that time I was secretary of the Communist Youth organization of the Berat region. The course

opened on March 4 and closed on March 20, 1944. All told there were 35 of us, men and women, comrades mainly from the districts of Gjirokastra, Vlora, Korça and Berat, and from the 1st, 4th, 5th and 6th Brigades. It was there that I first met and got to know Comrades Adil Çarçani, Manush Myftiu, Haki Toska, Josif Pashko, Bilbil Klosi, Sadik Bocaj, Zihni Sako, and others. We were billeted in the village school, a single-storey building with two big classrooms and a small room that apparently served as the teachers' room. In one of the classrooms we did our lessons and study while we used the other classroom and the teachers' room for sleeping. To eat we went to a nearby building which had probably served as a shop or store.

A long time afterwards, when I went back to Vithkuq in the summer of 1985, I inquired especially about this school of Panarit and the house in which the General Staff had stayed. I was very sorry to find out that they had been burnt down by the enemy, and now can be found only as models in the museum of the region.

We stayed in Panarit for more than two weeks and very quickly made friends with the people. The children whose schools we had occupied looked upon us as their comrades and brought us walnuts and hazelnuts, which grew in abundance in that region.

The themes which were dealt with in the course were of great interest to all of us who took part in it. However, both from the importance of its content, and from the beauty of its expression, the address which Comrade Enver delivered on the last day of the course stood out above all the others.

This address was a program which indicated the course that we would pursue. It opened before us new, very clear prospects of victory in the war and the seizure of power.

In those years, all our attention and energies were concentrated on performing a sacred duty: we had to fight for a free Albania, for an Albania of the people. We spoke with agitated and fiery words about the need to fight against foreign occupiers and local traitors, for social justice and equality, for socialism, and did quite a bit of dreaming about the future. But most of us were none too clear about what the future society would be like. We lacked ideological preparation, did not have the necessary Marxist-Leninist knowledge. Nevertheless, this did not diminish our enthusiasm and determination in the war, or our confidence in the future. Though we lacked the professors who would have introduced us to the theory of socialism, we had a great and unshakeable conviction: we were sure that somebody knew what Albania would be like in the future, and this was the Party and Enver Hoxha.

We understood this even better at Panarit. Comrade Enver Hoxha's address clarified our view of the future, showed us what the new Albania would be like. In that address, which has been published in the 2nd volume of Comrade Enver Hoxha's *Works* according to the notes I took at Panarit, all that we had been taught in the course about revolutionary strategy and tactics, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the class struggle, the Party, the peasant question, etc., were concretized. When we heard Comrade Enver speaking about

the course we would pursue and the tasks awaiting us, many ideas which had seemed too theoretical and hard to grasp during our studies assumed a form appropriate to the Albanian reality and our struggle.

Enver's address gave us new strength and filled us with optimism about the future. And we must not forget that it was delivered in March, immediately after the Winter Operation, when the enemies were trumpeting loudly that the partisans had been exterminated and that the movement had come to an end. Meanwhile, in Panarit, Enver told us with full conviction that the "prospect of the seizure of power is imminent" and that "the people will be masters of new Albania."

Enver Hoxha propagated the line of the Party with ardour, passion and great force of argument. He knew how to sum up the experience gained and draw lessons from our struggle, and he had accurate foresight and clear thoughts. In presenting his address, which he had not written out, he spoke slowly but in a confident tone. As early as that turbulent period, he had the ability to leave nothing unclear or hazy, avoiding situations which are mortally dangerous for a Party, especially in time of war and difficulties.

The lessons of the course at Panarit, and particularly Comrade Enver's address and thoughts, showed us the primary importance of mastering the revolutionary theory and linking it with the life and concrete reality of the country. This conclusion is valid to this day for every communist, the entire Party and our youth. We must value our theory, the Marxist-Leninist science, not just in order to sit ex-

aminations or write propaganda articles, but so that we can cope with our concrete activity, our daily work, by means of the theoretical principles and teachings of Marxism-Leninism and avoid making mistakes in life. The Party has said that we need Marxism-Leninism not as an ornament, but as a guide to action. Nowhere can you find abstract theorizing in the thinking of Comrade Enver, who was a great theoretician. Always you find creative thinking, revolutionary thinking inspired by the teachings of Marxism-Leninism.

On the day after the course ended, all we participants dispersed to the duties to which we had been assigned by the Central Committee of the Party. I was appointed a member of the Political Section of the newly formed 7th Brigade. Of course I was happy to be transferred to the brigade. But my joy was greater when I met Comrade Enver.

I was told to report to the house in which the General Staff was located. I went. Enver himself received me there. He asked me about the situation among the civilian population in the Skrapar and Berat zones, about the stand of the people and the partisans during the Winter Operation, about the work of the youth and the Party, and about the comrades. While I was giving him the necessary information, the conversation seemed to flow easily and I managed to control my emotions.

“From now on,” Enver said, after having heard me out, “you will still be working with the youth, although not the civilian youth, but in the partisan ranks.”

Then he explained to me the importance of the work with the youth, the need for its organization,

for its political and cultural education, for the continuous raising of its militant spirit and determination in the war against the nazi occupiers and local traitors.

“Collaborate with all the comrades,” he advised me, “not only with those of the political section, especially the vice-commissar of the brigade Comrade Adil Çarçani, who is responsible for the work of the Party in the brigade, but also with other cadres.”

Then he spoke about the care we ought to take in order to explain the aims of our war to the people.

“Wherever you go, in every village, gather the people, gather the youth and work with them. The women partisans should get together with the women and talk to them. Explain the political situation to them, tell them about our war and its prospects. We must see to it that the people are linked as closely as possible with the war, and hate the foreign occupiers and the local traitors, the Ballists, the Zogites, etc. Your brigade will operate in the zone around the city of Berat. Its task is to attack the enemy ceaselessly with the aim of liberating the city and to strengthen the movement and the national liberation councils in the regions around it.”

Finally, he instructed me that we should write to the Central Committee from time to time, to keep it informed about the situation in the brigade and in the zones through which it would pass. “This has special importance,” he stressed, “because the Central Committee and the General Staff cannot lead and direct the war without knowing

what the partisan units are doing, without real, concrete information from the Party and the various detachments of the army.” That said, we embraced, shook hands and parted.

This meeting and the advice Comrade Enver gave me remain permanently fresh in my memory. At that time I was quite young, but eager to learn. That is why throughout the whole meeting I listened attentively to absorb every word the leader said, considering it a valuable asset that would help me in all my work. Emotions? I cannot describe them.

After this meeting my dialogue with Comrade Enver became more and more frequent, becoming daily later, when for more than two decades I worked beside him in the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Party. For me this dialogue was a great school in which I learnt how to work and fight better for the people and the Party, a school where I was formed as a communist and a cadre. In the school of Enver Hoxha, I mastered the ideology of the Party and its scientific policy. Enver’s advice and encouragement were a great influence which gave me a better and more profound knowledge of affairs of the time and the future.

From Panarit I set out for Skrapar to make contact with the brigade. I found it in the village of Therepel. There I met the staff of the brigade and the comrades of the political section to whom I transmitted Comrade Enver’s instructions. After this I went to the various battalions of the brigade, met with cadres and partisans, the young men and women, some of whom I was meeting for the first

time. Apart from the partisans who made up the “youth” battalion of Berat and Skrapar, most of whom I already knew, there were many partisans from the regions of Korça and Gjirokastra in the ranks of the brigade.

I am not going to dwell on the work and military actions of the brigade. However, I would like to show with what close attention and diligence Comrade Enver followed the activity of the various partisan units and the life of the party and youth organizations during the war. To this end I shall mention two episodes.

In the second half of May 1944, numerous German forces left the city of Berat and set out on the road to Përmet. Immediately they came under attack from the partisans of our brigade. The fighting was especially fierce in the zone of Paraspuar and at Qafë-Shkoza. The fighting raged for several successive days. Each night the Germans withdrew to the city, but resumed the attack next day with greater forces.

On one of these days, Comrade Adil and I telephoned Comrade Enver and reported to him the critical situation that was being created. We told him we had suffered many casualties. He listened attentively to our report and then said:

“Your brigade must not retreat one step, regardless of the losses you will suffer. The Germans must not get past you. You know the importance of the meeting we are going to hold.” He was referring to the Congress of Përmet that was to be held those days. And in fact, our delegates, including the commander and commissar of the brigade, had set out for Përmet.

Of course we took the necessary measures to ensure that the order he gave us was carried out. But Comrade Enver, too, had considered the situation. Next day the 12th Brigade, which had just been formed in Këlcyra, district of Përmet, was deployed in the direction of Paraspuar in support of the 7th Brigade. Despite the efforts they made and the armoured vehicles they used, the Germans could not get through. The Congress of Përmet conducted its proceedings successfully, because the General Staff and Enver Hoxha personally had thought out how to protect it and had charged our brigade and the 12th with this task. The 5th, 6th and 8th brigades, as well as other partisan forces, had been charged with special tasks for the defence of the city of Përmet, in particular.

Not infrequently, in reading reminiscences or articles about the war, especially when they are about a particular brigade or important military action, it seems as if our war was waged in fragmentary fashion, according to the desire and initiative of this or that staff or partisan detachment. Without doubt, in war as in every other field, the initiative of a commander or a detachment plays a major role. And there were many actions with individual initiative during the National Liberation War. But our war was an organized war, a well-thought-out war, led by the General Staff on the basis of a studied plan of operations. Each brigade operated in a given zone and moved only on orders of the General Staff. Every major military operation which required the combined action of various brigades and detachments was guided by the General Staff. Thus, the 1st Division and other partisan brigades

marched towards the north on the orders of the Commander-in-Chief of the National Liberation Army, Comrade Enver Hoxha, on the basis of a plan carefully considered from the political, tactical and strategic standpoints. Likewise, the heroic battle for the liberation of Tirana was waged according to a detailed plan worked out by him. This operation, one of the most important of our war, included a series of battles and concrete measures. To accomplish it, battles were fought from the Greek-Albanian border, in the Korça zone, all along the route of withdrawal of the German forces, in Elbasan, at Qafë-Kërrabë and Mushqeta, ending with the partisans' heroic deeds in the streets of our capital city.

And the final blow which was struck at the nazi occupiers and the combined forces of local reaction, the Balli, the Zogites and other collaborationists, a blow that also foiled the Anglo-American plans and led to the complete liberation of Albania and the establishment of the people's power, was not an isolated action of this or that partisan formation. It was the realization of the strategic plan of the Party, the crowning with success of our war which the Commander-in-Chief, Comrade Enver Hoxha, guided with a sure hand.

Another episode which shows Comrade Enver's close, personal involvement in guiding the war has to do with my first exchange of letters with him. In April and again in June of 1944, right after the second enemy operation which is known as the June Operation, I sent two reports to the Central Committee of the Party. In these reports, I sent in-

formation about the work of the communist youth in the brigade, the increase of its ranks, its moral-political stand, and especially the courage and persistence it displayed in fighting the enemy, the educational work done with it, etc. But I had also noticed certain incorrect stands of some leading cadre of the brigade in his relations with the people or his behaviour with the partisans. There were manifestations of big-shotism and sectarianism which harmed the links of the Party with the masses. In both reports, while informing the Central Committee about these and some other matters having to do with the work with peasants, I also expressed some personal opinion or assessment of them.

It never crossed my mind that Comrade Enver, personally, would read those reports. But although occupied with the major tasks of preparing for and holding the Congress of Përmet and, afterwards, with guiding the partisan forces to overcome the enemy's June Operation, he had not only read them, but had found time to send me a long reply full of instructions. That letter, which began so simply and warmly with the words "Dear comrade," made a deep impression on me.

Such was Enver! In later years, when I became more closely acquainted with him, I noticed what great importance he gave to knowing the situation, the activity of the Party, or the development of the economy and culture, and the opinions of cadres, ordinary workers and peasants. It was his habit to carefully read every report or letter he received, to listen attentively to everything he was told, to draw conclusions from an ordinary conversation or item of news, to give assistance and advice to any com-

rade who sought it.

The letter Comrade Enver sent me is known because it has been published in the 2nd volume of his *Works*. However, here I will recall the special concern he displayed for the organization and education of the youth. He had a high assessment of the role of youth, therefore he demanded that “all members of the Party should be interested in working with this important sector.”

Comrade Enver has said that the “youth are the future of the Homeland.” This is not a slogan, but a constant guideline for our Party. I have had occasion to experience his interest in the youth directly and at every stage of the revolution and the socialist construction. I will return to this question later. But here I want to emphasize without the least exaggeration that this care and work for the education of the children, young pioneers and youth was not only a special concern of Enver’s but also his “weakness.”

Even today when you read Comrade Enver’s letter, the importance he gave to links with the people and the Party’s work of persuasion is apparent. The masses, the working people must be made clear, they must be acquainted with the line of the Party. In this way they will fight to apply and defend it. This leitmotif pervades all his thinking. Enver was a stern enemy of arrogance and sectarian attitudes towards the people, just as he was irreconcilable with opportunism and liberalism.

In my second report I informed the Central Committee that Gjin Marku, then commander of the 7th Brigade, and some other cadres treated the partisans and the people harshly. In the case of

some newly-recruited young partisan, who for one reason or another had left the brigade during the June Operation and returned later, they had gone so far as to propose that extreme measures should be taken against him and his family.

Comrade Enver wrote to me:

“In regard to Gjini and the matters you raise with us, he is wrong. On no account should the measures he proposes be taken... Measures cannot be taken against a partisan who has been in the army only two months, who has never taken part in any meeting or seen any concern shown for him by the leadership and who finds the opportunity to go home, and even less can they be taken against his parents. Draconian measures must be taken against a seasoned partisan who deserts, but only against him and not against his parents or family.”

But that was not all. From the information about Gjini's behaviour he drew valuable conclusions for the guidance of the whole Party.

“Guard against ill-considered opinions and decisions and do not permit, in any way, the development of opportunism in the ranks of the leaders,” he instructed. And he went on: “The partisan's respect for his leader must have its source not in threats and insults but in the good behaviour and the ability of the leader.”

For me, Enver's letter was a source not only of satisfaction but also of special encouragement. It gave me support and impelled me to work with greater enthusiasm. It gave me a better understanding of the scope of the work of the Party, of the need for the communist to avoid confining himself to a narrow circle of problems or restricting his

activities only to the performance of the task for which he bears direct responsibility. The communist must be active and militant at any time and over everything that is linked with the interests of the Party and the people. Comrade Enver advised me: “Don’t forget that all these things must be done by the method of persuasion and with great patience, by going on the attack again and again until the shortcomings of comrades are eliminated.” And then he added: “Don’t limit yourself to observing problems, but involve yourself directly in these matters, think them over well and with a cool head, take correct decisions and try to make them comprehensible and acceptable to the comrades.”

This advice, these lessons, were valuable then in the struggle for new Albania, but they are highly instructive today, too, for me and for every leader and young cadre who wants to serve the socialist construction and the defence of the Homeland with all his strength and in the best possible way.

Thus, from this letter and afterwards for decades on end, by thrashing out and exchanging opinions on questions of the Party and the development of the country, I started and continued my education in the school of the Party and of Enver Hoxha — this great school of the theory and practice of the revolution.

The 1st Congress of the Anti-fascist Albanian Youth Union (AAYU) was held in August 1944. This event played a very important role in the movement of the Albanian youth. I shall return again to this major event, but first I want to speak

briefly about the impressions I had from my meeting with Comrade Enver after the Congress.

One day after the Congress of the AAYU in the village of Helmës, district of Skrapar, where the General Staff of the National Liberation Army was located, a meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Youth was held. Comrade Enver Hoxha, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Albania, was present at this meeting, which analysed the tasks facing the organization of the communist youth for the implementation of the decisions of the 1st Congress of the AAYU and the further mobilization of the youth in the war for the liberation of the Homeland. Thus I had a chance to speak directly with him again.

We met before the meeting. He asked me for my impressions about the youth congress, then inquired about the situation in the 7th Brigade after the June Operation, asked about its cadres and then he informed me that I had been appointed to work in the political section of the 2nd Division, which had been formed in those days and was located in Northern Albania. He explained to me the great political importance that the dispatch of partisan forces to the North had. As is known, for various reasons, the National Liberation Movement in the northern districts had not assumed the same proportions or developed as rapidly as it had in the south of the country.

“The dispatch of divisions of the National Liberation Army there,” Comrade Enver said, “will be of great assistance to the party organizations in the regions of the North, for the mobilization and engagement of the masses in the war. And the results

are already evident," he continued. "The 17th, 18th, 22nd and 23rd Brigades have been or are about to be formed."

Comrade Enver Hoxha's assessments of the situation in the North were characterized by an unshakeable belief in the patriotism of the people of those regions who, despite the great influence of reactionary elements, were closely linked with the Party and the National Liberation Movement. In Shkodra and Tropoja, the work of the Party was never interrupted, and the partisan rifle was never silent. The people of Dibra, Kukës, Mat, etc., displayed their fighting spirit and great patriotism.

"The dispatch of partisan divisions to the North," he pointed out, "has as its special aim the foiling of the plans of enemies of the freedom and future of the new Albania."

Both external reaction, especially the British and the Americans, and internal reaction, the Ballists and the Zogites, aimed to hold the North as their zone and to set up a government there which would oppose the people's government elected by the Congress of Përmet. If they did not succeed in having this accepted as the only government of the country, they would try to impose a compromise, the formation of a "government of national unity," which would emerge from the National Liberation Movement, which, according to them, held only the South, and from reaction which, allegedly, held the North. So the camp of reactionary forces calculated.

All the enemies of Albania were set in motion to implement these plans. The Ballists and Zogites, the British and Americans, *bayraktars* and reaction-

aries of a hundred-and-one flags were openly collaborating. Even the German nazis, who could see the end approaching for them, were aware of these plans, encouraged them and collaborated for their accomplishment.

The enemies were working, but the people were not asleep. They were fighting and had wise, far-sighted men, like Enver Hoxha, who “read” the plans of reaction and took the decisions which were necessary to ensure the victory of the people and their war, and to defeat the enemy’s plans.

“Therefore, bearing in mind these complicated circumstances,” Comrade Enver concluded the conversation, “you must strengthen the work of the Party and the youth not only in the National Liberation Army, but also among the people, with whom you must work tirelessly to popularize the war and expose the aims and propaganda of the enemies.”

In the meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Youth, Comrade Enver also spoke about the numerous tasks ahead of us. What impressed me particularly there, as it had done in March in Panarit, was his ability to think far ahead. He spoke about the immediate tasks, about the need to mobilize the youth in the war for the complete liberation of the Homeland. But he also spoke about the reconstruction of the country, the mobilization of the youth in work, as active supporters of the new people’s power. Comrade Enver summed up his ideas in one phrase:

“State power and the army — this must be the motto of the Communist Youth today.”

It was decided that we members of the Central

Committee of the Communist Youth who had been elected at the same time to the Secretariat of the AAYU should go immediately to the base zones and to the partisan units. Besides my work with the youth of the 2nd Division which included the 6th, 7th and 22nd Brigades, I would also be responsible for helping the civilian youth in the regions of Mirdita, Puka and Shkodra, where the forces of our division were operating.

Together with Comrade Nexhmije Xhuglini (Hoxha) and two other members of the Central Committee of the Youth, I set out from Helmës in the direction of the North. We travelled through Tomorrica, to Gramsh, to Gjinar of Shpat, to Polis, and after crossing the Shkumbin River, climbed up to Labinot village. There we met the partisans of the 6th Shock Brigade and the Staff of the 2nd Division. I stayed with the partisans of the 6th Brigade, while Comrade Nexhmije went on to the village of Shenmëri, district of Tirana, where she was to make contact with the Staff of the 1st Army Corps and later proceed to Peshkopia. We were to meet again at Priska of Tirana, where the Conference of the youth of Central and Northern Albania was held on October 2, 1944.

At this meeting I first met Comrade Hysni Kapo, who at that time was political commissar of the 1st Army Corps. He greeted the Conference on behalf of the Central Committee of the Party. Very friendly, comradely relations were established between us from this first meeting. Hysni won my respect and admiration with the attention and care he showed for the comrades, with his behaviour and characteristic wisdom, and his modesty. We stayed

together only a short while, but to me it seemed we had known each other for a long time. Thus there was born that close friendship and sincere comradeship between us which was never shaken in any situation, that communist collaboration which, from the time we first met, grew and intensified during 35 years of our joint work and struggle for the cause of the people and the Party, always beside our great teacher, Enver Hoxha.

From the Conference at Priska I have another very dear memory. It was there that I met my unforgettable comrade, Semiramis, for the first time. She had come to Priska as a youth activist from Elbasan. As I write these notes I can see her in my mind's eye just as she was in those days: her hair in plaits but not very long, lively, delicate and gay.

Later after the Liberation of the country, we got to know each other better and married. I write these lines with nostalgia for they remind me of the one most dear to me with whom I lived the happiest years and shared the greatest joys of my personal life. I write with nostalgia remembering the fine communist who was my life's companion. Together we shared the good and the bad, together we worked and fought for the cause of the Party, together we raised and educated our children who have now become my comrades and co-fighters. But I write these lines also with a heavy burden of deep grief, because I lost Semiramis too soon, lost her at a time when I needed her, her friendship and love, more than ever.

I beg the reader to forgive me for this digression of a strictly personal character.

The meeting of Priska having ended, I set out

for Mat, where the forces of the division were located. From there we went to Lura and then entered Mirdita. After that region was completely liberated, we moved into Puka and from there marched in the direction of Shkodra. The 6th Brigade crossed the Drin River and, passing through Lekbibaj and Dukagjin, arrived in the zone of Upper Shkodra. Shkodra was liberated on November 29, 1944 and thus the whole of Albania was cleared of foreign armies.

With the liberation of Shkodra, the heroic National Liberation War was crowned with complete victory; the bloodshed, the innumerable sacrifices of the people and the heroism of the partisans were rewarded; and the consistent line of our Communist Party, the organizer and leader of the National Liberation Movement of the Albanian people, triumphed.

The role of Enver Hoxha in the achievement of this historic victory was decisive. From its very founding, the Party chose Comrade Enver as its head. In the heat of the war, he won the complete trust and support of the entire people, who saw in Enver an outstanding leader who responded to their aspirations. And the people and the Party were not mistaken: Enver Hoxha guided them wisely and led them from victory to victory. He placed all his revolutionary activity in the service of the liberation of the country and, later, of the socialist construction, in the service of the happiness of the masses and the progress of Albania.

A genuine Marxist-Leninist and a great strategist, Enver Hoxha reached the historic conclusion that the people could not triumph, that freedom

could not be secured, without creating the organized political force and the military force of the movement. And consequently, if for the first time in history our people achieved a militant unity, which to this day constitutes one of the basic factors of the mobilization of all the energies of the working masses, this is due to the persistent work of Enver Hoxha who, as a true communist and ardent patriot, fought with all his might for the creation of the National Liberation Front, the great organization which united all Albanians to whom the freedom and independence of the country were dear.

Enver Hoxha was the organizer of the National Liberation Army. As Political Commissar and Commander-in-Chief, he led it in all the decisive battles. Thanks to the correct leadership of the Party, the scientific strategy and tactics worked out by the General Staff and Comrade Enver Hoxha personally, our war — which began as a partisan war — very quickly was turned into an organized war with a regular, disciplined army, which operated according to a well-thought-out, unified plan. As a result, our war was waged correctly, the military operations ended with success, and our people liberated the country from the nazi-fascists and traitors with their own forces.

We have said and say again that the National Liberation War is our greatest war, although our people have waged many wars, have shed torrents of blood and have suffered incalculable devastation and hardships. But the National Liberation War, led by the Party with Enver Hoxha at the head, is great not only on account of its dimen-

sions, but also on account of the ideas that inspired it and, above all, its results.

Right from the outset, Enver Hoxha made it clear to the Party and the working masses that their sufferings and misfortunes came not only from the foreigners, the fascist occupiers, but also from the exploiting classes, who had ruled Albania up till that time and had always collaborated with and submitted to the foreigners. Without fighting simultaneously and with equal determination against both these hostile forces, true freedom could not be achieved, national independence could not be realized and the social aspirations of the masses could never be fulfilled. Our National Liberation War triumphed because the people, with the Party at the head, fought consistently on both fronts, against the foreign occupiers and against the local traitors, because the line of the Party was clear and overcame any attempt at sectarian or opportunist deviations.

In Albania, the war for national liberation was transformed into a broad popular revolution. This great, creative revolutionary idea, which Comrade Enver Hoxha made the foundation stone of the line of the Party and the platform of the National Liberation War, led not only to securing genuine national freedom and the complete independence of the Homeland, but, above all, to the establishment of the people's state power, and made the people masters of their destiny.

On the day of the liberation of Shkodra, November 29, 1944, I entered the city together with the partisan forces. My joy was two-fold: we had

won the war, and precisely on the day of the Liberation of the Homeland, I found myself in the city of my birth.

I had left Shkodra when I was eight years old. Thus, I had grown up in Tirana, where I attended primary and secondary school, militated in the ranks of the communist youth, and was admitted to the Party. In the spring of 1943, I was sent to work with the youth in the region of Berat, and later in the partisan ranks in Skrapar. Nevertheless, in my heart I retained love for my birthplace, memories of my childhood companions, acquaintances and friends, and even of the streets and lanes of the city. The time that had elapsed had increased my longing to see them.

We partisans, together with the people of Shkodra, celebrated the first day of freedom with indescribable joy. Every home in Shkodra had opened its doors to the partisans. There was no end to the revelry in the city. The dances and songs continued day and night.

I made contact with the comrades of the regional committee of the communist youth of Shkodra, and we discussed the tasks facing us at that time, the need for the reorganization of active groups of the communist youth and the mobilization of the entire youth for reconstructing the country, etc.

But, while I had set about this work, only two days after the victory, on December 2, the headquarters of the 3rd Army Corps to which our division was attached notified me I must set out for Tirana where I had to report immediately to the General Headquarters. "Immediately" was relative,

because at that time we had to travel on foot, since all the bridges between Shkodra and Tirana had been blown up by the Germans. It took us three days to get there. I speak in the plural because we were a group of 20-25 partisans from various detachments who travelled together.

Somewhere in the vicinity of Bushat, during a short break, a partisan of mature age said to us:

“Listen, comrades, all through the war we have fought under commanders and commissars. So why are we travelling like an unorganized band of brigands? Suppose we run into a group of bandits. What are we going to do? Who will lead us? So listen to me: from this moment I’ll be your commander, while the commissar...”

He paused for a moment, while he looked us all over and, pointing at me, said: “...will be this young man.”

No one had any objections. The partisan who appointed himself commander was Riza Vehipi, until then deputy-commander of the 6th Shock Brigade. It was the first time we met. When he appointed me commissar, neither he nor I knew that in fact the Party had charged me with such a task. I learnt this when I arrived in Tirana.

The capital of the Homeland which had been liberated about three weeks earlier was bursting with life, and the people looked happy and enthusiastic. The atmosphere of freedom could be felt in every step, in every conversation, in every meeting. As soon as I arrived, I went straight home where my mother, brother and sisters welcomed me with open arms. Then I met my old and new comrades, my childhood friends, those with whom I had

grown up and had gone to school, as well as those I had met in the mountains during the war. I found them in the offices of the Secretariat of the AAYU, of which I too had been elected a member at the Congress of Helmës.

The day after my arrival in Tirana, I reported to General Headquarters as ordered. There they informed me that I was to meet the Commander-in-Chief of the National Liberation Army, Comrade Enver Hoxha, the next day. I was filled with an indescribable joy. That night I scarcely slept a wink, partly from joy, partly from wondering what Comrade Enver Hoxha was going to say to me at that meeting.

At the appointed time, I presented myself at the offices of the Chief Ministry, which were in the building occupied by the Ministry of Industry and Mining today. There I met Comrade Enver. I had not seen him since August 1944, at the time when the Congress of the AAYU was held. He welcomed me cordially with that characteristic smile of his which immediately put one at ease, and he embraced me. He inquired about the comrades, the partisans, the liberation of Shkodra, the people, my impressions from life in the division, the work of the youth, etc. I tried to answer his questions briefly, as best I could.

Then Comrade Enver spoke about the great work that awaited us in connection with the reconstruction of the country devastated by the war, the organization of the state apparatus, the restoration of the economy, the development of education, etc.

“But,” he turned to me suddenly, “you will continue the war!”

And without leaving me time to imagine how I was going to continue this war that had ended, he added:

“The Party has appointed you political commissar of the 5th Division which is now in Kosova.”

For me this was quite unexpected. All through the war I had worked as a youth cadre. Therefore the task of political commissar of the division, which was a task of great responsibility, almost frightened me, both because of my lack of experience and because of my age at that time.

Apparently Comrade Enver guessed my state of mind, although I was speechless and could not say good or bad, yes or no. He added: “The Party is confident that you will perform this task well. The brigades that make up the 5th Division — the 3rd, 5th and 25th — have capable cadres. Rely on the comrades and work with them to ensure that the organizations of the Party and the Youth, the commands and the staffs perform the great mission which has been entrusted to them with honour.”

After this, Comrade Enver explained to me the importance of the decision of the Party to assist in the liberation of the peoples of Yugoslavia too.

“The decision to send two divisions of the National Liberation Army to pursue the German army in Yugoslavia has special political importance,” he said. “In this way we assist the fraternal Yugoslav peoples in their heroic struggle for national liberation. On the other hand, with this act our people show that they are consistent in their anti-fascist war and that they will never cease it until the Hitlerite military machine is finally destroyed.”

By now I had pulled myself together and was listening attentively to the Commander's instructions. They constituted the political and military platform for as long as we would continue the armed struggle beyond the borders of the Homeland.

"At present, the 5th Division is in Kosova and after the liberation of that zone you will continue the war in those directions that will be decided in cooperation with the command of the Yugoslav forces," he instructed me. "In Kosova you must maintain contact with the Kosmet staff and pay attention to relations with the people, our brothers of one blood. As you know, in Kosova, in the past, there was very severe national oppression and exploitation by the Serbian bourgeoisie. This has created distrust between Albanians and Serbs. Reaction, both Ballist and Četnik, has used this against the National Liberation Movement. You must collaborate with the comrades of Kosova and those of the Yugoslav National Liberation Movement so that the situation in Kosova develops normally and our brothers understand that, in the conditions of the people's power which is being set up as a result of the victory over fascism, they will gain all the rights which they were denied in the past."

Enver Hoxha was a true Marxist-Leninist. By ordering the divisions of the Albanian National Liberation Army to continue the war in Yugoslavia, he expressed in deeds the internationalist feelings of our Party. Irrespective of the fact that Albania had been liberated, he regarded the anti-fascist war as not yet over, perceiving it as a common cause of the peoples. Hence, our aid for the libera-

tion of the peoples of Yugoslavia from fascism, our collaboration with the Yugoslav partisan forces to this end, reflected our anti-fascist ideals and the spirit of friendship with the neighbouring peoples.

Likewise, he judged the question of Kosova, too, like a principled communist. There was no undertone of nationalism in his instructions. But certainly he had a profound affection for our brothers of Kosova and a deep desire that, through their war against fascism, they would gain their freedom and realize their aspirations for the elimination of any kind of national oppression and social exploitation.

The partisan forces of the Albanian National Liberation Army fought for almost six months outside our state borders. As is known, the 3rd and 5th Brigades had crossed into Kosova in October 1944, and, in collaboration with the local partisan forces, had taken part in the fighting for the liberation of Prizren and Gjakova, and later of Ferizaj and Drenica. Upon the formation of the 5th Division, the 25th Brigade joined them. The forces of this division fought together with the partisans of Kosova and units of the Yugoslav National Liberation Army for the liberation of the whole of Kosova, Sandžak and southern Bosnia. Thus our partisans fought their way, through battle after battle, to Prishtina and Mitrovica, Novi Pazar and Sjenica, Prijepolje, Nova Varoš and beyond, as far as Višegrad. Meanwhile, the 6th Division, which set out from Shkodra at the beginning of December 1944, pursued the Germans through Montenegro to reach Rudo in southern Bosnia.

In the fighting which our two divisions waged

beyond our borders, more than 600 partisans fell as martyrs. Through the sacrifice of their young lives, with the pure blood they shed, they displayed the internationalist spirit of our people, their love of freedom, their desire for friendship with the Yugoslav peoples, and expressed their resolute anti-fascist sentiments.

The stand of our partisans in the fighting in Yugoslavia was exemplary. The people in Yugoslavia knew the Albanian fighter as heroic and indomitable in fighting the nazis and the Cetniks, correct and kindly with the people, whether the Albanian brothers of Kosova and Montenegro, or the Montenegrins, Serbs and Bosnians. During the whole time they stayed in Yugoslavia, the Albanian partisans, with their correct behaviour and friendly actions, gave nobody cause to catch them in errors or to try, subsequently, to sully their name and accuse them of nationalist, anti-Serb or anti-Yugoslav chauvinist sentiments.

Everywhere our brigades won the love of the people who, for their part, spared nothing to give them generous assistance. Our forces were welcome with special affection in Kosova. Enver Hoxha's instructions and teachings regarding the stand towards the brothers of Kosova and the correct and careful implementation of them yielded fruit. Within a short time, through the work of our forces, together with the local organizations and cadres, thousands of young people from Kosova joined the partisans to continue the fight against the Hitlerites and the Cetniks. More than 2,000 sons of Kosova were incorporated in the brigades of our division. Thousands of others were incorpo-

rated in the Kosova units and those of other divisions of the Yugoslav National Liberation Army.

These are eyewitnessed facts, experienced in the war and sealed with blood. They raise high the name of our Party and are in its honour. They raise high the figure of Enver Hoxha and are in his honour. The stand of the Albanian partisans in Yugoslavia, their heroic struggle and exemplary behaviour are a reflection of the justness and correctness of the directives and the Marxist and internationalist stands of our Party and the Commander-in-Chief of the Albanian National Liberation Army, Comrade Enver Hoxha. They refute the slanders, insinuations and accusations which anti-Albanian chauvinism has made it fashionable to level against our Party and its glorious founder, against socialist Albania and Albanians in general.

During the war and after, our Party, with Enver Hoxha at the head, always pursued a correct Marxist-Leninist line in regard to the national question, just as it has consistently worked to have friendly, good neighbourly relations with Yugoslavia. This is the standpoint from which it has considered the question of Kosova and the Albanians who live on their own lands in Yugoslavia, and it has been guided by these principles in dealing with it.

It is not the aim of these notes to give an exhaustive description of the history of Albanian-Yugoslav relations. However, I am obliged to dwell on them briefly, since the Yugoslav leadership, which is the cause of the failure of these relations to respond to the norms of good neighbourliness, poses as a victim and tries to lay the blame on Albania. According to Belgrade, the Albanian side is

not for normal relations, Albania interferes in the internal affairs of Yugoslavia, for 45 years on end Albania and Enver Hoxha have pursued anti-Yugoslav objectives, a nationalist, chauvinist policy, etc.

The Yugoslav officials turn everything upside down, according to the principle that attack is the best defence. In reality, the source of the unsatisfactory situation in the relations between our two countries is the consistently anti-Albanian policy which Belgrade has pursued systematically towards our country, the paternalist feudal mentality, and the objective of making Albania the 7th Republic of the Yugoslav Federation.

The official circles and the Yugoslav propaganda do not say a single good word about the internationalist struggle which our two divisions waged, shoulder to shoulder with the fraternal Yugoslav peoples, but, on the contrary, for 45 years on end they have tried and are trying to this day to present the issue as though the new Albania is the creation of Yugoslavia, indeed as though it exists simply because of the good will of Belgrade!

They began these endeavours with the thesis that "the Communist Party of Albania was created by two representatives of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia." This is what the Yugoslav officials and propagandists say even today, "forgetting" that the formation of a party of the proletariat requires not a delegate from abroad, but the maturing of objective and subjective internal conditions, the existence of the working class, the spread of revolutionary ideas, given historical circumstances, etc. Of course it would be wrong to say

that the Yugoslavs do not know the laws of social development. Why, then, do they “forget” them when they speak of the Communist Party of Albania?

It is clear that the authors of such claims have other things in mind. By placing this “marker-peg,” by awarding themselves this “merit,” they want to reach the conclusion that “the Yugoslavs organized the National Liberation War in Albania, too,” that “the Albanian leadership did not know how to form battalions and brigades, or how to lead them!” According to this logic of the Yugoslavs, we ought to be grateful to them for the liberation of the Homeland too.

Their aims do not remain within the context of history; they aim further. By presenting the question in this way, the Yugoslav propaganda tries to prove that Albania cannot do without a “tutor,” that it is incapable of self-government, and that therefore it is quite natural, indeed to the benefit of Albania, for it to be included in the Yugoslav Federation as its 7th Republic! These are not hypotheses. There are in existence documents worked out during the war by the Yugoslav leadership, headed by Tito, about these plans. There are also articles and public statements about them by top Yugoslav officials, which anyone can read.

The Titoite emissaries in Albania, with the active assistance of Koçi Xoxe and company, worked with special zeal to accomplish these aims. They tried to subjugate the Party, to attack its correct line and, especially, to get rid of its General Secretary, Comrade Enver Hoxha. In the history of our Party, what took place at the 2nd Plenum at Berat

in October 1944 is well-known. There Koçi Xoxe, Sejfulla Malëshova, Nako Spiru and the Yugoslav delegate launched an open, frontal attack against the line pursued by the Party during the war, presenting it as sometimes sectarian, sometimes opportunist. In fact their real aim with these furious attacks on the line of the Party was to denigrate and condemn the founder and leader of the Party, Enver Hoxha.

However, the plotters did not manage to liquidate the General Secretary. Their “accusations” were unfounded and failed to convince the communists and the masses. At that time most of the country had been liberated. The final assault that was to bring the liberation of the whole of Albania was being prepared. Is it possible that this historic victory, not to mention the establishment of the people’s power everywhere, could have been achieved with an erroneous line? How is it possible that a whole people was aroused and 70,000 partisans followed the Party and Enver Hoxha when the latter allegedly had an erroneous line?

Koçi Xoxe and company and the Yugoslavs made a temporary retreat, but they did not give up their plans. On the contrary, they intensified their work in all directions in order to bring about the “union” of Albania with Yugoslavia, although they saw that this was not easy to do. The main obstacle for them was the Party and Enver Hoxha. Hence, the attack had to be aimed against them. This attack was launched in February 1948 at the 8th Plenum of the Central Committee of the Party. The circumstances in which this Plenum was held are well known. There Koçi Xoxe and the Titoite del-

egates and diplomats who directed him managed to strike a heavy, although only temporary, blow at the Party, to disorient it, to isolate the General Secretary and besmirch various cadres loyal to the Party.

However, the plans of the Yugoslavs and Koçi Xoxe and company to subjugate Albania and unite it with Yugoslavia as its 7th Republic failed. Stalin's letters addressed to the Yugoslav leadership, followed by the Cominform Resolution, also threw light on the vile aims which Belgrade had towards the freedom and independence of Albania. It became clear that Albania was facing a great danger of being gobbled up by Yugoslavia, and that what had looked like incidents, disagreements or chance conflicts were different aspects of this monstrous plan.

The Albanian people, our Party and Enver Hoxha publicly denounced these objectives and resolutely opposed their fulfilment. This is the main reason why the Yugoslav propaganda pours out all its chauvinist venom against Enver Hoxha and his work. Even to this day Belgrade tries to divide our Party and people from Enver Hoxha. But it is gravely mistaken. For our Party and people, Enver Hoxha is a symbol of freedom and independence, national sovereignty and socialism. The road and line of our Party are a road and line inspired by Enver Hoxha.

The Albanian people have always been for friendly, good neighbourly relations with the peoples of Yugoslavia. They have been and are interested that Yugoslavia should be a free and independent country. However, socialist Albania has

no intention of denying its own history and course in order to secure friendly relations and good neighbourliness with the Yugoslavs. We have been and are for mutual respect and non-interference in each other's affairs.

Belgrade also attacks the Party of Labour of Albania and Comrade Enver Hoxha over the question of Kosova and the Albanians who live in Yugoslavia. They call our concern for them, as brothers of the same blood, interference in the internal affairs of Yugoslavia and an attempt to create the so-called "Greater Albania." This has never been a slogan of our Party, and our Party has never used it. Neither "Greater Albania" nor "Small Albania" exist for us, for our Party. For us, the Albanian people, the Albanian nation, the Albanian culture and history exist. The Albanians are an indigenous people, a very ancient people in the Balkans, who live in their own territories on this or that side of the state border of the PSRA.

Our Party has never raised the question of the revision of borders, but has demanded that the Albanians living in Yugoslavia, in the Autonomous Province of Kosova, in Macedonia or in Montenegro, be given the national and civic rights which belong to them, neither more nor less than those which the other peoples of Yugoslavia have.

Formerly, in the years of the Anti-Fascist War, the CP of Yugoslavia had proclaimed the recognized Leninist principle of self-determination up to secession as its line concerning the national question. One need only leaf through the documents of that time to be convinced of this. J.B. Tito, in his article entitled "The National Question of Yugo-

slavia in the Light of the NLM,” published in the magazine *Proleter* at the end of December 1942, said: “The Communist Party of Yugoslavia has not abandoned and never will abandon the principle that every people has the right to self-determination up to secession... The question of Macedonia, the question of Kosova and Metohia, the question of Montenegro, the question of Serbia, the question of Croatia, the question of Slovenia, the question of Bosnia and Herzegovina will be easily solved to the satisfaction of all... And each people earns this right, rifle in hand, in the present National Liberation War.”

Likewise, the letter of the CC of the CPY of March 28, 1944 to the Regional Committee for Kosova and Metohia, regarding the decision of the Bujan Conference, stressed: “...We instruct you how the national question should be handled. First of all, you must understand the decisions of the 2nd meeting of the AVNOJ, and popularize the essence and aim of these decisions more widely. These decisions guarantee all peoples equal rights and make possible the right of self-determination.”

There are many other documents too, just as there are many public statements which affirm this legitimate right of the peoples, by Edvard Kardelj, Moša Pijade, Blagoje Nešković, and others. However, from the end of the war and especially in the first post-liberation years, this stand of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia changed radically. This came about because it linked the solution of the question of Kosova with another plan: the inclusion of Albania in the Yugoslav Federation, as its 7th Republic. The present Yugoslav stand towards

the People's Socialist Republic of Albania and towards the Albanians living in Yugoslavia stems from this about-face of the Yugoslav leadership, its deviation from the Leninist teachings on the national question.

Now Belgrade intends to cut back further even those rights which the Albanians won through the liberation war and which the Constitution of 1974 recognized. And in order to achieve its aims, it is operating on a broad plane. It is even trying to distort and negate the history of the Albanians, which is known worldwide. The Illyrian origin and autochthony of the Albanians upsets Belgrade. It is upset by the Albanian League of Prizren and the Albanians' struggle against the injustices of the Great Powers and the Balkan chauvinist bourgeoisie towards us as a nation. It is upset by the Bujan Conference, at which Albanians, Serbs and Montenegrins jointly decided to step up their struggle against fascism and expressed their aspirations for the future. In conformity with this nihilist line, various circles in Yugoslavia have begun to alter existing documents and concoct history according to their own wishes.

But history and historical documents cannot be altered. They remain as time has fixed them. If the new chauvinists in Serbia or anywhere else want to interpret them as suits their present taste, that is their affair. But it is a foolish and worthless business. Our Party and Enver Hoxha have always stressed that the question of Kosova and the Albanians living in Yugoslavia, the problems that have accumulated there, can and must be solved justly, only through a wise, realistic and objective stand.

The rights which the constitution and the fundamental laws of Yugoslavia recognize for the people of Kosova and other regions must be respected and their legitimate demands must be fulfilled in equality, with understanding and justice. Any other course that disregards the rights of the Albanians, or even worse, opposes them, will get nowhere. It cannot lead to the solution of the problems, but damages the interests of Yugoslavia itself, of the Albanians who live there and of good neighbourliness between our two countries.

**A Close Friend and
A Great Educator
of the Youth**

In the history of our youth, the 1st Congress of the Albanian Anti-fascist Youth Union, which was held in August 1944, is, without doubt, one of the most important events. At that time, the situation was fully in favour of the National Liberation Movement. The historic Congress of Përmet had been held. The second enemy operation, that of June, from which our National Liberation Army emerged stronger and more tempered, had been defeated. Southern Albania, with the exception of some towns, had been liberated. On the orders of the Commander-in-Chief, Comrade Enver Hoxha, the forces of the 1st Division of the National Liberation Army had crossed into Northern Albania. Meanwhile, new brigades were being set up in Southern, Central and Northern Albania. In short, the final battles for the liberation of the Homeland had begun.

The Congress of the AAYU was held at Lirëza Flat, above the village of Helmës in Skrapar. At that time, this small mountain village was also the location of the General Staff of the National Liberation Army.

August 8, the day when the Congress was

opened, dawned fine and sunny. All the preparations had been completed. The Congress "hall" had been fixed up. It was a shelter built of leafy branches from the forest, and, of course, decorated with flags and militant slogans.

Comrade Enver's participation in the Congress was a special joy. We awaited his arrival outside. The enthusiastic cheers of 285 delegates rose to the sky. Then we all entered the "hall" and the proceedings of the meeting began immediately.

A special honour fell to me. The comrades charged me with welcoming our beloved leader and Commander, Comrade Enver Hoxha, on behalf of the Congress. This greeting has been published from the minutes of the meeting, because, at that time, it was not our custom to speak from written notes.

"Comrades," I said, addressing the Commander and the delegates to the Congress with emotion, "in the name of all the delegates who represent the youth of the liberated and unliberated zones and all the detachments of our Army, I welcome to the Congress of the Youth the main leaders of the Communist Party, the army and our new state."

Stormy applause broke out immediately.

"In expressing our heartfelt thanks to them," I continued somewhat more confidently, "let me say that we consider their participation in the Congress a great honour, encouragement and assistance for the younger generation of Albania."

These few words were enough for the delegates to be carried away by the enthusiasm of their age and to cheer loudly for the Party, the Army and the

Commander-in-Chief.

Amidst this enthusiasm, Comrade Enver took the floor. His fiery eloquence, the force of the logic and conviction of the ideas he transmitted gripped all of us delegates. His words penetrated our souls and implanted themselves in our minds because they came from his heart. They gave us a feeling of invincible strength.

After greeting the Congress and the whole Albanian youth, Enver Hoxha congratulated them on their war and heroic deeds. Then he put before us a series of new tasks which had to do with the final triumph of the National Liberation War. And the more we listened to him, the more we were inspired, and our confidence in victory increased.

Comrade Enver instructed us that the unity of young Albanians should be further strengthened in the final battles against fascism and the traitors, that the Congress should be the symbol of fraternization in a sacred common cause of all the youth, without distinction as to political tendencies or region; it should be an expression of the unity of the youth with the people who were fighting, an expression of the loyalty of the youth to the war, to the front, to the Army and to the Anti-fascist National Liberation Committee.

In concluding his speech, he expressed his conviction that, after this historic Congress, the youth would work with even greater force to hasten the great victory over the occupier, and would carry the revolutionary enthusiasm and ideas of the Congress everywhere, in the ranks of the heroic National Liberation Army, in the base areas and in the occupied territory.

Enver Hoxha valued the youth very highly. Immediately after the Communist Party of Albania was founded, he launched the idea of forming the communist organization of the younger generation. The event of November 23, 1941 has its origin in November 8. Comrade Enver called this day of the founding of the Communist Youth of Albania an historic day, not only for the youth but also for our whole people. He engaged concretely in the work for the creation of the youth organization. He greeted the meeting for the founding of the Communist Youth on behalf of the Provisional Central Committee of the Party, and he paid continuous attention to the Communist Youth to ensure that it became a militant organization.

In his book of memoirs, *When the Party Was Born*, Comrade Enver has devoted a whole chapter to the founding of the Communist Youth. There and in every speech and article of his, one can feel his love for the youth, his great belief in the abilities and revolutionary energies of the youth, his special concern that our younger generation should be educated and grow up worthy of the people and the Homeland. In the youth he saw one of the main militant forces, both in the war for the liberation of the Homeland and in the work for the reconstruction of the country, for the realization of all-round revolutionary changes in town and countryside, and the development and advancement of our culture.

At the 1st Congress of the AAYU, the youth pledged that they would always follow the Party and Comrade Enver Hoxha, that they would al-

ways be ready to respond to the call of the Party; that the younger generation would not spare even their lives in the war against the nazi hordes and the local traitors; that they would not lay down their arms until the final victory, until the Albanian people had secured the democratic state, of which they dreamed.

We delegates to the Congress of Helmës rejoice over many things when we call to mind this great event. We remember the enthusiasm of the days of the fruitful proceedings of the Congress, the nights when we sat round fires and sang revolutionary songs, and the life of the young delegates, which was so rich, so beautiful and so pure.

We remember the great friendship which linked us with one another, the determination and the spirit of selflessness, the optimism and the unshakeable faith in victory with which the Party imbued the hearts of the youth. But, above all, we who participated in the Congress of Helmës rejoice over the fact that its historic decisions penetrated so deeply into the consciousness not only of the delegates but also of all our anti-fascist youth, that they rose with new, unprecedented force in the sacred struggle to fulfil their duty to the Homeland with honour. The youth fulfilled the pledge they made to the Party and Comrade Enver.

We, former delegates to the Congress of Helmës, rejoice that the youth today are marching confidently and with determination, following in the footsteps and the glorious traditions of the generations that waged the war and laid the foundations of the new Albania. It is a very good thing that the youth organization devotes importance to

the education of its members with the militant traditions of the people, with the heroic traditions of the National Liberation War, with the teachings and ideas of Enver Hoxha. This has exceptional importance, because it inspires every young man and woman to lead a life that is not petty and mean, but a really great life, full of dignity, which is not measured with personal gain, but with deeds for the benefit of the Homeland and socialism.

The struggle for the new Albania, which began half a century ago, is a struggle which continues today in new ways and forms. Our life will never be like a stagnant swamp, but always like the clear rivers which rush sparkling down from the mountains. Here, in life, in the struggle of today and tomorrow for the cause of socialism and communism, there is always room for new heroism.

In the first days after liberation, Comrade Enver told us:

“Yesterday it was heroic to fight arms in hand to smash the old and lay the foundations of the new. Today it is heroic to build the new, to defend it, to eradicate the backward remnants of the past, to withstand the pressure of the enemy and to master culture.”

Our Party has been and is committed unreservedly to this struggle — that is why the world calls it an “heroic Party.” Our people have followed the Party step by step on this road — that is why we call them an “heroic people.” Our youth have always been in the vanguard to put into practice the word of the Party — that is why they have fully merited the name “heroic youth.”

Today work, lessons, ideological and political

uplift, the defence of the Homeland and the struggle for the triumph of Marxism-Leninism are the arenas in which the new heroes emerge and are tempered. Just as all the major changes that have been and are being made in our country bear the hallmark of the youth and must always do so, so the consciousness of the youth bears and must always bear the hallmark of these revolutionary changes, the hallmark of socialism and communism. The work of Enver Hoxha is the foundation of the revolutionary consciousness of the younger generation.

After the liberation of the country, Comrade Enver Hoxha had countless meetings and talks with the youth, and wrote many things dedicated to them. One idea prevails in all of them: his great confidence in the younger generation, which he called "the right arm of the Party," and his special care for its education, as the generation which represents the future of the nation.

It must be said that never, in any situation, were the Party and Enver Hoxha disappointed by the heroic younger generation of our country. In the years of the war, it was precisely the youth who gave the Party powerful support, who became the mainstay of the Party and Enver. As the most active force of the partisan army, it was the youth who were the first to line up unreservedly on the front of the great battle for life or death with the fascist occupiers and local traitors. In the Party the young men and women of Albania saw their secure and happy future.

After liberation, too, when the reconstruction

of the war-devastated country and the building of the new life began, their emergence again in the forefront of this struggle does credit to the Albanian youth. Those were hard but heroic times. The Party filled the youth with optimism and confidence; it showed them the bright prospects of the future.

The young men and women of the years of reconstruction were armed with the revolutionary enthusiasm of the war and the vigour of their age. They never laid down the rifle, but learned to use the pickaxe and the book with equal skill and mastery in order to draw Albania from poverty to prosperity, from darkness to light, from ignorance onto the road of civilization. Just as they saw in the war their salvation from fascist thraldom, the young people saw in the work for the building of the new Albania the happy future which awaited them. They were convinced that their toil and sweat would not be in vain. This conviction was linked, first of all, with the name of the Party and with the name of its beloved leader and teacher, Enver Hoxha.

The bonds of the younger generation with the Party have been and are as strong as steel. In the Party and in the ideas of Comrade Enver, our youth see their own most ardent ideals and aspirations. That is why the younger generation has always considered the word of the Party as the most sacred thing and why the youth regard the Party as the political force which fully responds to their fundamental interests.

Today the Party and the people are fighting with all their energies to carry forward the socialist

construction and to guarantee the future. It is a joy for the people and a guarantee for the Homeland that the young men and women of Albania, linked with the Party like flesh to bone, comprise the most active and most militant force on every front of these majestic battles. The youth have never allowed the word of the Party to be placed in jeopardy. They work selflessly and untiringly wherever the Homeland summons them, and eagerly assimilate lessons, culture and education in the Party spirit in order to make themselves more and more capable of fulfilling the important role which they have and will always have in the construction of socialism and communism.

Whenever he talked about the youth, Comrade Enver Hoxha spoke with special enthusiasm.

“No one has a youth like ours, unsullied, loyal to the Party, and ready to fight for the cause of the people and socialism,” he declared with deep satisfaction.

His high assessment of them can be seen also in the fact that there is no action of the youth, especially in the first years of the reconstruction and the socialist construction, to which he has not gone to meet the volunteers on the job. Likewise, there is no congress or important meeting of the younger generation in which he has not participated and spoken.

Among my personal impressions of Enver's ties with the youth, I would like to recall some impressions from the 2nd Congress of the AAYU, which was held in Tirana in April 1945. In order to attend it, I came back from Yugoslavia, where the 5th and 6th Divisions of our National Liberation Army

were still deployed.

An atmosphere of exceptional joy was created when Enver Hoxha took the floor. The young people could not contain themselves. The youth were fired with enthusiasm, but Comrade Enver Hoxha set them ablaze with his ardent words and inspiring ideas, when he brought the message of greetings of the Party and the gratitude of the democratic Government and the General Staff of the Army for the sacrifices the youth had made in the war and for the great work they were doing in the reconstruction of the Homeland. He addressed the delegates with these words:

“You, my comrades of the war, who rose one and all, who were in the front ranks, wherever the sacred duty and the honour of the Homeland required...”

The delegates rose to their feet and the cheering for the Democratic Government, for the Party and for the Commander, Comrade Enver Hoxha, went on and on, so that for quite some time he was unable to continue his speech.

At this Congress he described the youth as “torch-bearers of a solid constructive work” and expressed his belief that they would always be in the vanguard, would learn and gain education with great zeal, and would become the steeled defenders of the people’s interests, protecting the people’s state power and implementing its laws.

The main tasks which the Party set for the youth for the building of the new life were not easy: the reconstruction of the war-ravaged country, the protection and consolidation of the new state power, the construction of major projects of the

first plans through labour actions, the struggle against illiteracy, and the education and cultural development of the new man. And just as the youth took up the partisan rifle in the war at the call of the Party, they were the first to set to work in response to Enver's call with that enthusiasm which is expressed so well in a song of those years:

*Come, let us work,
Let's pour out our sweat,
Because we are building
The new Albania!*

The labour actions began. In May 1946, the Party proclaimed the building of the Kukës-Peshkopia motor-road an action of the youth. The first volunteers set out from Korça and Delvina, from Tirana and Durrës, from Shkodra and Kukës, from Elbasan and Berat, from Dropul and Konispol. By the middle of June 1946, more than 2,500 young men and women began the work on this road, which was built without machinery, with picks and shovels only, through very rugged terrain.

Those were difficult times. There were many shortages — shortages of building materials, cement, dynamite and sometimes even bread. Times were difficult also because at that time, armed bands of saboteurs were circulating in those parts. The volunteers of the Kukës-Peshkopia road worked, but also had to set up armed guards to fight off the bandits who tried to intimidate the youth and stop the construction of the road.

I remember one day in September 1946. At that time I was working in the Secretariat of the AAYU.

Wanting information about the state of the work, I tried to contact one leading comrade of the youth action by telephone. From the other end of the line came the calm reply:

“Ring again after two to three hours, because he is out at the moment with a group of volunteers in pursuit of some diversionists who opened fire on the volunteers’ camp last night.”

Those moments of June 1983 when, on Comrade Enver’s instructions, I went to visit some districts of the North, come fresh to my mind. When I returned from my meetings with the people in the districts of Dibra, Kukës and Tropoja, during a conversation about my impressions from this visit, he suddenly asked me:

“Which way did you go to Kukës? Did you see the Road of the Youth?”

“That’s the way I went to Kukës, Comrade Enver,” I told him. “I recalled all those early memories.”

“Very good,” he said. “The first labour actions of the youth cannot be forgotten. They were difficult, but there was plenty of heroism and great beauty in them.”

And, in fact, the actions of the youth in those years became the first school for the communist education and formation of the young people. The participation of the youth in the reconstruction of the Homeland, in the great actions, was the first anvil on which they were tempered to go ahead with determination on the road of the construction of socialism in our country. The actions were the touchstone of their loyalty to the road of the Party and Enver Hoxha.

Action followed action. As soon as the Kukës-Peshkopia road was completed, at the beginning of 1947, the youth began the work to build the first railway from Durrës to Peqin. During 1948, nearly 30,000 young men and women worked on the Tirana-Durrës railway.

Whenever we inaugurate new railway lines, almost invariably I remember the day when the Tirana-Durrës railway was inaugurated in February 1949. It was a special celebration. To mark the occasion, a big rally was organized, with the volunteers and many citizens of Tirana taking part. I delivered the inaugural speech. Then, as usual, the first trip was made. Comrade Enver boarded the train amidst the cheering of the many volunteers who, through their heroic work, linked the capital city with the main seaport of the country by railway.

Comrade Enver highly praised the work of the youth in actions.

One day he said to me: “Actions create conditions for intensive educational work, but they also stimulate the revolutionary fighting spirit of the youth, and exert a positive influence to give them a sound, all-round formation. Actions are especially important for the training of cadres,” he emphasized.

At that time the country was short of cadres in every field. On the Tirana-Durrës railway, we had only two engineers. The greatest burden was shouldered by a few surveyors and the cadres of the youth. Carrying out Comrade Enver Hoxha’s instructions, the actions of the youth became a great source of cadres, especially for the sectors of the

work with the Party and the youth, as well as for construction and land improvement projects, the use of transport, etc.

Our railways are the work of the youth. But the sweat and voluntary work of the younger generation are embodied in many other projects, too — in hydro-power stations, the terraces of Lukova, the construction of major products, etc.

In November 1948, the 1st Congress of the Party, one of the most outstanding events not only of the Party but also of the entire history of our people, was held. It made a detailed analysis of the work of the Party from its creation, and of the victories in the National Liberation War and after the liberation of the country. The shortcomings and mistakes were criticized. The interference and hostile activity of the Yugoslav revisionists and that of Koçi Xoxe and company were exposed. The Congress laid down the orientations and the tasks of the Party for the future.

After 15 days of free debate, which was characterized by a militant spirit and serious criticism and self-criticism, the leading organs of the Party were elected. I was elected a member of the Central Committee of the Party. This was a great honour and trust.

Immediately after the Congress, I was appointed First Secretary of the Central Committee of the youth. In this period my contacts with Comrade Enver became more frequent, providing increased possibilities to learn more and more from him.

I have always worked with special enthusiasm

and satisfaction with the youth and its organization. Of course, this is connected, in the first place, with the fact that the younger generation constitutes the liveliest section of the population, eager for knowledge and culture, uncontaminated and enthusiastic. The youth have a vigorous fighting spirit, a spirit of initiative at work.

As I have mentioned above, the youth have been and are linked with the Party like flesh to the bone. In their time, both Nako Spiru and Koçi Xoxe made attempts to have the youth organization as their reserve against the Party by “pampering” it, encouraging the spirit of “independence” from the Party, etc. But they did not succeed. The younger generation of the new Albania has always seen its life and future in the Party and in its ideals — in the teachings of Comrade Enver Hoxha.

The further inculcation of this spirit, the strengthening of the communist education and of the leading role of the Party in the youth organization, was considered one of the main tasks, especially after the 1st Congress of the Party. We would attain these objectives through work organized in the most varied forms, but especially through mobilizing the youth in the work for the construction of the economic base of socialism. Action is the best method of education. Comrade Enver assisted and encouraged us in this direction.

It is known that during the war and in the first years after liberation there were two youth organizations, the Albanian Communist Youth, which was relatively small, and the Albanian Anti-fascist Youth Union, which was the broad front of the entire youth of the country. These two organizations

had fully justified themselves, especially during the war. After liberation, however, when the building of the new life presented itself as the main task for the whole mass of the youth, when the communist education had to include every young man and woman of the country and when the leading role of the Party had to be exercised directly over the entire youth, the question arose: are two organizations necessary?

Immediately after the 1st Congress of the Party, Comrade Enver put forward the idea of the unification of the two organizations, their amalgamation into one: the Labour Youth Union of Albania, the great, militant organization of the Albanian younger generation, which is formed and educated with the communist spirit. According to his idea, we set to work to carry out this task as well as we could. Of course many problems emerged, but at every step we had the support of Comrade Enver. In this context, I had frequent meetings with him.

At one of these meetings, I reported to him about how the work was going, what the youth thought about the amalgamation of the two organizations into one, etc. I told him about the preparations for the Congress of the Unification of the two youth organizations, and in this connection also about the draft-statute of the Youth Union. When I spoke about our concept of the internal structure of the future organization, he asked me, not without purpose:

“Why do you call the basic units of the youth ‘basic organizations’ instead of groups of youth activists?”

It must be borne in mind that during the war,

especially in the organization of the communist youth, the group of youth activists was the grass-roots organizational unit. The term basic organization was introduced after Liberation (in the Party too).

I tried to explain to Comrade Enver why we had chosen the name “basic organization” for the youth too, saying that this term responded better to the building of the organization according to where the youth worked, studied or lived, and that in the other countries that was what they were called. I mentioned, for example, the Komsomol — the organization of the Soviet youth.

Of course this did not convince him, because in fact I was telling him things which he knew even without my explanation. The question which pre-occupied him was not one of form, not just a matter of the name. He explained:

“The future organization of the youth should not be a narrow, sectarian organization, ‘bound’ by strict organizational rules like those which the Party has and must have, and which it, too, must handle correctly and not in a formal manner. The Komsomol might have such rules, but our conditions are different from those in the Soviet Union. Guard against copying things mechanically, but take what is rational and responds to our requirements from the experience of the work of the Komsomol.”

I must admit that he had hit the mark: at that time there were a number of comrades among the cadres of the youth who, from their lack of experience and knowledge, were inclined to copy the Party, to copy the Komsomol, in the organizational

structure and internal rules of the youth, considering this a positive action.

“In calling the basic unit of the youth a basic organization,” Comrade Enver continued, “there is the danger that you will demand the same discipline as is required of the members of the Party, while the youth ought to be freer from the standpoint of organizational rules. The youth organization is a broad one. Therefore great care must be taken to guard against sectarianism there. One of the reasons why it was decided to unify the two youth organizations is that all the young people can be gathered into this unified organization, and its influence extended to the whole mass of the younger generation. Sectarianism is not in the nature of the youth. They themselves are opposed to it.”

I was in full agreement with this concept of the youth organization and told Comrade Enver that in our practical activity we would bear in mind his advice. But I still did not give up the term “basic organization.” I fired my last shot.

“We call the meeting of cadres of the youth a meeting of the activists, therefore, if we use the same term for the meeting of the grassroots organizations we are afraid we will confuse matters.”

Perhaps this argument was not very convincing either, but Comrade Enver, bearing in mind that the important thing was the concept of the future organization and not the name of its basic unit, agreed.

In September 1949, the Congress of the Unification of the Youth Organizations was held in Shkodra. Today this organization, the Labour

Youth Union of Albania, is a large organization with about 600,000 young people in its ranks. It works and fights with devotion, under the leadership of the Party, and scores successes. This organization with an honoured name responds fully to the requirements, the level and the interests of the youth.

But the leadership of the Youth Union should always bear in mind Comrade Enver's instructions: it must combat sectarianism and narrowness, stimulate the initiative of the youth, support their creative spirit, encourage the advanced, fulfil the requirements of all strata and categories of the youth, think about the political and ideological education of its members and also about their cultural and educational level, and pay attention to sports and physical culture and to cultured rest and recreation for the youth.

Comrade Enver returned again and again to this question of enlivening the creative spirit of the youth. The talks he held at various times with leaders of the youth are valuable orientations for the present and future to preserve the Youth Union as a great active and militant organization, fostering the education and the creative spirit of the youth.

Comrade Enver displayed special care and tact in his work with people, and especially with the young cadres. I shall try to illustrate this with an episode connected with the preparation of the report that was to be submitted to the Congress of Unification of the two youth organizations. When I completed it, I sent a copy to Comrade Enver. I waited impatiently for his reply. It was not delayed.

One of those days, at the beginning of September 1949, he invited me to his house. After we had exchanged the customary greetings, he placed the report I had sent him on the table and began to ask some questions while he turned over the pages. I gave him the answers he sought, but at the same time watched carefully as the pages were turned. I was glad to see that there were only a few corrections and, inwardly, I concluded that he was pleased with the material.

I was sitting beside him at his desk. After hearing my report on how the preparations for the Congress were going, he began to speak about the report. He stressed the importance we should attach to the question of the education of the youth, to raising their educational and cultural level.

“Without education and without culture,” he said, “we cannot go ahead and cannot achieve any radical and successful solutions to our problems. This must be clear to everyone and, in the first place, to the youth, for whom all these efforts are being made. The state entrusts them with important tasks. Therefore the youth must learn as much as they can and as well as they can.”

Comrade Enver spoke about the importance of enhancing the role of the youth in the struggle which the Party was waging for the reconstruction of the country according to the decisions of the 1st Congress of the Party.

“The young people should be in the forefront of the struggle for the building of socialism,” he said to me. “No one understands better than they the need to increase production in the factories, to wipe out the ignorance and backwardness in the

countryside, the need for progress in agriculture. Therefore the youth organization must help every young person to be in the forefront of the struggle for the new life.”

But what remains vivid in my mind are his remarks about the part of the report which dealt with foreign policy. On this question, he demanded that the analysis of the international situation and the duties emerging for the youth in defence of the freedom and independence of the Homeland should bear the hallmark of the age and thinking of the youth. He demanded also that the style of the report should be adapted to the nature and role of the younger generation. All these ideas he explained to me clearly and in a very instructive manner.

When he opened the report at the part dealing with the tasks that emerged for the youth in the international situation of that time, I saw that Comrade Enver had written in red pencil along the margin of one of the pages:

“Suitable for bearded men.”

That was a synthesis of the remarks he made to me. He suggested that reports and speeches should be adapted to the audience to which they are addressed. I kept the report with that note on it. Today it must be in the archives of the Central Committee of the LYUA.

Noticing my embarrassment because of the note that I had seen, Comrade Enver began to mention some of the good points of the report. Of course he did not spare his criticisms, but his tone was very comradely.

“We must speak to the youth in their own lan-

guage,” he said. “This part about the international situation is not bad, but it is not suitable for the youth.”

Naturally I re-wrote that part of the report, but even to this day I have Enver’s criticism ringing in my ears. From that day onward, whenever I have to write for the youth, the first thing that comes to mind is: not the way you write for old men or for diplomats. The youth want a different language. You must speak to them in such a way as to touch their hearts, their feelings. They cannot tolerate the pedantic tone.

Even today there are cases when the youth are spoken to from the position of the schoolmaster — of course, that kind of schoolmaster who has a feeling of false superiority. But we must not behave like pedantic teachers with the youth. Indeed, we must learn from them.

The Party opens the way for the vigour and energies of the youth. The younger generation is forging ahead with a will, holding high the torch of the revolution and fighting heart and soul for the prosperity of the Homeland.

Both in the years of the National Liberation War and continually since liberation, I have seen that Comrade Enver Hoxha considered the work with the youth, the work for its education with the communist ideals and the virtues of socialist morality, a main task for the organizations of the Party. Very often I recall his brilliant assessment and well-known definition: “The youth give life and animation to the Homeland and new blood to the Party.” The relationship Party-Youth-Home-

land could not be expressed better. The Party must view the younger generation with this eye and must proceed from this assessment when it builds its work with the youth.

On the eve of the 5th Party Congress, when Comrade Enver was working out the ideas for the all-round revolutionization of the life of the country, during a meeting with Comrade Hysni and me, he told us:

“The revolutionization of the life of the Party and the state is imperative, a vital question for the fate of socialism. Are we going to safeguard the victories of the revolution or allow them to be eliminated, as is happening in the Soviet Union? We must and we will safeguard them,” he said with determination.

Thus began a lively exchange of opinions about the tasks which emerged for the Party, about the struggle against anything which diminishes the revolutionary spirit, which gives rise to indifference, which inhibits the initiative of the masses, and which damages the links of the masses with the Party and the state, etc.

“For the revolutionization of life in every field, the youth must play a special role,” he said. “The youth must be the assault force, because they are also ardent fighters for the new. They must become a great driving and revolutionizing force in all directions. The active participation of the youth in the mass movement against alien manifestations, against backward customs, against conservatism, etc., will be of exceptional assistance in the education of the youth themselves.”

And it turned out as Enver Hoxha said. The

youth, inspired by the ideas of the Party and Comrade Enver's teachings, placed themselves in the forefront of the revolutionization of the life of the country. The initiative of the youth to step up the struggle against religion and backward customs is especially well known. Also well known are the many actions which burst out in the mid-1960s in the social, economic, ideological and cultural fields, in which the young people of our country were outstanding for their fighting spirit, revolutionary drive, determination and wisdom.

Comrade Enver continually stressed that the youth, as the most active force of society, need to take part actively in revolutionary practice. At the same time, he said, our Party must always keep the communist ideals ablaze in the minds and hearts of the youth. He demanded that the youth must be educated as loyal fighters of the Party, so that they dedicate all their physical and intellectual energies, their talents and their entire lives to the Homeland and the people, to the Party and socialism.

"The man with conviction builds castles," said Enver. "He who has no conviction ruins what he has."

The youth are a great force everywhere in the world. Comrade Enver was firmly convinced of this; therefore he made a high assessment of the youth movement in the years 1967-1968, which had extended to nearly all the countries of Europe and beyond. At that time, our youth were working to build the Rrogozhina-Fier railway. At a meeting with the volunteers on this project, Comrade Enver spoke about the place and the role of our youth and about the student movement which was on the up-

surge in the world. I was present at this meeting and, on June 30, 1968, I made this note:

“The day before yesterday I accompanied Comrade Enver on his visit to the Rrogozhina-Fier railway. He met the volunteers. Then a mass rally was organized at Gradisht where Comrade Enver made a very important speech.

“Of course, the main attention in his speech was focussed on the work and role of our youth, their place, especially at present, in the struggle for the revolutionization of the life of the country. Comrade Enver set major tasks in this direction. But the present student movement in the world also occupied a considerable space in it.

“Comrade Enver made a high assessment of this movement. For some days he has been following the demonstrations of the youth with close attention, seeing in them the revolt which has swept the younger generation in the capitalist and revisionist countries. He has spoken to me about these demonstrations again and again. Regrettably, the working class, especially in the capitalist countries, is standing aloof and is not uniting with the youth. This can be seen in France, in particular.

“Speaking to our youth, in fact, he hailed this democratic and revolutionary movement of the youth the world over, who are fighting for more rights, more freedoms and more democracy, against social and political discrimination by the bourgeoisie and revisionism.

“Comrade Enver’s speech was published in the press. We had it translated into foreign languages in order to distribute it abroad too.

“‘With their actions,’ Enver said, ‘our youth are

not only building important economic objects. Above all, the action serves as a great school for tempering the younger generation, for educating it with correct concepts about work; it serves to instil in the youth the spirit of collectivism, of the struggle to overcome difficulties, of love for one's comrade, pure friendship, and revolutionary determination.'

"The characterization of the Albanian youth which he made in this speech was a scientific synthesis of the road for their revolutionary formation.

"Our youth have not been educated in hot-houses or with mouldy scholastic books,' he said, 'they have been tempered like steel and imbued with an indomitable revolutionary spirit in the heat of stern battles against savage internal and external enemies, in the struggle to overcome the colossal difficulties which stemmed from the profound backwardness we inherited from the anti-popular regimes, in the fierce struggle to smash the hostile imperialist-revisionist blockade which was imposed on our country...' He advised the volunteers: 'The young workers, peasants, and the students must increase their efforts to learn as much as they can, to master culture and science, which are indispensable conditions for the progress of the country. They must learn while working and work while learning.'

"I watched the young people attentively. Their eyes were riveted on Enver and they were absorbing every word he said.

"The preoccupation of our young person, student or intellectual, unlike that of the youth in the countries where the capitalists and the revisionists

hold sway, is not his personal fate, the problem of finding any sort of job in order to earn a living for himself and his family,' he pointed out. 'The young person in our country does not study and fight just "to emerge in the limelight" so as to avoid being oppressed by others, or gobbled up by the big wolves. The ideal of our student or intellectual is not personal security or the gaining of qualifications so he can face the tempests of an oppressive and exploiting society. His ideal is very grand, very militant and very inspiring.

"This year is a stormy year, for our youth too,' Enver went on. 'But whereas the youth in the world are fighting to gain more rights and freedoms, in our country they are erupting in great revolutionary initiatives to carry socialism forward and emancipate our society.

"Before us we see two contrasting worlds and two quite different destinies of the youth,' Comrade Enver declared at the rally.

"Living testimony to this are the powerful student demonstrations which we have seen lately in Europe and the other continents, both in the capitalist countries and in some revisionist countries.'

"And he continued:

"Regardless of what reasons impelled the students to rise in these demonstrations, and they are various — educational, economic, political, ideological, structural, university organization — they have shown that the youth are a courageous, militant force when inspired... Despite the variety of opinions and political views prevailing in their ranks, one thing is plain: they are all attacking the capitalist system. These demonstrations are the

first tests, the beginning of the use of revolutionary violence against the bourgeois-fascist violence.”

I cannot close these notes about the youth without also stressing the fact that Enver Hoxha not only loved and valued the youth, but also resolutely defended them against any attempt to sully or question their very good name. We know now that Mehmet Shehu was a very dangerous enemy hidden in the bosom of the Party. Of course, now we also understand the diabolical aim of his insulting accusations against our youth: to embitter the relations between the youth and the Party. But he was unable to achieve his aim, because the youth have always had a great and unyielding champion in Comrade Enver Hoxha.

This is not just a declaration, but a fact observed in life. By way of illustration, I shall mention just one episode reproduced from the notes I made on the day it occurred, November 7, 1980.

“At today’s meeting Comrade Enver dealt extensively with the problem of the youth, emphasizing the need for greater care for their education and upbringing, and the correct treatment of the younger generation. The discussion was provoked by some ‘complaints’ from Mehmet Shehu about the behaviour of the younger generation. I do not understand why he points out only the negative aspects of the youth. Accusations like ‘the youth are degenerating,’ ‘the youth hanker after extravagant fashion,’ etc., etc. are always on the tip of his tongue.

“In the talk which followed, Comrade Enver openly criticized his opinions.

“The important thing is that the Party must help the youth,’ he said. ‘But I have the impression that in many cases this help is given in formal, bureaucratic ways. But the youth do not accept formalism. They reject anything that smells of formalism. Sometimes it is said that “the youth discuss their worries on the streets and not at the meetings of the organization,”’ Comrade Enver continued. ‘But what is wrong with that? Those who say these things forget that life is broad and deep, that the youth have so many interests that they cannot exhaust them all in an hour and a half at the meeting of the youth organization, which is held once a month. The youth go to meetings of the organization to get an orientation, on the basis of the line of the Party, but not to solve everything.’

“Comrade Enver developed the idea about the many interests of the youth further.

“It is not right to think that when the youth converse in the streets they are talking corruption,’ he went on. ‘When I asked the secretary of the Youth Committee of Tirana about this question, he said that outside the meetings the youth talk about films and books, about the Soviet aggression in Afghanistan, about the war between Iran and Iraq, just as they also talk about their lessons, and, why not, about love too. What harm is there in this? Why are some comrades alarmed about it?!’

“It was clear that his criticism was addressed to Mehmet. Nevertheless, Enver did not content himself with that.

“Turning directly to Mehmet, he continued: ‘It is wrong to lay the blame for every shortcoming we notice on the youth. I say this because I often hear

the youth saddled with the blame for things which are not their responsibility. No, the youth are not to blame for everything. The Party must work better and better with them. But let us be clear that the work of the youth is not assisted by moralizing and by barking orders right and left: "Don't walk here and don't walk there," or "don't do this, don't do that." Distrust does not help to educate the mass of the youth.

"'The youth are the future of the country,' continued Comrade Enver. 'Our young people are honest, patriotic and linked with the Party. Therefore the organizations of the Party and of the youth must devote greater attention to them. The youth organization has a great educational role. Of course, there will be criticism of some young person for his shortcomings or undesirable behaviour, but the educational work must not be reduced simply to continual criticisms. What we must do is to improve the work in order to form a healthy opinion based on our Marxist-Leninist world outlook among the young people.'"

All through his life Enver Hoxha had the youth in his mind and heart.

"We have a youth who are as pure as the air and the crystal waters of the mountain streams," he pointed out in his message of greetings addressed to the former delegates to the Congress of Helmës on August 7, 1984.

The youth of today are the sons and daughters of those who waged the National Liberation War and carried out the reconstruction of the country, those who fulfilled the first five-year plans and laid the foundations of the new Albania. Not only are

they worthy heirs to the majestic work of those heroic men and women, but they are also ardent followers of their revolutionary ideal.

Our Party, our society, our people rejoice and are proud of this. They rejoice over the pure spirit and the healthy character of our youth, their lofty morality and good behaviour, their great attachment to their work, and the cultured life they lead. Love for the Homeland, for the outstanding historical traditions of our people, for their freedom-loving sentiments and indomitable character, respect for the national culture, the mother tongue, the contribution which men of our land have made to Albanian and the European culture are permanent traits of all our youth.

The Party, the youth organization and our whole society will work unsparingly to ensure that our youth will always be pure and militant as Enver Hoxha wanted them, that the patriotic and revolutionary traditions inherited by the youth never become tarnished, that the new virtues of our socialist morality are never violated in any circumstances and that the drive of the youth is never stopped.

Comrade Enver had great faith in and great love for the youth. Likewise, the youth have loved him wholeheartedly and will always retain their undying love for Enver Hoxha and for his monumental work, which will be handed down safely from generation to generation.

On our New School and Its Revolutionization

The progress in the field of the education of the people constitutes one of the most remarkable successes of our socialist order. In four decades we passed from mass illiteracy, which included over 80 per cent of the population, to secondary schooling for all, which now covers almost the entire younger generation. This is extraordinary progress. The inspirer and leader of this major victory is Enver Hoxha.

Only such a man as he, with a sound formation and clear horizon, with unwavering confidence in the future and especially in the people, could foresee such vigorous developments in the field of education and culture at a time when illiteracy was a grave infliction in a country which was waging a desperate struggle to heal the wounds of the war and to overcome the threat of famine and the inherited poverty.

Comrade Enver saw clearly that the country's economy could not be restored and advance unless the educational and cultural level of the entire mass of working people, especially of the younger generation, was raised. Just as the greatest care had to be taken to ensure that the land was worked to

grow food, and factories set up, so, indeed first of all, people's minds had to be cultivated to increase their knowledge and elevate their spiritual world. Enver Hoxha was guided by the Leninist teaching that with illiterate people, without culture and knowledge, there could be no socialism.

Furthermore, he was well aware of the Albanian people's age-old eagerness for the light of knowledge, just as he knew their natural intellect, their aspirations to culture and civilization, their desire to advance alongside more developed peoples and countries. Our people have always considered schooling and knowledge as indispensable for the construction of a new life, for the elimination of the centuries-long backwardness.

Enver Hoxha did not wait long. As soon as the country was liberated, when there were endless shortages and privations, when even textbooks, notebooks and pencils were difficult to procure, he launched the slogan that served as a clarion call: "More bread and more culture for the people." This call aroused the people, especially the youth, to action.

The struggle against illiteracy, the struggle for schooling, to open the people's eyes and arm them with knowledge for the coming battles, was transformed into a mass movement which brought forth its heroes — heroes of struggle and self-sacrifice for the light of knowledge. It was this inspiring call of Enver Hoxha's for more culture which gave courage to the brave young man from Mirdita, the militant teacher Ndrec Ndue Gjoka, to send word to the Commander, as the folk song has it:

Fifty schools in Mirdita I need.

And knowing that Enver Hoxha never separated his ideas of development and progress in any field from the struggle to apply them, the people put into his mouth the immediate reply:

*Bravo, well spoken,
All Mirdita enlighten.*

The eloquent evocation which Enver Hoxha made of the heroic figure of the communist and teacher, Ndreç Ndue Gjoka, at the 2nd Congress of the Party held in March 1952 is well known. Speaking about the difficulties encountered in opening new schools and the struggle against illiteracy, and the great services which teachers render their Homeland and the construction of socialism by teaching the people to read and write, he addressed these moving words, full of respect and honour, to the Congress:

“A communist called Ndreç Ndue Gjoka lived and fought in Mirdita. He was a teacher. He could not endure the oppression and darkness which fascism and Gjon Marka Gjoni imposed on Mirdita. Implementing the directive of the Party, he opened 50 schools as early as December 1944 — immediately after Liberation. It was on his own initiative and with the assistance of Bardhok Biba. Can 50 schools be opened without premises, without pencils, without notebooks, and especially without teachers? Yes, they can. There is no citadel that the communist cannot take. Ndreç Ndue Gjoka, a poor peasant, set up the schools in the peasants’

homes. He himself collected the notebooks and pencils wherever he could, and the main thing, the teachers, he assembled from the former pupils of the Orosh Boarding School. He spoke to them about the need to open schools and he conducted a short pedagogical course with them. And the schools were opened, comrades — 50 schools — which continued to function in this way until the Ministry of Education approved them in 1945. The old pupils of the Orosh Boarding School, who have now become experienced teachers, say proudly: ‘We are the first teachers trained by Ndreç Ndue Gjoka. But our comrade, Ndreç Ndue Gjoka, was murdered by the traitors of Gjon Marka Gjoni in Vorra Pass in 1946, precisely because of this great patriotic deed of his. I invite the Congress to honour the memory of this outstanding communist pioneer of light and education. If everyone were to think and act in this way, the problem of illiteracy would soon be consigned to the archives of the history of the People’s Republic of Albania.’

Enver Hoxha saw in Ndreç Ndue Gjoka an inspiring example, the symbol of a revolutionary ideal, a blazing beacon light. That is why he lauded him in an anthem of well-deserved praise.

The work of the Party for education and knowledge has been heroic. It was so not only from its dimensions, its mass character and the speed at which it was done. It was heroic also because it was carried out in conditions when many people doubted or did not believe it could be done, while others underrated and resisted it. The bandits murdered Ndreç Ndue Gjoka, but they also murdered the Highland Lass because she taught women to

read and write. Meanwhile, Sejfulla Malëshova opposed the policy of the Party, declaring: "An illiterate cannot teach illiterates." "First we must train teachers, then proceed further," etc.

Had our Party retreated in the face of difficulties and heeded the capitulationists, our school would have been very much delayed in tackling its tasks and would have lagged behind life.

Although Enver's call "more culture for the people" seems to be historically linked with the first years of Liberation, it has been a motto for the work of the Party to this day and it will remain so in the future. The Party had always regarded the development of education and culture, science and the arts, the entire spiritual development of our society, as indivisibly linked with its economic and material development.

Under this motto, a profound revolution took place in our life, a revolution which represents the true liberation of man from every outdated thing from the past, the ennoblement of his feelings and thoughts. The ideological and cultural revolution which was masterminded and led by Comrade Enver Hoxha and which the Party, together with the masses, is accomplishing, constitutes one of the most important transformations of the socialist epoch, the basis of the new Albanian civilization, a major force for the all-round emancipation of our society and of the personality of its new man.

The correctness of this far-sighted policy has been proved by life. Without such a policy for the education of the people and the training of the necessary cadres and specialists, our society today would be unable to respond to the major demands

and tasks which have emerged on the agenda. The plans for the economic and cultural development of the country, the technological and technical progress, the all-round advance of the productive forces, would be unimaginable if we did not have that real army of learned people, from qualified workers and peasants to outstanding scientists, which we have today.

Now we can say without the slightest doubt that the toil, sweat and sacrifices of our people, the great expenditure which the opening of schools in even the most remote villages required, constitute one of the most useful investments. The Party and Enver Hoxha have never considered the education of the people merely as an illuminist question, but as a condition for the wholesome development of our society. In our time, the level of material production depends directly on the level of knowledge, education, and qualification of the working masses. In their interaction, they drive one another ahead.

We take pride in our many achievements in various fields of social activity. The “Light of the Party” hydro-power station of Fierza and the “Enver Hoxha” hydro-power station of Koman, the terraces of Lukova and the yields of world levels that are obtained in agriculture with locally produced hybrids, the drilling of deep oil wells, the rational utilization of mines and the production of steel, the results in medicine and the advances in art and literature, etc., etc., are, undoubtedly, the fruit of the self-sacrificing work of our people, of the creative activity of workers, peasants, engineers, various specialists, artists and scientists.

But, at the same time, they are triumphs of the development and progress of our school. These achievements reflect the high level of ideo-scientific preparation of the youth, the elevated level of knowledge provided by our school, and the role it plays in the all-round progress of the country.

I have talked with Comrade Enver about the problems of the development of education and the school on many occasions since the first days of freedom. My work has involved me in these fields, both in the leadership of the youth and later when I was Minister of Education and Culture and in the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Party. In the talks and conversations I have had with him, he spoke repeatedly about the necessity of creating a school with a national physiognomy and scientific content. He insisted most particularly on the issue that the purpose of our school is not merely to provide knowledge and culture, but also to educate the youth as revolutionaries and fighters for the cause of socialism, that its task is not only to give people theoretical knowledge, but also to prepare them for life, with practical habits and lofty moral-political qualities. This he considered a basic issue and a noble function of the school. In order to ensure that this mission is understood, and especially to ensure that it is performed, he demanded that the party organizations stand at the head of the teaching-educational work and that the youth organizations take an active part in it.

In the first years, it happened in practice, and indeed it occasionally happens even today, that some organizations and leaders of the Party at the

base do not concern themselves as much as they should with the problems of the school.

“This weakness must be resolutely combatted,” Enver insisted. “The organizations and cadres of the Party must pay continued attention to the questions of the school. The communists should not hesitate to involve themselves in problems of education on the grounds that they are not specialists in this field. Every communist is a specialist in the line of the Party and its correct implementation.”

I have often heard this orientation from him. He stressed it to me again when I was appointed to work as Minister of Education and Culture.

In June 1955, Comrade Enver summoned me to the premises of the Central Committee for a meeting. It was his practice to inform himself about the state of the work in each sector from the mouth of the person in charge of it, and not simply from written reports. On the other hand, we — with this I mean the leaders of the mass organizations and many other Party and state cadres — had, you might say, become bold and did not hesitate to ask for meetings with him in order to express some idea or ask him for any suggestions about the problems we faced.

Nevertheless, whenever I saw him or heard his voice I felt powerful emotions. This was always so, both at the first meeting I had with him and at the last. I am speaking about the elevated spiritual state that his presence caused in everyone, about the inspiration and enthusiasm which his words aroused, and the satisfaction and confidence gained from talking with him. I always went away feeling heartened and optimistic.

I went to Comrade Enver. He welcomed me, smiling and friendly as usual. First he spoke about the beauty of the work with the youth. Then he said with a smile:

“Today I am going to talk to you about another sector, but I began with the youth because I know it is not easy for you to give it up. It is fine both for those who work with the youth and for the others.”

Then he paused briefly. I did not understand what he was leading up to in this roundabout way.

“You have been working with the youth for a long time,” Enver came to the point. “Therefore the Party thinks you should be transferred to another task. We have decided to propose you as Minister of Education and Culture.”

And without allowing me much time to digest this, he went on:

“Don’t worry, you will still be working with the youth, because education and culture cannot be conceived without the youth.”

Again silence. Then I expressed my doubts whether, not being a real specialist, I would be able to cope with such an important task.

“The Party is convinced that you can,” Enver gave me heart. “You have been working with the youth organization for so many years now. The problems of education and culture are not unknown to you. Then at the ministry there are capable comrades and specialists who will help you.”

He went on to speak about the main tasks facing the school at that time, giving me advice on where I should begin, to which problems I should pay particular attention, how I should conceive and work for the future development of education, and

so on.

“The problems of education and raising the level of our culture have decisive importance for our country,” he stressed. “The construction of socialism requires able cadres and specialists in all fields. Illiteracy is coming to an end, but we must open 7-year schools, secondary schools and even higher schools. We cannot fulfil the needs of the country by training specialists abroad.”

I listened to him attentively to the end, taking notes from time to time.

“We shall have time to talk about this again,” he said before we parted, “but there is one piece of advice I want to give you right now. Collaborate with the comrades and the specialists, and consult their opinion whenever you have to decide anything. Don’t give up the way you worked in the youth organization. Meet and talk with the teachers and also with the pupils, far from officialdom. Study all the time and read as much as you can. In this way it will be easier for you to grasp and solve the most difficult and specific problems of the school and culture.”

In the Ministry of Education and Culture I found good comrades, comrades of the war and the work, some of whom I had known since the years of the people’s revolution. I found outstanding experts who, with their experience, gave me great help in my new work. Among them I would like to recall especially the highly cultured, enthusiastic and competent Kahreman Ylli, Qibrie Ciu, Kadri Baboçi and Kolë Koci, Vangjel Gjikonji, Ahmet Duhaxhiu, and a number of other comrades.

This was the time when the mass struggle on all

fronts against illiteracy was coming to an end. Today the conquest of illiteracy may seem an ordinary thing to some, but it marks one of the great victories of the Party for the emancipation of the man of the new Albania. It can be said that the wiping out of illiteracy completed the first revolution in the field of education and culture. This was an action of the entire people, which began during the National Liberation War and continued for more than a decade after the Liberation of the Homeland. It had to do not only with the teaching of writing and reading, but also with raising the revolutionary consciousness of the people, who had now become masters of the country. If, previously, ignorance was a symbol of our slavery, now culture was an expression of our freedom.

The struggle against illiteracy encountered numerous difficulties. Young people, and men and women of mature age, had to sit at desks in school to learn the alphabet. If you glance over the documents of the first years, the records and especially paysheets, instead of the signatures of the majority of citizens you will find their fingerprints. Step by step, in actions, in work centres, in evening schools, in the army and everywhere, the people learned to write and read. The youth and the women especially distinguished themselves in this great action.

The struggle against illiteracy was accompanied with great efforts to implement the education policy of the new people's power, the purpose of which was to draw all the children into compulsory primary schooling, to spread 7-year schooling widely and gradually extend secondary schooling.

On the eve of the 9th Congress of the Party, in discussing the new developments in the field of education with the comrades, the conclusion was reached that now the conditions have been created for most pupils who complete their 8-year schooling to go straight on to secondary schools. No one spoke about compulsory secondary education, but only about more rapid extension of it. Automatically, I recalled the wearying toil, the great efforts that the teachers and the state organs made three decades earlier to draw into the elementary schools all those whom “the law compelled.”

Today the demand has been entirely reversed: the state and our society no longer have to compel the youth by law to attend school. On the contrary, the state is faced with the increased demands of the youth and the people for more education and knowledge, for more schools.

But let us return to two or three decades ago. Although the struggle against illiteracy was still going on, the Party was looking further ahead. At the same time, work was going on for the development of higher education. We had already set up the Higher Pedagogical Institute, the Higher Agricultural Institute, the Polytechnical Institute, the Economic Institute, the Medical Institute, and some others. Thus, the tasks in the field of education were being accomplished on all fronts, not according to the “classical” order, by waiting for the creation of the optimal conditions to pass from one level to the next. The spirit of attack has always been part of the style of the work of our Party and Enver Hoxha.

During the whole period that I worked at the

Ministry of Education, and at all other times, I have been witness to Enver's unremitting concern for education and for our new school, which was developing and forming its socialist features. He inquired about the curricula and textbooks and displayed concern for the teachers and their living conditions, but he showed particular concern for the pupils. He insisted that even such small villages as Bradvica in the Korça district, or Klisyra in Tropoja, which had no more than 3-4 children of school age, should have schools.

The founding of the University was a dream dear to the heart of Comrade Enver. For many years before it was founded, he never missed an opportunity to speak about it. With this he was not expressing simply a respect for knowledge. Comrade Enver proceeded from the idea that culture and education precede the development of our society and enhance its productive and intellectual potential.

“Study the question of founding the University,” he said to me in a meeting I had with him at the beginning of 1956. “Now all sectors of the economy and culture are forging ahead and are developing rapidly. It is essential that we speed up the training of cadres. Cadres are needed everywhere. But that is not the only reason. The University will be an important cultural centre, a great intellectual centre, where various sciences will be studied for the benefit of the progress of the Homeland.”

When he talked about such questions of the future, Comrade Enver transmitted his enthusiasm,

and he himself became inspired. He did not stop at the University, but became carried away with his passion for science, publications, laboratories and study institutes in which the sons and daughters of the people would put all their knowledge in the service of socialism. In conversations about the school, he almost always went beyond the narrow limits of the theme and looked ahead far into the future. And he spoke about it with great confidence and absolute conviction.

“Of course the question of ensuring the necessary cadres is important and cannot be solved easily,” he told me during a conversation after I had spoken of the difficulties we were encountering on this matter. “How are we tackling this question of cadres in the institutes we have today, in that of agriculture, engineering or the pedagogical institute?” he said as though to himself. “Just as we boldly entrusted young cadres with the task of teaching in these institutes, so we must trust others to do it in the University. Now, at first, we won’t have cadres with high scientific titles, but we will soon get them.”

Enver Hoxha had great faith in the young cadres. He supported them and encouraged us, too, to charge them with responsibilities, because, as he said, in their daily work, in clashes with difficulties, they would acquire the necessary qualities.

Although optimistic by nature, Enver did not fall prey to euphoria. At the end of that meeting, during which he had spoken for nearly an hour about the need to speed up the opening of the University, he did not forget to point out to me:

“Don’t think that on the first day the lectures

will be brilliant, that the students will have all the textbooks in their hands and that the laboratories will be complete. First, we must make a start. Then all these matters will be put in order in the course of the work.”

Enver's ideas were welcomed with great joy by my comrades at the ministry and some specialists with whom we exchanged our first ideas. It was precisely this encouragement of Enver's that made us unafraid of the difficulties to overcome the various obstacles that emerged.

The University of Tirana, the first Albanian university in history, was founded in October 1957. Comrade Enver Hoxha himself took part in the opening ceremony. It was a great joy for all, for the students and teachers, for the entire people. Enver rejoiced too, for he was the inspirer of this great deed of the Party.

The creation of the University was a decision of historic importance, not just because it fulfilled an ardent dream of several generations of Albanians, beginning from the men of our Renaissance, but above all because it became the nursery for the training of the higher cadres that the country needed, because it became the greatest pedagogical, scientific and cultural centre in Albania.

Within a short period the University has become a school of great authority which has created its own history and traditions. Last year we celebrated the 30th anniversary of its creation. In these three decades the faculties of the University and other higher schools have turned out about 70,000 cadres of different specialties who are coping ably with the tasks of socialist construction in all fields.

Without the army of higher cadres and specialists, qualified workers and learned people trained in our schools, it would have been impossible to apply the principle of self-reliance. To have to beg for cadres and expect to get every design from abroad, to seek experts and ideas on everything, means dependence no less than to be short of food, electric energy or spare parts for machinery. Hence, the Party's decision to set up the University also had strategic importance. This guaranteed the training within the country of the higher cadres and specialists so necessary for the socialist construction. In this way another solid foundation was laid to ensure the independence of the Homeland.

Comrade Enver's links with the University of Tirana were intensive. He spoke about the University on scores of occasions, even before it was founded; he had frequent meetings and exchanges of letters with the scientists and teachers.

In the sad days of April 1985, when the Plenum of the Central Committee was to take decisions to perpetuate the memory of Comrade Enver, we brought to mind all the major projects of Albania. Among them we chose the University to bear his name. This honour befitted the University, its teachers, and the student youth. In taking this decision, we took into account Enver's great love of science, knowledge and culture, of which the University is a centre.

On the day when the ceremony was held to give the University of Tirana the name of Comrade Enver, I told the students and teachers that the honour which the Party conferred upon them was, at the same time, a major obligation for them, the

Party and the youth organization. To merit the name of Enver Hoxha, students and teachers together must boldly carry forward the teaching and scientific process and enhance its quality, raising the prestige of our University ever higher.

Comrade Enver Hoxha was the person most disposed, most willing and most courageous for the development of the school, culture and science. He understood, better than anyone else, that the development and progress of the country, the present and future of the Homeland, could not do without culture and knowledge, intelligence and ability.

In June 1982, the measures that had to be taken in regard to raising the quality of the work in the school were discussed in the Political Bureau. Before that meeting I exchanged some ideas with Comrade Enver. Here I shall summarize his ideas in order to show that he saw the tasks of the school in constant increase, in conformity with the requirements of the country's development.

"Now the moment has come when the greatest importance must be given to the quality of the teaching," Comrade Enver told me. "The material presented to us says that the overloading of pupils and students must be avoided. That is right. But this must not be taken as meaning that this is done to lighten their workload. On the contrary, unnecessary and superfluous things must be considered as overloading, but these should be replaced by true scientific knowledge."

Not only in this instance but in general, Enver was able to anticipate the negative consequences that this or that orientation might have, along with

its undeniable values.

“We must insist,” he pointed out during this talk, “that production should guide the school, in the sense that the formation of pupils and students should respond to the level of contemporary technique and technology, the requirements of industry, agriculture, etc. The essence of the matter,” he went on with his reasoning, “is that the school should keep ahead of the all-round development of the country. It should inspire and mould the students so that they can cope with the future development.”

Comrade Enver gave very great importance to relations between teachers and pupils, and to the problems of the democratization of life in the school in general. He frequently dwelt on this important problem.

I was with him at the 40th anniversary of the Qemal Stafa General Secondary School of Tirana in December 1965. Both of us had many memories of this hotbed of revolution. For a short time Comrade Enver had been a teacher there, a professor, as we called our teachers then, and I had been a pupil. Unfortunately, I did not happen to be a pupil in that school at the time Enver was there. However, the pupils of the senior classes talked about him, especially about the comradely spirit in which he communicated with them, the sense of justice which characterized him and the culture that distinguished him.

As is common knowledge, in 1965, the period which in the history of our Party has been called the period of the all-round revolutionization of the life of the country, had commenced. The school

was one of the first links which had to be included in this process. In this context, Comrade Enver's visit to the Qemal Stafa General Secondary School was not accidental.

The bulk of the speech which he made there was devoted precisely to the meaning of the revolutionization of the school. This had to include the establishment of comradely relations between teachers and pupils, the struggle against false authority and tutelage on the part of the teachers, the further strengthening of conscious discipline and encouragement of the pupils' desire to learn more.

His words were very warm, sincere and inspiring. His speech took the form of a quiet, intimate talk, in which the great ideo-pedagogical ideas were combined with reminiscences of the time when Enver himself was a teacher. In his speech he expressed the honour and respect which the Party and he himself nurtured for the teachers, these militants of knowledge and culture, the zealous educators of the younger generation with the teachings of the Party.

Although the ideas which Comrade Enver expounded in his meeting with the pupils and teachers of the Qemal Stafa School have been published and are well-known to the masses of our people, I consider it in order to recall some of them, not merely for the sake of history, but for the value they have today as very useful orientations for the progress of the school.

"The revolutionization of our life, hence, also of the school, cannot be achieved by sticking to traditionalism and remaining slaves to inherited schemes," he said in essence. "The revolutioniza-

tion of the school needs creative thinking. It must be accomplished according to the principles of the new socialist pedagogy, that is, in struggle against anything alien to our Marxist-Leninist ideology, in struggle against outdated mentalities.

“Don’t take me amiss if some of the matters I am going to present differ somewhat from the norms of classical pedagogy,” he began, addressing the teachers of the school. And then he came straight to the point. “You, comrade teachers, must handle the youth with special care and the most advanced revolutionary methods. You should neither overstrain them, nor allow them to become lazy, but should temper them every day with the Marxist-Leninist norms.”

Enver was concerned to ensure that the younger generation would grow up strong and indomitable in character.

“The youth must be brought up to be courageous and to have initiative. They must have fertile minds and not be automatons,” he pointed out. “The boy and girl must be able to make judgments, to reason and to express opinions freely, to make proposals about any problem, not just in the youth organization, but everywhere.”

These ideas of Comrade Enver’s have special importance at any time and not only for the school. They reflect the role of the teachers and the great aim of our school, which should train people who not only master the sciences but, above all, are conscious fighters for the cause of socialism, citizens who are concerned to ensure that the work proceeds well, interested in the development and progress of the country in all directions.

In this meeting Enver laid special stress on the democratization of the relations between teachers and pupils. He regarded this process as the most effective weapon against bureaucratic methods.

“Bureaucratization,” he said, “is a dreadful disease, which, expressed on paper in regulations and curricula, has tied the hands of our teachers and professors to the extent that they can do nothing on their own initiative. For your part, comrade teachers,” he instructed, “you should seek the best methods, eliminate feelings of bureaucracy, scholasticism and superiority from your thinking and working practice.”

The development of our school has gone through several phases, not only in the quantitative sense, but also in the qualitative sense. Radical changes have been made in the content of the school, in the curriculum, the textbooks and also in its structure on several occasions. It must be said that Comrade Enver was directly involved in every one of these changes. This was so with the first educational reform immediately after Liberation in 1946, again in 1960, when the linking of lessons with productive work presented itself as a pressing problem, and again in the further revolutionization of the school, which began in 1968 and which also constitutes the most thorough reform and includes our entire school system, the whole teaching-educational process.

In working out the orientations for the 1968 reform, Comrade Enver proceeded from the idea that the problem of the school is one of the key questions of the development and progress of the coun-

try. At the same time, he considered this question as one of the important factors for the consolidation of the revolution and the uninterrupted strengthening of the revolutionary spirit and ideas.

In a meeting we had in February 1968, he told me: "Education in our country has undoubtedly advanced at a rapid pace. However, considering the progress made in other fields and bearing in mind the needs of the country, we should regard the school as a powerful weapon that should help us carry the entire process of our development further forward. We should take every good aspect of it and benefit from the experience to date, but we should also take innovative steps to ensure that the school responds to the requirements of the socialist construction, the needs of the economy and our society."

I listened to Enver attentively, because in such talks, which we held sometimes in his office, sometimes in mine, and sometimes while we were strolling around his house, he liked to be "prodged" with some query, some supplementary information or opinion. This helped him to work out the ideas he had.

"The thinking of the Party, its ideas," Comrade Enver went on, "must guide every field of social activity, production and culture. Therefore, the teaching of Marxism-Leninism at school must be strengthened. The school is not only a centre of knowledge, a place where only theory is taught. It should also train the pupils as good workers, capable of serving wherever the country needs them, and as defenders of its freedom and independence."

In the course of this talk he also stressed the well-known thesis that the Marxist-Leninist ideology of the Party should run like a red thread through the entire teaching and educational process at school.

Comrade Enver put forward these ideas in concrete form when he presented the platform for the further revolutionization of our socialist school, the basis for which, as is known, was his historic speech of March 7, 1968. In that speech, Comrade Enver analysed the role our school has played at different stages in the country's development and stressed the need for the radical improvement of all aspects of education.

It should be borne in mind that the demand for the revolutionization of the school was a constituent part of the struggle that the Party was waging on a broad front for the revolutionization of the whole life of the country. If bureaucracy and routine, traditionalism and stagnation in other fields of social activity had to be combatted, above all they had to be combatted in the schools because regulations and norms were canonized there more than anywhere else, but also because our entire youth pass through and are trained in the schools.

In his speech, Comrade Enver raised issues concerning the further development of the new socialist pedagogy, the building of a school system which would include all the working people and enable the youth to assimilate that knowledge which would serve them in their work and life. He devoted his main attention to questions related to the content of the school, the ideo-political education of the youth with the teachings of Marxism-Lenin-

ism. He defined clearly that the aim of the school is to train people with adequate knowledge so that they can serve the socialist construction and be politically and physically ready to defend the Homeland.

In the years when the Party undertook the great action for the further revolutionization of the school, Comrade Enver's commitment to it was of vital importance, very active, extremely concrete and instructive. As we all know, the idea about the revolutionization of the school occupied an important place in the 5th Congress of the Party, held in November 1966. Then the work for its concretization, the discussions, the search for ways to solve the problems we faced, began.

However, the old, with its inertia, was still strong. Neither the Ministry of Education and Culture, nor the specialists who assisted it, were hitting the mark. But it must be said that neither was it easy for us, the comrades of the Central Committee and the Government, whom the Party had charged with guiding education, to determine the key aspects from which the problem had to be tackled.

Precisely in these circumstances, the meeting of the Political Bureau of March 7, 1968, given over entirely to this problem, was held. The Ministry of Education and Culture had presented the respective report, in which to some extent the work done up till that time was reflected. But it lacked the necessary depth precisely on the fundamental issues. The contributions to the discussion in the Political Bureau enriched the report and made it more concrete. But still the way out from a kind of somewhat

traditional “vicious circle” was not being clearly charted.

At the end of the meeting, Comrade Enver took the floor. The impression his speech made remains clear and fresh in my mind today. Right from the outset it electrified everybody present at the meeting.

Comrade Enver’s vision of the question was very wide-ranging, theoretical and practical, historical and actual, national and international, scientific-pedagogical and ideological. All of us sat tense, absorbing his ideas about the development of education in conformity with the stage of the country’s overall development, about the most fundamental thing of all in the work of the school, the Marxist-Leninist ideological axis that must pervade the entire teaching-educational process, about the attitude towards our cultural heritage, about its reflection in the teaching programs of the respective subjects, about textbooks and teaching methods, etc.

His long speech, with which all of us are familiar, came to an end. Following a period of extremely concentrated attention, the faces of all of us were smiling, happy and optimistic. The Political Bureau unanimously decided that this speech should be the platform of the Party for the further revolutionization of the school, that it should be published immediately in all the organs of the press, and that a broad popular discussion should be organized on the basis of it.

This was truly a popular plebiscite. The questions I mentioned and others deriving from them were discussed in detail for about a year and a half.

Comrade Enver followed this discussion with special interest and commitment, received information and gave opinions, and spoke again in public, especially at the Party Conference of Tirana in 1968. The Political Bureau, likewise, discussed these problems several times.

In October 1968, I went to Comrade Enver's office to report to him on what had emerged from the popular discussion on the revolutionization of the school, a thing which I did regularly. In this meeting he took the opportunity to re-emphasize the ideas of his speech of March in a concise, concrete way and the tasks for the future.

“With the educational reform, we must solve the question of educating the youth with the teachings of Marxism-Leninism,” he said. “This subject should be studied as a separate science at school, but also through all the other subjects. All the subjects taught should be linked closely with Marxism-Leninism as their main ideological axis.”

Precisely in this talk, Comrade Enver insisted that productive labour should be introduced into the school as a revolutionizing factor, but also as a way to temper the school youth ideologically.

“The third basic element of the further revolutionization of the school,” he pointed out, “has to do with the training of the school youth in an organized way for the defence of the country.”

On this basis, following the broad popular discussion, the Plenum of the CC of the Party on education, which was held in June 1969, took its well-known decisions.

The revolutionization of the school is not something that belongs to the past. It is a continuous

process and includes the entire educational activity of the country. Comrade Enver's ideas on this question, which are among the most important of the ideological and cultural revolution that is taking place in our country, remain fully valid today. Time does not diminish their value. Now, when decisive steps are being taken towards compulsory secondary schooling for all, these ideas must be carried further ahead. The educational reform, which was inspired by Comrade Enver and can be described as the all-round transformation of the school, should never stand still. Raising the quality of the teaching work implies the continuous democratization of the school, the increased participation of society in the solution of its problems, enhancing the active role of pupils and students in the pedagogical activity, etc. The Party raised these problems once again at its 9th Congress.

Although our socialist pedagogy has been consolidated and the process of the revolutionization of the school is continuing successfully, democracy in the school has not yet overcome and left behind certain limitations. Therefore, much remains to be done. The proper relations between the teaching-pedagogical personnel and the youth organization have not been fully established in practice and in concept. Both the teachers and the youth organizations have a lot to do to achieve this.

Not infrequently, the activity of the youth organizations is restricted by interference from several directions. Consequently, in many instances, instead of persuasion we have orders; instead of sound reason, we have pedantry; instead of faith in the ability of the youth to act on their own, distrust

and prejudices. On the other hand, there are young people who, in the name of respect for the teacher or pedagogue, but also under the pressure of narrow interests, lapse into passivity and accept a bureaucratic and boring tutelage by the teachers.

Of course, these are not simple matters. On the contrary, they are very complex. They have to do with the tradition, the level of ideo-pedagogical emancipation of the school and the teachers, as well as with the weaknesses of the youth organization itself. Therefore, this struggle must be waged on a broad front, under the leadership of the organizations of the Party.

Enver Hoxha, with his dialectical spirit, grasped the acute problems facing our school and our scientific pedagogical thinking, and raised them at the proper time. At the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s, when our people's education in general had solved or had embarked on the road to solution of many weighty problems of our quantitative development in this field, he seized the moment and was the first to come out with the demand that it was high time to put more stress on the all-round qualitative strengthening of the school, on the scientific-pedagogical modernization of its entire teaching-educational process. He also linked this need with today's scientific-technical revolution and with the rapid acceleration of the increase of social information.

Not only as a leader of the Party and the state, but also as a man with a broad scientific and cultural horizon, Enver Hoxha raised the issues which derive from this on the pedagogical and didactic plane too. His recommendations on the organiza-

tion and selection of the scientific information given at school, on the continuous renewal, updating and enrichment of the knowledge provided in the textbooks, without creating overloading, according to the different links and categories of school and the capacity of the pupils to assimilate this knowledge, are well known.

Our school is working hard to solve these problems. Guidance from the teachings of Enver Hoxha is a fundamental guarantee that they will be solved correctly.

More Culture for the People

Comrade Enver Hoxha had a scientific concept of culture and its role in the transformation of society. In his writings and works on this subject, the passion of the patriot, characteristic of the works of the men of our Renaissance, is blended with the strict and unerring logic of the rigorous Marxist scholar.

In all his work for the advancement of the Homeland, Comrade Enver was guided by the principle that culture is freedom, the reign of truth, assurance in resolving situations, emancipation and civilization. When he spoke about culture he was, you might say, completely in his element. On this subject his oratory was more brilliant than in any other instance, and his thinking reached the greatest profundity.

The development of culture was one of Comrade Enver's permanent preoccupations. With culture he understood not only schooling, but also science, knowledge, art, people's behaviour and their way of life. And of course, the way they work. "Our whole life is and should be culture" — that was his motto. Proceeding from this concept, a series of important changes have been made in all our social

and cultural activity.

Enver Hoxha devoted himself to the development of culture, with all his passion, with all his strength and energy. If you leaf through the press, from the first post-liberation years until the last moments of his life, you will see that there is no marked event connected with culture and science, art and literature, in which he has not taken part.

In working for a rapid development of culture, Comrade Enver proceeded from the fact that our people have been illiterate, but not ignorant. Indeed, without any exaggeration, the vitality of their culture is unrivalled. Since antiquity, our people have had to do battle with the greatest powers of the times. Therefore their culture has been formed in uninterrupted struggle. If this culture was not assimilated and did not lose its national originality in the course of this struggle, this is evidence of its broad base among the people and its unbreakable resistance. In historical relations and contacts with the Hellenic culture, the monopoly culture of the world of antiquity, faced with the Roman, Slav and Ottoman cultural invasions and the aggression of decadent art today, the Albanian culture could not have survived through elements of self-preservation alone without an internal creative force.

As a result of the bitter historical circumstances of our people, their rich culture remained mainly oral until modern times. Their cultivated professional creativeness, with a few exceptions, has developed since the beginning of the National Renaissance. The Albanian national school is also more or less the same age. Despite these privations, however, our people have been neither igno-

rant, nor savages, as their enemies have labelled them. As Comrade Enver said in his message of Greetings on the 40th Anniversary of the Liberation of the Homeland, history shows that the Albanians have never been barbarians in their relations with other peoples. On the contrary, when the blind savagery of invaders has assailed them, they have had culture on their side.

The National Liberation War opened the way for the all-round progress and development of culture in all fields. But, above all, the war laid the basis to endow it with new qualities, mainly in regard to its content. Comrade Enver fought persistently to spread culture widely and make it the property of the people, to strengthen its national character, to consolidate the finest values of the cultural legacy and, at the same time, to place them in the service of socialism and the interests of the people.

Enver Hoxha had a very broad concept of the progressive and civilizing mission of culture and considered it one of the most effective weapons to carry forward the revolution and socialism. He had complete confidence that the great plans of the Party for the cultural development of the country would be accomplished. Nevertheless, in the early years of the new life, the question was inevitable: Where should we begin?! How could the people acquire culture when the absolute majority of them were illiterate? As we said, in the field of written culture, almost nothing had been inherited. A simple arithmetical calculation shows that in 1938 there was one book printed for each twenty people. There was not even one professional troupe for the

theatre, for music or for any other artistic activity. In a word, the material and organizational basis for a cultivated culture was virtually non-existent. Even the occasional talent that emerged in those years found no support from the regimes of that time.

This was the basis from which we started. Imagine what courage it took in those conditions to demand that culture should be spread with priority among the broad masses. Let us not forget, also, that Comrade Enver launched the monumental slogan of more culture for the people in the program of the first Democratic Government of the PR of Albania, in March 1946, at a time when Koçi Xoxe and his clique equated intellectuals with intellectualism and, even worse, with reaction, and when they were working to sabotage the plans of the Party for the uplift of the people's culture. Culture frightened Koçi Xoxe, just as it frightens all those who, instead of freedom, have tyranny in their hearts and instead of the thirst for knowledge, sinister evil designs.

In such a turbulent time, Enver Hoxha was oriented towards culture and challenged the bitter heritage of the past, just as he challenged the obstacles raised by our enemies.

Albanian Marxist aesthetic thinking owes much to Enver Hoxha's great contribution. And not only aesthetic thinking, but also criticism and serious studies on art. He has contributed a great deal to this specific field of human activity. The affirmation in theory and practice of the principles of the method of socialist realism itself, as a school, as a

general guide and orientation for creative work, in the conditions of the burgeoning of modernism and general decadence of aesthetic values, is dedicated first of all to his Marxist thinking.

In our country, in the decades of free socialist life, major results have been achieved in all fields of literature and art, as well as in cinematography, which has made a great stride forward. Today we are one of the most productive countries as regards the number of films per capita.

Raising the quality of literature and art has now emerged as a priority and has become a pressing task. The accumulations up to now are sufficient to reach greater heights. Waiting is no longer in order. Even if gaining experience is still necessary, it can be achieved without stopping or slowing down the literary process. Accumulation and artistic production should go hand in hand. Otherwise both are inhibited. These tasks, which the Party has raised forcefully in recent times, serve the perfecting of our new culture. But without Enver Hoxha's constant dedication to its ceaseless development, they would not have emerged on the order of the day for a long time yet.

In regard to the writers and artists, right from the outset Comrade Enver directed the Party to apply a genuine Leninist policy. It was he who made the true assessment of the cultural heritage of the past, rising against the nihilist spirit which the enemies expressed towards it.

In the early years after Liberation, there was a somewhat narrow concept about the cultural traditions. There were signs that these traditions were underrated even by some artists, while Koçi Xoxe

and his ilk, consistent in their stand against the intelligentsia, openly denigrated the traditions, describing them as anachronisms. As a consequence, erroneous interpretations and barren discussions about outstanding historic figures appeared here and there in the press.

During the war, a good number of writers in our country, especially the generation of the 1930s, linked themselves with the Party and Enver Hoxha. After the war, even those who stood aloof temporarily or withdrew to positions of passivity were treated with patience and kindness to the end. With the passage of time, practically all the progressive creative artists embraced the revolutionary ideas of our Party and the method of socialist realism. Enver Hoxha has the main merit for this. He approached the writers individually and communicated with them in a comradely spirit.

The method of socialist realism and its principles were not imposed on the writers and artists. The one stage prepared and brought the other. The Party and Enver gave the writers and artists the revolutionary ideal, which became a universal spirit of their creativeness. In this way their talents and gifts were not wasted in all sorts of experiments, but were placed in the service of the revolution.

In many instances, Comrade Enver's intervention saved the situation, in the fullest sense, for the development of literature and art on the right road. One such case was, as I said, his defence of the national traditions, at a time when they were proclaimed outdated, and indeed obstacles to the pro-

gress of art.

Complicated situations were created on other occasions too. Early in the 1960s, in the literary press and in discussions, a broad debate flared up about the method and style of writing, which in fact reflected some alien concepts instigated by external and internal enemies under the label of the so-called “conflict of generations.” The traditional writers and artists, if we may call them so, accused the new literary generation of damaging poetry by disregarding its classical rules of rhyme, rhythm, length of line, etc. The latter, for their part, accused the established writers of being conservative and of suppressing the creativeness of young writers through the key positions they held in the publishing houses. The danger in this debate lay more in the fact that both sides engaged in the discussion with excessive heat and passion, with exaggerated praise for the eight-syllable verse and total negation of free verse, or vice-versa.

Although it seemed in many cases as if the “quarrel” was inspired by personal motives, the danger was great, because this situation not only led to the waste of creative forces, but also threatened to bring about a split. In these conditions, in July 1961, a broad meeting of the writers and artists was organized to clear up the situation. Comrade Enver Hoxha took part in this meeting, which was convened in the lecture hall of the University of Tirana. I delivered the report.

In the report, I devoted special attention to the question of the content of literature and art, in order to point out that it was this and not the style and form of writing which should engage our main

attention. There I emphasized the need for a healthy creative atmosphere in the ranks of the writers, a spirit of collaboration and exchange of experience among them, arguing that in our country there are not and can be no contradictions among generations. I reminded them tactfully to avoid offending either side, that just as Naim or Mjeda had shone with their metered verse, so De Rada or Migjeni had shone with their unrhymed verse. The fundamental thing is that any kind of verse should be used with skill. Misuse, imitation and snobbishness do great harm to poetry.

“Affirm yourselves with your own kind of verse and, if the people love you, and like you, you are on the right road,” I advised the writers, once again stressing that content is primary in literature, as in everything else.

At this meeting, the writers expressed their ideas freely, whether right or wrong. The meeting did not last long. Comrade Enver spoke too. With his warm and wise words, he created such an atmosphere that they left the meeting spiritually relieved, but also inspired. He showed them the course that our artists should pursue to overcome the erroneous concepts and alien influences, whether old or new, conservative or liberal. And the fact is that from that time on, collaboration and understanding was re-established and has prevailed in the ranks of our artists.

I was especially impressed by the fact that, although the meeting was a fiery one, with impassioned discussions, sometimes from one-sided positions, and in some cases from wrong positions, Comrade Enver began his speech not with reprimand.

mands, as some might have expected, but with an astonishing warmth and kindness:

“In this meeting it is difficult to distinguish who holds and who does not hold the Party card,” he said. “This comes about because we, the Party and the people together, have not only liberated the Homeland and are building socialism, but have also created a steel moral-political unity, which cannot be achieved with propaganda or words, but only with deeds... In our country, just as the Party members speak with love of their Party, so do the people, who are not Party members, because they all have a boundless love for it, for everything it has done and is doing for the people. You cannot speak in such a way if you don’t feel what you say.”

Thus, he put foremost the question of unity, the basic issue which unites the writers and artists, the political motive before which all other considerations take second place.

Enver always distinguished and underlined what unites our people, not what divides them. While I was preparing for this meeting, he advised me, too, to take care that the phenomena that were criticized were not exaggerated unduly. Proceeding from these instructions, I pointed out that the “contradictions” were assuming an antagonistic appearance not because of any difference in political attitudes, but because of one-sidedness and the dialectic of the emergence of the new, which presses forward with birth pangs and difficulties.

Comrade Enver’s emphasis of this aspect, the calm, the balance, the comradely spirit and kindness which pervaded his speech, were a lesson for everyone.

“When I was listening to the contributions of some comrades, to tell the truth, there was one thing I did not like: it emerged as if the question is one of the ‘young’ and the ‘old,’” he said. “I think that the question of the division between the ‘young’ and the ‘old’ is not a problem here. The young people, with their dynamism and liveliness, do well to shake up us older ones. We should be grateful to them for this. The dynamism of the young comrades is a great treasure for the Party and our people. You, young comrades, must know that the older comrades, too, have gone through these phases which you are going through now. Therefore I will never believe that the older writers and artists want to impede the younger ones in their creativeness, but since they themselves have travelled these paths earlier, they are afraid that in your great enthusiasm you might skid off the road. But I am confident that our writers and artists, young and old, will never skid off the great road, the method of socialist realism.”

As I listened to Comrade Enver’s speech, it was quite obvious that he had followed the contributions of the comrades very attentively. From time to time he referred to what one or the other had said. The leader of the Party did not content himself simply with explaining the political line on literature and art. He also dealt competently with questions which had to do with their further development.

“Whether he writes poetry with eight, ten or twelve syllable lines, with free verses or with rhymes, this is up to the author,” he said. “But first of all he must consider what the people will say,

what the working class and peasantry will say, how the broad public will receive his work. This has great importance.”

The writers and artists emerged from this meeting with clear ideas about their mission, able to cope with new tasks. The years that followed were years of rich creativeness, years of the final affirmation of a new pleiad of artists.

The 15th Plenum of the Central Committee of the Party, held in October 1965, constitutes one of the most important moments when Enver Hoxha's aesthetic thinking was manifested with special depth. This time, too, being in charge of the ideological questions in the Party, I presented the report to the Plenum. It has been included in the Principal Documents of the Party and has been published in that collection.

Comrade Enver gave attention to this report during the process of its preparation. In general he liked to discuss, to exchange opinions about the questions which should be dealt with. He did not attach importance to schematic theses, which determined the structure of the report. He concentrated on the range of problems, on what would be said about this and that phenomenon, on the conclusions which should be drawn, and the tasks which should be put forward. He sought the opinion of the comrades on these things and spoke about them himself. That is how we worked together for the preparation of the report to the 15th Plenum too. Of course, he read the report afterwards, before it was discussed in the Political Bureau and submitted to the Plenum. As was his cus-

tom, he did not withhold his remarks and suggestions until the meeting, but put them to me beforehand, during the discussions we had together.

Therefore, in practice, in the report which I delivered to the Plenum, Comrade Enver's thought was present too. Nevertheless, at the end of the meeting, he put the stress on some basic questions. He began his speech with his characteristic modesty:

"I was of two minds whether or not to speak in this meeting," he said to those present at the Plenum, to which many writers and artists had been invited. And he continued: "What I am going to say will not have any more special importance than what you said."

In fact, however, in this well-known speech, which has been printed and reprinted several times, he dealt with a series of very important problems of the field of culture, such as the need for creative artists to link themselves with the people, with life; the need to know the time and history, and to conceive them in unity; the need for artistic skill, etc. But he attached special importance to problems of the role and priceless values of folk creativeness.

Folklore was always a special passion of Enver's. He took every opportunity to exalt the values of the art of the people. In his speech to the 15th Plenum, however, he synthesized the teachings of our Party on this important sphere of the spiritual activity of the masses, in a way that has rarely been equalled.

"Folklore is not only folk music," he said in his speech. "Music is one expression or manifestation

of folklore. Folklore is the fundamental element of the popular culture, which covers a very wide range, as wide as the life of the people.”

His very simple but profound definition that folklore is the song, the *lahuta*, the flute, the drum; that neither the folk tales, the weddings, joys, sorrows, the multi-coloured costumes, nor the popular handicrafts can be divorced from folklore, from the popular culture as a whole, any more than the customs, the written and unwritten laws, etc., etc., can be divorced from it, is well known. Comrade Enver proceeded precisely from this comprehensive concept of folklore and popular culture when he expressed such admiration and veneration for their never-ending wealth.

If even today we refer to the materials of the 15th Plenum, especially on questions of the national character in literature and the arts, realism in the reflection of life, the attitude towards world culture and experience, and towards alien modernist influences, this speaks not only of their current value, but also of the foresight of Enver Hoxha's thinking.

In his work, Enver Hoxha has given a scientific definition of the relationship between the traditional and the new, establishing a stable and dynamic equilibrium between them which excludes both conservatism or petrification and formalist experiments, both banal folklorism and the cosmopolitan spirit in artistic works. He analysed this relationship not only in theory or in its general aspects, but also in each genre of creativeness, in a series of speeches, and with exceptional power of thought in the speech delivered to the 15th Ple-

num. In this speech, precise criteria are established for the selection of the artistic creativeness of the past and of the world. The publishing houses of the country have worked successfully and continue to do so to this day on the basis of these criteria.

Enver Hoxha's aesthetic thinking, his concept of culture, literature and the arts, developed and evolved in step with the course of the creative processes. The literary-artistic practice impelled him to meditate, to formulate new ideas and directives, to guide the development of these fields on the right road.

Everybody remembers the unhealthy situation which appeared in literature and the arts early in the 1970s. In these spheres there emerged modernist imitations in music, especially in the 11th Radio and TV Song Festival, naturalist experiments in prose and a kind of abstrusiveness in the existentialist spirit in poetry. Of course, these were mostly attempts by snobs, frequently untalented, who, wanting to pass themselves off as innovators, borrowed forms and means from the modernist schools and trends which were more "avant-garde" and, consequently, less known among us.

The Party's concern over the negative phenomena in literature and art was increasing, and we discussed this several times with Comrade Enver. I can say that the materials of the 4th Plenum of the Central Committee of the Party, held in 1973, were prepared over a long period, hammered out in daily debates and discussions about the alien influences which were taking root in the fields of literature and the arts.

The alien manifestations which showed up in these fields, the spread of extravagant fashions among some young people, the encouragement of a liberal, dissipated way of life devoid of ideals, were part of a diversionist plan inspired by external and internal enemies against the Party and our socialist country. It is not accidental that precisely at that time the conspiratorial groups of Beqir Balluku and company in the army, and Abdyl Këllezi and others in the economy, were activated one after the other. The counter-revolution also had need for the ideological and cultural diversion, at the head of which emerged Fadil Paçrami and Todi Lubonja with some collaborators and sycophants.

When the fierce conflict with the putschists in the army or with the enemies and saboteurs in the economy broke out, we faced a fundamental question: could socialism be built, and could the Homeland be defended with our own forces, or must we hold out our hand to foreigners, hitch ourselves to the superpowers and pin our hopes on them and their strength? Similarly, when the ideological struggle in the field of artistic creativeness and culture in general erupted, we faced the question: should we rely on the people, on their art, on our own culture, on Marxist-Leninist ideas, or should we blindly imitate the world, become slaves to modernism and cosmopolitanism? It is clear that the Party and our people did not enter the road of betrayal, but united firmly around the Central Committee, with Comrade Enver Hoxha at the head, and defeated the enemy plots and sabotage.

The 4th Plenum of the Central Committee was made essential by the sharpening of the class strug-

gle in literature and the arts. It became urgently necessary to summon the Plenum in order to smash the attempts of the front of enemies, who aimed their attack precisely at the revolutionary essence of the arts, their proletarian partisanship, to alienate the creative arts from the people and to damage their content. That was the time when the bourgeois and revisionist aesthetics raised the value of the ugly, the primitive and the denigration of the beautiful to a principle. The anti-heroism which swept like a polar wind through the art of the Soviet Union and other countries was, in fact, rejection of the aesthetic Marxist concept of the majestic and the beautiful.

In the speech that Comrade Enver delivered at the 4th Plenum of the Central Committee, so well known to all, he not only gave the solution to a given situation, but also highlighted the prospect of the fruitful development of literature and art, cultural life and educational work. These teachings remain valuable and instructive for today and for the future. In essence, they are based on such cardinal questions of the theory of art as the relationships between the national and the foreign, between partisanship and freedom of creation, between form and content, etc.

Comrade Enver's speech at the 4th Plenum dispelled the fog and put an end to the empty theories about the new and innovative, about the contradictions and the handling of them, about the modern and about a series of other questions. He eliminated the confusion and clarified in theory and practice the concept of proletarian partisanship and the method of socialist realism. The radiation

of his teachings has been and is very widespread.

In these notes I consider it necessary to dwell a little more extensively on Comrade Enver Hoxha's attitude towards the cultural values of the past, especially those of world culture. While combatting alien ideological influences in the field of culture, literature and the arts, he was an ardent partisan of positive values of the whole cultural heritage, of knowing and using them to enhance the intellectual formation of people. He saw this problem from the standpoint of a Marxist dialectician, in the spirit of the known Leninist treatment.

Enver Hoxha was an indomitable fighter not only against cosmopolitanism, but also against xenophobia. This was inherent in his formation. A man of such broad culture and learning as Enver could not allow the isolation of the people from the most outstanding achievements of world culture and science of all times.

Comrade Enver gave the youth very valuable advice about how they should acquaint themselves with the most renowned representatives of our national and world culture and science. Time after time he referred to various scholars and thinkers, celebrated writers, musicians and others, and recommended to the youth that they should become acquainted with their deeds and lives.

It was precisely his knowledge and mastery of a broad culture which helped Enver Hoxha to be critical of the ideological, scientific and artistic limitations of representatives of the culture of the past, even those of the greatest renown, and which equipped him with the intuition necessary to distinguish and condemn anti-culture.

With his wide-ranging erudition and the unquenchable passion and thirst for knowledge which characterized him, he often immersed himself in “his own forest” of books, delving into the concrete phenomena of art and science, which might seem like details, without forgetting to link them with our work and tasks.

I have kept a significant note, which I made after a talk in which he referred once again to the question of the importance of culture.

On October 27, 1982, I made this note: “Today, in the meeting which I had with Comrade Enver, he spoke at length about the need for our people to work to acquire as much culture as possible.

“Comrade Enver said: ‘It is necessary that the Party members should understand that the work and directives of the Party must be explained as fully as possible, not only from the ideological and political aspects, but also with technical and scientific data, with the present and past historical circumstances, with the developments in the world that surrounds us, etc. This requires culture.’

“As often happened in these cases, the conversation went on to literature, translations, and the knowledge which the publishers and editors should possess.

“‘World literature is a treasure which has been created in the course of historical epochs,’ Comrade Enver emphasized. ‘That is why some of it is not suited to our requirements and tastes. But in its own time, each great work influenced the development of society. Thus, in France, for instance, after the classical theatre, the romantic theatre, which was more vivid and revolutionary, was born. When

Hugo's *Hernani* was performed in Paris for the first time, it caused a major controversy, indeed led to exchanges of blows between romanticists and classicists. This event is known as the "Fight of *Hernani*." Thus, a major split occurred. Similar things have occurred in the musical world too. There was a time when Bellini's music was no longer accepted because it was sentimental. But then came Verdi, whose compositions helped to rouse the Italian people against the Austrian occupiers. His opera *Nabuco* had a pathos which was different from Bellini's melodies. Development has proceeded in this way. So the past should not be lumped into one and discarded lightly, saying "all this is worthless." No. Each work must be analysed carefully, bearing in mind the period in which it was created.'

"Naturally,' Comrade Enver concluded, 'we cannot pretend that every Party member should know all these things from history. But every cadre, every specialist must go deeply into his own field and have competent knowledge about the problems that emerge. For this they must work uninterruptedly.'"

Comrade Enver was the mastermind and inspirer not only of the general line of the cultural and artistic development of the country, but also of the creation of central cultural and artistic institutions.

I was the Minister of Education and Culture when, during a meeting with him at the beginning of 1956, he charged me to explore the possibilities of setting up a national folk song and dance troupe.

Such a thing might have seemed premature to many at that time.

In fact, not only the lack of artistic forces, but also the shortage of material means impeded the setting up of the national network of cultural institutions. Large initial expenditure and by no means small state subsidies were needed. The financial possibilities of the state at that time were limited. This is so true that when the staffing levels for the Folk Song and Dance Ensemble were being prepared, the comrades of the Ministry of Finances, who were extremely strict about administrative expenditure, insisted that some singers and dancers should perform as both, as required. Of course, this sounds ridiculous today, but anyway, it shows how the economic straits at that time led to such “brain-waves!”

Nevertheless, according to Comrade Enver’s idea and on his insistence, in 1957 the Folk Song and Dance Ensemble was established as a separate institution.

His interest in the cultural and artistic institutions and the works of art was systematic. When the feature film *Skanderbeg* was released, he deemed it reasonable to write the article about the screening of it with his own hand. By participating in the ceremony of the establishment of cultural institutions and by writing about them over his own signature, in fact, he increased their importance and value in the eyes of the people.

Science was one of Comrade Enver’s great passions. He had profound knowledge of historical developments and their tendencies in modern times

in many fields of learning. His all-round erudition was not merely a veneer, but an effective weapon which never missed the mark. The bulletins of new books, in Albanian and in foreign languages, would be found in almost every instance on his desk, in his office or at home. In them he searched for knowledge, his indispensable mental and spiritual nourishment, and he chose and ordered the publications he needed.

Anyone who has had occasion to see Enver's personal library in his home has certainly been amazed. It contains tens of thousands of volumes, including, apart from philosophical and artistic publications, many purely scientific books, biographies of distinguished people, books of history, monographs about historical movements and epochs, various encyclopedias, studies on the evolution of sciences, especially of new disciplines, etc.

Although he worked with books for many hours every day, he had the great ability that he never reasoned in a bookish manner. On the contrary, the more he read and studied, the more his logic of life was strengthened. Marx's adage "Books are my slaves" fits Enver to a T.

Comrade Enver valued knowledge and science very highly, just as he valued men of learning and scientists. He was concerned that the younger people should learn from our distinguished men, and that the experience of the more learned people should be transmitted to those with less experience. In connection with this, there is a very instructive conversation which he had with me shortly after the creation of the Academy of Sci-

ences. He had summoned me to his office to inform him about the work that was being done for the organization on sound foundations of this very important institution that had just been created. But almost unnoticed, the conversation changed direction:

“Whenever our great scholars are mentioned, whenever we speak of Professor Cabej, Buda and other senior scientific cadres,” he said, “I feel I want to ask, perhaps for the umpteenth time, whether we have assigned young cadres to work with them, diligent people with perspective, who should collaborate with them and be able to benefit from the great culture they possess.”

I informed him briefly of what we had done about attaching young cadres to these scholars, pointing out that this work was still unsatisfactory.

“You need someone with a tape recorder trailing behind Aleks Buda, Cabej and some others,” he continued. “People have different methods of work. For example, there are some to whom writing comes more easily and there are others who write less, but are unsparing in expressing their opinions, expressing the knowledge they have accumulated by word of mouth. Young cadres of his profile must be attached to Aleks Buda, so that they benefit from him on every question about which he is competent and ready to speak to them for one, two or even three hours at a stretch.”

On many occasions I have remembered this ordinary conversation with Comrade Enver. I remembered it especially on the eve of the 5th Plenum of the CC of the Party, held in March 1988, which was devoted to the problems of culture. It

was precisely this instruction of his which impelled me to speak about the need for a systematic struggle against the levelling of personalities and against the “equalization” of creative values in literary criticism.

Enver regarded the scholars and the scientists as his close advisers, the aides of the Party. If we leaf through the press or his *Works*, or merely the volumes of correspondence *Yours, Enver*, it will be seen that his dialogue with the scholars went on uninterruptedly. He followed the process of the scientific activity of the country and of every personality individually. He always advised us younger comrades:

“Culture is gained in two ways: through study and from books, and through direct consultations with scholars, with wise men. Both ways must be used. The latter must not be underestimated, because it is a very fruitful way to obtain synthesized knowledge.”

Comrade Enver attached great importance to the study of the phenomena of production and culture, and to the scientific treatment of them. He insisted that studies and scientific analyses should be made of everything — the economy, trade, admissions to the Party and the development of education. There is no planning without studies and there is no development without science — this is a statement we have heard many times from his mouth. This led to the Party’s thinking being always clear, accurate and inspiring. He stressed continually that science must keep ahead of future developments.

“World science has advanced and we must as-

simulate its results,” he said in connection with this during one of our meetings, on April 14, 1982. “But for this to be done, for its achievements to be applied, we need passionate people who love progress, who understand and master science. This requires that our cadres and specialists should use their brains and be creative in their work. But preparations are needed too; for the school, the task emerges that it must work for the future. Application is not a mechanical process. It is creation in itself.”

I remember this conversation, especially when the role of science in the development of production is mentioned. Comrade Enver put forward, as requirements of the day for our school and science, issues which were to emerge for the economy much later.

“Irrespective of the fact that someone may not be a specialist, say in electronics,” he said in the conversation I mentioned above,” if he is interested in it, if he studies and carefully follows every result achieved in this field, he will become a cadre with extensive knowledge.”

And he himself was an example of how, through persistent work, without being a geologist, an economist, an architect or an engineer, when necessary he could express competent opinions about these fields.

“In our country,” I said at that meeting, “there are sciences or branches of science with which we are not well-acquainted at present. There are others the application of which could be considered premature. But I think we should master these sciences, and should train specialists in them, because

we will need them in the future.”

“That is essential,” said Comrade Enver. “But at the same time, we must urge all our cadres to acquaint themselves with the new developments of science and urge them to study. They must browse in the libraries and reflect on what they read. The specialist, the engineer, the economist and others should sacrifice their sleep for these questions and should work with passion, because without passion no progress can be made in science.”

In Enver’s treatment of science, his concept of the technical-scientific revolution has special importance to us as a guide. He has spoken about this question at length, dealing with all its dimensions, and I am not exaggerating when I say that he has dealt with it exhaustively. His definition of the technical-scientific revolution as part of the socialist revolution, as a permanent transformation which the masses accomplish, and his opposition to opportunist theoreticians of the Eurocommunist type over the “new role” of the technological revolution, etc., are well known.

I shall not dwell at length on this point because his materials on this subject have been published. Here I shall mention only one conversation that took place on the eve of the 8th Plenum of the Central Committee of the Party, which was held in June 1980 and which, as is known, was devoted to science. This was one of many joint consultations over the preparation of the materials for this plenum. I shall present his words and ideas from some notes which I took that day:

“‘We must understand thoroughly,’ Comrade

Enver said to me, ‘that the technical-scientific revolution means the application in a revolutionary way of technical experience, based solidly on scientific knowledge. The technical-scientific revolution must be understood profoundly. It involves many problems, not only in breadth but also in depth. Each problem in itself is not inexhaustible, but it cannot be solved at one stroke either. Dialectics tells us that improvement leads to improvement, also reveals a failure and leads to an experience. Therefore, when we speak of the technical-scientific revolution, we should not skim over problems, but must seek solutions to them.’

“Comrade Enver links everything with man, with the people. Science to increase production, to improve the well-being of the people — that was the essence of his talk.

“‘The technical-scientific revolution should be understood in its ideological essence,’ he told me, drawing attention to how this question should be dealt with in the report on which I was working. ‘Capitalism promotes the technical-scientific revolution in order to intensify the work, to squeeze one section of the working class harder and throw the rest out in the street. In our country, things are different. Even if machinery makes the labour force of one enterprise redundant, on a country-wide scale that labour force will never be redundant.’

“Comrade Enver emphasized that the technical-scientific revolution in socialism does not imply unemployment, but precludes it, that progress must include the equipment and the people simultaneously. He regarded the technical-scientific rev-

olution as one of the main ways for the liberation of the working people from the burden of physical toil and for narrowing the distinctions between physical work and intellectual work.

“When we speak of the productivity of labour, which is directly connected with the technical-scientific revolution,’ I have noted his words, ‘we must bear in mind that this will create possibilities for us to give the worker more time to rest. We must not forget the human aspect, which is not taken into account properly by everybody. I am told that in some collectives they go to excess by overburdening the workers, apart from their work, with meeting after meeting. Even on Sundays the workers are asked to do voluntary work. This is not permissible. Voluntary work is necessary, but it must not be overdone, not the same person every week. We must increase the productivity, but this should be achieved by mechanizing the work, by improving the working conditions and means.’”

In practice, the fundamental theses and arguments not only of the 8th Plenum of the Central Committee of the Party, but also of every other important meeting of the Party have emerged in such conversations, in the free exchange of opinions with the comrades.

The technical-scientific revolution is a process which brings about profound changes in the life of society, in the development of the economy and culture. But, as Comrade Enver pointed out, in practice it happens that no distinction is made between pure science and a minor technological improvement. Naturally we need the two, both pure science and any technological and technical im-

provement, however small. But pure science is not some commonplace thing. It is a high-level synthesis of long experimentation which opens broad vistas to knowledge and application for today and for the future.

The advice Enver Hoxha gave our people, wherever they work, that they should have a proper appreciation both of pure scientific work and of work of the application of science in practice, remains fully valid. Experiments in the mines, in agriculture and in laboratories are the origin of scientific syntheses which carry science forward.

Enver Hoxha fought with knowledge and wisdom to bring people and science together. He armed them with confidence to embark on this road. Science is a social phenomenon, just as art, literature, etc., are. Science has its roots in the social, political, economic and ideological soil. It was born in a given historical epoch, and its development and application are conditioned also by the character of the social order, he underlined.

Comrade Enver especially stressed the emancipating role of science. Science, he declared, develops thinking and frees it from the shackles of idealism, prejudices and religious mysticism. It discovers and elaborates the best and most rational methods of thinking and action. By developing science, by transforming nature and society, man also changes and develops himself. The more rapidly science advances, the more it goes ahead, the further darkness and mysticism will be left behind and the more rapidly they will disappear.

As I have pointed out, Comrade Enver was

closely linked with science and its new developments. Among the different disciplines, however, the Albanological sciences, as we have become accustomed to call them, were, you might say, the closest to his heart. His concrete instructions about the historical, linguistic, archaeological and ethnographic sciences, about advancing step by step to throw light on the past, proceeding from the known to the unknown, have been of very great value. He never confused his desires with the possibilities. On more than one occasion he showed an interest in illuminating the Pelasgic or Etruscan problems with scientific methods. Nevertheless, he was objective in his judgement and stressed that before orienting studies on antiquity towards this problem, we must fully clarify the main problems of the Illyrian-Albanian connection. You cannot pretend to explain one unknown by means of another which is in the course of becoming known.

This orientation, in fact, has served as a line for the scientific workers and the institutions engaged in this field. They have not been diverted to side-issues, to questions of the Etruscans, the problems of the Pelasgic and pre-Pelasgic culture or the circle of enigmas of the Mediterranean civilization, etc.

The volumes of Comrade Enver Hoxha's *Works* include a series of pure scientific historical studies, although they are presented as articles, speeches, memoirs, and historical and political notes. They constitute complete syntheses and models of the concrete application of strictly scientific methodology and methods in his analyses of revolutionary movements, historical figures, interstate relations,

the role of religion and the values of ancient philosophers, the different periods of the history of our people, etc. Among them we can mention "The Uprising of the Peasantry of Central Albania, led by Haxhi Qamili," "About the Men of the Renaissance," "Rising Above Old Animosities," "A Little History," "On the Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Joseph Stalin," and many more. It is a fact that the movement of the peasants of Central Albania has taken the place it deserves in Albanian historiography solely due to the direct intervention of Comrade Enver Hoxha, without whose contribution it would have remained, perhaps for a long time, if not denigrated, at least obscure and befogged.

Comrade Enver Hoxha's *Works* include many materials on science as a system of theoretical generalizations and knowledge of the laws of development of nature and society, as a special field of creative social activity in various branches of knowledge. Some of them have an orienting character and serve the enrichment of the cultural policy of the Party. But, as I said, there are also many materials which have the character of studies and treatises with full professional competence.

Comrade Enver's passion for the Albanological sciences is explained not only with his patriotism, but also with his profound knowledge in this field. I have had opportunity to discuss this problem with him on scores of occasions, especially when history had to be defended against the distortions of enemies.

"Bourgeois historiography and different chauvinists," he told me, "attack our past and the his-

toric figures of our people, declaring them 'antiquated idols' with the aim of cooling the youth towards them. With this, in fact they want to deny our history, to arrogate to themselves the right to predetermine the end of us, because as is known, a people without a history has no future."

He insisted that powerful feelings and passions about our antiquity and the biography of earlier generations should be fostered in the younger generations.

"In my opinion," he said at a meeting of the Secretariat of the CC of the Party, "in the meetings of the youth, after the problems of work have been discussed it is good to speak about our traditions, about history and archaeology, and even about the folk arts of carving or embroidery."

At this meeting, Comrade Enver spoke with enthusiasm about the achievements of our science, especially about the Illyrian-Albanian continuity and the autochthony of our people.

When he returned to Tirana after his visits to Gjirokastra and Saranda in March 1978, he spoke at length to Hysni, Hekuran, Prokop and me about the vivid impressions he had gained and the pleasure he had had among the people. He spoke about the great optimism of the people and the results those two districts had achieved in their work, and expressed some opinions about what could be done for their further progress in the field of the economy and that of culture. Then he dwelt on the visit he had made to Butrint.

"I gave the comrades some advice on how they should study antiquity," he said, turning to me. "Good work has been done there in Butrint, but

more can be done.”

When the daily meeting of the Secretariat of the Central Committee was over, I asked to see the complete notes the comrades had taken on the visit to Butrint and read them carefully. There were numerous instructions and orders:

“You, scientists and archaeologists,” Comrade Enver had instructed the scientific workers present at the ancient city, “must make accurate studies. What is Illyrian is Illyrian; what is Roman or Greek is Roman and Greek. Our culture has its own specific features and occupies an honoured place among the ancient cultures of the peoples. Therefore it is necessary to make studies, to excavate the territory inch by inch, to make comparisons and draw conclusions about which of the values belong to our ancient culture and which are borrowings, and so on.”

Before leaving the ancient city of Butrint, Comrade Enver advised the specialists:

“You must make greater efforts and must study in order to bring to light these treasures, which reveal the culture of our country and which others have wanted to conceal from us, to deny us, to damage and steal from us.”

All Comrade Enver’s thinking on science is pervaded by the idea of the irreplaceable role of science as a motive force to carry forward not only knowledge and culture, but also production and the economy. Indeed, the latter is first and foremost. Knowledge which does not help to increase the material blessings and raise the well-being of the people had no value in his eyes.

He saw another aspect of the usefulness of sci-

ence too. Once during a conversation, precisely in the meeting with the leading cadres of the Academy of Sciences, which had just been formed, I said to him, mainly to encourage the scientists:

“Scientists are also capable organizers.”

He seized on this and continued:

“Undoubtedly that is so. Because what is organization? Organization is knowledge, culture, knowledge of the general laws of the processes of work and social psychology.”

Comrade Enver’s thinking about knowledge and men of knowledge has been collected and arranged in the book *About Science*, but speaking figuratively, this title could be applied to all the volumes of his *Works*. As he himself said, the Marxist ideology is true science. In this sense, the value of Enver’s all-sided theoretical thinking lies precisely in its scientific character, in its synthesizing and generalizing force.

**A Great Patriot and
Ardent Internationalist**

Enver Hoxha's theoretical thinking and political and social activity are very rich and extend over a wide range in all fields of life. But if we were to distinguish one sphere in which he has shown special permanent interest, this, without doubt, is the sphere of international affairs: the foreign policy of the Party, the international relations of our state, the problems of present-day world development and the struggle against modern revisionism. This has been the main field of my collaboration with Comrade Enver. There was hardly a day when we did not discuss foreign affairs and the events that occurred in the world, especially those connected with our country.

Comrade Enver was always well-informed about everything related to foreign policy. He read many books which had to do with the history of international relations and international law, as well as with the development of events in the regions and "hotspots" of the world. He paid close attention to the foreign press, the official statements of various personalities and the commentaries of the main news agencies. He listened to political broadcasts on radio and television, kept himself in touch

each day with the reports from our embassies and the information from the Foreign Ministry, studied various materials and reports on the international communist movement, etc.

Enver Hoxha sympathized sincerely with the peoples and the revolutionaries in their sufferings and dramas, and carefully analysed events in the African or Latin American areas, in Asia or in the United States of America or wherever they occurred. Undoubtedly, developments which were linked more directly with our country, such as events in Europe, in the Balkans, in the Mediterranean basin and in the Middle East attracted his main attention. About all these he reflected, discussed continuously, drew conclusions, and wrote.

His *Political Diary*, which documents the process of development of Enver Hoxha's thinking on international questions, is of unique value. It represents a truly encyclopedic chronicle of the people's struggles for national and social liberation in the recent decades. This separate body of his works, from volume to volume and from page to page, presents a procession of political personalities, history and events, and the destinies of peoples and nations from all parts of the globe. It contains many conclusions and instructions about the international activity of Albania, as well as advice and instructions, valuable to this day, about the strengthening of vigilance and the defence of our national independence and sovereignty.

Comrade Enver guided the foreign activity of our Party and state day by day. By keeping abreast of the development of situations and basing himself on the line of the Party, he formulated the con-

crete stands which had to be taken towards them and the tasks which emerged for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and other state organs and our press and propaganda. As a result, it can be said without hesitation that there is no important document of the Party and the Government, no official statement or leading article of our press on foreign affairs, which has not been drawn up under his guidance. Many of these materials have been written by him personally, while a large part of them have been formulated on the basis of theses and suggestions he made.

Conversations with Comrade Enver on international problems were always very lively and interesting. They were so not only because of the manner in which he analysed the events and linked one phenomenon with another, not only because of the depth of his thinking and the clarity with which he expounded his ideas, but also because of the wealth of historical, economic, cultural and geographical information with which he accompanied the arguments he presented. In the field of international problems, as in every field, Enver Hoxha was creative, especially from the tactical aspects. At all times he saw and placed the present and future interests of our socialist Homeland, the interests of the revolution, above everything.

An outstanding characteristic of Comrade Enver was his ability to react to specific events with determination and clarity and at the proper time. Many remember the Czechoslovak events of 1968. On the day of the Soviet intervention against that country, he, Comrade Manush Myftiu and I were

in Vlora on holiday. As soon as we heard the announcement by foreign radio stations that the Soviet army and the forces of the Warsaw Treaty had entered Czechoslovakia, we got together. Comrade Enver at once described this act as a fascist-type aggression. But at the same time he saw in it a danger which might threaten our freedom and independence.

“Let’s return to Tirana immediately,” he said. “We must discuss with the comrades how to act. The events of Czechoslovakia are a precedent which might have unpredictable consequences.”

“With their military intervention in Czechoslovakia, the Soviets want to give themselves the right to ‘punish’ anyone who disobeys them,” I remarked.

“Precisely here lies the danger,” Enver continued this idea. “Brezhnev and his associates are using the army. So now between us and them, it is no longer just a matter of ideological contradictions which stem from the Khrushchevite betrayal of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. From now on, the Soviet Union must be regarded as an imperialist country which threatens the freedom of our Homeland.”

The fate of the Homeland was Comrade Enver’s fundamental concern.

“When it did not hesitate to attack an allied country,” he carried the idea further, analysing the Soviet act, “why shouldn’t we think that it might do such a thing against Albania or Yugoslavia too?”

We returned to Tirana forthwith. At a special meeting of the Political Bureau we approved a

statement, which was published over the signatures of the Central Committee of the Party and the Council of Ministers, in which the aggression against Czechoslovakia was condemned sternly and with indignation. That same day, the decision was taken to convene the Plenum of the Central Committee to discuss the situation. At the meeting of the Political Bureau, Comrade Enver raised the question of denouncing the Warsaw Treaty.

“The time has come,” he said, “for our country to withdraw *de jure* from this military pact, which has now been transformed into an aggressive pact, like NATO. It is true that *de facto* we have not been part of it for a long time, because the revisionists have expelled us, but now we, for our part, must publicly denounce the Warsaw Treaty and proclaim our withdrawal from it and all obligations towards it.”

Later this proposal of Enver Hoxha’s was unanimously endorsed by the Central Committee of the Party and was sanctioned by law by the People’s Assembly of the People’s Republic of Albania.

Comrade Enver Hoxha has written a whole book about our friendship with the Greek people. It clearly reflects the consistent policy of our Party and Government towards our neighbours. But this book is also a brilliant illustration of the efforts of our state to utilize the developing situations to the advantage of our country, and to open the way to the favourable developments of relations with other countries.

At the beginning of 1984, Greek reaction, headed by representatives of the Church and the

Vorio-Epirote chauvinist circles, set up a noisy anti-Albanian clamour. This did not surprise us, because such things had happened before, but that year the reactionaries' actions were more aggressive. Matters went so far that these circles even organized provocations against our embassy in Athens by blowing up its vehicles, holding menacing demonstrations, etc.

At that time we had several discussions with Comrade Enver about these provocative acts and the stands we should maintain. He carefully analysed all the information we received, followed the reactions to these reports in various countries, and especially watched the stands of official Greek circles.

“We must resolutely oppose the activities of reaction,” he said, “but we must also be patient. This reaction does not come from the Greek people or from the present Greek government. We must bear in mind that the aggravation of Albanian-Greek relations today is in the interests of the imperialists, and especially of certain Yugoslav circles, which are itching to seize on any ‘fact’ to ‘confirm’ their thesis that the Albanians are allegedly troublemakers, a people who quarrel with their neighbours, etc., etc.”

Through the prudent stands we adopted, we brought about the failure of the aims of the reactionaries and assisted the progress of friendly relations with the Greek people.

In May 1984, I informed Comrade Enver about some positive signals which had reached us from the Greek government, in which a desire for rapprochement and good neighbourliness was ex-

pressed. Without the slightest hesitation he gave instructions that we should respond to the Greek side with the same desires. Thus, our vice-minister for Foreign Affairs was sent to Greece, and later Papoulias, at that time exercising the function of Alternate Minister for Foreign Affairs of Greece, came to Albania. A new, promising atmosphere began in our relations.

In these conditions, on Comrade Enver's proposal, our side made another friendly gesture by deciding to open the border crossing point at Kakavija. A few days before the respective ceremony was held, Comrade Enver, who was not in good health at that time, summoned me to his home. We talked about various internal and external problems, and the conversation came round to the opening of Kakavija.

"This event has great importance for the relations between our two countries," he said to me. "Therefore it must be organized to the best advantage."

"There is an idea," I said, "that the ceremony should be simply a protocol affair. The Greeks have announced that Papoulias and some other personalities will be present on this occasion. Therefore some say that we, too, should keep it at this level."

"Why should we?" he interjected. "Those who think so are wrong. On the contrary, it would be better if the ceremony were organized with broad participation of the people on both sides of the border. Let this event be transformed into a manifestation of the Greek-Albanian friendship. Therefore see to it personally that everything goes as well as

possible.”

And that is how it was done. Thousands of Albanians and Greeks, ordinary people and officials, participated joyfully with songs and dances, not like a protocol ceremony, but like a popular celebration of our common friendship.

Despite the irreconcilable ideological and political contradictions which have existed and still exist between Albania and Yugoslavia, Enver Hoxha strove to create favourable conditions for the establishment of the most stable and useful state relations possible with our northern neighbour. As early as 1970, he formulated and publicly announced the great pledge that if Yugoslavia is attacked by one of the imperialist superpowers, the Albanian people will fight shoulder to shoulder with its peoples. He also formulated and announced the other pledge that no evil has come or will ever come to any of the neighbouring countries from Albania.

In June 1983, when as President of the Presidium of the People's Assembly, I visited some of the northern districts on Enver's suggestion I repeated these statements, especially in the speech I made in the district of Tropoja, in order to affirm once again that we want friendship and good neighbourly relations with Yugoslavia.

About two years later, in January 1985, when the inauguration of our part of the railway which links Shkodra with Titograd was to take place, he instructed me that we should invite a Yugoslav delegation to this ceremony. This was yet another friendly gesture towards our northern neighbour. However, it must be said that the desires of our

side have not found the response we hoped for. When has any Yugoslav personality publicly and solemnly declared that no evil will come to Albania from Yugoslav territory? Or who has solemnly pledged, in the name of the Yugoslav state, that if Albania is attacked by a superpower, the peoples of Yugoslavia will be beside the Albanian people? No one has done so, ever.

Enver Hoxha is the founder of the foreign policy of our Party and our socialist state. The principled and courageous stands of our Party and people towards international problems and events, their resolute struggle against imperialism and reaction, and their irreconcilability with modern revisionism and with political and ideological opportunism in general, have earned Albania respect and an honoured name everywhere in the world. These stands are linked directly with his ardent patriotism and consistent internationalism.

If in the spheres of production and civilization, in the economy and culture, it can fairly be said that the development of the country in the epoch of the Party began virtually from nothing, from scratch, in the sphere of foreign policy this statement would be incorrect. In this field, first it was necessary to destroy the whole system of ties with the world, by means of which the anti-popular regime of Zog had placed Albania in the position of a dependent colony. Without the denunciation and abrogation of this system, there could be no talk of a new foreign policy which would respond to the democratic, popular and national internal policy of the new Albanian state.

It was Enver Hoxha who, from the tribune of the Congress of Permët, declared all the enslaving and subjugating acts signed previously between Albania and some imperialist countries null and void. This was a great patriotic act, a far-sighted stand important to our future, a logical conclusion which the Party had drawn from the experience of the National Liberation War. In fact, with this act he warned the various imperialist and chauvinist powers that henceforth the traditional imperial mentalities and practices towards our country would work no longer. No one could treat Albania as a possession, a token for barter in his own interests.

In the years of socialism, Albania's international relations with the world have changed radically. During the war Enver Hoxha also distinguished himself as a statesman and diplomat of uncommon wisdom. He made the principle of the preservation of complete national sovereignty the cornerstone of the foreign policy of the new Albania. He insisted that Albania should have its say in the world, that it should defend its own interests directly, without intermediaries, without "protectors" or third parties.

The assertion of Albanian foreign policy as an entirely independent, principled, internationalist policy, achieved through stern ideological and diplomatic struggle, began in the time of the National Liberation War with the unequivocal stands against the intentions of the Anglo-Americans to poke their noses into the internal affairs of the new Albania. This process, which had particular importance for the independence of the country, continued with the diplomatic struggle to ensure for

the new Albanian state equal status with the other states and nations which had participated in the world anti-fascist coalition. Enver Hoxha's famous statement at the Paris Peace Conference will never be forgotten:

“Albania has not sent its delegation here to render account, but to demand an accounting.”

This courage of our Party stemmed not only from the fact that we were demanding a more than legal right, but also from the broad support it had among the people. At the time Enver Hoxha spoke at this Conference, the popular poet sang:

*In Paris gathered UNO,
Speak out Enver, bravo, bravo,
Speak out for our rights,
I want you to speak to them so.*

Today socialist Albania has numerous friends and well-wishers all over the world. The Party has made these friends and won their firm support through its open and courageous stands, its sincere and resolute words about every problem that is simmering in the world, and the correct principles on which it has built its foreign policy, which is based on the internal factor, on the political and moral unity of the people, on the sound and healthy situation which prevails in the economy, in our culture and social life, and on all the successes of our socialist order.

The foreign policy, the stands and the actions of our Party and socialist state in the international arena are guided by the lofty and noble aims of the people to safeguard and consolidate the freedom

and independence of the Homeland, to ensure peaceful conditions for the socialist construction of the country and to fulfil their internationalist duties. Enver Hoxha urged the new Albanian diplomacy to follow this course. He proceeded from the principle that Albania and its people need as many friends as possible.

Our foreign policy was born from the war for liberation, and its content has been enriched in our efforts to safeguard the victories we achieved. As such, it is the bearer of freedom-loving ideals, of aspirations to equality and mutual respect in international relations and of sincere collaboration excluding any dictate or imposition among different countries.

As citizens of a socialist country, liberated from the ideologies and mentalities of the former feudal and bourgeois societies, as a people who for centuries have been enslaved, denied as a nation, torn apart by foreigners, we Albanians are not afflicted with nationalist animosities and hatred, with the expansionist and hegemonistic pretensions so widespread not only among the great powers but also among many others, or with the ambitions for rule and domination which still confuse the minds of leading circles in many other countries. We wish all peoples well.

It is precisely this disposition of ours which makes the Albanian viewpoint about world developments respected and trusted by the international community of the peoples. This has come about also because our Party and Enver Hoxha have had clear views on every important development, and because in no instance have they waited until oth-

ers expressed themselves in order to conform to a stand, but have expressed their independent and mature judgement frankly and without kid-gloves, penetrating into the essence of causes of events, making whoever has deserved it — the superpowers, the chauvinists or international reaction — the target of their polemic.

Our Party's ideological struggle against modern revisionism will remain a glorious page in its history. This struggle brought out with special force the personality of Enver Hoxha as an outstanding Marxist-Leninist, as an indomitable fighter for and staunch defender of the ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, as a great proletarian revolutionary who fought with singular courage and determination to apply the ideas of scientific socialism in Albania and to defend the banner of the revolution in the world. To him belongs the main merit for determining the principled stands which our Party has maintained at all times in the struggle against modern revisionism, whether against Yugoslav Titoite revisionism, or against Soviet, Chinese or Eurocommunist revisionism. He formulated the main ideas of this struggle, he worked out the theoretical arguments, and he played the decisive role in determining the strategy and tactics of the struggle.

Our Party's first clash with the betrayal began with Yugoslav revisionism. Comrade Enver gave an extensive description of this struggle of our Party in his well-known book *The Titoites*. With Marxist competence he also criticized the Yugoslav road of "specific socialism" in his work *Yugoslav "Self-Administration" — A Capitalist Theory and*

Practice. Now the Yugoslav reality itself, the political and economic chaos which has engulfed present-day Yugoslavia, is fully confirming Enver Hoxha's analysis and forecasts about this system, which was claimed to be a model of socialism for all countries. Hence, comment is unnecessary.

Our Party has always waged the struggle against Yugoslav revisionism, as well as against any other variant of opportunism, first and foremost, from principled positions of an ideological character, proceeding from the general interests of socialism, from an internationalist concern about the future of the revolution. Never for one moment has our Party dabbled in the waters of nationalism.

Not infrequently, enemies as well as uninformed people have tried to present the struggle of the Party and Enver Hoxha against opportunism, our clashes with the Yugoslav, Soviet and Chinese revisionists, as inspired by narrow nationalist motives, indeed even as a consequence of a policy of "trouble-makers." Of course this is erroneous. If there has been any national impulse in these stands, and there has been, this is connected with the fact that, proceeding from their own revisionist ideology, both the Yugoslavs and the Soviets, and subsequently the Chinese, have tried to impose their line on our Party and country, have acted to transform Albania into an instrument of their policy and ambitions, and hence, have sought to impair the sovereignty and independence of our people.

Our Party has clashed with and has waged its principled struggle against all variants of revisionism not over petty or side issues, not over momen-

tary disagreements, but over fundamental problems of the theory and practice of socialism, that is, over questions which have to do with the universal laws of Marxism-Leninism. Our struggle has been directed against the revisionist preachings that allegedly the time of class battles, the time of revolutions and national liberation wars, has passed forever, and that the epoch of “universal harmony,” of class conciliation, of equal collaboration between capitalist metropolises and oppressed peoples, etc., has begun.

The revisionist current most dangerous to the world communist movement has been and still is Soviet revisionism. About three decades have elapsed since our Party began the open, face-to-face struggle against the Khrushchevites. This is the period in which the revolutionary qualities of our Party, its courage and unshakeable confidence in the cause of the revolution, its ideological and political ability to cope with the innumerable attacks and intrigues of the enemies of communism, stood out with special force. In these years, Enver Hoxha emerged before the communists and world opinion more clearly than at any other time, not only as a dauntless militant, but also as a great Marxist-Leninist theoretician, displaying all his rich political, moral and social qualities.

Whole books, memoirs and artistic works, articles and studies have been written about the epic struggle of our Party against Khrushchevite revisionism. Of particular value is Comrade Enver’s book of memoirs *The Khrushchevites*. It reflects the struggle of our Party on a broad historical, political

and ideological plane, and provides facts to prove the correctness of its line and stands.

As a member of the leadership of the Party, in charge of ideological questions and foreign affairs, from the moment when the contradictions with the Khrushchevite revisionists manifested themselves, I was one of Comrade Enver's close collaborators and was beside him in the battle that began. I have also participated in many meetings at which our Party clashed with the Soviet revisionists. In these lines I shall try to avoid repeating well-known events. However, when I am obliged to refer to them, I shall do this in order to show how Comrade Enver reacted, how he judged and decided at this or that moment, just as those unforgettable events have been imprinted on my memory.

At the beginning of the 1960s, the Soviet Union still enjoyed indisputable prestige and authority in the eyes of the peoples, the communists and all revolutionaries, as the first socialist country and the centre of international communism. The revisionist line of Khrushchev, who had begun to throw his weight about, especially after the 20th Congress of the CPSU, was well covered-up with communist phrases. Khrushchev posed as the consistent follower of Lenin.

At that time, it was not easy to raise your voice against the deviations of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. In the first place, this meant to draw upon yourself the wrathful fire of a big party and a mighty country, such as the Soviet Union was. So, before deciding to begin the battle, you had to have made up your mind to stand up to every kind of pressure and reprisal of a political,

economic or even military character. And at that time Albania was not what it is today. Now our internal economy produces about 85 per cent of the consumer goods, and over 90 per cent of the spare parts we need. The income from exports covers all the needs of the economy for machinery and import commodities, and we produce all our bread within the country. But in 1960? In those years our total industrial production was one-seventh of today's. At that time we got an average of 12-13 quintals of bread grain per hectare, and in order to secure our bread, we were compelled to import from abroad, mainly from the Soviet Union, tens and even hundreds of thousands of tons of wheat and maize every year.

To oppose the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which had great political and theoretical authority, meant to isolate oneself at least for a time from most of the communist parties in the world.

Precisely herein lies the heroism of the Party of Labour of Albania, the majesty of its decision, and its courage and determination for the cause of Marxism-Leninism, for the cause of socialism and communism.

At the end of June 1960, Comrade Hysni Kapo, who was in Bucharest representing our Party at the Congress of the Workers' Party of Romania, reported that at an impromptu meeting with the foreign delegates, Khrushchev and his associates, besides attacking the Communist Party of China, had also begun an open attack on our Party. The Soviets were displeased by the fact that we did not join

in their attacks against the Communist Party of China at Bucharest. They were displeased that our Party described the hasty meeting of Bucharest as premature, a meeting out of order from the organizational standpoint and conspiratorial from the political standpoint.

On the evening of June 25, at about 7 o'clock, I was with Comrade Enver when a radiogram arrived from Hysni, who informed us of the grave situation which had been created in Bucharest, the pressure and provocations that were being made against him and the insidious attacks which Khrushchev and company were directing more and more against our Party.

The radiogram clearly reflected the atmosphere created in Bucharest by the Khrushchevites.

“Very disturbed about the situation developing behind the scenes,” wrote Besnik. “Intrigues and plots are being hatched... Dreadful pressure can be seen.”

When a political stand had to be determined, it was Comrade Enver's habit to thrash out the opinions for and against, and to reason about them in the form of a dialogue. Through this “debate” and “dialogue” he reached the conclusion about what stand should be adopted, how we should act and what arguments we should use. That is what he did that evening too. He proposed a thesis and I gave an answer; he presented an argument, I a counter-argument.

Hours passed. In the end, on the basis of the orientation which the Political Bureau had laid down previously, Comrade Enver composed two radiograms to Hysni in which he instructed him

not to accept any accusation against our Party, but to give a firm and clear-cut reply to anyone who attacked its line. He also instructed him to refuse to sign any document which was not in conformity with our stands and decisions.

“You must speak according to the instructions of the Political Bureau,” Comrade Enver instructed him, “because we can never agree with the spirit and methods which are being used in this meeting for the solution of problems of the international communist movement. The opinion of our Party is that these questions should be handled carefully, with cool heads and in a comradely spirit, according to the Leninist norms.”

During our exchange of opinions that evening of June 25, Comrade Enver was fully aware that the Soviets would attack our Party and country with all their ferocity. Several times he repeated that we must be prepared to withstand any kind of pressure or provocation. Above all, the solidarity of the Party and the unity of the people around it must be strengthened. He was particularly worried about the presence of the Soviet naval base at Vlora and the possibility that provocations with dangerous consequences could be hatched up there.

“No one can do anything to a strongly united people led by a monolithic Party loyal to Marxism-Leninism,” Comrade Enver emphasized.

He composed and dispatched the last radiogram at midnight, after which we went out to get some fresh air. We were walking along The Martyrs of the Nation Boulevard near the Lana Bridge, some way from the building of the Central Committee of the Party, when we heard the sounds of

dance music. Apparently there was a party in progress in the Dajti Hotel or some other place nearby.

“The young people are dancing and enjoying themselves,” said Comrade Enver. “They don’t know that right now, in Bucharest, a great tragedy is being played to the detriment of communism and the peoples, and to the detriment of our people.”

We turned to go home. Before we parted, after enumerating once again the arguments on which the stand of our Party at Bucharest was based, he asked me:

“Could we have acted otherwise?”

“There’s no other way. We are right.”

After hearing my reply, he continued: “Yes, we are right. Any other stand would mean betrayal of Marxism-Leninism, betrayal of the people and socialism. It would mean the loss of the freedom and independence of the Homeland. By all we hold dear, we could not have taken a different stand!”

Our Party’s contradictions with Khrushchev and his group had begun a long time before. It must be said that the protracted struggle against the Yugoslav revisionists had not only tempered our Party, but had also equipped it with a wealth of experience and acute political intuition. This helped our Party to discover the similarity between Khrushchevism and Titoism very quickly, to see that their ideological bases were identical and their political directions similar. Therefore, when Khrushchev was working towards conciliation with Yugoslav revisionism, our Party sounded the alarm bells.

The Central Committee of our Party officially opposed this “turn” of the Soviet leadership as early as 1955. Later, it did not accept the decisions of the 20th Congress and the anti-Marxist line which Khrushchev proclaimed there. In particular, it never approved the attacks on the work of J.V. Stalin. Likewise, it did not accept many other opportunist theses which, as practice confirmed, constituted a flagrant departure from the positions of communism and an open concession to the bourgeois ideology and pressure.

Until 1960, however, these and other contradictions had been kept within our two parties and countries. They had not been made public, although it was not difficult for anyone who attentively read our press, the speeches of Comrade Enver and other official documents of the Party to understand that there was a marked difference of views between us and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. These differences became more obvious especially at key moments, such as during the events connected with the Hungarian counter-revolution of 1956, etc.

The Hungarian events were the direct outcome of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Under the influence of the opportunist line proclaimed by Khrushchev, all the scum of Hungarian society — from the revisionists, the kulaks and the bourgeoisie within the country, to the fugitives, the Vatican and the imperialists — were activated and thrown into the attack on socialism in Hungary.

Right from the start of the Hungarian events, Comrade Enver saw in them the signs of the coun-

ter-revolution in action. In September 1956, when the delegation of our Party and Government was on its way for an official visit to China, Korea and Mongolia, Comrade Enver Hoxha talked for two hours with comrades of the leadership of the Hungarian Party. I was present at that meeting and remember that he told the Hungarians bluntly that with their stands, they were laying the carpet for reaction, and that they should close the road to anti-socialist actions immediately. "Otherwise it will be too late," he warned.

In the first days of October 1956, on our way back from China, when we met the secretary of the CC of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, M. Suslov, Comrade Enver again told the Soviets of our views about the situation in Hungary, about the undermining role of Tito and the anti-communist activity of Imre Nagy. Suslov listened to us with outward calm, but he discounted our words, because he put his hand in a drawer of his desk and said:

"Don't worry, because here I have Imre Nagy's self-criticism, and everything will be put in order."

A few days later, communists were hanged and murdered in the streets of Budapest, just as in the time of black fascism.

Naturally, as time elapsed, the further Khrushchev and his associates advanced on the road of betrayal, the more the contradictions between us were increased and exacerbated. And, as a consequence, the more difficult it was to avoid the collision.

Nevertheless, our Party and Comrade Enver

Hoxha displayed prudence and coolheadedness, and handled the contradictions with the Soviets with great discretion and wisdom. Our Party has never given way on principles, but has been vigilant to avoid provocations, always bearing in mind the great interests of socialism and the Homeland.

Khrushchev was an adventurer and a cunning rogue. But our Party had the wisdom and the courage to be able to cope with his diabolical plans, which were intended to lead it into a blind alley.

In April 1957, a delegation of our Party and Government, headed by Comrade Enver Hoxha, went on an official visit to the Soviet Union. At that time the press and the propaganda, both in our country and in the Soviet Union, spoke about unbreakable friendship and unity, but the reality was not so honeyed. The contradictions which were simmering between our Party and the Soviet leadership headed by Khrushchev burst out openly in the official talks.

During its stay in the Soviet Union, our delegation visited Leningrad and Tashkent, apart from Moscow. Comrade Enver Hoxha, Gogo Nushi and I went to Leningrad, while Mehmet Shehu, then prime minister of our country, Spiro Koleka and Rita Marko went to Tashkent.

In Leningrad, Comrade Enver spoke to a mass rally in the V.I. Lenin Machine-Building Plant. In this speech, after paying tribute to Leningrad as the cradle of the October Socialist Revolution, he pointed out the struggle of our people through the centuries for freedom and independence, and spoke about the friendship between our peoples on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian in-

ternationalism. In his speech, he dwelled especially on the question of the imperative need to wage the struggle against imperialism and revisionism. The workers of the plant received this speech with very great enthusiasm and applauded all his ideas. But this was not to the liking of F. Koslov and P. Pospelov, the Soviet officials who accompanied us. This became obvious when the question of the publication of the speech at the rally came up.

In the evening, the delegation attended a performance at the Leningrad Opera House. The ballet *Taras Bulba* was being performed, but meanwhile, in the government box, Kozlov and Pospelov were trying hard to persuade Comrade Enver to delete from the text of his speech some expressions which, according to them, "were very hardline." It was left to Pospelov and me to put the finishing touches to the material which would be published in the press. In view of Comrade Enver's instructions, I, of course, refused to cut out anything that harmed the essence of the speech. But the Soviets were not to be trusted. When we read the newspaper the next day, we saw that the part of Comrade Enver's speech about Yugoslavia had been altered.

The frictions we had with them made it even clearer that the official talks between our delegation and the Soviet delegation would be held in an electrified atmosphere. For this reason, we decided that from our side only the comrades of the Political Bureau who were part of the delegation should participate in the talks. Indeed, we did not take even an interpreter. I did that job.

The talks were held in the Kremlin immediately

after our delegation returned to Moscow (the rest of our delegation had returned from Tashkent at the same time). From the Soviet side, Khrushchev, Bulganin, Mikoyan, Suslov and others participated in the talks. Khrushchev, who opened the meeting, proposed that Comrade Enver should speak first, which he did.

After speaking about our internal situation, Comrade Enver presented the views of our Party on the international situation. Comrade Enver's exposition took a direction opposite to that of the line of the 20th Congress, which had been held one year earlier. In particular, it attacked the consequences of this line, which had manifested themselves in ugly ways in the counter-revolutionary events of 1956 in Poland and Hungary. His analysis of the international situation and the struggle against imperialism and revisionism was a direct criticism of Khrushchev and his group, who were abandoning the road of the revolution and socialism.

When Comrade Enver had finished, Khrushchev got up. From the moment he began to speak, it was clear that he could hardly control himself. He was extremely angry. He tried to explain his policy, but he saw that his arguments were not convincing us. He asked questions, sought our opinion, mostly to have us approve what he said, but when he saw that Comrade Enver and our delegation were not yielding, he lost his temper. At one moment he banged his fist on the table and said:

“You want to turn us back to Stalin! Therefore we have nothing further to discuss with you!”

And he sat down. A heavy silence fell. Appar-

ently Khrushchev had calculated that with his arrogant and provocative stand he would intimidate our delegation and compel it to review its stand, that is, to submit to the revisionist line. But very quickly he saw that he had made a bad mistake. Enver Hoxha said very calmly, but firmly:

“You, Comrade Khrushchev, proposed that we should speak first and express our views. And we have told you what our Party thinks. Now it is your turn to speak and tell us your viewpoint. Hence, we have something to discuss.”

Khrushchev saw that he had hit a snag and immediately changed his attitude. He began to speak about various events, going from one extreme to the other, sometimes trying to convince us that “Rakosi and company had made great mistakes in Hungary,” or that “the Yugoslavs were not involved in the Hungarian events,” sometimes attacking Imre Nagy, who “had opened the doors to Horthyite reaction,” and Tito who “is doing the work of imperialism,” etc., etc.

In order to prove that he was “sincere” in what he said and that the disagreements with our Party were an “incident” which had not influenced Albanian-Soviet relations, Khrushchev hailed the successes achieved in our country and even pointed out that it was the duty of the Soviet Union and the other countries of people’s democracy to give Albania greater assistance so that it could develop more rapidly. On this occasion, the Soviet government exempted Albania from repayment of the credits still outstanding at that time, which amounted to 42.2 million rubles. But all this did not influence or alter the relations between our

Party and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the least. Our views remained what they were. Our delegation, headed by Comrade Enver Hoxha, did not fall a victim to and was not swayed either by Khrushchev's pressure and provocations, or by his blandishments and "generosity."

By 1960, Khrushchev's contradictions with the Marxist-Leninist movement had become very profound. At the core of these contradictions lay differences over the assessment of the ratio of forces in the world after the Second World War and the determination of the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary communist and liberation movement, over fundamental issues of the theory and practice of scientific socialism. According to Khrushchev and company, as the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had proclaimed, such great changes had taken place in the world that the Leninist theses about our epoch, the epoch of imperialism and the revolution, had become outdated and invalid. With ulterior motives, Khrushchev and the modern revisionists exaggerated the alteration in the ratio of forces in the international arena in favour of socialism to the extent that they declared that the development of human society from now on would inevitably proceed towards socialism. From this, the revisionist ideologists reached the conclusion that imperialism and world reaction were powerless in face of this situation, that our epoch was the epoch of the triumph of socialism on a world scale, without the need for revolution, and indeed, without the need for a party of the working class.

The whole Khrushchevite strategy for the future was based on the notorious three-point slogan: peaceful coexistence, peaceful competition and the peaceful road to socialism. With these revisionist theses, Khrushchev rejected the basic Marxist-Leninist teachings on war and peace and on revolution and the class struggle.

Today, Gorbachev is more outspoken. He does not theorize as Khrushchev did, sees no need to use Khrushchev's "Marxist" phraseology, but acts energetically to put the same policy, the same ideas, into practice. He has summed up Khrushchev's platform in one thesis: "Nowadays there is no class struggle, but struggle for peace. Atomic weapons kill both the proletarian and the capitalist indiscriminately. Therefore, to escape from this danger it is necessary to put aside any differences, to unite, to advance by giving each other a hand."

Khrushchev's reactionary, revisionist course was bound to lead to division and disagreements within the socialist camp. The contradictions between China and the Soviet Union, which had existed previously, flared up with greater intensity. What was the essence of these contradictions?

In his *Works*, Enver Hoxha has made a penetrating and many-sided analysis of the deviationist line of the Communist Party of China and the policy pursued by Mao Zedong, Liu Shaoqi, Zhou Enlai, and others. From this analysis, it emerges quite clearly that the basis of the contradictions between the Soviet and the Chinese revisionists was not connected with the correct application and defence of the purity of Marxism-Leninism, but with the state interests of one or the other side. Both the

Khrushchevite revisionists and the Chinese revisionists aimed and acted to establish their own hegemony in different regions of the world, even at each other's expense.

After the death of Stalin, the Chinese, with Mao Zedong at the head, thought that their time had come. On the one hand, they tried to take the Khrushchevites under their wing and to raise the banner of the "centre" of the international communist movement in Beijing. On the other hand, they wanted to gain as much as they could from Soviet economic aid in order to become a great power, indeed, an atomic power. But these projects could not be carried out smoothly. If Mao Zedong had his hegemonistic ambitions, Khrushchev and his associates had their expansionist plans too.

The Khrushchevites were not deceived by the flattery of Mao Zedong, who, in order to gain Khrushchev's respect and sympathy, supported him publicly at some difficult moments. As is known, at the Moscow Conference of 1957, Mao Zedong openly supported Khrushchev against Molotov, Malenkov and others, who had been eliminated from the leadership of the party and state a few months earlier because they had not reconciled themselves to the new course.

While making the most of what benefit they could get from the Chinese, at the same time Khrushchev and his associates began to be "cautious" and "restrained" in their support and aid for them. They did not want China to grow strong, economically or militarily. Therefore, they were especially reserved in providing military aid. In fact, the Soviets did not give China necessary aid, which

they had promised, for the production of the atomic bomb. This angered the ambitious Chinese. The policy of rapprochement with American imperialism, which Khrushchev was pursuing, likewise, was incompatible with the interests of the Chinese because that would leave China out of the game of great powers.

In this situation, seeing that Khrushchev's line had caused concern in the communist movement, the Communist Party of China seized the opportunity to present its contradictions with the Soviets as ideological contradictions, as opposition which allegedly resulted from Khrushchev's deviation from the positions of Marxism-Leninism. Hence, the Chinese seized the banner of "defence of the principles of Marxism-Leninism," the banner of "the unity of the international communist movement," in order to win the communist parties to their side and, together with them, to exert pressure on the Soviet Union. Why? At that time it was difficult to arrive at the essence of the truth, but today, when we can link the events and situations together and explain one with the other, the conclusion is clear: undoubtedly, the Chinese did not want to compel Khrushchev to abandon his course of betrayal of Marxism-Leninism, but to have him accept the hegemony of China and join it in its plans.

Enver Hoxha followed the development of events within the socialist camp with special care. He analysed the different actions and the stands that were maintained, and he discussed with the comrades to find the reasons for every thesis and viewpoint of Khrushchev's. His preoccupation was

two-fold: both in regard to the world revolutionary movement and the threat which the opportunist line of the Soviet leadership posed for it, and in regard to our country and the threat which this line posed for the freedom and independence of socialist Albania.

When he analysed the dangers which Khrushchevism posed for the future of our Homeland, Enver saw two main reasons for alarm: first, in his haste to smooth the way to betrayal, Khrushchev made common cause with Tito and the Yugoslav leadership. On many occasions, Khrushchev showed clearly that in order to ensure their support he was ready to “sacrifice” the interests of Albania, that is, to support the Yugoslav plans against our country. This is the usual game of superpowers which, in order to attain their aims, gamble with the destinies of peoples and strike deals at their expense.

The second reason is connected with Khrushchev’s plans to use Albania as a base from which to attack the neighbouring countries, especially Greece and Italy. Comrade Enver has described all this in detail in his book *The Khrushchevites*. He relates how Khrushchev and his Minister of Defence, Rodion Malinovsky, during their visit to Albania in May 1959, were entranced with Butrint and the Bay of Vlora, not on account of the natural beauty and the cultural values of these places, but rather on account of the strategic importance they could have if they were placed in the hands of the Soviets. “From here, with a powerful naval fleet, we have the whole Mediterranean in our hands... and can control everyone,” they dreamed. But the Albanian

people and the internationalist communist and patriot, Enver Hoxha, thought differently: “No, Nikita Khrushchev, we shall never allow our land to be used as a starting point to enslave other countries and shed the blood of other peoples. You’ll never have Butrint, or Vlora, or one inch of Albanian territory for your sinister aims.”

And less than two years after this visit, the Albanian Government took the decision to expel the Soviet fleet and to liquidate the base they had in Vlora. This was a courageous decision, a correct decision which served not only to defend the freedom and sovereignty of the Albanian people, but also to defend peace and security in the Mediterranean basin and the independence of our neighbours. The importance of this great act emerges still more clearly today when the Mediterranean countries are continuously threatened by the presence of naval fleets of the United States of America and the Soviet Union, which prowl the Mediterranean like bloodthirsty monsters. This historic act owes a great deal to the determination and foresight of Enver Hoxha.

Our ideological disagreements with the Soviets were not and could not be expressed at first in the form of open debate, not simply because in that way we would have provided them with an “argument” to blame us as “splitters” — a thing which they tried to do later, when contradictions became public — but also because we still had hopes that the revisionist distortions would not become a political line of the whole Soviet party and state. Therefore, in the first phase of the ideological

struggle with the Khrushchevites, our debate with them in the press was conducted indirectly, by criticizing the revisionist views and refuting their fundamental theses, without mentioning Khrushchev or the Soviets by name.

On April 22, 1960, the 90th anniversary of the birth of V.I. Lenin was to be commemorated. I had been appointed to deliver the address at the commemorative meeting organized by the Central Committee of the Party. Comrade Enver instructed me that we should make the most of this opportunity, both to affirm the validity of the Leninist teachings and to reject the opportunist theses of the Khrushchev group. To this end, he instructed me that the report should be constructed in the spirit of a stern, soundly-reasoned criticism of Khrushchev's views on the most fundamental issues of the time, especially on his stands on war and peace, imperialism, opportunism, etc., but without mentioning Khrushchev by name. Tito's name was used, but it was clear that it implied Khrushchev, because many views and stands of these two representatives of modern revisionism were identical. It was not difficult for anyone who heard the speech to understand that the polemic was directed against the opportunist line and stands of Khrushchev. Of course, this could not but be clear to Liri Belishova too, at that time secretary of the Central Committee of the Party who, immediately after the meeting, came to me full of "concern" and asked:

"Have you consulted with Comrade Enver about this speech?"

She had not read the speech beforehand be-

cause she had not been in Tirana those days. Since her worry seemed to me to be quite out of place, I answered her question with another.

“Do you have any criticism so that I can correct it, at least, before it is published in the press?” I said.

“No,” she said, “I’ve no criticism. Except that... this speech is a very open attack on Khrushchev, and you must have certainly sought the opinion of the comrades.”

For the sake of appearances, Liri said that she had no criticism, but in fact she did not agree with our Party’s stand against Khrushchevite revisionism, as was proved later.

“Don’t worry about this,” I “calmed” her, “because until now not one of the comrades has made any criticism. If they had any, they would certainly have told me.”

As time went by, it was becoming more and more clear to the leadership of our Party that the collision with Khrushchev and his group was inevitable. The Soviet leadership was pressing ahead rapidly on its revisionist course. Using threats and blandishments, arrogance and sly tricks, Khrushchev was trying to impose his line on the entire communist and workers’ movement. He wanted to achieve this at the meeting of Bucharest, which was held in the second half of June 1960.

The events there, which have been explained in detail in Comrade Enver’s books and in many documents of the Party, are well known. They form the prelude to the heroic stand, to the open clash with the Soviet leadership, with its imperialist aims and

its anti-Marxist ideology and line, to the opposition which was expressed with such clarity, force and determination by Enver Hoxha at the Moscow Meeting in November 1960.

In Bucharest, the Khrushchevites resorted to every means: slanders, threats and intrigues. But our Party raised its voice against them loudly and with determination. Comrade Hysni Kapo, our Party's representative, carrying out Enver Hoxha's directives with political and ideological acumen and the coolness which brave men display, faced up to the provocations and arrogance of Khrushchev and his associates, and defended the correct line and the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist stand of our Party.

Without any exaggeration or enlargement of the truth, it can be said that the resolute stand of our Party, the opposition which it put up to the anti-Marxist aims which Khrushchev pursued at the Bucharest meeting, was the main factor which brought about the defeat of this typical Khrushchevite plot. Khrushchev and his group were obliged to retreat. But this retreat ruined their plans because they lost a strong weapon on which they had been counting for their triumph: surprise. Now, in order to get the approval of different parties for their reactionary course, they would have to wait for the meeting of all the communists and workers' parties of the world, which was to be held in November.

After the Bucharest meeting, Khrushchev began to vent his anger against our Party in the form of escalating provocations and threats. This pres-

sure was manifested, in the first place, in the economic field, through “delays” in the shipment of different materials, failure to fulfil contracts, etc. Matters reached the point that the Soviets even refused to sell wheat to Albania with clearing. Knowing that we had grain for the people’s bread for only a few days, they demanded that we pay for the purchase of grain in gold from the State Bank reserves.

In the political field, threats and pressure followed one after another. This was a period of extremely great tension which caused Comrade Enver Hoxha particular anxiety. We had to avoid falling into the traps of the provocations which came from various quarters: from the deliberate actions of the Soviet embassy and specialists, who aimed to sow doubt and discontent among the people and to incite and encourage various elements against the leadership; from the “quarrels” which the Soviet army men and command sought and the scandals which they created at the Vlora base, and which were fraught with the danger of the outbreak of an armed clash at any moment; from the internal enemies, the fifth column of the Soviets, with elements like Liri Belishova and Koço Tashko who, in complete accord with the Khrushchevites, came out in the open after Bucharest and opposed the Marxist-Leninist line of the Party.

As I said earlier, after the Bucharest meeting it became clear that the clash with the Soviets was inevitable. Khrushchev and company had thrown off all restraint: they themselves were betraying the cause of communism and demanded submission and obedience from others. “Disaster” and the

great “fire” awaited all those who dared to oppose them. Khrushchev warned us of this in a special letter in the summer of 1960, in which he openly demanded that either we submit to him or, as he declared, the “spark” that had been kindled in Bucharest would be turned into a “conflagration.”

But nothing could make our Party deviate from its correct Marxist-Leninist course. Enver Hoxha turned to the communists and to the people and told them frankly how things stood. For him, at every moment, but especially in difficult times, the opinion of the people was decisive. The opinion and determination of the masses were crucial in choosing his stands. The masses gave Enver strength and made him fearless and courageous.

On the eve of and throughout all the events of the year 1960, just as in the time of the war, the people followed the Party, as always. Old and young, communists and workers not in the Party, united firmly around the Central Committee, around Comrade Enver Hoxha. After this unanimous “plebiscite,” Enver Hoxha set to work to prepare for the assault on the Khrushchevite betrayal, for the confrontation with a very much larger and extremely dangerous force. I will always have vivid in my memory how calm, how confident and how clear he was in what he did and wanted to do at that time.

Enver Hoxha personally led this great struggle. He planned the preparatory work for the exposure of Khrushchev’s revisionist line. In this phase, in a talk at the end of June, he instructed me to organize the work to carry out special studies in connection with the fundamental problems that would be

discussed in Moscow, to make a critical analysis of the Khrushchevite theses on the fundamental problems of the time and to work out the ideo-political arguments which would prove that the Soviet leadership had set out on a revisionist course.

It is characteristic that our Party prepared for attack and not for defence. Therefore, all its attention was concentrated on exposing the Khrushchevite line, uncovering the great betrayal and the danger which threatened the International Communist Movement. Even when Comrade Enver dealt with the problems of Albanian-Soviet relations, defending the cause of socialism in Albania, the cause of the sovereignty and freedom of the Albanian people, he remained on the attack, proving that the anti-Albanian actions were a consequence of an anti-Marxist line.

Mikoyan, Suslov, Kozlov, and many other envoys tried over and over again to convince us that "mistakes may have been made towards Albania" sometimes by a "stupid" ambassador, sometimes by Malinovsky "who knows nothing of politics," sometimes because "we have not known the needs of Albania," etc., etc.! But our Party was firm in its conviction, and its reply was just as firm: "The anti-Albanian stands are not accidental mistakes. They reflect a well-defined line, a program directed by the central Soviet organs, by the Party and the Government of the Soviet Union."

The communist and workers' parties had agreed that a Preparatory Commission consisting of representatives of 25 different parties should work in Moscow to prepare for the November meeting. The delegation of our Party, headed by

Comrade Hysni Kapo, was made up of Foto Çami, me and some other comrades.

There we saw for ourselves the ferocity and perfidy of the revisionists, as they attempted to manoeuvre in the open and behind the scenes, and we were convinced once again of the force and vitality of Marxism-Leninism, and the justness of the cause which our Party defended. The meeting of the Preparatory Commission was a great experience for us.

In this Commission, which met from October 1 to 21, 1960, the aim of the Soviets was to ensure that our Party did not come out against their party and Khrushchev, did not bring the fight out in the open, and did not speak about Bucharest and the contradictions which existed. To this end, they created around our delegation a harsh and dangerous atmosphere, in which open threats were combined with cunning flattery.

Comrade Enver followed the work of the Commission attentively, day after day. We kept him informed about the theses that were presented, the contributions that were made to the discussion and the stands that were taken by different delegations. And all the time he instructed us what to do and how we should react in the situations that were created.

Most of the very valuable, concrete instructions which our delegation received from Comrade Enver have been published in Volume 19 of his *Works*. In his letters and telegrams, he pointed out clearly the aims of the Soviets, saw precisely what the Khrushchevites were aiming at and the diversion they wanted to accomplish, and also revealed the

weakness of the Chinese and their tactics of “sitting on the fence.”

“The Soviets think that we are desperately concerned about declarations. We have Marxism-Leninism. What we need and insist on is that the Soviets should correct their opportunist mistakes. The declaration should be the conclusion of these discussions. Precisely this frightens the Soviets, but it does not frighten us,” he told us in a radiogram.

In another one he wrote:

“The Moscow Meeting cannot be a formal meeting, or a meeting of sterile polemics... It will not have the character of a ‘pacifist’ conciliatory meeting in order to draw a veil over the grave mistakes.”

And the main thing:

“The declaration should be made as strong as possible, with gunpowder and not with cotton-wool.”

He warned us that we must not get trapped by the form:

“Don’t try to adjust the questions on the phrasing presented by the Soviets because they have constructed that text... in order to introduce a dose of poison in several places, or they have spread the poison in a whole ‘tirade,’ in which they have also sprinkled a sugar-coating over their course.”

These orientations opened our eyes, gave us strength and inspired our confidence in the just cause which our Party defended. With his radiograms and letters, Comrade Enver helped us accomplish our task with success and avoid falling into various traps which the Soviets and their accomplices were past masters at constructing.

During the first days, the discussions in the Commission went calmly. The Soviets were satisfied. And so were the others. But on October 6, this calm was broken. Comrade Hysni's speech was the cause. While he was speaking, the Soviet delegates were very uneasy. Kozlov, Suslov and the others could not contain themselves, but whispered angrily to one another.

The speech which Hysni made presented the view of our Party on the fundamental questions of the time. It was clear, well-reasoned and without equivocation. Right from the outset, it stressed that serious differences and disagreements existed within the communist movement and therefore, "The Commission cannot and must not pass over them 'lightly.'" In connection with this, it expressed the opinion of our Party that the Bucharest meeting, both in form and in content, was a hasty action in breach of the Leninist rules and the practice of the communist and workers' parties; that far from being beneficial, Bucharest had done nothing but harm. For this reason, our delegation demanded that the actions up till that time should be analysed with a critical eye, in order to draw the necessary lessons. Otherwise, the document that would be drafted for the November meeting would not be appropriate, but would be transformed into a source of evils in the future.

After this preamble, the speech expressed our Party's views on some of the fundamental questions about which there were differences. It must be said that while we were in Tirana, before leaving for the meeting of the Commission, Comrade Enver instructed Hysni and me about what questions

we must speak and what we must leave for the November meeting. From the tactical aspect, he judged correctly that in the Commission we should limit ourselves strictly to certain problems related to the document that was to be drafted, while the strong, direct criticism of Khrushchevite revisionism would be made at the general meeting of the parties in November. The stands of the Soviets towards Albania would be raised there too. Comrade Enver reasoned in this way:

“In Bucharest, Khrushchev saw that his views are not accepted in our Party. In the Preparatory Commission, let him have a taste of more open criticism. At the November meeting, we shall deal him a knock-out blow.”

As is known, in Bucharest Khrushchev's attack was directed against the Chinese. It was foreseen that they would come under attack in the Preparatory Commission too. But whereas our Party went to Moscow with the intention of speaking openly and getting to the bottom of things, the Chinese had come there with a different aim. Without doubt, it was to oppose the Soviets, to shake the authority and prestige which the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had at that time in the revolutionary movement. However, the Chinese delegation had not come to Moscow with the intention of fighting for the complete exposure of the revisionist views, theses and stands of the Soviet leadership.

This is clear to us now. But what impression did the Chinese make on us at that time? Their delegation to the Preparatory Commission was headed by

Deng Xiaoping, then General Secretary of the Communist Party of China. The delegation also included Peng Zhen, Kang Sheng and others. Upon their arrival in Moscow, they asked to meet our delegation. Of course, Comrade Hysni and I agreed, and we talked with them.

From the first meeting, we were struck by the excessive “prudence” of the Chinese.

“We are not going to speak about all the issues, although many things have been presented incorrectly in the draft-declaration which the Soviets have given us,” said Deng. “We shall insist on discrediting their position of the ‘conductor’s baton.’”

As if to make the attitude they would maintain towards the Soviets even clearer to us, Deng continued:

“We are not going to use such terms as ‘opportunist’ or ‘revisionist,’ etc.”

After speaking about some other questions, especially about the stands some parties in the meeting might adopt, Deng Xiaoping informed us about further developments in the relations between the Soviet Union and China, about the withdrawal of the Soviet specialists from China and the canceling of contracts and credits planned for it, etc.

After we left the meeting with the Chinese, Hysni and I had a long discussion about the opinions which they expressed to us. Neither their reasoning nor the “tactic” they were going to apply pleased us. But we did not reach the conclusion that this stand expressed an overall opportunist position. Enver Hoxha was to draw this conclusion as soon as he read the text of Deng’s speech at the meeting of the Commission, which we sent him at

once.

In the letters he sent us those days, he wrote:

“The tone in which he (the Chinese) puts the issues is conciliatory...”

He described Deng’s speech as “lemonade” and their tactic as “spineless...”

“They (the Chinese),” he wrote, “are not for carrying the matter through to the end... They are for mending what can be mended, and time will mend the rest... If I were in the Soviets’ shoes, I would accept the field which the Chinese are opening to me because there I will find good grass and can browse at will.”

The development of events in the Commission, in the Meeting of 81 Parties and later, during the years of the open polemic with Khrushchevite revisionism, were to fully confirm this analysis of the Chinese stands, vacillations and opportunism which Enver Hoxha made at that time.

At the Moscow Meeting, we found many points in common with the Chinese, especially on questions which had to do with the criticism of the Soviet views on imperialism and their concepts about relations among the communist parties.

As regards the criticism of modern revisionism and the struggle against it, however, we were far apart. The Chinese were concerned only about the “conductor’s baton,” which they wanted to break. They went no further. But Moscow was not the place for a confrontation of our views with those of the Chinese, nor did the moment allow us to make a thorough analysis of the Chinese strategies and tactics, the traditions and the history of the Communist Party of China, etc. All that remained in our

minds from those encounters which we had with the Chinese delegation, from the different interjections and replies at the meetings of the committee editing the Declaration, as well as from Deng Xiaoping's speech at the general meeting, were only fragmentary impressions and observations, a mixture of positive and negative evaluations. All of them, taken together, required serious study and detailed verification.

When we returned to Albania, one of the tasks which Comrade Enver set for himself and for all the rest of us was to find out about China, this partner with which the struggle against revisionism had made us fellow-travellers and had linked us closely. We had to know how we would proceed on our common course: at the same pace, towards the same objective, by talking and reaching agreement or by quarrelling.

We Albanian communists did not know China, its party or its leaders. We did not have a complete idea of its position in the international communist movement or its relations with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

As Comrade Enver has explained, the victory of the Chinese Revolution in 1949, under the leadership of the Communist Party, had made a profound impression on us. Its great weight which tipped the balance of the world ratio in favour of socialism, the encouragement which it gave the struggle against colonialism, which at that time had blazed into a great conflagration, impelled us to see the good aspects of China as a factor encouraging the triumphant march of the world revolution.

Nevertheless, Enver Hoxha's revolutionary in-

tuition was very strong, his ability to pause and reflect about even a phenomenon which might have seemed accidental, or a fact that was still not clear, was exceptional. It took a very short time, not even a year, for him to become completely convinced that the Chinese line was full of vacillations that resulted from erroneous ideological concepts, that their tactics were not only opportunist but also very dangerous for the international communist and liberation movement, and the future of socialism in the world.

In June 1962, the Central Committee of the Party sent Comrade Hysni Kapo and me to China to talk with the Chinese leadership about all the problems that had emerged in the communist movement after the Moscow Meeting. Comrade Enver wanted to get the real feel of things, to verify and confirm them several times over so that no step would be taken hastily or imprudently and without carefully weighing up the consequences.

After 25 days of a weary journey by ship over seas and oceans, we reached China, where we received a friendly and cordial welcome. We talked at length with Liu Shaoqi, Zhou Enlai, Deng Xiaoping and other leaders. We also met Mao Zedong. We discussed many problems of the international situation and the communist movement, relations between our two countries and parties, and tactics in the struggle against modern revisionism and Khrushchevite revisionism, in particular.

On many questions we and the Chinese were in agreement. But as regards the stand towards Khrushchevism and the tactics of the struggle against it, our differences were great. We parted

without achieving unity of views.

Although we had still not returned from China and made a detailed report to Comrade Enver, some of our radiograms had been sufficient for him to reach a conclusion about the talks in Beijing and to write in his *Diary*: “The Chinese comrades seem to be vacillating and afraid of the struggle against the revisionists. They overestimate the strength of the enemy and underestimate our strength and that of international communism. They are trying to reach some sort of compromise... We do not budge an inch from our correct positions of principle... If the Chinese do not change their stand on this important tactical issue, then we shall not reach agreement on anything.”

And that is what happened: we never reached agreement with the Chinese. The history of our relations with China, which is documented in detail in Comrade Enver’s work *Reflections on China*, is a history of disagreements. But it is, at the same time, a history which testifies to the revolutionary wisdom and correctness Enver Hoxha displayed and to his unmatched efforts to maintain good relations with China and to establish relations on a correct and principled basis. It is a history of that titanic struggle he waged in order to rescue the communist movement from opportunism, and of his permanent preoccupation to ensure that the struggle against imperialism and modern revisionism should develop on a correct course and mount to ever higher levels.

His efforts initially to help the Chinese communists to correct the opportunist waverings and to take a correct position in the struggle against

modern revisionism, and the Marxist criticism which he made later of the line of the Communist Party of China and the political and ideological views of Mao Zedong, go far beyond the framework of bilateral relations and the conflict with the Soviets. They represent the theoretical basis for building a truly revolutionary strategy of the Marxist-Leninist movement of our time.

The work in the Commission, especially for the drafting of the declaration which was to be presented to the November meeting, proceeded very slowly. There were many debates, frequently fierce ones. Besides the Chinese, our delegation too was now the target. We had only to make a suggestion or propose an amendment for the supporters of the Soviets to jump up and object to it for no reason at all.

Comrade Enver was informed of how the work was going in the Commission and imagined the tension we were under. Therefore, along with instructions that we should concentrate our attack on the Soviets, who were the main cause of the opportunist deviation, he gave us continual encouragement, which enabled us to keep calm and cool-headed and to carry out the task with which the Party had charged us to the best of our ability.

On the basis of his advice and orientations, Hysni and I decided each day on the stands we should adopt, the arguments we would use and the answers we would give.

One day, the part of the draft-declaration which spoke about the possibilities of avoiding imperialist wars was discussed. Our delegation had made a

proposal to strengthen this paragraph, opposing Khrushchev's well-known thesis of "a world without weapons, without wars and without armies." The French delegation, too, had presented a proposal on this paragraph, quoting a statement which Maurice Thorez, at that time General Secretary of the Communist Party of France, had made during those days.

Since the French proposal was correct in essence, we decided to support it. Thus, when the discussion of the paragraph about the imperialist wars began, I stood up and asked that our amendment should not be discussed. Everybody was surprised. But this did not last long, because immediately after this the discussion of the French amendment began. As we had decided beforehand, I stood up and supported it, at the same time unmasking the illusions which the opportunists were trying to create about imperialism. A heated debate began which was somewhat difficult for the revisionists. In attacking my arguments they had to reject Thorez, too. In the middle of the discussion, Leo Figer, the French representative, stood up and withdrew his amendment, declaring that he supported the proposal presented by the Soviets!

In the interval, I met Leo Figer, whom I had known for a long time, because both he and I had previously worked with the youth. To provoke him, I said:

"Were you so frightened of the Soviets that you denied Maurice Thorez, the General Secretary of your party?"

"Don't you see what's happening in this meeting?" he replied. "As soon as you get up to speak,

without listening to what you say, without reasoning at all, they're all against you. From the moment you supported our amendment I realized that it would be rejected. Therefore, I withdrew the proposal in order to prevent them from bringing Thorez into the discussion."

I mention this example in order to show the atmosphere which prevailed in the meeting of the Commission. Later, at the Meeting of the 81 Parties in November, the atmosphere was to be much more oppressive and the environment even more hostile, with still more pressure and intrigues. But then Enver Hoxha would be there in person!

At the end of the work of the Commission, on October 22, Khrushchev put on a dinner for all those who had taken part in the meeting. The "dinner" was used to threaten those parties which might oppose the line of the Soviets in November. The wrath of "gods" would burst upon them.

This "message" was conveyed to us too. During the dinner, the member of the Soviet leadership, Yekaterina Furtseva, who was seated next to Hysni, after a long silence, eventually addressed him:

"Are you Hysni Kapo?! I've heard so much about you..."

Comrade Hysni replied:

"For good or for bad?"

"You have attacked the Soviet Union, but you are heading for trouble on that course," she replied, unable to control herself.

Naturally she got the reply she deserved. Furtseva shut her mouth. Apparently her mission was just to transmit the signal. Throughout the

whole dinner, she did not speak to us again.

As we were leaving the dining room, another member of the Political Bureau, Dmitri Polyansky, joined us. We had previously met this fellow, who had earned a reputation as a cunning intriguer. I had met Polyansky first in 1957 when he came to Albania on holiday. But the second encounter with him especially, in April 1958, made an impression on me. Comrade Hysni and I were in Moscow in a delegation of our Party. Those days Polyansky had been appointed chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation. We learned he lived at the Moscow Hotel, where we were staying. We telephoned him and went to congratulate him. In Polyansky's suite we found the secretary of the party committee for Krasnodar. His flattery of Polyansky was intolerable. But it shed light on the psychology of the Soviet leaders of the Khrushchevite group. He drank toast after toast to Polyansky and kept babbling:

“To the Tsar of Russia! It is no joke to be the Tsar of Russia!”

He kept “Tsaring” him again and again! The word “prime minister” never came from his mouth.

And Polyansky? He laughed and never interrupted his obsequious friend, except to point out that Khrushchev (not the party) had done him this honour.

So this Polyansky, whom we knew well, approached us and, without greeting us, began to attack our Party over its stand at Bucharest and in the Preparatory Commission.

“You're betraying the Soviet Union. But where will you go?” he too threatened us.

He received the proper reply:

“It is not we Albanians who have changed, but the Soviet leadership which has set out on a dangerous course,” I said there and then.

Polyansky’s face flushed with anger and he left us saying: “You Albanians have become conceited.” And who said this? An unrestrained megalomaniac, who dreamed like the Tsars of Russia of extending his rule over peoples, seas and oceans.

The next day we left Moscow. As soon as we arrived in Tirana, we gave Comrade Enver a detailed account of everything. He listened to us attentively and, after instructing us to prepare a report for the Political Bureau, told us:

“Now it is clear that we will have a fierce struggle with Khrushchev and his associates. But we are on the right road. We cannot and must not leave their opportunism unmasked. We cannot yield because we are communists, Marxist-Leninists. We cannot sit idle because Khrushchev’s revisionist line constitutes a danger not only to the international communist movement, but also to the freedom and independence of our country.”

As he talked to us, Comrade Enver was looking far ahead:

“In this struggle,” he continued, “we will not be alone. Even in the Commission you saw that there were representatives of some parties who did not share the opinion of the Soviets on many questions. I am disappointed in the Chinese,” he said. “They were in the centre of the Soviets’ attack, but they did not stand firm on their accusations. They proved to be conciliatory, as if they sought the compromise. But let us hope that the stand of our

Party will encourage them to show more fight at the November meeting.”

But, as was seen later, this remained a desire.

“While you were fighting in Moscow,” Comrade Enver said at the end of our meeting, “I have been preparing for the battle of November. I have written the speech we will deliver at the Meeting of 81 Parties. Read it and we will talk again later. Of course, it will be necessary to make some additions, which are linked with the latest developments, especially with the work of the Commission.”

The Plenum of the CC of the Party, which unanimously approved Comrade Enver’s speech and appointed the delegation, headed by Comrade Enver Hoxha, which would represent our Party at the Moscow Meeting, was held early in November. Hysni and I were included in the delegation.

Comrade Enver stayed in Moscow for three weeks, from November 3-25. The atmosphere that surrounded us was icy. The people who served us, the security officers and guards, and the officials assigned to maintain contact with us all did their jobs like robots. There was no warmth, no friendly behaviour from them, but only a sort of cold correctness. When the time came to meet the leaders, from Suslov and Andropov to Mikoyan and Khrushchev, however, the hostility was open.

The Soviets’ aim was to ensure that Comrade Enver did not speak openly in Moscow and that, at the most, he should restrict himself to general criticisms on a theoretical plane. They wanted at all costs to avoid discussion of Khrushchev’s oppor-

tunist actions, of his revisionist line on the cardinal questions of the communist movement, the concrete stands of the Soviets towards Albania, their pressure and interference in our internal affairs, etc.

In order to achieve these aims, on the eve of the meeting and during the first days of it, they brought all-sided pressure to bear on our delegation. Various envoys sent by the Soviets came and went. The main leaders of the country were set in motion. They indulged in flattery, raised their voices in threats, promised "aid" and "credits." They came by day and by night. They even used the official reception for the celebration of November 7 against our delegation for these purposes. There they brought their marshals and generals into the act.

The Soviet leaders were not accustomed to having anyone tell them home truths to their face. Therefore, in the different meetings and talks, when Comrade Enver and we members of the delegation spoke about the opportunism which was characterizing the Khrushchevite policy, the Soviet leaders turned red, became agitated, raised their voices, became angry and uttered threats. But Enver Hoxha was not shaken!

A day before Comrade Enver was to deliver his speech, we held our last meeting with Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders. I remember Comrade Enver as if it were today. Calm, determined, concise in his thinking, sparing in words. As if to tell them: "Here we are, you wanted to talk, we've come. Speak, we are listening!" As is known, the meeting ended without any result. The Soviets demanded submission. But the Party of Labour of Albania

and Enver Hoxha would not submit!

At the moment when our delegation was leaving the room, I heard Khrushchev say to Mikoyan and Kozlov:

“What shall we do with them now?!”

Its source could have been this meeting, or it could have been a plan decided upon previously, but the fact is that a few days later (after Comrade Enver had spoken to the meeting and had shifted from the villa, in which we had all stayed together, to our embassy), one of the Soviet security officers who accompanied us told Hysni and me:

“Comrade Enver did very well to leave the villa and go to the embassy. The security colonel who accompanies him is a very mean character.”

That expression of Khrushchev’s — “What shall we do with them now?” — implied the idea of a criminal plan which, after the failure of the efforts to subjugate our delegation with promises and threats, envisaged even the physical liquidation of Comrade Enver.

The method of liquidating opponents is a method of putschists, of those who, in order to seize power or keep it in their hands, resort to any means, flattery and intrigues, pressure and murder. Khrushchev and company belong to this category. In order to attain their aims, whether on the internal or the external plane, they recognize no norm of human morality. What did they do with Czechoslovakia, their ally in Comecon and the Warsaw Treaty? They embraced Dubček in Bratislava, but two days later the Soviet troops entered Prague. They helped Taraki of Afghanistan to seize power, but Brezhnev’s tanks brought Amin to power, and

later the same Soviet army assisted Babrak Karmal to assassinate Amin and his clan. Precisely according to the principle of perfidious rogues who murder you by night and weep over you by day!

On November 16, Enver Hoxha delivered his historic speech to the Moscow Meeting. This speech was a real indictment of revisionism. It must be said that neither the Soviets nor the other participants in the meeting knew the content of the speech. Probably they hoped that the “pressures” would have had some influence on it. But soon, from his first words, everybody quickly understood that Enver Hoxha was not going to speak with “kid-gloves.”

With his calm, strong voice, with his characteristic oratory, Comrade Enver imposed complete silence in the hall. All listened attentively. All with preoccupation. I say all, because the Chinese, or some other delegation which perhaps was “pleased” about the blows that Khrushchev was receiving, in fact still did not agree that the polemic should assume an abrasive character, that the struggle against revisionism should be waged so consistently.

Naturally, those most worried were the Soviet delegation and the representatives of the parties which had bound themselves hand and foot to Khrushchev’s chariot. They were frowning and could not control their anger. There were others who were deep in thought. They listened to Comrade Enver’s words attentively. Plainly, the arguments he presented were making an impression on them, but at the same time they seemed to be say-

ing to themselves: "What kind of people are these Albanians? How dare they challenge Khrushchev and the Soviets face to face?"

When Comrade Enver spoke, all the delegations were present in the hall. From the Soviets there were Khrushchev, Mikoyan, Suslov, Kozlov, Polyansky, Brezhnev and others. Khrushchev displayed his anger more openly than the others. And that was natural. For the first time his activity was being heavily criticized. His views which the Soviet press and that of the satellites exalted to the skies as "brilliant," "Leninist," "creative," and so on and so forth, were being rejected one by one and unmasked as anti-Marxist, opportunist, reactionary views. And this attack was taking place in the presence of the representatives of 81 communist and workers' parties of the world, at a time when Khrushchev had "captivated" the UNO, when his prestige was at its zenith, when he had begun and was working to establish the unconditional hegemony of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union over all the countries which made up the socialist camp and all the communist parties. Therefore, while Enver Hoxha was speaking, Khrushchev held his head in his hands, fidgeted in his chair, whispered sometimes to Mikoyan, sometimes to Suslov, whom he had beside him, made gestures of amazement or smiled ironically, in order to show others that what was being said did not "pertain" to him! But in the end he gave up this charade and began to lose his patience. At one moment he took off his wristwatch and held it in his hand, to have it ready before his eyes. It was clear that he was impatient, that every minute

seemed like an hour to him.

Enver Hoxha's speech lifted the crust from the pie and revealed what was inside it. The Soviets failed in their aim to avoid polemics and concrete discussion of the opportunist deviations which had manifested themselves in the communist movement. Therefore, they took the necessary measures to organize the counter-attack with fresh slanders and threats against our Party.

I have kept detailed notes of each session of the Moscow Meeting and what the representatives of different parties said there. Leaders of parties from Europe, Latin America, Africa and Asia took the floor one after the other. Communist morality was discarded. Now one could hear the most resounding epithets and insults.

They even found a clown, the General Secretary of the CP of Paraguay, who wept bitterly because "the Party of Lenin had been attacked." Some years later, in 1976, I saw this "valiant fighter" weep again, but this time in Tirana, when he came to make self-criticism about what he had said in Moscow. He told me that he had been compelled by the Soviets, who had subsequently gone to work against him too: they had organized a faction within the party of Paraguay against the "brave" Oscar Creydt. He ended up in the Chinese stable as a partisan of the Maoist theory of "three worlds."

Despite the efforts of the Soviets to drown the criticism which Comrade Enver made and to distract attention from the problems he raised by showering insults on us, the impression which the participants in the meeting gained was not to the

liking of the Soviet leaders, and especially of Khrushchev personally. Everybody saw and heard that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union could be criticized, that Khrushchev could be criticized, that the Soviet leadership and Khrushchev were not infallible, but on the contrary, were opportunists and anti-Marxists. Precisely in order to do something to patch things up, so that the meeting would not end leaving these impressions, on November 23 the Soviets suggested a second round of discussions.

Nikita Khrushchev took the floor first. He began by saying that he had not intended to speak, but was obliged to do so because of the things Enver Hoxha had said. He tried to appear calm. He read his written text almost mechanically. He disputed the views of the Chinese, although without great heat. But this "coolheaded" pose did not last long. As soon as he began to reply to Comrade Enver's speech, he lost his head and began to shout, scream and splutter.

This speech of Khrushchev's aroused no special reverberations. On the contrary, it was quite obvious that many delegations, even some who toed the line of the Soviets, listened to him without enthusiasm. By speaking about the figure of Khrushchev, as an opportunist who had departed from the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary line, and proving this with many facts, Comrade Enver had shaken Khrushchev's prestige in the eyes of the participants in the meeting.

On November 25, Comrade Enver set out for Albania in order to be in Tirana for the celebration of November 29. The farewell to him at the Ki-

evskiy railway station in Moscow has remained in my mind. From the Soviets there was F. Kozlov, who seemed very uncomfortable and maintained a very cold stand, but the Albanian students, civilian and military, who were studying in Moscow and had come to greet the leader of the Party, created a fiery atmosphere. It was a magnificent manifestation, a public demonstration of great political importance, a powerful support which warmed our hearts, a manifestation of the steel unity of our people around the Party and Enver Hoxha. There were only 200-300 students, but they conveyed the pure feelings of our whole people, the close ties of the people with the Party and Comrade Enver, a bond of unity which neither Khrushchev, nor Kozlov, nor any other enemy of our country could understand.

Soon after the Moscow Meeting, the great polemic between Marxist-Leninists and modern revisionists was to begin within the communist and workers' movement. Enver Hoxha, at the head of our Party, played a role of first-rate importance in this polemic, making an outstanding contribution in defence of the purity of our triumphant doctrine of Marxism-Leninism.

In February 1961, the 4th Congress of our Party was held. It is one of the most enthusiastic and militant congresses in its history. The unity of the Party and its determination to march unwaveringly on the road of Marxism-Leninism were displayed there more clearly than on any other occasion.

The Congress endorsed the political and ideological line of the Party, which included both the

former stands and the future struggles which it would wage against revisionism. A new stage was beginning in the life of our Party and country. This was the stage in which our ideological and political independence would be further strengthened and consolidated, the stage in which the personality of Enver Hoxha, as the ardent defender of our triumphant ideology, as a consistent fighter for the cause of the revolution and socialism on the international plane, was to manifest itself in a brilliant manner.

After the 4th Congress, the relations between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Albania became further embittered. When they saw that they were achieving no results on the ideological plane, Khrushchev and his group transferred their efforts to the political and economic planes. The provocations at the Vlora base, which were stepped up day by day, took pride of place in their political pressures. On the other hand, the Soviet embassy in Tirana engaged in feverish anti-Albanian activity. Meanwhile, in the economic field, the carrying out of agreements and contracts was impeded, and the materials contracted for were delayed or did not come at all. Matters reached the point that a ship which had sailed into Durrës, bringing building materials from the Soviet Union for the Palace of Culture in Tirana, the foundations of which had just been laid, was sent back without unloading its cargo.

Along with these actions, the series of letters exchanged between the Soviet Party and Government and our Party and Government began. Long letters containing slanders and threats came from Moscow, sometimes over the signature of the Cen-

tral Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, sometimes of both the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, sometimes over the signature of Alexei Kosygin, and so on. With these letters, apart from other things, the Soviets tried to play on our nerves. The opinion that the Albanians are hot-headed was widespread at that time. Therefore, Khrushchev tried to provoke us, believing that we would fall into his trap, would lose our logic and take some ill-considered action, which he could exploit to discredit us in the eyes of world opinion.

I have spoken earlier about the way in which Comrade Enver worked. He was systematic in everything. He studied the problems that presented themselves to our Party thoroughly. He was not hasty, but once his opinion had matured, he was very quick in writing and very precise in formulating his ideas. He had a special ability to analyse phenomena and knew how to distinguish the main issues from the secondary ones.

He engaged personally in the preparation of the correspondence with the Soviets and the main articles published in our press, the object of which was to expose the views of different revisionists: Soviet, Yugoslav, Chinese or Eurocommunist. As a rule, before deciding to write or prepare any such material, he exchanged opinions with the comrades, analysed the stands of the revisionists, pointed out their mistakes, weak points and deviations from the Marxist-Leninist standpoint, and after listening to the opinions of the comrades, he wrote,

sometimes a complete article, sometimes expanded theses, sometimes particular ideas. These were weighty writings, both from the ideo-theoretical and from the publicist aspects, from the power of the thinking and from the excellence of the presentation.

As I said, Comrade Enver put his thoughts on paper very quickly. Therefore he would say to me jokingly:

“I’ve prepared a ‘hot-scone.’ Have a look at it with the comrades!”

But those “hot-scones” were bombshells; they were the Marxist-Leninist truth, the thinking of revolution which tore the mask from the counter-revolution.

Comrade Enver carefully considered each word, each epithet and each phrase from the tactical aspect. He gave importance to the ideo-political clarification of the questions that were raised and to finding the necessary arguments which refuted the views of the opponent. He gave importance to the ardent defence of the Party line and the unequivocal denunciation of revisionist stands. While giving importance to the content, the thought and the ideas which were to be expressed, he was not unduly worried about the order of paragraphs or similar formal details. This method of writing was natural to him.

The ideological struggle against revisionism in general, and against Khrushchevite revisionism in particular, raised the figure of Enver Hoxha to great prominence. It is also one of the fields of his most fruitful theoretical creativeness. He had always shown himself to be a consistent Marxist-

Leninist: in the time of the National Liberation War, in opposing Yugoslav revisionism, in his attitude towards the 20th Congress of the CPSU, and so on. But Enver Hoxha emerged as the ardent defender of Marxism-Leninism especially with the exacerbation of the ideological struggle in the 1960s, when Khrushchevite revisionism emerged as the main danger, and later, in the 1970s, when Maoism too was shown to be a bourgeois, pseudo-communist ideology. Apart from the numerous articles published in our press, the outstanding works: *Imperialism and the Revolution*, *Eurocommunism Is Anti-Communism*, *With Stalin, When the Party Was Born*, *The Khrushchevites*, *The Titoites*, *Laying the Foundations of the New Albania*, etc., belong to this period. These works constitute a great theoretical heritage, both for the Albanian people and communists in their struggle for the cause of socialist construction, and for the proletarians everywhere in the world to carry forward the cause of revolution and communism.

The revisionists' main argument to make their theses and course acceptable and to present them as "creative" and in "conformity" with the time has always been based on misrepresentation of the significance of the changes which have taken place in the world since the Second World War, the development of the technical-scientific revolution and the sharpening of different social contradictions. Thus, they proclaim Marxism-Leninism "obsolete" and its teachings unsuitable for the present-day conditions.

The merit of the Party of Labour and Enver Hoxha is that they opposed these misrepresenta-

tions and proved the vitality of Marxism-Leninism. In the above-mentioned works, Comrade Enver resolutely defended our triumphant doctrine and developed it creatively, providing answers to the problems that had emerged and always from correct positions of attack.

By analysing the conditions of present-day development, the ratio of forces, imperialism and its reactionary strategy, on the one hand, and the struggle of the working class and the peoples, on the other hand, with special mastery and in the Leninist style, Enver Hoxha proved in all his works that the changes which have occurred in the world have given rise not to the need to revise Marxism-Leninism, but to put it into practice by leading the proletariat on the battlefields to attack the bourgeoisie and leading the peoples to attack imperialism.

He proved the connection which exists between the reactionary strategy of imperialism and that of modern revisionism. In his works Enver Hoxha does not limit himself to observations. He opposes this two-fold reactionary strategy with the strategy of the revolution, of the overthrow of society with antagonistic classes, as an inevitable result of progressive world processes.

With their resolute struggle against modern revisionism of all hues, our Party and Comrade Enver Hoxha have opened the eyes of many disillusioned revolutionaries in the world, proving that the revisionist retrogression was not a failure of socialism, but just a zigzag in the long and difficult road of progress.

The courage of the Party of Labour and of its leader Enver Hoxha in the struggle to draw the demarcation line between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism has been one of the important factors which gave impetus to the process of differentiation in the ranks of the communist and workers' movement, and the creation of new Marxist-Leninist revolutionary parties. In these parties Comrade Enver saw the future, the invincible force of the revolution. Therefore, he placed his wide experience as an organizer and communist leader, and his theoretical abilities as a Marxist-Leninist ideologist at their disposal at any time.

Enver Hoxha is an outstanding figure of international communism. Just as he was an ardent patriot, he was an equally ardent internationalist. He saw the victory of the revolution and the socialist construction of our country as a fulfilment of our internationalist duty to the world proletariat, while he considered the growth of the Marxist-Leninist movement, the victories scored by the revolutionaries and the peoples in the world against capital as a powerful external support for socialism which is being built in Albania.

Historically, after the emergence of modern revisionism, many communist parties of the world, especially in Europe, deviated to counter-revolutionary positions. As a reaction against them, first there emerged Marxist-Leninist groups which grew very quickly into parties. At that time, as a result of the revisionists' pressure, but also because of the lack of experience, rightist or leftist tendencies were displayed in some of these new Marxist-Leninist parties and groups. That was natural. As

emerges from his works, in meetings and talks, Comrade Enver frequently drew attention to these dangers and to the need for the revolutionary tempering of Marxist-Leninists.

In a working meeting in his office on November 1, 1972, he told me: “Both opportunism and sectarianism are equally dangerous for the Marxist-Leninist parties. While putting the stress on opportunism as the main danger for the communist movement, sectarianism must not be underrated. If we bear in mind that the new Marxist-Leninist parties were born in struggle with revisionism, that is, with the rightist deviation, the possibility that sometimes they may deviate to sectarian positions as a reaction to opportunism cannot be ruled out.”

On quite a number of occasions I have taken part in Comrade Enver’s meetings with delegations of Marxist-Leninist parties. He never spoke to the friends of our Party with “must,” even when they sought his advice directly, but told them of our experience, saying: “Our National Liberation War, or the struggle for the socialist construction has taught us that... We carried out collectivization in conformity with our conditions, over a period of several decades... Life has led us to the conclusion that the class struggle is waged even in the phase of the complete construction of the socialist society and after it,” etc. This made a special impression on me and has been a very valuable lesson to me in my work. In one word, he did not impose the experience and road of our Party on others.

“The Marxist-Leninists,” Comrade Enver pointed out in the above-mentioned meeting, “have organized themselves into parties and

groups which, for the time being, may be small. But the effect of their work can be much greater if they operate prudently. The working class is at war with the bourgeoisie, with the owning class, as we know; different detachments of it have different demands. If the Marxist-Leninists unite with the working class, in struggle and through struggle, support its demands and propagate their line in the course of actions, the conditions for the party to increase its influence among the working class and to link itself better with the masses will certainly be created.”

On February 15, 1979, I informed Comrade Enver about a meeting I had had on one of those days with a representative of the Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist), who told me about the work which the Marxist-Leninists are doing there on the class struggle, the struggle against U.S. imperialism, etc.

“The comrade from the Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist) presents the problems of his country and the need for the struggle against U.S. imperialism correctly,” Comrade Enver said. “Of course, the comrades of each Marxist-Leninist party have their objectives for the struggle against the local bourgeoisie, imperialism or revisionism. We can exchange opinions in a comradely manner. But it is they themselves who decide what is necessary and what is not necessary for them to do because neither we, nor anyone else, can tell them how they should act. Precisely herein lies the ability of each communist party to apply the principles of Marxism-Leninism in conformity with the concrete conditions of the country.”

Throughout the whole of his life, Comrade En-

ver Hoxha remained close to the Marxist-Leninist communist movement. He has dealt extensively with and has enriched Marxist thinking on proletarian internationalism. Some of his definitions, like that on performing one's internationalist duty, first of all, by carrying out the revolutionary tasks within the country, etc., are of a great theoretical and practical importance.

“There is only one internationalism,” Comrade Enver often said. “There are not and cannot be ‘active’ internationalists and ‘passive’ internationalists. Internationalism is loyalty to Marxism, devotion to the interests of the proletariat and dedication to the cause of the revolution. Internationalism is active and cannot be otherwise.”

The Marxist-Leninists, revolutionaries and progressive people, both those who have had direct contacts with him and those who have been acquainted with him through the study of his works, have always expressed their admiration and sincere love for this great proletarian fighter. Comrade João Amazonas, First Secretary of the CC of the CP of Brazil, has pointed out: “Enver Hoxha is an example of self-denial, of revolutionary courage, of perseverance in the ideas he represents, of the staunch and honoured militant of the Party of communists. He is the symbol of perseverance in struggle, of faith in the people, of love for the socialist Homeland, of the consistent internationalist — a symbol of the invincibility of revolutionary ideas.”

In the struggle against modern revisionism which the Albanian communists, with Enver Hoxha at the head, waged with exemplary con-

sistency, our Party emerged victorious. Life itself is confirming more and more each day the correctness of this struggle and the correctness of their analyses, forecasts and conclusions. What Enver Hoxha saw and declared from the outset — that the revisionists would degenerate and would restore capitalism, that the other revisionist parties would fall into the social-democratic mire, that modern revisionism would turn into a “basket of crabs,” — can now be seen by everybody. We are seeing this in Yugoslavia which, in order to be “self-administered,” is financed and administered by 600 international banks and the International Monetary Fund. We are seeing this in China, where the last congress of the Communist Party officially declared that China can set out on the road of socialism only 50 years from now. We are seeing this in Poland where, in order to keep “socialism” alive, the government has borrowed 30 billion dollars from the Western banks and now cannot repay them. We are seeing this in Hungary, which in recent days officially announced that it is in debt to the tune of 17 billion dollars, etc.

The results of the revisionist line are also clearly apparent in two of the “most ardent” parties of new opportunism: the French and Italian Communist Parties, the standard-bearers of Eurocommunism. In the parliamentary elections of 1956, the French Communist Party got 5,450,000 votes, or more than 25 per cent of the votes of the whole country. In 1968, it got 4,430,000 votes, or 20 per cent of the votes. But in 1986, it got only 9.8 per cent of the votes. The revisionist line brought no better “luck” to the Italian Communist Party ei-

ther. In the last 10 years alone, this party has lost more than one third of its electoral support. In 1976, it won 34.4 per cent of the votes, whereas in May 1988, it secured only 21.9 per cent of the votes. At a meeting of the central committee of that party, held in July of this year, one of its leaders said openly, "the Italian Communist Party has now been transformed into a social-democratic party."

The results of the revisionist line are appearing with special clarity today in the Soviet Union which, with Gorbachev at the helm, is striving to carry through to the end what Khrushchev did not finish: the complete transition to a society which has only the socialist label left. The so-called perestroika and glasnost are ways to reform even those elements which still retain their socialist appearance. "Perestroika" means reforming the whole of Soviet society, not in order to strengthen the positions of the working class and socialism, but in order to strike them the final blow. "Glasnost" means to open the way once and for all to the bourgeois ideology, to enable opportunists and the partisans of pluralism to determine what is good and what is bad, and how they should and should not act, according to their liking. Gorbachev's group needs "perestroika" and "glasnost" in order to create the necessary conditions for the Soviet Union to proceed on the same course as the United States of America, to compete with it for spheres of influence and expansion, for the exploitation of the peoples and for hegemony.

Our Party will march consistently on the road of irreconcilable struggle against modern revisionism of whatever kind and whatever name it as-

sumes. As Enver Hoxha advised us, socialist Albania will work persistently for the building of socialism, with complete faith in and unwaveringly following the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, which have displayed and are displaying their vitality and universal value day by day. Guided by these teachings and implementing them in a creative manner in our concrete conditions, socialist Albania is forging ahead, developing and becoming more beautiful.

Strategist of the Socialist Construction

It is not possible to present even a general outline of the whole contribution of Enver Hoxha as the architect of the policy of the economic and cultural development of the new Albania in a single book, let alone in a single chapter. Scientific studies and conferences, books and monographs, and publications of all kinds have been devoted to his theoretical thinking as a whole, and to his economic thinking in particular. Nevertheless, our sciences still have much to do to bring out the all-sided value of his thought as a weapon for progress and development in all fields, as the inspiration of socialist continuity.

In these notes, rather than give an historical presentation of the course pursued by the Party under the leadership of Comrade Enver Hoxha, for the material and spiritual progress of our society in the years of the new life, I want to underline his role as a strategist of the socialist construction in Albania, as a fighter and creative thinker for the implementation of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism in the conditions of our country.

He has made a decisive contribution both to envisaging and to putting into practice every reform,

every socialist transformation that the Albanian economy and culture has undergone in the last half century. The main merit for mapping out the course for the all-sided socialist development of Albania from Liberation to this day belongs to him.

When the country was liberated from foreign occupiers, it was in a very grave situation: the devastation from war was added to the general backwardness and poverty. No bridge had been left standing; nothing but ruins could be seen everywhere. The main and most urgent need was for food. Almost no medicines were available at a time when diseases were rampant everywhere. The state's finances had been exhausted, and the existing experts could be counted on one's fingers. In those first years, the internal and external class enemies, defeated by the revolution, plotted and operated with the ferocity of a wounded beast, employing every means, including arms, diplomacy and also their economic power to overthrow the people's state power. How was this situation to be coped with? How were the victories achieved to be defended and carried further ahead? Where should we begin?

When we look back, when we view the socialist development of the country in retrospect, we feel a legitimate pride that in all the situations and stages of the revolution, the strategy and line of the Party have been correct. The reconstruction of the country and the difficulties of the beginning were coped with successfully. An economic policy that reflected the interests of socialism, the independence

and the sovereignty of the Homeland, the people's well-being and prosperity was applied. The majestic program of socialist industrialization, our original road for the collectivization and modernization of agriculture, and the ideological and cultural revolution are historic achievements of extraordinary importance. Profound social transformations such as the creation of the working class and the enhancement of its leading role, the establishment and strengthening of social equality, the emancipation of women and the democratization of the life of the country, the creation of a new way of life, the cultivation of socialist moral values and the development of correct demographic processes — all these are due to the wisdom of the Party and our unforgettable leader, Comrade Enver Hoxha.

The more time goes by, the more value the great ideas of Enver Hoxha on the elaboration of the economic line of the Party assume. Today, the policy of directing investments with priority to the branches of the heavy industry, to oil and energy production, to the extraction and processing of mineral assets, as the first and main step for the socialist industrialization of the country, might seem to many simply a mechanical application of the universal economic laws of socialism. But in the situation of our country during those first years, this was a very bold decision.

I am not referring simply to the “recommendations” and pressures of “friends” of those times, first the Yugoslavs, then the Soviets, to begin the industrialization from the sectors with the most rapid economic effectiveness, the light and foodstuffs industry, that is, to impose a distorted, un-

stable, one-sided economic development on our country, or, to put it more plainly, to close the prospects for heavy industry, this fundamental branch of the economy. Indeed, they went so far as to elevate to theory the thesis that a small country has no need to set up a complex industry.

Neither am I referring to the undermining activity of internal enemies, to their systematic efforts to attack and distort the economic policy of the Party, nor to the attempts of external enemies, imperialists and others to intervene with counter-revolutionary aims in Albania.

To invest with priority in heavy industry immediately after the war meant facing the economy and the people with difficult tests. It meant appealing to them to make new sacrifices. Let us not forget the period about which we are speaking. In the first years, the level of production secured was so low that it was insufficient, even if it had all been used for consumption, without mentioning sources of accumulation and new investments.

Confronted with such a situation, it seemed justifiable, at least for a certain period, to take steps which would lead immediately to raising the level of well-being of the masses, that is, to avoid the tightening of belts, thus falling into the petty-bourgeois positions of those who do not want to make sacrifices themselves, but want to leave them to future generations.

It is the harmonization of the fundamental proportions of the economy and the construction of its complete and solid structure which, more than anything else, highlights the adherence to principle and the political wisdom of our Party and Comrade

Enver Hoxha. Precisely because the Party and Enver Hoxha wanted prosperity for the Homeland and happiness for the people they encouraged and applied such a line of development, the essence of which is the priority of the interests of the future over those of the moment.

It is not difficult to create temporary situations of abundance in consumer goods, to foster illusions and sow euphoria about well-being among the masses by abandoning obligations towards the future. In history there are many ambitious leaders who, wanting to placate the masses and gain their support, have raised the level of the people's consumption artificially and prematurely. However, illusions have always been followed by disillusionment, which is even more unpleasant than momentary insufficiency.

In our neighbourhood there are countries in which the present generations are paying for the undeserved standard of living of several previous generations and, moreover, generations to come will continue to pay for it. Speaking in concrete terms, each newborn citizen in Yugoslavia inherits an average of one thousand dollars of foreign debt left to him by his forebears. This is the case also in many other countries, in which the respective working class would have to work years on end without remuneration in order to pay off the obligations to creditors.

Our Party and Comrade Enver Hoxha did not follow such a course. They did not seek easy, comfortable solutions and did not fear sacrifices and difficulties. Therefore, each day that passes increases the gratitude of generations for the course

pursued. This is the reliable road of advance towards the future, the road of harmonious development of our whole socialist life. A leadership like our Party, which has the people with it, can march on this road.

In the first post-Liberation years, the fundamental task of the program for the development of the country was to quickly overcome the profound backwardness inherited in the economy by vigorous development of the productive forces. The socialist industrialization of the country was the essence of this strategic task.

If we refer to chronicles of that time, it emerges that the first step towards the setting up of the new industry was the nationalization of local and foreign private capital. In fact, the nationalization was more a political than an economic act, because the value of the nationalized capital was insignificant, especially by current standards. Moreover, from the technical and organizational aspects, this legacy did not constitute real industry.

In these conditions, industrialization, especially giving constant priority to heavy industry, seemed like a great, insurmountable mountain. But Enver Hoxha with his wisdom found the ways to scale these difficult and dangerous slopes. When he spoke about the necessity for heavy industry and its priority development, he had in mind, first of all, the exploitation of latent underground assets, the extraction of oil and coal, chromium and copper, iron and other minerals.

Our Party and Comrade Enver were guided by the idea that, in the process of industrialization, each stage would prepare for the next one: the ex-

tracting industry would require and supply the processing industry; from this, the metallurgical plants would emerge and go on to secondary and deeper processing of raw materials, and to the completion of their cycles. Therefore, while instructing that heavy industry should begin with the mines and the extraction of underground riches, they never failed to point out that this would be a transitory phase, just as it turned out to be in practice, because the final objective was the setting up of the processing industry. The fact that the increase in the proportion of processed minerals has been a continuous trend of our exports from the start of our industrialization to this day demonstrates this.

In seeking the large-scale utilization of our natural resources, Enver Hoxha had in view the development of the iron, steel and chrome smelting industries, the petro-chemical industry and the production of complex machinery. With such logic, he never separated the development of industries in extent from their development in depth, but saw these as two simultaneous processes.

He considered the production of steel and the setting up of the Albanian iron and steel industry, the construction of the metallurgical combine at Elbasan, as "the second liberation of Albania." It should be borne in mind that Comrade Enver made this high assessment at a time when the metallurgical plant required large investments and subsidies and would require them for a relatively long period. Nevertheless, he had the unshakeable conviction that the day would come when ferrous metallurgy would repay the country many times over for all the accumulations and sacrifices because, in

time, each new factory added to the plant would immediately increase its overall profitability to a considerable extent.

With this broad political and economic concept, the Party, with Enver Hoxha at the head, saw the way to ensure the necessary financial resources for the whole socialist industrialization. It was well aware of the patriotism and readiness which the peasantry would display to finance the setting-up of different industries, just as it was aware of the effectiveness of these industries and the many possibilities they would create over the whole national economy for accumulation. The political alliance between two friendly classes, between the working class and the cooperativist peasantry, Comrade Enver pointed out, must be reinforced by a stable economic alliance.

Right from the first years, Enver Hoxha saw clearly that the social and economic progress of the country could not be achieved without its electrification. He was so firmly convinced about this that he regarded the socialist revolution and the electrification of the country as closely linked with each other. His faith in the future made him talk about the use of electric power in industry and mines, in plants and combines, in those years when our country possessed only handicraft workshops and some small factories.

If today we have a multi-branched, complex, heavy and light industry, based on the local resources, which meets the needs of the economy on a broad front, a unified electric-power system and a positive energy balance, a harmonious development of industry and agriculture, a mature working

class distributed over the whole territory to the most remote corners of the country — all these things stem from the far-sighted policy of industrialization, consistently applied by the Party under the leadership of Comrade Enver Hoxha.

Today Albania is approaching the stage of its transformation into an industrial-agricultural country, which represents a more advanced level of the construction of the material-technical base of socialism. This will be a majestic victory, of which the Party and the people have dreamed, for which they have worked and struggled, and indeed sacrificed, for about half a century. The transformation of Albania from a backward agricultural country into an industrial-agricultural country has been the constant direction of the economic strategy worked out by the Party and Enver Hoxha. The years of the past five-year plans have been steps to ascend towards this historic objective, which will crown with success the work and heroism of several generations of builders of socialism.

The industrial-agricultural stage, towards which we are taking the decisive steps, is evidence of the maturity of socialism, proof of the all-round progress of the country, of the development of the productive forces and relations in production, of the raising of well-being and the improvement of the way of life, of the emancipation of our society as a whole. This is the stage of the consolidation of the multi-branched structure of the economy and its greater intensification, of qualitative changes in the composition of social production and the branches of industry, of the improvement of the structure of resources for the creation of national

revenue and exports, of new social-class developments of our society, etc.

It is common knowledge that following the Second World War, a series of European and Asian countries of people's democracy set out on the road of the collectivization of agriculture. Since then, more than four decades have gone by. During this period, all the forms and systems applied in agriculture by the different "theoreticians" of Marxism have been tested thoroughly. The fact is that today, both the Soviet "kolkhoz" and the Chinese commune, as well as the other collective-type economies which were set up in the past in the Eastern countries, have been discredited. In those countries the content of collectivization has been destroyed; only the façades of it remain.

In the revisionist countries, in some earlier and in others later, in some openly and in others in camouflaged ways, private property in agriculture has been restored or assumed large proportions. Thus, the cooperatives have been done away with once and for all. The slogan that allegedly the co-operativist system in agriculture is one which cannot carry production forward in this branch or raise the well-being in the countryside has been used to justify this reversal. But the cause of the failures of agriculture in these countries lies not in the Leninist idea of setting up cooperatives, but precisely in the revising of it.

The correct agrarian policy which our Party has pursued, while continuously bringing about radical changes in the countryside and giving an unprecedented impulse to the development of agriculture,

is also a brilliant defence of the teachings of Lenin against the revisionists' distortions and attacks.

If the superiority of the cooperativist order is indisputable in our country and its advantages are steadily increasing, this is due, in the first place, to the theoretical clarity and the penetrating class logic of Enver Hoxha. Membership in the cooperative has brought the Albanian peasant well-being and culture, a dignified way of life and socialist moral concepts.

Of course, this achievement, colossal in its dimensions and importance, has not been made easily. To bring it about required not only political wisdom and revolutionary courage but also respect for the conditions of the country, not only free will on the part of the peasantry but also large investments and continuous financial support on the part of our society.

Although under difficult conditions and confronted with the urgent need to increase agricultural production, the Party and Comrade Enver have always pursued a prudent and cautious agrarian policy. In every phase it has been applied without haste and has responded to the interests of the peasantry and the socialist development of the country. The very fact that it took more than 20 years to complete the collectivization of agriculture in our country (1946-1967) shows how consistently the principle of voluntarism, the persuasion of the peasantry, was adhered to in our country. On this cardinal question of the revolution, too, our Party has not skipped the stages, has not rushed matters, but has done everything at the proper time.

The history of the collectivization of agriculture in our country is full of facts which show that our Party has never confused desires and imagination with the real conditions and possibilities of development. The decisions of the special 11th Plenum of the Central Committee of the Party, held in May 1951, are an illustration of this maturity with universal value.

A meeting of the Central Committee held only one month before this Plenum had examined the question of the collectivization of agriculture and issued the slogan of the mass extension and acceleration of this process. In fact, these conclusions were hasty, if not deliberately hostile acts intended to discredit the line of the Party on collectivization. I say that they could have been deliberately hostile acts because the main report was delivered by Mehmet Shehu, who chaired this meeting and guided its proceedings in the absence of Comrade Enver, who was on a visit to the Soviet Union at that time. In fact, that meeting violated the decision of the 2nd National Conference of the Party held one year earlier, at which the line of the collectivization of agriculture was summed up in the slogan "we must neither rush matters, nor mark time."

When Comrade Enver returned to the Homeland and acquainted himself with the documents of the meeting of the Central Committee of April 1951, he demanded reconsideration of its decisions, describing them as premature and one-sided. On his proposal the Plenum of the Central Committee met once more and discussed the question of collectivization again, on a sound basis.

At this meeting of the Central Committee (11th Plenum), which has gone down in the history of the Party as the "corrected 10th Plenum," Comrade Enver patiently explained with theoretical and practical arguments the importance of voluntarism in such a revolutionary transformation as the transition from small-scale private property to the joint property of the group, and from individual to collective work. This was a revolution in itself, which required profound political and economic understanding, which had to do with the psychology and cultural level of the peasant. By creating new relations in production, collectivization would bring about a new development of agricultural and livestock production, just as it would bring about important changes also in the life in the countryside, in its development and progress and in its links with the town and the working class.

Hence, for numerous reasons of an ideological and political, economic and organizational, psychological and social character, the Party had to display prudence in the work for the collectivization of agriculture. Haste was equal to failure. The decisions endorsed by the 11th Plenum of May 1951 constituted a real platform for the roads and rates with which collectivization in the countryside would be pursued.

The peasant question in all its complexity, involving economic and social policy, with the final aim of wiping out the essential distinctions between town and countryside, is one of the most difficult questions of the socialist construction. Therefore it requires special attention from the Party and the state organs. It requires persistent

all-sided work and scientific Marxist-Leninist handling. This is how Enver Hoxha saw this problem and this is how the Party, basing itself on his teachings, sees the questions of the peasantry and the development of our socialist countryside today. I emphasize this because the progress of socialist relations in the countryside, the development of agricultural production, the emancipation of the countryside in the broad sense of the term, depend to a large extent on the correct understanding, and especially on the correct application of the Party's agrarian policy.

The Party and Comrade Enver often had to combat narrow concepts, subjective desires, underestimation of the countryside, and actions harmful to the interests of the peasantry and agricultural cooperatives, presented under the pretext of defending the interests of the socialist state, etc. I spoke earlier of the danger that existed in the first years that the principle of voluntarism would be violated and the pace forced in the collectivization of the countryside. But instances of superficial, incorrect theoretical and practical views have occurred since then, and it cannot be ruled out that superficial theoretical interpretations may be made even today. Of course, it is the duty of the Party to work to clear up these misunderstandings and correct the mistakes.

That is how Enver Hoxha acted.

"In the meeting I had with Comrade Enver," I wrote in my notes of December 10, 1980, "material presented by a group of economists on the mechanism of the transformation of the higher-type cooperatives into state farms was discussed. The

question was presented: should the members of these cooperatives be paid for even a part of the common property, when their cooperatives are transformed into state farms? The prevailing idea in the material was that the cooperativists should not be compensated, reasoning that this is justified by the fact that here we have to do with the transformation from a lower into a higher form of social ownership. This reasoning seemed rational to some of the authors of the material. They based their recommendation to cancel the right to compensation on the defence of the interests of society and the state.

“We did not agree with such an idea. Comrade Enver dwelt especially on this question.

“‘In the material which they have presented to us, it seems to me that our economists do not present the question of property correctly,’ he stressed. ‘For them there seems to be no difference between the property of the group and state property. This is not true. To convince yourself of this you need only read Engels carefully in his work *Anti-Dühring*. There, referring to Marx’s thinking, he clearly explains the difference between the property of the whole people and the property of the group. However, by denying the peasants the right to a certain compensation for the common property during the transition of the higher-type cooperatives into state enterprises, the economists who have prepared this material are saying, indirectly, that the property of the entire people is the same as the property of the group. But that is wrong in principle.’

“Comrade Enver frequently proceeded from a

simple fact of practice to important generalizations. Wanting to urge his thoughts in this direction, I intervened in the conversation saying:

“Such apparently principled reasoning has not been lacking in earlier phases of development of the cooperativist order. Even today,’ I continued, ‘sometimes, especially in the field of theory, discussions are held and the question is asked: Why was it necessary to carry out the Land Reform when immediately after this, the collectivization of agriculture began? Why was it necessary to give the peasant the land when only a little while later he was going to unite in cooperatives? Was it not possible to skip this reform?’

“To ask questions and indulge in theorizing is easy,’ said Comrade Enver, ‘but every action must be judged according to the concrete historical conditions. The Land Reform was indispensable. It was an immediate task of the new people’s power, one of the conditions most decisive for opening up prospects for the development of the Albanian countryside.

“Our Party has never done anything just for the sake of form,’ he stressed next, ‘and it did not act in that way over the Land Reform either. Our peasantry, which had fought for the Homeland and for land for centuries on end, committed itself to the National Liberation War unreservedly, expressing its profound sentiments of patriotism and desire for freedom and social justice, as well as its aspirations to a better life and its dream of owning the land. It fought and sacrificed itself unsparingly, in the hope that it would become the lawful owner of the land, just as the Party had promised during the

war. The Albanian peasantry had become accustomed to promises about the land in every struggle and battle that required its contribution, just as it had always been disillusioned once they were over. This time it was not going to allow this to happen again, and it did not happen.

“‘On the question of collectivization,’ Enver continued, ‘we did not rush matters. Had we insisted that collectivization be carried out right away for the entire peasantry, we would certainly have failed and the very existence of our socialist state, the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, would have been placed in jeopardy.’”

When the foundations of our cooperativist system were laid, our country had just emerged from the war. The people shouldered a heavy burden of work and accomplished difficult tasks. The protection of the plains from flooding and the draining of swamps, the building of irrigation projects and the systematization of land, the terraces, irrigation, the mechanization of farming and the provision of chemical fertilizers, without which the collectivization would have been worthless, were actions which were carried out with great toil. And this was precisely at a time when agriculture carried the main burden in the socialist accumulation and financed the setting up of the new industry.

Comrade Enver always stressed that the Albanian peasantry merited every contribution of our society. With this he had in mind the special characteristics of our peasantry, its differences in many aspects from the peasantry in other countries.

The specific character of our peasantry is linked with its role, place and contribution in all the strug-

gles for freedom and independence, but especially in the people's revolution and the struggle for the construction of socialism, in the building, consolidation and defence of the new people's power — the magnificent achievements of the epoch of the Party. In those struggles and battles, the peasantry has been a resolute fighter and exemplary in applying the teachings of the Party.

Our peasantry is not merely an ally of the working class, but its worthy co-fighter. It has assimilated and is assimilating the ideology and consciousness of the proletariat, the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. It is a reality that the Albanian working class constitutes the leading class of the society, but it is equally true that our peasantry has never lagged behind and has made an historic contribution as a resolute fighter for the cause of the construction of socialism.

I have dwelt on this in order to point out that Comrade Enver Hoxha judged the various phenomena not according to schemes, but according to the logic of life, the logic of our daily struggle and work. Some studies and lectures, however, when referring to the role and nature of our peasantry, tend to become mostly theoretical discussions and often make assessments on the basis of known general stereotypes. These assessments either completely "overlook" or diminish and minimize the role and contribution of our peasantry in the socialist construction. However, the practice of the construction of socialism in our country demolishes such scholastic theorizing.

Albanian agriculture, which has always been at the centre of the Party's economic policy and plans

for the development of the country, has been in constant transformation. It has become an inexhaustible source of products for the people's consumption, for the socialist accumulation and for export. With the yields achieved in the main products, our collectivized agriculture has made giant strides ahead. Year by year it is consolidating that victory of strategic importance — ensuring the people's bread within the country — and now it is able to cope with even more difficult tasks.

Socialist agriculture has been developed with sure steps and in original ways in our country. Such experiences as the setting up of higher-type cooperatives, the combination of economic relations of group property with the state, the priority of intensification of production in broad zones, the combination and harmonization of the intensive road with the traditional ways of development, the concentration, specialization and regionalization of crops and livestock according to the experience of Plasa, the narrowing of distinctions between the lowland and the hilly and mountainous zones and the stability of the peasant population, are all of special importance. They have opened new horizons for deepening the process of socialist construction in the countryside and for the steps that will be taken in the future.

When the first cooperatives were set up, Albania could not provide enough bread for the little more than one million inhabitants it had, while today, 40-50 years later, with its own production it secures not only the bread but also the overwhelming bulk of the foodstuffs for a population increased nearly three-fold in number and with de-

mands many times greater. Today, our agriculture produces about twice as much per capita as it did in 1960. This is the effectiveness of the cooperativist order; this expresses the correctness of the agrarian policy of the Party of Labour and the value of the creative thinking of Comrade Enver Hoxha.

Throughout all the stages of the socialist construction, from the first democratic reforms to the profound revolutionary transformations which came later, Enver Hoxha personally bore the main burden of the economic management of the country, not only for as long as he was Chairman of the Council of Ministers, a task which he performed until 1954, but all the time, as First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party. He ensured that the tasks he formulated as political leader were carried out successfully through his work as organizer for their implementation in practice. His political clarity and broad cultural horizon sharpened his organizational qualities, just as his direct participation in the activity of organization and management provided inexhaustible and irreplaceable material for his powerful generalizing thinking.

Comrade Enver's economic vision was very broad, covering all fields of the development of social production. One need only glance over the index to any of the volumes of his *Works* to be convinced of this. There all the fundamental questions of the development of the country are listed, from the problems of priorities and the main principles of the management of the economy to those of the detailed organization of the work. If we proceed

from the thematic criterion, from his wide-ranging and varied *Works*, whole volumes with selected materials could be published, not only about the role of the Party, about oil or such sectors as agriculture, science, education and culture, literature and art, the army and the organs of Internal Affairs, etc., volumes which, in fact, have long been available to the reader, but also, say, about chromium, coal, livestock-raising, construction and transport, about the economic effectiveness or the social aspects of production.

Among the broad public as well as in scientific studies and meetings, it has been declared, quite correctly, that Enver Hoxha is the inspirer of the magnificent transformations which have changed the face of our country. And he has not provided only general ideas about these transformations. For every new step that had to be taken in the economy, he studied science and the contemporary achievements, consulted with the cadres, listened to the opinions of specialists, sought information and analysis. In this way, he formed a clear concept of what had to be done. This enabled him not only to determine the new directions of development or the proper moment to take the new step, but also to present his ideas for the future with inspiration and in detail.

When he spoke about the future, Comrade Enver astounded his listeners with his optimism. He thought about the metallurgical plant when the first mines commenced production. He envisaged the complete electrification of the country at a time when even the cities did not have adequate and reliable supplies of electric power. He described Lu-

kova to us as it is today when it was only scrub-covered mountainside.

The contours of the future were ever present in his thinking. The temporary shortages and difficulties did not prevent him from seeing the future developments clearly. Precisely about this outstanding gift of his, in March 1983, after a normal daily meeting with him, I made this note:

“Today Comrade Adil Çarçani informed me about a meeting held some days ago at the Ministry of Agriculture in which he had taken part. The comrades of that department had spoken with optimism and convincing arguments about the possibilities and prospects of the development of livestock-raising, fruit-growing and some other sectors of the economy.

“Comrade Enver was pleased with the information. He gave Adil a series of instructions for now, but also for later, looking 15 years ahead, regarding the improvement of the work in the livestock sector. He spoke at length about the work that must be done regarding breeds, the centres for raising replacement stock, the livestock complexes and especially about the fodder base for livestock.

“He gave special importance to the question of coordination of the work in all sectors of agriculture and livestock-raising, the foodstuffs industry and trade, so that nothing produced by the peasantry is left unused. When he spoke about fruit-growing, he stressed the need that every product of this sector should be used and not go to waste.

“How optimistic Comrade Enver is! He speaks about the future of fruit-growing and in his imagination the entire range of hills stretching from Ti-

rana to Durrës and Lushnja and extending to Berat, Këlcyra up to Gjirokastra is covered with trees; he speaks about different kinds of fruit that must be grown in order to ensure an uninterrupted supply for the market, about the people's satisfaction when they see their tables laden with different kinds of fruit in all seasons, and it seems as if they are before our eyes, and we can touch them with our hands. So vivid, so convincing are his concepts; with such passion and confidence he presents the tasks for the future.

“Every transformation that has been carried out in our country has been first elaborated in Comrade Enver's mind. His predictions are not euphoric and romantic but are scientific foresight. When he speaks, the difficulties seem lighter, the prospect seems closer at hand and you feel stronger.

“Our people trust what the Party and Comrade Enver say. This trust is a powerful weapon in the hands of the communists, a great stimulus to the march ahead. It has been formed in practice, in life. Our people have tasted the blessings of the orientations of the Party. This is a great advantage for the work with and mobilization of the masses.”

The pivot of the economic policy of our Party is the strengthening of the country's independence and reliance on our internal forces. Without doubt, the strategist of this policy, which has been and will remain unalterable, is Enver Hoxha. This policy has been inspired by the lessons which our history taught us. It has been impelled by the concrete conditions of socialist construction in Albania and the

defence of the victories achieved, and it serves the interests of the people and the Homeland.

The socialist industrialization in general and the creation of the energy system in particular, the collectivization of agriculture and the achievement of self-sufficiency in bread grain, the provision of schooling for the masses of the people and the creation of an army of cadres, represent three main pillars which make possible the totally independent development of our country today. Had these fundamental conditions not been prepared step by step and in time, the country would have found it impossible to implement the principle of self-reliance successfully and without any restrictions. Therefore it is quite correct to call this policy of our Party the salvation of the country.

The facts, the truth, testify to this. Only the enemies of socialism refuse to recognize this reality. Astonished at the economic, political and social stability which exists in Albania at this turbulent time, when chaos and stagnation reign in the world, and blinded by antipathy, they attack the line of the Party and try to denigrate and discredit our victories. The policy pursued hitherto has left Albania backward, they lament. With another policy, by holding out our hand to others for credits and becoming partners in various political treaties and economic groupings, the development of Albania would have been far more rapid, the enemies of socialism, various bourgeois and revisionists, recommend and preach.

The aim of the enemies is clear. They want us to renounce the line of the Party and the teachings of Enver Hoxha, which would mean abandoning

the road of freedom and national independence, the road of socialism, the road for which 28 thousand heroes laid down their lives in the war and for which all our people and country have made innumerable sacrifices.

The Albanian people are proud of the free life they lead, proud of the victories they have achieved, and sure that under the leadership of the Party they will achieve new, even greater successes.

The economic policy of independent development which socialist Albania is pursuing is guided not by narrow nationalist aims as the enemies try to make out, but by the lofty ideal of the complete affirmation of the socialist order, as an order with active motive forces and inexhaustible creative potential. We want to live with honour and dignity, from our own sweat and toil, and it is precisely the socialist order and self-reliance which enable us to do this.

No one has given us what we have gained. We are indebted to no one for anything. Others are indebted to us because they have caused us damage and bloodshed, have plundered our wealth and sabotaged us. Albania has no external economic, moral or any other kind of debts. Above all, our country is independent because it is master of all its own assets, because it is sovereign and decides for itself how and to what extent to utilize these assets. All those forms and practices of collaboration that turn political independence into an empty formula and which, in fact, are the seal of subjugation and loss of sovereignty, are unknown and unacceptable to us.

Self-reliance, in the concept of our Party and

our economic practice, does not rule out or impoverish our exchanges with the world, as the foreign propaganda maligns, but on the contrary, it implies and increases them. It is a fact that our foreign trade, our purchases and sales with foreign countries have increased year by year. And this will continue in the future too. The development of the economy, the increase of production and the needs of the people require this.

Foreign trade is a sector which plays a primary role in the continuous progress of the entire economy and in ensuring its independent development. Therefore, the Party and Comrade Enver have paid special attention to improving the work in the field of economic and trade relations with other countries, to increasing exports and balanced supplies of imports, and raising the commercial ability of the comrades who work in this field.

“The export-import question is a complicated problem with which the fate of our socialist economy is linked to no small degree,” pointed out Comrade Enver in a talk he had with some comrades charged with those problems in September 1980, at which I was present. “How our economy will develop further, with what rates we will proceed and in what directions we will advance depend greatly on exports-imports.”

“I have noticed that some comrades have one-sided concepts about foreign trade,” I interposed in the conversation. “There are some organisms and cadres that blame the world crisis and the blockade for every failure in our exchanges with foreign countries...”

“That idea is demobilizing,” said Comrade En-

ver. "Our exports depend on our internal forces. Of course, the world crisis and the blockade may turn into obstacles if we do not work well, do not counteract, or operate clumsily. We have trade relations with many countries of the world, and overcoming the effects of the crisis or the blockade depends to a great extent on the volume and structure of the goods we exchange with them, their quality, and our correctness. Therefore we must work better, must study the markets and supply and demand, and reply to the blockade by always putting the emphasis on the development of the productive forces within the country."

He returned to this question several times in his last years, but here I want to reproduce only some brief notes I took in my daily meetings with him, since a large part of his ideas on questions of foreign trade has been published in his *Works*.

"Increasing exports," said Comrade Enver in a talk on October 21, 1980, "is the way to ensure the possibilities of importing machinery and other goods we need and will need in the future." He went on to elaborate his idea: "First of all, we must produce. On this basis we shall be able to extend our local consumption, but also to sell more from the surplus production in order to fulfil our needs better with foreign goods."

Regarding the development of foreign trade, Comrade Enver insisted that the most exhaustive studies should be done not only to find possibilities to increase exports, but also to know the regulations and demands of the foreign market.

During a meeting I had with him at the beginning of June 1982, he said, "In the past the people

working in foreign trade could 'take it easy,' but now, in the conditions of fiercer competition and reliance solely on our own financial and currency resources, they must make greater efforts to find buyers for the goods we offer."

"In foreign trade, as in every other field, today we cannot proceed as before," I remarked.

"That is so," he agreed. "Abroad many studies are being conducted in this field and all kinds of books are being published. Our people must read them because you cannot conduct trade with some economic data that you can get by telex. Our comrades must study in order to obtain information regarding the possibilities of selling goods today and in the future, must define clearly where it is in our interest to buy and to sell, which products we must promote and which we must improve in quality."

The Party and Enver Hoxha have never been rigid in working out the economic policy of the country. Without deviating from fundamental principles, they have sought new ways of development in conformity with the conditions that have been created. This policy is pervaded by concern for the all-round development of industry and agriculture, for the utilization of assets above and below the earth's surface and for technical and technological progress. It has at the centre of its attention the consolidation of the country's independence, the raising of the material and cultural well-being of the masses and the overcoming of the blockade and the hostile external pressure.

Comrade Enver has spoken again and again about the decisive role of self-reliance in the war

and in the socialist construction, but his thinking about the development of the country on the basis of this principle gained new impetus, especially after 1960 and even more in the 1970s.

In those years our experience was further enriched. As is known, in 1960-61, because our Party did not submit to the anti-Marxist line and the imperialist aims of the Khrushchevites, the Soviet Union not only broke off any kind of collaboration with Albania and arrogantly annulled contracts and projects in the course of construction, but also applied a savage economic blockade against our country. Khrushchev sought to create difficulties for us in the hope of subduing us or forcing us to hold out our hand to the capitalist countries, in order to prove his cynical prophecy that we would sell ourselves to imperialism “for 30 pieces of silver.” But this did not and never will occur.

Not long after this, we were made painfully aware once again of the enslaving aims which the big imperialist countries pursue towards their smaller partners through the mechanism of “aid.” From about 1968, and especially after 1971, when the ideo-political differences between our Party and the Chinese leadership increased and Albania refused to be transformed into an instrument of the Chinese hegemonistic policy and the infamous theory of “three worlds,” we were obliged once again to resist economic pressures, this time of a Chinese brand. Like the Soviets, they too thought they would make us submit through such measures. But, like the Khrushchevites before them, they were gravely mistaken.

Of course, the Party and Comrade Enver drew

the necessary lesson from these bitter experiences. Now it was clear that our development had to be based no longer mainly, but entirely, on our own forces. This stand constituted the indispensable condition to defend our independence and national sovereignty. Therefore, on Comrade Enver's proposal it was sanctioned in the New Constitution of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania that was adopted in 1976.

Self-reliance, which lies at the foundation of the economic policy built by the Party, headed by Comrade Enver Hoxha, is one of the basic principles of our present and future development. The stand towards this principle is a touchstone of socialist continuity on the road of Enver Hoxha.

The essence of the principle of self-reliance at the present phase has been expressed clearly in the orientations of the Party that we must cut our coat according to our cloth, consume as much as we produce and guarantee imports with our exports. However, these requirements must be understood correctly and in a progressive way. To consume as much as you produce does not mean simply to content yourself with a proportionate division of whatever quantity of products you produce. It is precisely from such an erroneous understanding of our principles that some foreign public information services proceed when, enslaved by their own prejudices, they hasten to proclaim Albania a country of "self-sufficiency," identifying this with lack of progress.

To consume as much as you produce means that with greater production you fulfil more needs of the citizens; it means that the material well-be-

ing of the people is raised continuously while maintaining a necessary norm of accumulation. This is the true, revolutionary meaning of Enver Hoxha's orientation. Its fundamental requirement is not the restriction of consumption but the expansion of production.

In an analogous way we could say: to cover imports with exports does not mean to restrict and reduce exchanges with the world, but to bring in more essential products and means with greater exports. It means that sales on foreign markets must constantly increase in order to create greater possibilities for a dynamic development of the economy.

I have discussed this question with Comrade Enver a number of times. In a conversation with me in the spring of 1983, he dealt more fully with the concept of reliance on our internal forces. I put his ideas and the impressions I gained on paper immediately, and I reproduce them from the notes I took at that time, without reinterpreting the facts and without new comments:

“Comrade Enver did not come to the office this morning because he had several reports to study. I want to believe this is the only reason, but I think he stayed at home also to rest before the days ahead which will be full of activities.

“In the afternoon, I went to his house. We talked, as usual, about current international events, but at greater length about our internal situation. Comrade Enver inquired especially about the economic situation, about the fulfilment of the plan in industry, exports, etc. Prompted by some undesirable phenomena that are appearing here

and there in the economy, he spoke at length about self-reliance, about the need to understand this major principle in a revolutionary spirit.

“‘With our own forces,’ he stressed, ‘means to march ahead relying on our material and human potential, on our finances, as well as on our knowledge, on the strength of the intellect of our people. Already we have gained more than a little experience. With our internal forces alone we have managed to improve the well-being of the people and to continue our investments. And this is no small achievement, but we must not forget that in some cases we have been obliged to draw on the state reserves. Self-reliance,’ he went on, ‘must, without fail, be accompanied with the planned rates of development, with increased production and technical and technological progress. Self-reliance is expressed in all its value when three conditions are fulfilled: when the given program of investments is continued, when the level of well-being is raised steadily and when the essential reserves are filled and increased continually.’

“‘This has now become urgent,’ I said. ‘High rates mean a great stride, rising productivity, hence large investments and rapid progress by continuing the extended socialist reproduction, as well as the creation of possibilities for greater consumption in order to improve the people’s standard of living.’

“‘When we achieve these conditions in practice, then we can claim with full justification that we have learned to march entirely on our own feet, using our own heads,’ he stressed. ‘But this requires a great deal of work. It requires correct understanding by the Party and total mobilization by the

working masses.’

“‘Self-reliance is a vital principle for us, not simply because it strengthens the political and economic independence of the country,’ I added, ‘but also because it enables us to activize all our material, human and scientific potential in the interests and for the good of the people.’

“‘The experience of our country,’ Comrade Enver concluded, ‘shows that the safeguarding of our economic and political independence and the defence of our national sovereignty are closely linked with the consistent implementation of the principle of self-reliance. Just as the freedom and independence of a country are not donated, so the revolution and socialism are not imported. They are a result of the resolute revolutionary struggle of the broad working masses of each country, with the working class at the head, and under the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist party.’”

Comrade Enver applied the principle of self-reliance to the question of the defence of the Homeland too. We do not base this on military alliances and pacts with others, but solely on the military training of our people, on our armed forces, on our army. The Military Art of People’s War which has been elaborated by Enver Hoxha is based on the political, military and economic strength of our people, on our own internal resources. It is pervaded from end to end by the idea that the united people, militarily trained and politically prepared, are the decisive factor for defence, and that a strong defence also requires a strong economy.

Comrade Enver’s teachings contain important Marxist-Leninist theses which have enriched the

economic policy of the Party and have protected the country from any deviation and from any attempt at imposition or dictate from abroad. The course which our country has traversed has more and more strengthened the belief and conviction of the people in the great possibilities which exist to carry forward the complete construction of socialist society, relying solely on our own material and human resources.

Frequently in the foreign press there are opinionated people who, proceeding from fixed ideas, due to ignorance of the reality or deliberate ill-will, interpret our policy of self-reliance as an orientation that leads to "isolation" or "autarky," to technological backwardness, to "separation from the world," etc. — accusations which are levelled at Albania in profusion.

In a meeting I had with him in the autumn of 1983, referring to this enemy propaganda, Comrade Enver put forward a series of arguments to refute it:

"It is clear," he said, "that to ensure everything necessary for the economy and the people's consumption for the present and the future with our internal forces, with the local production alone, is impossible. This has never been and is not our policy. Application of the principle of self-reliance does not imply this. Therefore, the accusations of 'isolation and autarky' which enemies level at us are unfounded and false."

"Practice itself confirms what you say, Comrade Enver," I replied. "The export-import volume and our economic exchanges with other countries have increased steadily. At present, we exchange

about one-tenth of our social product with the external world, that is, as much as the average of many other countries.”

“Of course,” Comrade Enver went on, “in the conditions when the hostile bourgeois-revisionist world is trying to step up its influence on our economy through trade, also, we must try to reduce imports to the maximum by increasing production of new articles at home. It is a success of historic importance,” he stressed, “that we have satisfactorily solved the question of fulfilling the needs of the economy and the people with local production of the most strategic articles, such as bread and the main foodstuffs, fuel and electric power; and we are on the way to solving the problem of producing a series of other products such as iron and steel, spare parts, etc. Today, in terms of value, only about 15 per cent of the raw materials, machinery and equipment are imported. We must proceed in this way regarding other articles too.”

In the situation in which we are building socialism, self-reliance means to ensure everything we are able to produce ourselves within the country: wheat and maize, but also cotton and sunflower; electric power and technological machinery, but also simple agricultural implements and household appliances; steel and ferrochrome, but also artistic articles; precision instruments, but also ordinary artisan tools. Our small country needs just as broad a range of goods as a bigger country.

Enver Hoxha’s teaching, that self-reliance is complete and accomplished to the end when every collective and individual tries to fulfil and overfulfil the tasks assigned to them without asking the

state and the society for supplementary means, will remain an instruction of permanent value for our people. This places before us, first and foremost, the task of striving, everywhere and with determination, to increase the productivity of labour, to increase production and reduce costs, to preserve, increase and use the socialist property with high efficiency, and to raise the technical and technological level of production and intensify the movement for innovation and scientific progress. "The principle of self-reliance is correctly understood," he pointed out at the 7th Congress of the Party, "when it is implemented in every field of social activity, on a national and regional scale, when it is extended to every link and cell of our life, to every enterprise and cooperative, to every institution and army unit..."

In the meetings I had with Comrade Enver, especially during the last three decades, our talks centred mostly on political and ideological questions. We spoke about the development of events and international relations, problems of culture and science, education and the arts. As the people say, the tongue goes where the tooth aches. As a member of the leadership of the Party, I have been engaged in these fields continually. Hence, I was interested in exchanging opinions with him on these questions as often as I could. And he never wearied of speaking about questions of policy and culture. He was pleased to talk at any time about a book he was reading, about a political event happening in the world or about some question of science or art.

The problems of the economy and its development began to occupy a greater place in our meetings, especially during recent years. In those talks, as well as through many different conferences and meetings in which I have taken part, I became broadly acquainted with Comrade Enver's ideas regarding the economic policy of the Party and the ways which must be followed in order to advance confidently on the road of socialism and the progress of the country. During the preparations for the 7th Five-Year Plan, however, I had the opportunity to get to know much better how he thought and reasoned, what he expected from the cadres and people of science, how he saw the present and future of the economic development of the country, how he applied the universal laws of socialist construction imaginatively and defended them rigorously.

The drafting of the 7th Five-Year Plan had and still has great practical and theoretical importance for the socialist construction in Albania. This five-year plan was to begin a new phase in the economic and social development of the country. Its further progress would be accomplished without any material and financial aid, without credits from abroad. Hence, the work for planning the objectives of this five-year plan would have instructive value and serve as a guide for the coming five-year plans.

As is known, precisely at the time when the studies for the 7th Five-Year Plan began, the Chinese side unilaterally cancelled all the economic agreements which had been signed from time to time between our country and China. This act con-

stituted a new factor, not only of economic but also of political importance, which had to be weighed up well in the stage of planning. At that time, ill-intentioned world opinion started to make all sorts of suppositions about the future of Albania. With whom will Albania be? To which side will it turn? On what camp or state will it rely? In which economic grouping or alliance will it take part? These questions were frequently presented by various journalists or experts in the pages of the world press of the East and the West. Of course, attempts to lure us with blandishments and win our “affections” were not lacking from either side.

The world press and information services spoke of and prophesied all possibilities, except that of Albania’s safeguarding its political and economic independence, of its advance entirely on the basis of self-reliance without holding out a begging hand to anyone. That only a few foresaw.

In those circumstances, the drafting and implementation of the 7th Five-Year Plan was of particular importance. The question was: either to ensure the continuity of the socialist construction at satisfactory rates, and thus affirm the correctness of the economic policy of the Party and the principle of self-reliance, or on the contrary, to allow new great difficulties to be created, the process of development to be slowed down and the well-being of the masses to be damaged — a thing which would certainly shake the confidence of people in the road chosen.

For these reasons, the 7th Five-Year Plan especially, according to Comrade Enver’s idea, had to have precise and real objectives. The rates of de-

velopment should respond to the conditions created, that is, we should not deceive ourselves with unrealizable dreams. That plan which ensured the activation of the productive and creative potentials of the country and which had a high degree of guarantee of its accomplishment — that would be the most valuable plan.

It is a fact that this was a very difficult thing to do. Among the people, among the masses, the breach with the Chinese did not cause any pessimism, let alone shock, of which there was no sign. But for the directors, economists and accountants, including those of the central departments, it meant a great deal of work, because they had to supply answers to many questions. How was Albania to advance without any credits from abroad? How could a favourable positive economic and currency balance be built up in those circumstances? What must be done to ensure that the economy would advance and that the well-being of the people would continue to rise too? How would the numerous resources of the country be put into economic circulation when the possibilities for new investments were somewhat more limited? In order to choose the most correct roads and give the most precise answers to those questions, it was necessary to have complete mobilization of the specialists and leading cadres, to engage in many studies to find optimal solutions to general questions and specific problems of development.

Our practice for preparing the state plans is known. Usually, especially in the initial stages, the state and economic organs, from those at the base to the ministries, the State Planning Commission

and the Council of Ministers, are engaged in working out the draft-plan. To arrive at the plan which is endorsed by the Party Congress, numerous discussions are organized with the working masses, as well as with specialists and cadres at various levels. Again and again, first as general guidelines, then in the form of a rough outline and finally as a complete project, the plan is also discussed in the leadership of the Party, in the Political Bureau and in the Plenum of the Central Committee. This democratic procedure of discussing the objectives of the plan at the base and at the centre, in various stages, has proved to be very correct and effective. The preparations for the 7th Five-Year Plan, too, were organized in conformity with this procedure.

At the beginning of November 1979, the comrades of the Political Bureau were presented with a report about the 7th Five-Year Plan, which laid down the main objectives, the rates of development, the data on imports and exports, the basic investments and the financial resources, etc. This material presented by the Presidium of the Council of Ministers was to be discussed at a meeting of the Political Bureau. I was trying in vain to grasp the thread, to form even a vague concept of the future development of our country when:

“Are you free?” I heard Enver’s warm voice with his usual question on the phone.

“I am coming,” I replied.

I found him at his desk in his office with the same material in front of him.

“Have you read the material the Government has presented to us on the draft-plan?” he asked me.

I nodded. Then, without waiting to hear my impressions, he added:

“For my part, I have read it very carefully. But I have many questions arising from this material and I am very worried about it. I cannot understand where we are heading with the 7th Five-Year Plan. Its objectives are up in the air. Sometimes the end of the 6th Five-Year Plan is taken as the basis for the main indices of economic and financial growth, sometimes the average of the five years taken together, and sometimes the extreme years. This is not a tidy job,” he said with evident displeasure. “The data of the five-year plan must be built on a single unified basis of comparison.”

The material had made the same impression on me too, although I still could not make out why my head was really befogged, not to say confused, from reading it.

“You are absolutely right,” I said. “I felt the same thing when I was studying the material. At first I wondered whether the technical terms and approach were confusing me, indeed, I was about to call some economist to consult with, but...”

“No, no,” he interrupted me. “This is not a question of form or terms. It seems to me that the comrades who prepared this material have worked carelessly. In the report presented to us, the problems have been tossed as if into a basket, without any connection with one another, without arguments. Figures, and especially percentages, are given in overwhelming profusion, but the general picture remains unclear.”

I had noticed the fact that some cardinal questions of the future development of the country had

been touched on only in passing and quite superficially.

“For my part, in this material I see neither the difficulties which we shall encounter, the ways in which we shall overcome them, nor the solution to some contradictions that have arisen,” I said. “But why have they proceeded in this way? Why do the quotas of the five-year plan seem covered with smoke?!” I asked.

“I don’t understand,” Comrade Enver said thoughtfully. “This plan has exceptional importance for our country. Therefore everything must be well thought-out and carefully studied. We especially must keep our feet on the ground. Whereas with what they tell us here, it seems as if everything will run smoothly!”

“Can we expect the same rates of development, the same level of investments as in the conditions when, after all, we did get some sort of credits from abroad?” I queried.

“No. We must be very cautious. We must have the accomplishment of everything we put in the plan guaranteed with our material, financial and currency basis, etc. Otherwise, the plan does not respond to the possibilities, hence it will not be fulfilled. This would cause us incalculable political damage too. We need a scientific plan,” he went on, “but for this, studies must be done. We are not isolated from the world economy, nor immune from its influences. Therefore we must know the contemporary developments and their consequences, either positive or negative, for our country. We have capable specialists. Therefore we must listen to their opinions and conclusions on

this question too. But we must not dampen their enthusiasm by telling them we do not move beyond the limits we have predetermined, because in that case, there will be no creative thinking. Therefore, we must listen to what people tell us because they will speak according to the line of the Party. Then, having taken into account the various political, economic, organizational and other factors, we shall take the final decision.”

When the meeting of the Political Bureau was held, the other comrades also had many criticisms about this report of the Government. Comrade Enver not only criticized the shortcomings and weaknesses of the material presented, but also gave concrete instructions on how to proceed further so that we would have a plan based on the soundest scientific reasoning. He set out in detail the procedure of planning for the economy and culture as a whole and for each sector and field taken separately. Clearly this service was not his responsibility, but whenever he saw that the work was not running smoothly, Comrade Enver did not wait for the person whose job it was to wake up and see to it, but he set to work himself and finished it with flying colours.

This was not the end of the problems regarding the drafting of the 7th Five-Year Plan. On the contrary, this was only the beginning. At that time we did not know that amongst us, indeed at the head of the Government, we had a long-standing dangerous enemy, Mehmet Shehu. At the time when the Chinese cut off any kind of economic and technical collaboration with Albania, apparently this servant of many masters and mercenary of foreign-

ers thought that the hour had come for him to rise and put his diabolical plans into practice. According to him, our country was now exposed to major dangers and our hopes of escaping them were virtually non-existent, so that only one more blow was needed to bring down the castle. Undoubtedly, these calculations were inspired by his patrons too.

As I have said, however, at that time we knew nothing about this activity going on in secret. Nevertheless, the fact that even after Comrade Enver's criticisms and instructions at the meeting of the Political Bureau in November 1979, the materials presented to the secretaries of the Central Committee at the beginning of September 1980 on the 7th Five-Year Plan again had many defects and shortcomings, could not fail to make an impression on us. Here I am not referring to technical matters and details, but to wrong orientations and ideas. The studies were pervaded by a spirit of euphoria. The objectives of production and investments were inflated. They were not balanced and calculated on the basis of objective possibilities. In short, had we proceeded on that course, the masses and the Party would have encountered great difficulties. Thus, in fact, the seed of failure was sown right from the start, in the phase of planning. Such a plan, which contained more wishful thinking than real objectives, could not be accepted. In that way we might have pleased ourselves, but would have been feeding from an empty spoon, a thing that was fraught with dangerous consequences.

This time Comrade Enver was even more disturbed. He summoned us secretaries of the Central Committee, and without any equivocation, pro-

posed that the whole thing had to be done again from the beginning.

“It seems,” he said, “the comrades of the Planning Commission and the Government have not properly understood the instructions given by the Political Bureau on this question. What are we to do? There are two ways: we can formulate once again our criticisms of the materials presented to us already and demand that the comrades of the Government rewrite them on this basis. That is one way. But I suspect that we shall end up back where we are now, of course with some minor changes. The second way is that we here in the Secretariat do not confine ourselves merely to general observations, but after concrete examination of the main fields of the economy and culture, set out some basic ideas and figures for the future. In this way the Government and the planning organs will have not only our general suggestions and orientations, but also concrete points around which they will make the necessary adjustments.”

“I think the second way is more effective,” I remarked, “especially if we bear in mind that time is passing and the date when it must be completed is coming closer. With the way you propose, the assistance for the comrades of the Planning Commission and the Government will be more concrete.”

The other secretaries of the Central Committee were of the same opinion.

“Agreed,” said Comrade Enver. “But this will be a voluminous and difficult work for us, for we lack much data, statistics, special studies, etc. However, let us set to work without delay.”

To this end we set up special working groups

with comrades from the apparatus of the Central Committee who were charged with preparing materials for different sectors of the economy and culture. We supplied these comrades with detailed questionnaires about almost every field of production, which they were to complete with statistical data and the ideas they would draw from the ministries or in consultations with specialists and cadres of the Party, the state and the economy, as well as from scientists in the centre and at the base.

Meanwhile, Comrade Enver himself set to work with special persistence to work out the objectives of the five-year plan. September and the beginning of October of 1980 was a period during which he carried an exceptional burden. Every day he met one or another comrade of the leadership, exchanged opinions with members of the government, specialists and economists, comrades from the districts, etc. He discussed with them theses and variants, verified his own impressions, formed convictions and drew conclusions. Every day he dealt with a mass of tables and economic indices in order to gain concrete knowledge of the country's productive potential and possibilities.

After all these preparations, the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Party, under his leadership, spent a week analysing the main problems of the plan and formulating the respective recommendations for the Government. In those meetings which lasted for hours on end, and which were attended also by invited competent specialists, Comrade Enver analysed the problems with a stern economic logic, which any man of learning in this field might envy.

In examining one problem after another, dealing with the questions that emerged in order to accomplish the tasks which were presented for this or that sector, Enver Hoxha wrote a whole book which has been published under the title *On the 7th Five-Year Plan*. His main ideas about the economic and social development of the country during the years 1980-1985 are included in this book.

His work *On the 7th Five-Year Plan* is a brilliant defence of the policy of the Party for strengthening our economic independence in struggle against any kind of pressure or imposition. In fact, this work refutes the extravagant ideas and views of Mehmet Shehu, although his hostile aims to discredit the Party and the socialist construction in our country were still unknown.

While combatting euphoria and unrealizable subjective desires, Comrade Enver Hoxha demanded with equal force the deepening of the mobilizing spirit in planning, so that no internal reserve remained unactivated. His generalizations about economic effectiveness as a general resultant and as one of the main aims and tasks of socialist production have theoretical and practical value for today and always.

According to Enver Hoxha's scientific concept, effectiveness is not a spontaneous result of productive activity, but an objective that can be calculated exactly in the planning phase and which must be attained without fail during the fulfilment of the tasks in each enterprise and work centre, as well as in the whole economy on a national scale.

All our economists and working people must always keep in the focus of their attention the es-

sence of Comrade Enver's thinking about effectiveness, as the saving and evaluation of social labour, as the thrifty use of the national wealth, as the increase of the social productivity of labour and the reduction of expenditure per unit of production. Precisely such a concept promoted economic accounting and finances to the role due to them in the development and administration of production. It is of principle importance to understand properly that without economic effectiveness, without saving, our self-reliance will be damaged and devalued.

The Party of Labour of Albania has always worked to carry forward the cause of socialism, in theory and practice, in a small country like Albania, seeing the destinies of the people and the Homeland always closely linked with our social order, as Enver Hoxha taught us. The continuity of socialism as an historical experience and the affirmation of its superiority as the most advanced social order are linked with the name of the Party and Enver Hoxha,

There are ideological acrobats who, wanting to pose as "objective," accept the role of the socialist order for those countries in which it is established before the maturity of capitalist relations has been reached, or for only a short phase of development, at the most until the stage of a relatively advanced industrial country is reached. After that, they say, the death-knell tolls for socialism. In short, by proclaiming the revisionist degeneration in the Soviet Union and the other countries of the East as the failure and bankruptcy of socialism in general,

these ideologists preach its demise, but this time holding up the flag of “objectivity,” or even of “admiration.” In essence, such advocates, those who spread disbelief in the inexhaustible possibilities of socialism, are themselves revisionists, capitalists disguised with socialist phraseology.

The reasoning of such apologist theoreticians of capitalism who, through all sorts of sophisms, try to sanctify the old order and assert its perpetuity while attempting to present socialism as a deviation from history, is utterly without foundation. There is a great, essential difference between socialism and all preceding social orders. All the pre-socialist orders have had their birth, flowering and inevitable destruction after they exhausted all their possibilities to carry society forward. Such an end does not await socialism as it is conceived and built in our country. Its motive forces and creative abilities will never be exhausted. On the contrary, by implementing it in conformity with the historical conditions, its productive potential and social advantages are constantly renewed and strengthened.

Precisely herein lies the value of the theoretical and practical thinking of our Party and Enver Hoxha. Socialism in our country is going ahead continuously, consolidating its positive features, and it will proceed in this way until its final transition to communism. The socialist relations of production which are being constantly perfected never become a factor inhibiting the socio-economic development of the country. This is explained with the fact, already proved in theory and practice, that socialism is a vital order that never exhausts itself. On the contrary, the more the known existing pos-

sibilities of socialist development are utilized in rational ways and according to sound criteria, the more they increase for the future and the richer and more powerful the reserves for this development become.

The present and the future of socialism are like a healthy tree, said Comrade Enver. The deeper its roots — the nutritive system of the plant — in the ground, the greater its possibilities to grow tall. The roots of socialism are its achievements. The greater they are, the more the conditions for new developments are created and the more beautiful the future becomes.

In order to set up our complex industry, in the first years after Liberation we utilized the known mineral sources and those that were discovered in those years, the oil and the chrome, the copper and the waters. In order to set up a modern productive agriculture, we had to gain every inch of soil in the plains and in the mountains. Thus, possibilities that were beyond imagination in the past have been brought into use. Today agriculture and industry, science and culture, the stage of socio-economic development we have attained, constitute a great reserve and have created a powerful base from which to go further.

Albania embarked on the road of socialism and enriched its practice as a social system by making an unparalleled leap forward in record time. We inherited absolute backwardness in all fields, a thing that can be explained by the historical fate of our people and Homeland. We would have liked to have embarked on this road with a developed industry and modern technology, with a working

class formed from the vocational aspect and an intelligentsia of all specialties, with a consolidated education system and productive agriculture, with an economic structure and rich material base, etc. But we have been obliged to create these conditions, which constitute the foundations of development, in the course of our advance. With socialism, in less than half a century Albania has achieved what other countries took hundreds of years to achieve.

The people's trust in the Party and socialism has already become a motive force which operates permanently. Their experience to date has convinced our people that the platform of the Party and Enver Hoxha's predictions about socialist construction are not and never have been propaganda promises, but a reality in operation. Socialism has given Albania its freedom and national independence, its honoured name in the world, its own voice in the international arena. It has given it a solid economy and a modern civilization. It has given the people democracy, social and political equality, their new way of life, all-round emancipation and unwavering optimism in the future, which have become an inexhaustible source of inspiration for progress. The defence and advance of socialism in Albania, seen as a great internal and internationalist cause, constitutes, at the same time, a source of national pride for all of us. That is why our people look to the socialist and communist future with courage and confidence.

Among the essential questions of the theory and practice of socialist construction dealt with by

Comrade Enver Hoxha in a masterly manner and with profound humanism, an important place is occupied by the problems that have to do with the living conditions of the people, with the factors and ways which ensure the continuous and general raising of well-being in socialism.

The social policy implemented by our Party has been guided by the premise that only socialism creates objective and subjective conditions so that the development of the productive forces has the well-being of the broad working masses as its main social purpose, so that the material wealth can be used, as K. Marx pointed out, to fulfil the real needs of the people, and society has as its fundamental principle the full and free development of every individual.

The Albanian reality has proved the far-sighted prediction of the classics of Marxism-Leninism who stressed that only this social order creates the conditions for the distribution of material blessings to strengthen democracy and, on this basis, to enable the people to emerge from the beastly conditions of their existence, from the domination of products over the producers, into truly human conditions.

The just social policy pursued by our Party under the leadership of Enver Hoxha, a policy that is characterized by real social equality, makes it possible, even in the conditions of a relative development of the productive forces and in the conditions of a production which still does not fully meet the demands of the population according to modern scientific standards, to have well-being for all, to advance with sure steps towards fulfilment of the

growing material and cultural needs and to reduce the essential distinctions between social classes.

It is natural that in fulfilling the needs of the people, as in every other field, in the conditions of socialism there must be order and priorities. But the Party and Comrade Enver have never permitted any disregard for partial and momentary interests, or making unjustifiable sacrifices for the future by neglecting and minimizing the daily demands of the working people for the sake of these priorities.

In connection with this, I remember an early conversation with Comrade Enver, back in 1968, precisely at the time when I was engaged in preparing the report of the plenum of the Central Committee of the Party which was to deal with the question of deepening the socialist revolution through the development of class struggle and the application of the line of the masses — which is known as the plenum of the struggle against bureaucracy.

During the conversation with Comrade Enver, when we were exchanging opinions about the content of the main material to be discussed at the plenum, he said, “Bureaucracy may present itself under a political guise of the vanguard, so to say, but irrespective of its guise, in essence it endangers the interests of the working people, tramples them underfoot while using ‘revolutionary’ slogans.”

With these words he raised an issue which interested me in connection with the preparation of the report of the plenum. So in order to push the conversation in this direction, I intervened saying:

“Experience has shown that when it is in his interest, the bureaucrat justifies violation of the in-

terests of the working people by coming out with the banner of defence of the state. Some officials have a sort of one-sided 'state' psychology. They pose as if they are the only ones who safeguard the general interests, while the others, the workers and the peasants, according to them, have another concern — how to take from society more than is due to them.”

“For us, the interests of the state and those of the people are one and the same,” said Comrade Enver. “Hence, to go by the opinion of these bureaucratic officials means to put yourself above the people.”

Further on he stressed that it is indispensable to establish the best balance possible between various interests of society.

“Each generation accomplishes certain historic tasks, some more difficult and some easier, some greater and some smaller,” he said. “And each generation works not only for the future but also for the present; therefore it has the right to enjoy the fruits of its own labour to this or that extent, according to the possibilities and conditions.”

Our Party and people have gone through great tempests and storms on the course they are pursuing. But they have never taken a one-sided view of the construction of socialism and have not allowed any aspect of it to be sacrificed for the sake of overcoming temporary difficulties or obstacles that have emerged.

All the work and social thinking of Enver Hoxha, pervaded by major concerns about the fate of the people and Homeland, are a denial of the ac-

cusations that the enemies of socialism make against it as a society of “production for the sake of production,” in which “the criterion of growth” is opposed to and prevails over the “criterion of well-being,” in which “the forced accumulation” hinders the raising of the standard of living, etc.

In conformity with the nature of our social order and the perspective of the construction of communism, Enver Hoxha saw well-being not as wealth for a given class or stratum of people, but as fulfilment of the needs of the entire people, not only of the town but also of the countryside, not only of the lowlanders but also of the highlanders. With its social policy, the Party has not permitted and does not permit major differences in the standard of living and way of life between different classes, groups and strata of the population.

Of course, there are distinctions in socialist society. The Party and the practice of socialist construction over many years teach us that on this vital question it is very important to define the level of these differences fairly and to ensure that they are steadily reduced during the process of socialist construction. The general raising of the well-being of the people, Comrade Enver instructed, must necessarily be accompanied by the gradual narrowing of differences in the level of income and in the way of life between the intelligentsia and the working class, between the working class and the co-operativist peasantry, as well as within these two friendly classes of socialist society.

Drawing lessons from the revisionist degeneration, he pointed out that the fate of socialism depends not only on the political power, the type of

ownership or the social productivity of labour. It depends also on the mode and criteria of distribution. Both large and unjustifiable differences in peoples incomes and petty-bourgeois egalitarianism — which flattens out human individualities, inhibits the development of talents and discourages the initiative and spirit of competition of the working people — lead to the degeneration of socialism.

Like the freedom and independence of the Homeland, well-being, too, be it personal or general, is not donated but is earned with work, on the basis of the principle of self-reliance. This is a major conclusion that emerges from Enver Hoxha's work. Socialism, he declared, is the deed of the working class and the other working masses.

The Party, with Enver Hoxha at the head, has done a great deal for the people. It has changed the face of the country and has radically improved the living conditions of the masses.

For more than a decade, our country has fulfilled all the needs of the people for bread grain with its local production, and it is consolidating this historic victory year by year. The change in the structure of grains in favour of wheat, along with the many-fold increase in the quantity produced, is a success of economic and social importance. Now the possibilities have been created to speed up the steps to ensure that within a short time wheat bread is available all the year round for the peasant population too. We all have obligations to ensure fulfilment of this desire and behest of Comrade Enver for our heroic peasantry.

The industry for the production of consumer goods has always been considered by the Party as

an indispensable factor for guaranteeing and raising the well-being of the masses. In his speech at the meeting of the Political Bureau in February 1985, which was the last Comrade Enver attended, he argued that it was necessary to give priority to the development of this branch during the 8th Five-Year Plan. This idea lies at the basis of the current plans. The light and food-processing industry, for which the funds invested up to 1990 will be almost double the amount invested in the past five-year plan, will make a great stride forward.

Securing at home the overwhelming bulk of the food for the population constitutes one of the pillars of the country's economic and political independence. At a time when the imperialist powers are using their monopoly of food as a means of blackmail and a political bludgeon to force big and small states to their knees and into the imperialist orbit, this is one of the greatest political and social victories of our society. Its basis is the correct Marxist-Leninist line of the Party and it shows the vitality of the teachings of Enver Hoxha.

The employment of all the active forces of our society constitutes another major economic and social victory of the line of our Party. Work is the basis of material and social development, a source of inspiration and optimism for the entire society, and the highway to increasing well-being. But the systematic and massive employment of the younger generation requires ever greater material and financial resources, ever greater investments. At present, in order to create a new job, our society uses an average of over 100,000 leks in investments and other expenditure, almost twice as much as in

the 60s. Even more will be needed in the future, because the investments for advanced equipment and technology will become greater. To create the funds needed for the new jobs that are normally opened up in town and countryside each year, 4 to 5 billion leks are needed.

Without the self-sacrificing work that has been done in the years of socialism, without the material-technical base that has been created, without the socialist social property and the unified state management of the economy, a reliable prospect of radically solving the problem of employing all the active forces is unimaginable. This achievement assumes even greater importance if we bear in mind that this is being accomplished in a small country in which the population is increasing at high rates and that the tasks for the intensification of the economy and technical and scientific progress remain the order of the day.

Considerable expenditure and investments have been made also for the education of the people and the protection of their health. Comrade Enver reasoned that any possible investment by society in these fields is never too much. With extraordinary speed, under his direct care, schooling became a mass phenomenon, and the links and structures of the school system were completed, making it a strong support for the whole progress of the country.

In the first years of reconstruction and later too, Albania, newly emerged from a grave backwardness, had many needs, but when it came to the health of the people, Enver insisted that the maximum should be done. He considered the health

service a vital sector in the entire program of social measures. On his initiative, the health service was among the first that was provided free of charge for all citizens.

The setting up and full development of the system of social security in town and countryside is a social victory of national dimensions. This has enhanced the guarantee of a livelihood, has become a powerful stimulus at work and has strengthened the social relations in the family. Today the pensioners alone amount to about 260,000, or more than one fourth of the country's entire population before Liberation. Despite the dimensions which this system has assumed, Comrade Enver instructed, especially in his last years, that, in conformity with the possibilities and the economic strength of the agricultural cooperatives, further improvements should be made in social security in the countryside. This, he said, is a field in which we can proceed more rapidly to approach town standards.

In the epoch of the Party and Enver Hoxha, Albania became the first country in the world without taxes and levies on the incomes of the working people, a country that is developing at steady rates without social evils and disturbances, a country where life is secure and where working people are not threatened by all sorts of dangers that keep them in fear and anxiety in the world of capital. While having a high appreciation of the historic value of achievements in the social field, Comrade Enver instructed that they should always be a factor for progress, a force encouraging creativeness and dynamism, and not laurels of glory breeding

euphoria and lack of concern.

The socialist economy was not created and does not grow stronger and develop spontaneously. It was created and develops on the basis of the social property, the work, knowledge and sacrifices of workers, cooperativists and the intelligentsia. "...Work and the socialist property," Enver Hoxha teaches us, "are two great pillars on which the development of the economy, the entire life of the country, its present and the future are based." A great lesson of our life is that work creates material values. It increases the social property and makes it more effective. For its part, the social property becomes a stimulus for work, for new creativeness on a higher level.

The unshakeable confidence that Enver expressed in his Greeting on the Occasion of the 40th Anniversary of Liberation, that the generations will hand down to one another an ever-stronger and more prosperous Albania, an Albania which is red like the undying flame of partisan hearts and communist ideals, is based on these historic victories, on this living reality. This confidence of his is a major obligation and commitment for us, the Party, and the entire Albanian people.

Architect of the People's State Power

The construction of socialism and the all-round progress in the new Albania have been accomplished with success and on the right road. On our shores, the monstrous wave of modern revisionism was broken and rolled back, which proves that revisionist degeneration is not inevitable. The country is marching confidently towards a better future, towards new victories.

We have said and will say again, although repeating a known truth, that the key to our successes is the Party with its correct line. With Enver Hoxha at the head, the Party has known how to keep the revolutionary spirit alive among the people and to forestall the dangers which threaten socialism in the conditions of the imperialist-revisionist encirclement and the existence of a fierce class struggle, especially on the international plane.

Adhering to the Leninist teachings, Comrade Enver Hoxha pointed out continually that the socialist revolution does not end with the seizure of power or with the construction of the economic base of socialism. The socialist revolution is a long process, which is deepened uninterruptedly in all

fields. Without this continuity, the perfecting of our society would have been impossible.

In order to ensure the successful development of this process, our Party has always regarded the question of state power as the fundamental problem of the revolution. In all the revolutionary changes that have been made in the new Albania, the people's state has displayed stability, great organizing force and ability to get things done, and a truly popular, democratic and revolutionary character.

The question that the people should become masters of their own destinies, should take the running of the country into their own hands, was solved during the National Liberation War. It is a great merit of the Party and Enver Hoxha that they never separated the problem of national liberation, of securing the freedom and independence of the Homeland, from the question of state power. With his keen patriotic and revolutionary intuition, Comrade Enver Hoxha launched the idea at the Conference of Peza that the national liberation councils should be, simultaneously, not only organs of the unity of the people in the war against fascism, but also bearers of functions of the new state power.

The new state of people's democracy, consecrated in the historic decisions of the Congress of Përmet, constitutes one of the greatest and most brilliant achievements, one of the monumental works of the epoch of the Party, as Comrade Enver himself defined it in his book *Laying the Foundations of the New Albania*. With his powerful feeling of love for the people, and relying on the theory of

Marxism and revolutionary experience, Enver Hoxha came naturally to the basic idea that it is the masses who will build the new society, will carry socialism forward and will hand on the new state of socialist democracy from generation to generation. This was a conviction by which he was guided throughout all his activity. It has been formulated very clearly in the saying: "Socialism is built by the masses, the Party makes them conscious," which is a Marxist synthesis of importance for the fate of the revolution.

With Comrade Enver at the head, the Party considered the working masses the authors and actors of history and gave them the rights they had been denied for centuries. By affirming the primary role of the masses, the Party and Comrade Enver protected the communists against any feeling of superiority and showed the way for the continuous democratization of the government of the country. Enver Hoxha considered the question of safeguarding and strengthening the popular character of the state, the question of its perfection and revolutionization, as a permanent task of the Party.

"The people have won this state power with bloodshed," he often said. "Therefore we must guard it like the apple of our eye, must defend and strengthen it, keep it always effective and fresh."

Our people's power, which performs the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, realizes genuine democracy for the working masses and the emancipation of all strata of our society, and is the greatest guarantee of their freedoms and social equalities. In the conditions of our order, the obligations of the individual towards society and of so-

ciety towards the individual are realized in the most harmonious way.

Insisting on the need for the activation of the masses in running the country, Enver Hoxha demanded that this should be felt at all levels of the state, especially at the base, in production and in social life. One manages and governs not only by exercising party or state functions, he often repeated, but also by worrying over and giving valuable opinions for the progress of the country. This role of the masses in running the country is the basic factor which, as years passed, made it possible to develop the economy rapidly, to beautify the Homeland, to make progress in education and culture and to strengthen the state itself.

Enver Hoxha watched these changes which Albania was undergoing with joy and optimism, but at the same time, he did not hesitate to point out the shortcomings which were displayed from time to time in the activity of the people's state power. The state power, he said, must never lag behind the requirements of life; any remoteness from these requirements is an expression of the separation of the state from the masses, that is, an expression of the weakening of its popular character. Worthy representatives of the people, he pointed out, are those who know the people's problems and fight to solve them, and not those who keep aloof from the working people. They are those who work and live close to the masses, who listen carefully to their voice and take it to the higher organs. Only in this way can the elected representatives of the people be worthy of the attribute due to them as servants of the people.

“But what does it mean to be a servant of the people?” he asked, whenever the question of the links and relations between the state and the people came up. “First of all,” he answered his own question, “this means you must serve them with great loyalty on the basis of the line of the Party, must work tirelessly to carry out decisions and the laws in force, must never, in any instance, misuse the trust the people have placed in you for personal gain or privileges, but must always be fair, sincere and irreconcilable with any manifestation of favoritism, cronyism or nepotism. This also means,” Comrade Enver continued, “to be polite and correct with people, to maintain close links with the masses and listen carefully to their voice, to take a principled attitude towards complaints and criticisms they make, to be irreconcilable with manifestations of arrogance, conceit and haughtiness.”

The people are great. Compared with them, the individual, however outstanding, is small. Therefore, the employee of the state apparatus, the manager, the elected representative, even the most capable and valuable, must be humble before the people. Enver Hoxha proceeded from this when he concluded that the strength of the state lies in its democratic character. Otherwise, the declaration in the Constitution of the Republic that state power stems from the people and belongs to the people remains a meaningless slogan.

As an indomitable fighter for surmounting any obstacle which emerged on the road of the democratization of the activity of government, Enver Hoxha consistently attacked every manifestation of officialdom or bureaucracy. Especially during

the 1960s, and thereafter, when he was analysing the causes of the political catastrophe that occurred in the Soviet Union and in the other countries of the East, his conclusions about the struggle against bureaucracy were transformed into a complete and coherent system of demands for the revolutionization of the state and the entire life of the country.

On many occasions, but especially during the year 1965, when the apparatus of the Central Committee had just begun the preliminary preparations for the 5th Congress of the Party, Comrade Enver talked with me about the need to step up this struggle. He regarded bureaucracy as a serious threat to the state and the Party, to the future of socialism.

“Bureaucracy,” he told me in those conversations, “is a dangerous enemy which erodes the state from within. Just like the borer which eats away the timber if it isn’t killed, bureaucracy atrophies democracy and initiative if it is not combated consistently and with determination.”

It is known that he returned to this theme several times. The Open Letter of the year 1966, recorded in the history of the Party as an important document, represents a real platform of the struggle against bureaucracy. His many speeches and contributions to discussion in the Political Bureau comprise the basis on which the 6th Plenum of the Central Committee was held in September 1968, especially on the implementation of the line of the masses.

Enver Hoxha regarded the struggle against bureaucracy as the main factor to keep the state uncontaminated and to safeguard its popular charac-

ter. As is known, while uncovering the ideological and social roots of the revisionist reversal which took place in the Soviet Union and other countries after the Khrushchevite betrayal, he reached the conclusion that one of the main causes which prepared the terrain for the revisionist deviation was precisely the spread of bureaucracy. This disease infected the organs of the Soviet party and state, corrupted the cadres, caused apathy, and divorced the leadership from the masses and their control. In these conditions, the group of Khrushchev and company had no difficulty in seizing power, confusing the masses and liquidating the socialist victories.

The danger of bureaucracy is deadly, Comrade Enver said frequently. Therefore the struggle against it must never cease. While the alien remnants in the human consciousness lead to the degeneration of individuals or certain groups and can aggravate and damage the social atmosphere, bureaucratic distortions and methods lead to the degeneration of the state and its alienation from the masses, to the loss of the main victory of our revolution.

Proceeding from this consideration, he instructed that we must see the struggle against bureaucracy as one of the main directions of the class struggle. This struggle, he instructed, should not be oversimplified, treated superficially or formally, as if it has to do only with cutting down paper work or the reduction of staff establishments. Bureaucracy, first of all, is a certain way of thinking and acting contrary to the interests of the people. It has to do with the method and style of work, with the

manner in which the state organs manage affairs and solve problems.

Whenever Comrade Enver spoke about the struggle against bureaucracy, he did so with great concentration. He did not give up without convincing his partner in the conversation of the danger of this phenomenon. Bureaucracy makes its target the main achievement of the revolution: the state power. It is an enemy somewhat slippery and hard to grasp, which takes root and entangles our people in its web surreptitiously. Therefore the struggle against it has not been and is not easy.

The application of Comrade Enver's teachings on the struggle against bureaucracy is the best prophylaxis against this threat and a demand of our time, because bureaucratic officials can be found at any time and in different fields of activity. They do not take life and its development into account, so they engage only in paper work, reproducing phrases borrowed from the clauses of rule books. Remaining for a long time without moving from leading positions and offices, bureaucrats form the opinion that they are the most knowledgeable, that they are inviolable and irreplaceable. They have no faith in the democracy and initiative of the masses, and therefore they smother and inhibit them.

The bureaucrat is idealist in his concepts and judgements. In his opinion, words, orders and letters can work wonders. The bureaucrats are afraid of revolutionary action. The bureaucratic mentality automatically reminds one of the opening phrase of church manuals: "In the beginning was the word," which the materialists of modern times reversed fearlessly, declaring: "In the beginning

was action.” From this materialist way of thinking, it emerges that bureaucracy is not eradicated with words and moralizing, but with the active control exerted by the working class, by rejuvenating the apparatuses of the state and the Party, by applying justice in the party spirit in all fields of life, by involving the masses of cadres and leaders, the men of intellectual work, in general, in the dynamic of life and production.

The advice which Comrade Enver has given at different times, that the struggle against bureaucracy must be understood not as a technical-administrative measure, but, above all, as a measure of a pronounced political and ideological character, is valuable for the present and the future. If the manifestations of bureaucracy are not understood profoundly from this angle, they will revive and re-emerge, even after they have been combatted once.

In discussions and conversations, on scores of occasions, I have heard Enver Hoxha speak full of passion and energy about the most varied problems of social activity. But his thinking was never one-sided, not even when the debate grew heated and emotions came into it. I noticed this even in the mid-1960s, at the time when we were preparing to launch the phase of the all-round revolutionization of the life of the country, in the fury of the fight against bureaucracy.

Even in these conditions, when the extension of socialist democracy was being supported powerfully with a series of new organizational measures, he did not forget the other danger which threatened the people’s power: liberalism. In many speeches

and articles of that time and later, he argued that liberalism is not a phenomenon which suddenly descends from the sky; it is a product of the ideological pressure of the external and internal enemy, whose aim is to undermine the people's state power and socialism. If democracy and centralism have been balanced and are in harmony in all the stages of the socialist construction of our country, the decisive factor in this has been the orientations of the Party, the ideas and insistence of Enver Hoxha.

Arguing the necessity of the fight against liberalism, Comrade Enver said that with the advance of socialism, the enemies find it more and more difficult to come out openly with calls against the people's state power, against our social order, because the workers and the peasants, the intelligentsia, the women and the youth would spring at the throat of anyone who made such calls. Therefore the enemy and the whole of reaction strives to bring about the degeneration of the state and the socialist order by encouraging liberalism, seeking to open new paths to inject its poison into people's minds.

Comrade Enver's ideas about the danger of liberalism and opportunism, about guarding the Party and the state against the illusions which their alluring slogans can arouse, are an effective weapon even for today. Strong winds of opportunism from various quarters are blowing in the world today. They are fanned up and fostered by imperialism and world reaction, and are used to fight socialism and revolution, to spread liberalism and the counter-revolution. At the same time, the present-day opportunist currents represent the crisis of revi-

sionism, which is the cause of the general moral, political, ideological, economic and cultural degeneration in the Soviet Union and the other former socialist countries, which today have joined in the “fashion parade” of reforms.

In taking up the question of the revolutionization of the state, Comrade Enver did not limit himself merely to denouncing the danger of bureaucracy and liberalism. He also worked out the ways to avoid these evils which might assail the people’s state power. The “remedy” against bureaucracy and liberalism which Comrade Enver Hoxha recommends is to increase the socio-political activity of the masses of the people, their direct participation in the management of state affairs.

He did not define these ways in a bookish manner; they emerged in debates, discussions and consultations with the people, from summing up the historical experience of the socialist construction in our country.

“The communists, the cadres of the Party and state,” he said to me in a conversation early in 1972, “must always be in the vanguard. While leading the masses, they must, at the same time, submit themselves to their control. If we say that the communists have dedicated themselves to the cause of the people, then they must never behave like lords or be dictators over the masses. The Party does not need such communists.”

Continuing, he asked:

“Can this noble aim of the Party and the communists be realized when most of the office employees are party members?”

And without waiting for a reply, he stressed:

“It is wrong. Indeed, I would call it a petty-bourgeois mentality if there are communists who regard it as their duty to occupy the key positions and to give orders. But what about those who are not party members, among whom there are very capable specialists and cadres, especially in the ranks of the youth and the intelligentsia? What are they for? Just to take and carry out orders?”

A few days later, when I read the speech he delivered to the Plenum of the Party Committee of the Mat district, which is known as a speech of special theoretical and practical importance about the role of the masses in the socialist construction, I remembered that conversation and understood Enver's preoccupation better.

The line of the masses constitutes the main pivot of Enver Hoxha's thinking on the question of the state. The role of the masses, he declared, is decisive in everything. The working class, the peasantry and the people's intelligentsia are the bearers of progress, resolute fighters for the cause of socialism and for strengthening the people's state power. The communists must rely on the working masses because the Party itself has emerged from them.

In the course of the struggle against manifestations of bureaucracy, Comrade Enver elaborated a series of original ideas, such as that of the circulation of cadres, their participation in physical labour together with the masses, the working-class control and the establishment of a correct ratio between high and low wages. A red thread runs through these ideas: the Party and the state must

be linked with the people like flesh to bone. He stressed that the struggle against manifestations of bureaucracy and liberalism can be waged successfully only with the participation of the masses and by strengthening socialist democracy, and that the working-class control over the work of administrations, production and distribution is an indispensable condition to strengthen our socialist society.

“Nothing escapes the eyes of the people,” Comrade Enver told me in a meeting in April 1975, wanting to underline the idea of the strength of control by the masses. “Bureaucracy,” he repeated several times, “becomes enlivened wherever the class struggle against it is slackened. The bureaucrat cowers undercover when the fist of the working class and its Party hits him hard.”

As soon as I returned to my office, I began to put on paper the ideas which emerged from that conversation because they seemed to me very valuable, and I was concerned that they should not be lost. While writing, however, I noticed that the material was assuming the form of an article. When I finished it and read it over, I was still more convinced about this. I went back to Comrade Enver’s office:

“I’ve put some of the things we talked about on paper,” I said, handing him the article.

After he read it, I asked him for his impression of it.

“Don’t alter it or you’ll spoil it,” he said, smiling. “Let Hysni read it and send it to the newspaper.”

Hysni, too, was of the same opinion.

The next day, on April 3, 1975, the article was

published in *Zëri i popullit* as an editorial, under the title “When the Class Speaks, Bureaucracy is Silent,” which set off another powerful attack on a broad scale against bureaucracy, the inflation of staff establishments and the flood of paper work.

Comrade Enver Hoxha regarded the manifestations of bureaucracy and liberalism as linked with one another, as two sides of the same medal. He continually repeated Stalin’s saying that the most dangerous enemy is the one that is forgotten.

In the report he delivered to the 4th Plenum of the Central Committee in June 1973, he pointed out: “The Party has always been against any kind of distortion or underestimation of its orientations about a consistent ideological struggle on the two flanks, against liberalism and against conservatism. It has been and is against any kind of misrepresentation that for the sake of the struggle against one flank, the struggle against the other should be neglected or forgotten.”

In our history there have been conservative elements who have tried to wage the struggle against liberalism from their own positions, just as there have been liberal elements who wanted to do the opposite. The only correct stand on this question, a stand which stems from the work of Enver Hoxha, is that both the struggle against liberalism and that against conservatism can be waged successfully only from the positions of the Party, from the positions of Marxist-Leninist principles.

The great movement for the all-round revolutionization of the life of the country, which burst out all over Albania in the mid-1960s, is known to all. This movement of extraordinary importance

for the time when it took place, but also with lessons for today and for tomorrow, was not a spontaneous movement. Its initiator was Enver Hoxha. Summing up the experience of our revolution and that of the other countries, with their good aspects and weaknesses, he drew theoretical and practical conclusions about the need to take certain indispensable measures so as to ensure the uninterrupted development and deepening of the revolution in all fields, and prevent the development of rust on any cog in the machinery of our society.

The theme of the revolutionization has been the subject of many conversations in the meetings I have had with Comrade Enver. It is impossible to reproduce them all here, but I have selected just one which I think is typical, and which took place at the beginning of September 1968, when I was working to prepare the report for the Plenum of the CC of the Party, which was held at the end of that month:

“In the Plenum,” he said, “it is necessary to make a summing-up of the revolutionization of the life of the country from the ideological aspect. A great movement of the masses against bureaucracy, against backward customs, against mentalities that hinder the emancipation of women, against religious superstitions, etc., has burst out everywhere. This struggle must be considered as a whole, as a revolutionary action which has a single aim: to prevent not only any turning back, but also standing still. The revolution must march ahead, must advance, must mount higher and higher. The Party must understand this. Otherwise there are dangers.”

I noted down these ideas almost word for word, not only because they would come in useful in the stage of preparing the material for the Plenum, but also because of their value as a general orientation for the ideological work of the Party.

“What should we aim at with the revolutionization?” Comrade Enver continued, addressing the question to himself rather than to me. And he did not wait for an answer. “When the Party speaks about revolutionization, in the first place, this has to do with the people, their consciousness and world outlook, because man is the decisive factor in everything. Men make the revolution, therefore to revolutionize the life of the country means, first of all, to revolutionize their activity. You must pay special attention to this question in the report which you’re preparing because, not infrequently, the work with the people, the work to raise their level of consciousness, to purge it of the erroneous ideas inherited from the past or which come from outside through many channels, is underrated.”

This raised the question of going on to a new, higher phase, the phase of extending the struggle against any manifestation alien to the nature of socialism in all the state activity. Enver Hoxha’s instructions in this conversation clearly projected this phase:

“A great amount of work is being done for the struggle against bureaucracy,” he continued. “But we must insist that this question is understood properly. Revolutionization presupposes purging the superstructure of anything outdated and alien which is incompatible with the economic base of socialism which we have created. Without perfect-

ing it continuously, we cannot create the conditions for the rapid development of the country on the road of socialism. It is essential to explain clearly that when we speak about the superstructure, we do not imply only the state. Certainly this has decisive importance. Therefore the strengthening of its popular character, the struggle against bureaucracy and liberalism, the struggle against any other alien manifestation which hinders it in exercising its role as the state of the people, remains the main task.

“When we speak of the superstructure,” he went on, “we should not forget that, apart from the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, it also includes the Party, the organizations of the masses, the ideological and the cultural fronts, etc. Therefore the defence of their class character and their continuous revolutionization comprise a fundamental task in order to carry the revolution forward. We must always bear in mind the negative experience of the Soviet Union, where the degeneration of the superstructure exerted a powerful influence on the degeneration of the whole socialist order.

“There are other questions which must be dealt with too, such as the relations of production, which should be perfected uninterruptedly,” he pointed out at this meeting. “But it must be stressed that, in the final analysis, the purpose of all these measures is to increase production, strengthen the socialist economy and culture, increase the defence capacity of the country and raise the standard of living of the masses. I say this because there are comrades who see the question of the revolution-

zation, the struggle against bureaucracy, or for the revolutionary education of the working people, the struggle against backward customs or against religious superstitions, the struggle for the emancipation of women, the measures for the circulation of cadres, or for narrowing pay differentials, and all the other measures which we have adopted, rather as educational work, as raising the ideological level. It must be made clear, however, that this level must be expressed, first of all, in the attitude towards work, in the increase of the productivity of labour, in the protection of the property, in the attitude towards one another and towards society, in the degree to which the general interest is placed above personal interest, in the enhancement of proletarian discipline, etc.”

Our socialist society, economy and culture are advancing day by day. This progress is due to the working masses, who are also the creators of material goods, and who bring about every development in our country. Therefore the spirit of the masses in the apparatuses and the elected organs of the state is a revolutionary spirit, and as such, it is indispensable.

From the time when the national liberation councils were created to this day, the people's state power has grown up and strengthened according to the teachings of Enver Hoxha, who was constantly in the forefront of the struggle and efforts to ensure that this state power carries out its political, economic and educational functions in the best possible way, and realizes the boldest dreams and aspirations of our wonderful people.

The construction of the new Albania has been accomplished through a stern class struggle which has been waged on all fronts, against internal and external enemies. It is thanks to Enver Hoxha's ability that this struggle has always been waged correctly, without deviating either to the left or to the right, that it has resisted imperialist pressures and has never been influenced by revisionist views and practices. Enver Hoxha not only described this struggle as a main motive force of the socialist society, but he also proved with brilliant arguments that it would exist throughout the whole period of socialism, until communism. He considered the class struggle as an objective phenomenon which carries forward the revolution and the construction of socialism, which protects the Party, the state and the whole country from bourgeois-revisionist degeneration and the restoration of capitalism, and which purifies the consciousness of the working people and strengthens their proletarian spirit.

As our experience shows, the class struggle is waged on all fronts; it is waged in the fields of politics, the economy, culture and ideology, in the fields of internal development and foreign relations. It constitutes a continuous process which is opposed to anything which is incompatible with the interests of the people, or impedes the development of our socialist society, everything which harms the sovereignty, freedom and independence of the Homeland. It is the struggle between the new and the old, the progressive and the retrogressive, between freedom and material and spiritual slavery, between the general interest and attempts to place narrow personal interest above it.

Without intending to present the whole of Enver Hoxha's theoretical thinking on the class struggle, which is very rich and extensive, I wish to stress the importance he gave to the struggle on the ideological front. Whenever Comrade Enver spoke about this question, bearing in mind especially the revisionist reversal which occurred in the Soviet Union, he stressed that the victories of the revolution in the political and economic fields cannot be regarded as guaranteed without the triumph of the revolution in the ideological field, in the all-round ideo-political and moral formation of the people as well.

“The slightest weakening of this struggle,” he said, “gravely prejudices the construction of socialism, the line of the Party, because this opens the door to the spread of bourgeois and revisionist ideology, hence to the possibility of the degeneration of the revolution and a turning-back.”

This teaching of Enver Hoxha has great value for all our cadres and communists. The imperialist-revisionist encirclement and its all-round pressure on our people must not be forgotten for one moment; the remnants of alien ideologies, backward customs, religious superstitions, the force of attraction of private property and personal interests, which prevent the formation of socialist consciousness and create conditions for the spread of alien, anti-socialist manifestations, must not be underrated. It is the duty of the Party not only to condemn and explain the class roots of these negative phenomena, which are dangerous to socialism, but also to organize the work for the education of people so that, as Comrade Enver stressed, that world

outlook, those customs, feelings and tastes, that revolutionary morality and philosophy which make it possible to prevent the revival and implanting of alien petty-bourgeois and bourgeois outlooks are created everywhere, among our people and in the whole society.

Waging the class struggle correctly, as our whole practice has confirmed, exerts a direct influence in strengthening the political and moral unity of the people, which Comrade Enver Hoxha saw as the source of our strength and victories.

It can be said without the slightest hesitation that it was Enver Hoxha who worked out the platform for uniting the people and who guided its application in practice. To him belongs the merit that, as new problems emerged for the country, he was able to define the tasks which presented themselves for strengthening the unity of the people.

“A political front of the entire people, the Democratic Front, that is what Albania needed in the time of the war, that is what Albania needs now in time of peace, because the tasks that face us in these times are just as important and vital as those of the time of the war,” he said at the 1st Congress of the Democratic Front.

Subsequently, seeing the problem of the unity of the people in its dialectical development, he always treated it in close connection with the stage achieved in the development of our socialist society. In the present period, the unity of the people in the Democratic Front is a unity of identical political, economic and ideological interests, a unity of people who are not subjugated to any kind of oppression and exploitation, who live in freedom

and real democracy and are masters of their own country.

As the true dialectician that he was, Enver Hoxha stressed that our unity is dynamic, not static. It is not given once and for all. It is strengthened if the struggle to strengthen the political, economic, ideological and social foundations on which it is based is waged continuously, according to the teachings of the Party, if the Party's policy, both for internal problems and for external problems, is thoroughly and correctly understood by the working masses.

The enemies of the Party and socialism have tried and will continue to try in the future to attack the foundations of this unity, to create splits between the people and the Party. Therefore the consistent struggle against enemies, whether internal or external, old or new, must be seen as an important aspect of the struggle to safeguard and strengthen our unity and that of our people's state power.

The Party and Comrade Enver have pointed out that the class struggle does not develop in a straight line, but with zigzags, with ups and downs. This depends on many factors, on the activity of the internal and external enemies, on the issues over which this struggle is waged, etc. Nevertheless, our Party, being determined not to make any concessions and always maintaining a stand of principle, has neither kindled nor quelled the class struggle in artificial ways.

At the same time, the Party and Comrade Enver have continuously reminded the communists and the working masses that they must strengthen their

revolutionary vigilance uninterruptedly, must wage the class struggle with maturity and proletarian partisanship, not with empty phrases and slogans, but with active revolutionary ideas, judgments and actions.

Precisely as a result of this clear line worked out by the Party and implemented under the leadership of Enver Hoxha, the class struggle in our country has been waged correctly and has responded to the concrete situations and the given stages of the revolution.

At first, in the stormy years of the National Liberation War, the Party was guided by the principle of uniting the people in a single fighting bloc, seeing in people what they had in common, what brought them together in a single front against fascism. As is known, the basic slogan of the National Liberation Front was the unity of all genuine patriots in the war for the liberation of the Homeland from the occupiers and traitors. At every moment, the Party has known what it must demand of itself and what tasks it must place before the masses. This has made the political slogans of the Party outstanding for their clarity and courage, as well as for their maturity and prudence.

In his book *Laying the Foundations of the New Albania*, while describing almost the whole history of the National Liberation War, on the basis of documented facts, personal impressions and reminiscences, Comrade Enver has given a convincing and instructive portrayal of how the Party maintained its balance even in the complicated situations of those years. This book shows that the Party has never pursued its general policy indis-

criminally in waging the class struggle. Comrade Enver personally approached wavering elements, one by one, including even chiefs of nationalist organizations. And he did this not just to discharge some obligation to them, but in order to win them over, to save them from the disaster towards which the wrong road they had chosen would inevitably lead them.

Amongst us, the class struggle at all stages of the socialist revolution and towards every social grouping has been a struggle in the party spirit, a struggle of principle. In the line of our Party, flexibility has never been turned into opportunism and unprincipled compromises; forbearance and cool-headedness never led to making concessions on class positions; prudence and balance were not accompanied with a spirit of opportunism, just as vigilance towards enemies never assumed the colour of suspicion towards our own people, and ideological purity and devotion did not lead to narrowness and artificially-instigated social conflicts.

Enver Hoxha always defined which were the most suitable ways and means that had to be used in the situations created. He knew against whom to use the “weapon of criticism” and against whom the “criticism of weapons,” as Marx said. Our Party has always given people their due. Punishment without reason, or attributing non-existing merits, have not been and are not in its style.

To maintain balance in waging the class struggle is not an easy thing, the more so because our Party and country, with their revolutionary position, have been and are in permanent confrontation with the enemies, both internal and external. There

has been no lack of accusations against our Party from various enemies, especially the external ones, the Yugoslavs and the Soviets. These accusations are sometimes of "sectarianism in its line," so that we would fall into opportunism and liberalism, sometimes of "dogmatism in understanding development," so that we would yield ground to revisionism, sometimes of "self-imposed isolation," so that we would open the doors and put the freedom and independence of the Homeland in jeopardy. All these accusations have been made systematically in the past and are being made unsparingly today, accompanied with pressure and dictate in various forms, with economic blockade and ideological diversion, as well as with flattery and hypocritical smiles.

Whenever they have discovered the sinister aims which enemies have nurtured towards us, the Party and Comrade Enver Hoxha have exposed with arguments and resolutely denounced their ambitions. In this struggle, however, we have never proceeded from the formal logic that when the enemy maligns you, you are in order. Had we proceeded from this logic, sooner or later we would have fallen for the refined tactics of the class enemy, external or internal.

Today the rebuttal of these accusations is obvious, and is a much easier job than it used to be. They cannot be readily implanted in the minds of our people because their political formation and consciousness are at a much higher level. The ideological maturity of our people is the first and strongest barrier to repel the pressure of the enemies. In our days, when anathema is hurled at us

about “economic and ideological isolation,” or when there is talk about “opening up,” or “coming out of self-isolation,” the people know that our enemies are impelled not by their “concern” for the “welfare” of Albania, but by their desire to cause us to deviate in our policy, in order to gain advantages for themselves.

However, this was not always so. In the first post-Liberation years, when the situation was not as healthy as it is today, the accusations of external enemies not only placed weapons in the hands of the internal enemies and declassed elements, but also confused many unformed individuals from various strata of the people.

Our Party has had to fight and be ceaselessly vigilant to maintain a clear class line, policy and position towards events and situations. Comrade Enver Hoxha defeated every theory, the theses and plans of enemies, not just by dismissing them with one word, calling them wrong because they came from enemies, but by entering into debate with them, by confronting them with the historical facts and drawing the respective conclusions until they were finally exposed.

The line, ideas and teachings of the Party have always been superior to what enemies advocated, because at all times they have expressed the interests of the masses of the people, the interests of the freedom and independence of the Homeland. Enver Hoxha’s work is a clear reflection of this. The strength of his ideas rest precisely on the fact that they derive from sound Marxist-Leninist dialectical reasoning and not from prejudices and obsessions.

Enver Hoxha defended the line of the Party against any kind of hastiness and subjectivism. Again and again he repeated that the Party must analyse every phenomenon in the fields of policy and culture, or the economy and defence, calmly and objectively. Calm is characteristic of wisdom and courage, whereas haste is an expression of insecurity and subjective passions.

As well, the Party has been and is guided by these principled positions when dealing with the weaknesses, shortcomings or faults of particular individuals. Enver Hoxha was very cautious in his judgement of people's mistakes. He was stern towards enemies because he defended the interests of the Party and the people, whereas towards those who were disoriented, victimized or had made mistakes from ignorance, he showed concern and tried to help and save them.

He always emphasized that just as the manifestations of the class struggle vary in form and intensity, so should the educational measures and the counter-actions of the Party and the socialist state vary in conformity with them. He taught us that antagonistic contradictions are not resolved and the class enemy is not combatted through concessions and pleading. When anti-party elements engage in undermining activity and try to organize themselves in order to oppose the Party and the state, they cannot be fought with lectures. The work of clarification and explanation is valuable for those who make mistakes, who deviate from the line, because they have not understood it or are unclear about it, but not for those who come out against the Party and its line for hostile aims and who seek

to overthrow it with putsches and counter-revolutionary organization.

I remember an expression which he used frequently, whenever an opinion had to be given, or a clear-cut stand adopted towards some important event:

“Weigh it up carefully! The first thought is the horse’s, the second is the rider’s!”

With this he warned us that we must not be rash, must dominate our passions, and not be excessive either in praises or in reprimands. At first thought, when you are not yet free from the effect of momentary impressions and emotions, you may be mistaken, may not retain a sense of proportion and fall into one-sided positions, whereas every action of the Party must be carefully weighed up and motivated by convincing reasons. Therefore, second thought, based on sound judgement, is that which suggests the most correct stand.

Thanks to this logic, in the activity of the Party, even when its most dangerous enemies were judged, there has been no room for the spirit of vengeance, for sinister spiritual passions and struggle from subjective positions.

The Party has not been unfair to anyone. Likewise, the people have not harassed anyone unjustly with their laws, not even the open class enemies, the revolutionary overthrow of whom, as an exploiting class, has been justified by progress and history. Nor have the people unjustly treated those who were tools and collaborators with the occupiers, and who stained themselves with disgrace through their betrayal of the interests of the Homeland, or the foreigners and their secret agents who

wanted to dig the grave for Albania and put it up for sale as a chattel without an owner. The people and the Party have no debt even to those who united with the people at first and were swept along by the enthusiasm of the masses for the construction of the new society, but who subsequently wearied of it and, what is worse, sought to place themselves above the interests of the people and the Party, wanting to use Albania as their own property, to make a gift of it to foreigners. The law of the class struggle has operated and operates with justice towards all.

It is known that in the modern history of our country, there have been more than a few instances when people, who for a time held top positions in the state and the Party, who were members of the supreme leading organs of the country, have become involved in various hostile activities. The class struggle, in general, and the principled ideological struggle against revisionism on the international plane, could not but be reflected within the ranks of the Party. This has come about because wavering, career-seeking elements of hostile predisposition, who capitulated to the external pressure and placed themselves in the service of the foreigners, had infiltrated the organs of the state and the Party. The theory of "taking the castle from within," a very old theory in the history of mankind, is a weapon which not a few enemies, from the imperialists and the capitalist countries to the Yugoslav, Soviet and other revisionists, have used against us.

Life has proved and present-day developments

are proving that “big” countries and “big” parties with Marxist names work to ensure their influence and domination over “small” countries and parties, so that the latter proceed according to the interests of the former and dance to their tune, becoming spheres of influence and domains for the big countries and parties. Our experience, and not only ours, also shows that in order to attain this goal, besides exerting various political and economic pressures, the “mighty,” the “tutors,” try to win over persons of weak character, ambitious adventurers who do not hesitate to sell their souls to foreigners. The enemy tries to find, if it can, people with such vices, mainly from among those who influence the country’s policy. It is a fact that individuals of this type such as Koçi Xoxe and Mehmet Shehu, Beqir Balluku and Kadri Hazbiu, Abdyl Këllezi and others, have been found in our Party.

The foreign propaganda, dominated by hostile prejudices against our country, frequently presents the struggle of the Party and Comrade Enver Hoxha for the defence of the freedom and independence of the Homeland, for the defence of the victories of the revolution against anyone who has tried to violate them, as a struggle from personal positions, as a “settling of accounts with opponents.” It must be said that in this field, too, in the interpretation of these phenomena, there is a definite class stand. By distorting the truth, on the one hand, reaction tries to discredit socialism, to present it as a system which does not permit debate and tramples underfoot the freedoms and rights of individuals, and, on the other hand, in order to protect itself, it tries to defend its own lackeys, even

when they have been exposed and no longer have any moral or social value. Therefore, whereas our explanations are outstanding for their truth, slanders and distortions dominate the interpretations of reaction and ill-wishers.

In our country, the enemies who have placed themselves in the service of foreigners and who have aimed to overthrow the people's state through violence in collaboration with foreigners have rendered account according to the laws of the state and have been punished according to the degree of danger they represented. Those who have opposed the line and the policy of the Party and the socialist state, but who have not been involved in actions against the state and who have not tried to organize anti-socialist putsches and plots, have been expelled from the Party, of course, but they have not faced criminal charges. That is what was done with Sejfulla Malëshova and Koço Tashko, Ymer Dishnica and Liri Belishova, and others, although their activity has caused great harm to socialism and was inspired by foreigners, by the Yugoslav or Soviet revisionists.

There have been others who, for some time and over a given issue, held views differing from those of the Party, and even opposed the line and policy of the Party on such a major problem as the stand towards Yugoslav revisionism and its hostile activity towards Albania. But they soon recognized their mistake and made self-criticism. Not only were they not held penally responsible, but they were even allowed to remain in the ranks of the Party. They include Kristo Themelko and Ramadan Çitaku who, remaining communists, worked

where the Party sent them and are living in retirement today.

The maintenance and consolidation of the people's state power, the carrying out of democratic reforms, the construction of socialism, in general, in a small country like Albania, economically backward and surrounded by many savage enemies, were heavy burdens which could not have been supported without adhering rigorously to the principles of Marxism-Leninism and applying them properly, according to our conditions, but also with active political and ideological creativeness.

The Party was able to accomplish the colossal tasks of the socialist construction successfully because it determined the class ratios and alliances correctly and waged the class struggle consistently in our conditions. This struggle, which extends to all fronts and covers most of the problems and the most diverse aspects of the country's activity, becoming very fierce at some moments, has not been easier than the National Liberation War. Therefore, knowledge and wisdom were as necessary as courage and determination. It was the great good fortune of our Party and people that in these battles they had at their head such a great leader as Enver Hoxha, whose teachings we will always have in mind in our struggle to ensure the final victory of socialism.

The class struggle is not a phenomenon which exists only within a given country. It is also waged on an international plane, between the revolution and the counter-revolution. Enver Hoxha's work and teachings are of a very great value on this plane

too.

After the Second World War, profound revolutionary transformations in the interest of the peoples and socialism occurred, but there was also a great ebbing of the revolution. The people's struggle gathered momentum, the old colonial system was overthrown, but the neo-colonial system emerged, and the aggressiveness and interventions of imperialism increased relentlessly. The struggle of the working class and the revolt of the masses of the people against oppression and exploitation mounted, but the revisionist betrayal helped the spread of various bourgeois theories which deny the need for class struggle and the revolution. It spread illusions about the so-called peaceful integration of capitalism into socialism, and cast doubts on the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist theses and the ability of our revolutionary theory to supply the necessary answers to problems of the development of the present-day world of the atom and electronics.

At such a time, when reaction and the revisionists were trying to cause ideological chaos, Enver Hoxha showed that the road of the revolutionary forces and the prospects of the liberation struggle have not been closed, that the changes which have occurred and the present-day developments in the world do not negate Marxism-Leninism or the class struggle as a universal law of the development of class society. Enver Hoxha has proved that, despite the temporary zigzags, the cause of revolution remains on the agenda, not only as an aspiration of the peoples and the world proletariat, but also as a question put forward for solution.

**“Party-Enver,
We are Ready
Any Time!”**

Ëë dashuri të Shokut
Ramiz, bashkëpunë-
torit të mbarë ngushtë
në luftën e përparimit me
që po zhvillojmë për
ngritjen politike dhe ideo-
logjike të Partisë
sonë heroike që në theks
me sukses ndërtimin e
Socializmit

13. C. 81.

To dear Comrade Ramiz Alia, my close collaborator in the daily struggle we are waging for the Marxist-Leninist political and ideological uplift of our heroic Party, which guides the construction of socialism with success.

Facsimile of the dedication which Comrade Enver Hoxha wrote in the copy of the book *When the Party Was Born*, which he presented to Comrade Ramiz Alia.

Party-Enver, we are ready any time!

With this slogan on our lips, we paid our last respects to Comrade Enver Hoxha, that great standard-bearer of struggle, of work and of thought. And it was precisely the young pioneers, the heirs to the future, from whom those monumental words burst out in Skanderbeg Square.

At those moments it seemed as if we were at an ordinary meeting and not at a funeral ceremony. This slogan, which has always been an expression of unity and enthusiasm, gave strength to all of us. It drove away the idea of his death. There we bid farewell to Enver physically. There we kept him alive among us.

Many, many times we have clapped and cheered to the rhythm of this historic slogan. When did we hear it for the first time? Who was the first to utter it and where? It is hard to answer these questions precisely. Several generations have clapped and cheered "Party-Enver, we are ready any time!" It has burst from the hearts of the people. It is a synthesis of their love for the Party and its historic leader, an expression of gratitude for everything they have done for the good of the peo-

ple and the Homeland, a solemn pledge to forge ahead non-stop on the course they have indicated.

In the talks and meetings I have had with the people since April 11, 1985, I have stressed on several occasions that when we say the Party we imply Enver, and when we say Enver we imply the Party. Irrespective of the similarity of the means of expression, I have not simply adapted Mayakovsky's famous lines about Lenin. But it is a fact that among us, the Party and Enver entered history together, advanced and grew together and will always be together. Enver Hoxha lives in the Party he created in the heat of the war; he lives in the revolutionary vanguard of our working class, just as he lives in the minds and hearts of all our people.

Our people have expressed this true symbiosis of the Party with its leader beautifully in many of their creations. Look how clearly they have expressed it in just two lines:

*Hooray for you Party of Labour,
In the forefront Enver Hoxha.*

Whenever the people or the leadership expressed warm words of respect and love for him, Comrade Enver immediately directed them to the Party. Again and again he repeated that any good personal attributes he may have are due to the Party.

Of course, Enver's insistence that every value of his work should be attributed to the Party reflects his exemplary modesty, but it also reflects his awareness of the role of the Party as a school of communists, of all its members, including the lead-

ership itself.

“Those people who write to me about this or that question saying, ‘I want to discuss it only with you,’ or ‘the water runs pure from above but becomes muddy below,’ make me sick,” he said with evident displeasure when he came across such expressions in the letters of citizens or in their requests to meet him.

And he reasoned:

“No doubt, mistakes are made. But the absolute majority of the communists and cadres work honestly. They, together with the working masses, carry out the directives of the Party with devotion and achieve the socialist victories. Those who speak in this way, who reckon that any mistake or shortcoming they notice is general, in fact under-rate the role and work of the Party and the masses at the base.”

Any journalistic nonsense also annoyed him and upset him enormously, as occurred in the case when, in a report following a speech of his, a correspondent wrote more or less that “Enver Hoxha’s Albania stands like a granite rock facing the external blockade,” and Enver wrote an angry note on the margin of the article:

“No one has bequeathed Albania to me; it belongs to the people, to all Albanians.”

There were occasions when he came storming into my office, bringing a newspaper, underlined wherever his name was mentioned and, quite rightly, he drew attention to even the slightest excesses that might occur sometimes.

“Not I, but the Party has the merit for these things,” he would insist to the end on such occa-

sions.

Enver did not wait for, but created the moments, seizing every opportunity to underline his position as a pupil of the Party.

One of the daily meetings of the secretaries of the Central Committee, in the mid-1970s, at which, while speaking about the preparation of various documents of the Party, he dwelt at length on the criteria for the use of quotations, is a significant illustration of this. He raised the question in “principle” but, in fact, his aim was to eliminate the inappropriate use of quotations from his *Works*, a thing which did happen sometimes, especially in the press, in lectures and publications.

At this meeting he said, “It may seem to some that the use of many quotations shows the high level of the author of the article, for it ‘proves’ that the writer or reporter bases himself on theory. If we have a look at what we have written in the past, we shall see that at first we, too, put in many quotations.”

“Yes, that is so,” I agreed. “It came about especially because we felt the need to prove we were right. Instead of using arguments from life, from science, we used some quotation to ‘put the seal’ on our opinion. In this way we felt more sure of ourselves.”

“Lack of experience compelled us to make use of quotations,” Comrade Enver continued. “In time, our horizon broadened, and we began to use quotations more correctly. But look at the press,” he put his finger on the “sore point.” “These are people who fill their articles with quotations, using sayings of mine several times in one article. This

won't do. They should refer to the wisdom of the Party, which, being collective wisdom, is unerring."

For Enver Hoxha, to use his own words, the people and the Party were the greatest treasures. For him, as for every true communist, they stood above everything. He dedicated his whole life to them. Before them he always felt himself a soldier and a servant.

From November 8, 1941 until the last beat of his heart, Enver Hoxha thought, worked and fought for a strong, monolithic party, bearing the finest qualities and aspirations of the people, for a revolutionary, internationalist, Marxist-Leninist party, for a party that would always be young from the age of its members and nimble in its thinking, for a party whose members are people with lofty moral values.

Comrade Enver raised the Party with the care of an exemplary educator. His thinking about the Party, its place and role in the revolution and socialist construction, about problems of its internal organization and communist education, about the militancy and the revolutionary spirit of the communists and cadres, is very extensive.

Enver's concepts about the Party are reflected in all his revolutionary activity, during the National Liberation War and the socialist construction, in connection with questions of internal or foreign policy, problems of the economy or culture, defence or education, and every other field.

He saw the Party as a living organism, in permanent development, capable of responding to the

situations that are created and the tasks which present themselves at any time and in every field of social activity. He conceived the uninterrupted political, ideological and organizational strengthening of the Party in a dialectical way.

At the 5th Congress of the Party, which was held in November 1966, in the chapter of the report devoted to organizational questions of the Party, among other things, he insisted especially on two questions: the strengthening of the leading role of the organizations of the Party, and the qualities which must characterize the communists.

Why did he raise these issues precisely at that Congress?

This has to do with the conclusions and lessons which the Central Committee of the Party and Comrade Enver had drawn from the revisionist counter-revolution which had seized power in the Soviet Union and from the so-called Cultural Revolution that had begun and was developing in China. At that time, Comrade Enver exchanged opinions continually with all the comrades of the leadership of the Party on these questions. Of course, in regard to the Soviet Union, the appearance of revisionism and the degeneration of the party there, the picture was clearer. The lessons that had to be drawn from that bitter experience were more than evident. Meanwhile, what was happening in China was very astonishing, "enigmatic," as Comrade Enver put it right from the outset.

We heard talk of a "black gang" and of "leaders who have taken the capitalist road." The Cultural Revolution proceeded under disruptive slogans such as "attack the headquarters," etc. The Red

Guards and the army were leading everything, while the cult of Mao Zedong was being lauded to the skies. Just like a God! We learned these things from the news agencies because we received no information or reports from the Communist Party of China.

In the summer of 1966, Comrade Hysni Kapo and I went to Dajti Mountain for some time to work on preparing the materials for the Party Congress, but we kept in continual contact with Comrade Enver, who was in Durrës. Our common concerns were: Does the party exist in China any longer? Why did the Red Guards emerge on the scene and why is there no mention at all of the party members, the communist youth or the working class? Logic led us to the conclusion that there might be revisionists in China, indeed even in the leadership. But who were they? And who would fight them: the party, the working class and the people, or the Red Guards, the army and the cult of Mao?

In our talks with Comrade Enver, especially when the three of us got together in Tirana, we reached the conclusion that events in China were not developing on the correct party road. Comrade Enver reasoned that it was erroneous “to ignore the party” and even worse “to deride it,” while imposing the army on it, placing it above the party, that “there can be no thought of a cultural revolution without the participation of the working class and the peasantry,” etc. He was especially sickened at the cult of Mao, which, as he said, “they are turning into an almost religious cult.”

It was decided that at our Congress, the empha-

sis should be placed precisely on those questions which the Chinese were “underrating” or “overlooking,” but which had importance of principle for the Party and the cause of the revolution. Let the Chinese interpret them as critical suggestions, if they wished.

Thus, Comrade Enver devoted a special place in his report to the leading, hegemonic role of the Party. Just like the victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, he pointed out at the Congress, the construction of socialism, too, cannot be achieved without a revolutionary party of the working class at the head, without a party loyal to Marxism-Leninism, an organized party, which is able to lead and guide the working masses in the struggle and work. Any weakening, however slight, of the leading role of the party, the report deliberately stressed, alluding to the revisionist deviation in China, creates the great danger for the working class that it will be left disorganized and disarmed in the face of class enemies. This constitutes the source of ideological and organizational degeneration and the transformation of the party into a revisionist, bourgeois party.

Especially important are the demands put forward in the Congress about the tempering and education of the communists and the qualities that must characterize them. The party is strong when its members are active, the party is revolutionary when the communists are tempered, the party plays its leading role in society when its members are in the vanguard — this spirit pervaded the report from beginning to end. It is known that the ten qualities of a communist, so clearly and excellently defined

by Enver at the 5th Congress, have been included in the Party Constitution as fundamental requirements for its members.

The teachings of Enver Hoxha about the qualities of communists have permanent value and constitute the essential condition for safeguarding the purity of the ranks of the Party and for its all-round strengthening.

History always lays heavy burdens on the shoulders of the party and the communists. For them there is never time for inactivity. As soon as one task is accomplished, the need arises to mobilize forces to accomplish another task. This is the dialectic of life, the number one demand of development. Only a vanguard party, a militant party such as our Party of Labour, founded and educated by Enver Hoxha, can lead this process successfully. In order to safeguard and temper these qualities of the party, its members must, at all times, be fighters for the cause of the people, of Marxism-Leninism and the revolution; they must be exemplary in work, creative and with initiative; they must be progressive, resolute opponents of everything backward — obscurantism, religious dogmas and artisan mentalities, just as they must be linked with the masses of the people and outstanding for their cultured behaviour, pure moral figure, justice and correct social attitude.

The qualities of communists are judged for their worth in the struggle to implement and defend the line of the party, and not from their words. The consistent revolutionaries are formed and recognized in their daily work together with the

masses. In work and concrete actions the laggards and those who boast of their past and seek privileges are shown up, and those who have no right to be in the party are revealed in the course of work. As Comrade Enver taught us, the party must give each of them what he deserves: those of the first group it must support, encourage and educate so that they advance further; the second group it must help, open their eyes so that they abandon the swamps immediately and merge with the general revolutionary drive; the third group it must expel from its ranks as unworthy to bear the title of communist.

He saw the education of communists, also, as closely linked with their work, with their understanding and their accomplishment of tasks. He always insisted that formalism and officialdom in the party propaganda should be combatted, that the activity in the forms of education should be enlivened, that they should not function like the state schools, but be transformed into centres of discussion where problems of every type that the communists encounter are debated freely.

During a conversation with Comrades Hysni Kapo, Haki Toska and me in November 1972, Comrade Enver said in part:

“Greater efforts are needed to explain our practice with the Marxist-Leninist theory, that is, to generalize the experience of the Party from the theoretical standpoint. There are and will be defects in our work. But it is important to understand what is wrong from the ideological aspect too.”

“It often happens,” I broke in, “that the party organizations take practical measures to eliminate

a defect. But if they content themselves with that alone, there is no guarantee that the same problem won't crop up again. Therefore, as you say, what is wrong must be explained from the ideological aspect too."

"That is so," he continued. "We speak of unity in the Party, of communist conscious discipline, the struggle against bureaucracy and liberalism, etc., but if these questions are not explained theoretically, if the communists do not form the necessary ideological convictions about the danger of these phenomena, there will always be breaches of unity, violations of discipline and bureaucratic and liberal manifestations."

"This is true for the line of the masses too," said Comrade Hysni Kapo. "In order to achieve results, every cadre and communist must understand ideologically and politically why democracy must be deepened, why the voice of the masses must be heard and why they must go to the workers and peasants without formality, etc."

"Not only that," Comrade Enver continued the idea, "but the communists must also know theoretically how the Party can lose its authority if it fails to listen to and take heed of the opinion of the masses. Ideological understanding of these questions, understanding the content of the norms of the party, also ensures their correct implementation. Otherwise, when norms are understood formally, mistakes are made. Thus, there are some of our communists who implement the norms in a sectarian way, and who, when they are criticized, justify their actions with the reasoning that 'it is better to be sectarian than liberal.' Astonishing,

when the question is to be neither sectarian nor liberal!”

At this meeting Comrade Haki mentioned several facts which showed that the norms of the Party are often understood narrowly, like articles of some dry rule book. Hearing this, Comrade Enver said:

“The task of the Party is to explain better, more profoundly and from the theoretical aspect what its norms are, to show clearly in theory what dogmatism and sectarianism are, and not just what is dogmatic and sectarian, what liberalism is as a way of thinking and not just what is liberal as an action. We don’t need the recording of facts and events without interpretation and conclusions. Our comrades of the party apparatuses who are in contact with day-to-day life,” he concluded, “must make generalizations, deduce the causes of phenomena, and on the basis of our Marxist-Leninist theory, make recommendations about how to work better. In this way they will assist the growth of the Party.”

More than once Comrade Enver Hoxha demanded that the party organizations and the cadres should always see the reality in its constant development, should canonize nothing, but should go ahead boldly to leave behind everything outdated: in concepts, methods, forms of organization and management.

Here is a note I made on June 22, 1982, after a usual talk with him, to illustrate his thinking about the need for innovation in the work of the Party:

“Today Comrade Enver spoke at length about the need for dialectical understanding of the work

of the Party. The essence of what he said was that we should not stick to schemes but should adapt ourselves to life, and respond to changes that take place.

“‘The work of the Party,’ he said, ‘is extraordinarily interesting and beautiful. But it is complicated too. The line of the Party cannot tolerate rigid restrictions. It has to be adapted to development, which it must guide and direct. The members of the Party must understand the line in all its breadth, its good points and possible weaknesses in its implementation. They should recognize the objective and subjective aspects of development, where intransigence and where flexibility are needed. This makes the work of the Party as beautiful and attractive as it is difficult and delicate.’

“Then Comrades Simon Stefani and Lenka Çuko spoke about their experience in the districts in which they have worked, pointing out that there are cadres who, in many instances, lack initiative, but act only on instructions they receive from above.

“‘If the line of the Party is not properly understood ideologically,’ Comrade Enver said, ‘if it is applied without creativeness, then development will be impeded. And where it is impeded, there is bound to be bureaucracy and manifestations which have nothing to do with the norms and line of the Party. The work of the Party is not easy because it has to do with people of different levels and mentalities who have views that are not and cannot be clearly defined, and indeed, may even be sectarian or liberal. The communists and the Party must be able to adapt to this situation and work to encour-

age the good aspects and combat the weaknesses. The Party does not violate its line,' he concluded, 'when at given political moments, whether national or international, it adopts tactical stands that the interests of the Homeland require. The circumstances may require forbearance in one situation, just as they may require a stern stand in another situation. In short, principles must be applied in conformity with the concrete conditions. And this is Marxist-Leninist.'"

The Party and the people remained Enver Hoxha's two major concerns all through his life, to the last beat of his heart. We all remember his Greeting on the Occasion of the 40th Anniversary of the Liberation of the Homeland. It is pervaded from start to finish by his profound love and devotion to the people and the Party, by his revolutionary optimism and faith in the happy future of the socialist Homeland. It is a real masterpiece of Albanian journalism and of Albanian culture in general. Reading it, Naim's famous verse on the candle of knowledge comes to mind:

*When you see that I am absent
Do not think that I have died.
I am living, still in life
I am truly in the light.*

It evokes memories of all the men of our Renaissance, all the outstanding Albanian fighters of the past and of modern times taken together.

The people and Enver were linked by a pure affection. They were one in their aspirations and thoughts. Enver spared nothing for the people. But

the people, too, spared nothing for Enver, for the Party.

Our people are and will be grateful to Enver Hoxha for his historic act of founding the Party, but they are grateful also for the very valuable contribution he made to its revolutionary tempering, to the cohesion of its ranks. Enver Hoxha left us a Party free from contamination, a Party politically and ideologically mature, a Party that is characterized by its militant spirit and its feeling of responsibility to the people; he left us a Party with a compact and undivided leadership, with a militant staff in complete unity of thought and action.

* * *

The moments our Party and people went through in April 1985 were exceptional. At that time their political tempering, the strength and durability of the unity of the Party and that of the people around it, were put to the test.

The people and the Party passed this test because they were guided by the teachings of Enver. The Party stood by the people, and the people gave the Party unreserved support.

It had never crossed anyone's mind that we would lose Enver so soon. Not that we believed in immortality, but because even 100 years would have been few for Enver Hoxha, whom no one ever heard complain about his health or speak of being ill.

In his last years, the state of Comrade Enver's health deteriorated, especially following the 8th Congress of the Party and the discovery of the treachery of Mehmet Shehu and his associates.

Comrade Enver had suffered from diabetes for many years, while in 1973 he recovered from a severe cardiac infarct. But by maintaining a regular regime of living, with exemplary will and self-discipline, he managed to keep the diabetes under control and to avoid the repetition of another heart attack which, according to the doctors, was likely to occur in such a patient, bearing in mind his exceptional emotional and intellectual load. Of course, the doctors' care, which was continuous and qualified, both in diagnosis and in determining the therapy, exerted a positive influence in this direction.

In the summer of 1982, some serious problems began to appear. In the first days of September, the doctors, Prof. Fejzi Hoxha and Isuf Kalo, asked to talk with me. They were worried about the fact that his cardiac insufficiency had become more pronounced. The irregularities of his heart rhythm had become more marked, while pulmonary oedema was recurring more frequently. They raised the question that it had now become necessary to set up an organized team to supervise Comrade Enver's state of health and that this supervision should be continuous, day and night.

I was of the same opinion. I talked with Comrade Nexhmije right away about the organization of the work and the appointment of the team of doctors. We decided that the member of the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Party, Prof. Petrit Gaçe, should be in charge and that besides Prof. Hoxha and his personal doctor, Isuf Kalo, Comrades Ylli Popa and Ahmet Kamberi should also be members of the team.

We had to inform Comrade Enver about this. I went to his office and, without going into details, I told him that it was necessary to take some measures to strengthen his medical care.

“I agree,” he said, “because I have not been very well recently, although not as bad as the doctors make out. Don’t take too much notice of what they say because they exaggerate things a bit.”

Enver did not underestimate his illness, but he did not want to alarm the comrades. In particular, he did not want to cause any concern among the people. Therefore he instructed me:

“The less fuss about it the better. For this reason Isuf should continue to look after me for the most part. Consultations should be held infrequently and only when absolutely necessary.”

I told him that we would proceed cautiously, taking heed of his wishes. But on the other hand, I added, we are going to strengthen the medical care for you because we have responsibilities to the people and the Party.

“One more thing,” he said as I was leaving. “If you are thinking of bringing in some foreign specialists, I tell you right now, I do not and never will agree. Our doctors are very capable, and I am very satisfied with them.”

I pursued this no further. The fact is that the doctors raised the need for consultations with foreign specialists, but not as something indispensable. We dropped the idea of bringing some foreign doctor to Albania, but later, when his condition became more complicated, we were obliged to send doctors of the team abroad for special consultations.

I would like to point out that the team of doctors and the entire health service worked very conscientiously, with great devotion and love and with scientific competence. Everything science could do, our doctors did to the last. For his part, Comrade Enver personally, while continuing his work of guiding the Party and the state as usual, fought bravely and never gave in to his illness.

During 1983, his state of health was good in general. He had some episodes, but not very grave ones. However, 1984 began badly. I beg the reader to allow me to devote more space than usual to notes I made during those grave days full of anguish.

February 16, 1984.

It was just after six in the evening when Comrade Nexhmije phoned me: "Come to the house as quickly as you can," she said. Nothing more. She was extremely worried.

I guessed that something bad had happened. A few minutes later I went to Comrade Enver's house. There the doctors and then Nexhmije told me that he had suffered a cerebral ischemia accompanied by paralysis of the right side and difficulty in speaking. Medical aid had been given immediately.

By about eight or nine o'clock the deterioration of his condition had been slowed and stopped. Signs of improvement began to appear. Some slight movement of the hand and the leg, the answers "yes" or "no" when we spoke to him, filled us with

hope. With anxiety in our hearts, we awaited any sign of life in his eyes. We were not used to seeing him in that condition. Enver, from whose mouth honey had poured all through his life, could hardly utter a word.

February 18, 1984.

Today Comrade Enver's health condition is satisfactory. He is not running a temperature, and all the parameters are normal. The movements of his right hand and leg are more evident. His ability to speak has improved too. His whole organism is more dynamic. Let us hope this is not an illusion, a temporary remission, as the doctors say in such cases. It is our heart's desire to leave behind all the worries we suffered. Our people have a very beautiful and very fitting saying for such occasions: May it all be over!

Today we had the meeting of the Secretariat of the Central Committee. I chaired it.

"Comrade Enver had not planned to come," I told the comrades.

Of course, I have informed the comrade secretaries of the Central Committee about what has happened. But as usual, at the meeting there were also invited guests who have not the slightest idea.

After the meeting, I went to Comrade Enver's home. He learnt of my arrival and called me to his room. I was very upset when I saw him like that, as a patient, with serum tubes and the connections of various apparatuses attached to his hands and legs. But I kept my feelings under control because I saw

that he, too, was upset.

“Everything will pass,” I told him, and wished him a quick recovery. I conveyed to him the regards of the comrades.

During my stay, he looked me straight in the eye, with those eyes of his that reflect so much love and warmth. I kissed him when we parted. He kissed me too. He lifted his right arm as if to say look, everything is going well, I can move my arm. Rather than a greeting, this was a sign of the recovery that we were anxiously awaiting.

When I returned to my office, the comrades of the Political Bureau gathered around me at once. I informed them of Enver’s condition and the measures taken for his recovery. They were happy that things are improving.

February 24, 1984.

These days Comrade Enver’s condition is good. All the doctors and we, his comrades, think that he is improving rapidly. I believe that this is not just wishful thinking. Last night I went to see him and stayed quite a long time. With the doctor’s permission we even talked about the work for some moments. I informed him “in telegraphic terms” about the economic situation and the problems he was interested in, especially about the oil industry and agriculture. We exchanged opinions about the anti-Albanian campaign of Greek reaction which has been intensified recently.

We agreed that, for the time being, we must not respond in kind. It is clear that like Greek reaction,

the CIA and the Yugoslavs also want to put us between two fires, Greece and Yugoslavia. Hence we must not fall victim to their provocations. It is wiser to exercise restraint. Let us see what they will do next. We will know how to reply to them if need be.

Let us hope that Enver's health has taken a turn for the better. It is the extraordinary spiritual energy he possesses rather than the medical treatment that is making him recover. He is conquering his illness with his optimism, confidence and clear-mindedness. In this instance, too, he has given us a valuable lesson with this stand. We must not give up even in face of the greatest misfortune, but should meet the danger with courage. If we lose strength, the evil will get the better of us. Then it has triumphed before it has finally conquered us.

After some time, he improved more rapidly. His leg and arm were functioning again. Comrade Enver began to move freely about the house. His speech had become normal earlier. He got down to work immediately — at first in his study at home, and later, in April, also in his office. At the May Day celebration, when he appeared on the tribune, no one noticed that he had just recovered from a grave illness.

Nevertheless, the cerebral ischemia left its mark on his general condition and his physical capacity. It weakened his resistance considerably, which created conditions for worsening of the cardiac insufficiency.

Comrade Enver had great hopes of recovering during the summer holidays. The climate of

Pogradec suited him. Indeed, he worked there with great productivity. There he completed almost all his last books. Despite some improvement in the summer of 1984, however, he did not regain his former physical condition. I went to Pogradec, with Semiramis and the children, to see Comrade Enver and Comrade Nexhmije.

We talked over various questions. I informed him about the internal situation, the results of the wheat harvest, the situation of electric power and exports, etc. He had already received a report from Comrade Adil, so we did not dwell long on these matters. Then we exchanged opinions on various international events, especially on the situation around us.

I noticed that he was getting tired, so to cut the conversation short I said jokingly:

“It seems Nexhmije and Semiramis have gotten bored with us because I can’t see them anywhere.”

“Don’t worry about it,” he said. “Nexhmije has arranged for us to have lunch together at Drilon, so I suppose they have gone there already.”

We, too, stood up, got into the car and went to Drilon. On the way he mentioned in passing that he had had some trouble, but he did not enlarge on this.

Lunch over, we took our leave. I returned to Durrës. I met the comrades who were there and informed them about Comrade Enver, transmitting his greetings to them.

Although his health was not good, Comrade Enver continued his work without interruption. Up to March 1985, he was not absent from any meeting of the Plenum of the Central Committee, or the

Political Bureau, or even of the Secretariat. Whenever he met the comrades, he never said anything about himself or the state of his health, but he spoke about the economic and cultural development of the country, about the tasks facing us, about the prospects of the socialist construction, strengthening the defence of the Homeland and safeguarding its freedom and independence.

Even when, due to his illness, he was obliged not to come to his office regularly, he worked at home, read reports, studies and information materials, and issued instructions for the organs of the Party and state. From time to time, he summoned Comrade Adil and other comrades of the leadership to meet him, listened to them and gave them valuable instructions. I was in daily contact with him: we spoke on the phone, but mostly we met in his home. Almost always he stressed: the work with the communists, the party committees and basic organizations must be strengthened, the moral-political situation must be kept healthy, and the unity of the Party and the people around it must be reinforced.

Enver worked in this way, with this willpower and perseverance, to the last days of his life, days that were grave, very grave for our entire people, for his family and for us, his comrades and collaborators.

March 2, 1985.

Comrade Enver has been ill for some days. I went to his home because he had asked for me. Af-

ter I greeted him, he gripped my hand tightly and said:

“I am sorry you are being loaded with so much work while I am unable to help you. Work together with the comrades, united, always in unity with the people, with the Party.”

Comrade Enver’s words, his anxiety as a comrade and elder brother that we should not be overloaded with work, his concern that his illness had kept him in some way from participating in the daily work, moved me deeply.

“Just get well as quickly as you can, Comrade Enver,” I said sadly. “Don’t worry about the work because we shall do our best. We have a steel Party and unbreakable unity. We shall work harder, and you will help us by instructing, encouraging and teaching us.”

Comrade Enver listened to me attentively and smiled.

“The Party is tempered and has cadres qualified in every field to carry the socialist construction forward,” put in Comrade Nexhmije, who was present.

Comrade Enver’s state of health has taken a turn for the worse these two last weeks. This prevents him from moving. He is barely able to walk, no more than a few steps inside the house with someone to help him.

I have kept the comrades of the Bureau continuously informed about his state of health. He took part in the meeting of the Political Bureau on February 12. He was very weak physically, but he is as wise and clear in his mind as ever.

March 13, 1985.

Today I went to visit Comrade Enver as I have done all these days. He is still ill. He feels a general weariness.

Yesterday he was better. Today also. However, he cannot move freely and the weariness persists. Our doctors keep a close watch over him. They have the situation under control. I talked with Nexhmije and we agreed to send one of our doctors abroad for another consultation regarding the plan of treatment.

I found Comrade Enver in his study as usual. When we shook hands, he was very emotional. And I no less so. He inquired about the comrades. I informed him briefly about the situation in the country and reported on the results achieved in the Fier district, the leaders of which we had summoned to the Secretariat of the Central Committee yesterday. I told him, also, about the group of comrades who are going to Paris for negotiations with the British on the question of the gold, etc.

He listened to me attentively, asked about the situation at the hydro-power stations, then we went on to foreign policy. We spoke about the events of the day.

“International developments must always be followed carefully,” he said. “We are living in dangerous times. Therefore we must be vigilant. We have been and are in relentless struggle with American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. And the states around us are not all friends and admirers. The capitalists are offering us blandishments, but we must keep our eyes open and not be

taken in. At the same time, we must apply the line of the Party wisely, putting the interests of the Homeland, its freedom and independence, the interests of socialism, above everything.”

April 8, 1985.

Yesterday I was again at Comrade Enver's. He was well. He had come downstairs under the balcony of his house which looks toward Dajti Mountain. It was a fine, sunny day. We sat there together with Nexhmije.

We didn't talk much. I told him that we had the meeting of the Political Bureau on April 9. Laughing, I told him:

“This time we will allow you not to come, but not next time. Look, today you have come downstairs, tomorrow you'll walk a bit further. There are the offices of the Central Committee,” I said to him, pointing at them. “We are expecting you,” I concluded. He laughed too. He sent his regards to the comrades.

It never crossed my mind that this would be my last meeting with him.

April 10, 1985.

Yesterday, on April 9, we held the regular meeting of the Political Bureau. Comrade Enver was not coming. Before the meeting began, I telephoned to ask about his health, as I do every day.

They told me he was well. Indeed, he was pre-

paring to go downstairs, out in the fresh air.

I was pleased and went into the meeting feeling calm and more energetic. But this joy was short-lived. At half past nine, Comrade Nexhmije, very upset, called me on the phone. I guessed something very bad had happened. Otherwise, she would have waited for the meeting to end.

“Come quickly,” she said as soon as I picked up the phone. “The situation is very grave.”

I asked the comrades’ permission to leave, telling them that Comrade Enver wanted to see me, but to avoid upsetting them, I told them to continue the meeting. I didn’t know what else to tell them. I took Comrade Adil aside and said to him:

“I think something very bad has happened with Comrade Enver, but I don’t know what.”

Two or three minutes later I entered his home. I saw immediately that the situation was critical. In his bedroom, the doctors were doing all they could to restore the functioning of Enver’s heart, which had stopped beating. They explained that quite unexpectedly, while Comrade Enver was getting ready to go out in the fresh air, he had suffered a heart blockage as a result of a sudden ventricular fibrillation.

Their efforts to restore his heart function continued for several hours, but to me it seemed like years. Sometimes his heart gave up, and we were plunged into indescribable grief. Sometimes it fought and gave signs of life, and we were filled with hope.

Of course, our worry was constant, indeed, increasing, because even when his heart was beating he was in a deep coma, that is, he was unconscious,

felt nothing. This made the situation very grave. The more so since just when it seemed that the situation was being stabilized, indeed, precisely when his pulse and blood pressure became normal, his heart suddenly stopped again. This happened in the afternoon, at about two o'clock on April 9, and according to the doctors, marked the fatal attack.

Shortly before the attack of two o'clock on April 9, I went to the Central Committee to meet the comrades of the Political Bureau whom I informed about the gravity of Comrade Enver's condition. When I returned, I found the doctors fighting with all their means. About three o'clock, Comrades Petrit Gaçe and Isuf Kalo approached me with tears in their eyes and told me:

"The situation is extremely critical. It looks as if everything is coming to an end. Our efforts to keep his heart working are having no effect."

At those moments, we did not want to believe the words of the doctors or anybody else. I told the doctors to continue their endeavours and do the impossible. But in my heart, I feared the worst. At half past three, Comrades Adil and Hekuran came. Comrade Nexhmije and I told them that the situation was almost hopeless.

"Indeed, according to the doctors," I told them, "we are facing the state of death."

Although the comrades were not totally unprepared, this was grave news for them. Their sorrow was immense. Even Nexhmije and I, who had managed to contain our emotions through all the ups and downs of the fight against death, which Comrade Enver had been waging since the morning, could do so no longer.

Together we decided to call an urgent meeting of the Central Committee of the Party. The meeting was held, late at night, at about ten o'clock on April 9. At that time Enver's condition continued to be desperate. I informed the members of the Plenum in detail about his condition, and the history of his illnesses, emphasizing the events of that day.

"The prognosis is very grave and anything could happen," I told the Plenum. "The calamity may befall us... We must be prepared for any eventuality. For the time being," I continued, "only you must be prepared for this. This is not yet the time to alarm the Party or the people. But you must consider what you are going to do and how you will act in any eventuality. We shall keep you continuously informed. Don't lose heart!" I concluded, reminding the comrades of the slogan Comrade Enver always used in grave situations.

The comrades, most of whom were learning of his illnesses for the first time, sat in silence with grave faces. The meeting did not last more than 40 minutes. There were no questions, but it seemed as if everybody was imploring with his eyes, his hands, with his whole being: "Do the impossible to save Comrade Enver!" They left at once for their respective districts.

After the meeting, I returned to Comrade Enver's house. The situation was unchanged. At half past two in the morning of April 10, on the insistence of Nexhmije and the comrades, I went home "to sleep." But I was unable to sleep or to rest. I got up, and at half past six I was back at Enver's home.

I found him as I had left him, indeed somewhat

worse. During the night he had again had irregularities of the heart function, but even worse, had suffered kidney failure. The danger had increased, and the hopes of saving him were fading. Now his organism was threatened with the danger of uremia, self-intoxication. The doctors made unrelenting efforts to restore his kidney function, but to no avail.

All Wednesday, April 10, went by like this — tense, full of worry, without any hopeful signs. Now his kidneys had ceased to function, his temperature had begun to rise and his pulse was accelerating. Comrade Enver was fighting. His heart was resisting, but... it was difficult, very difficult to win the battle, as we wanted.

In these conditions, we comrades of the Political Bureau decided to inform the members of the Central Committee and first secretaries of the districts that the situation was hopeless. I sent a radiogram instructing all of them to start gradually informing the communists and the masses about the state of Enver's health.

April 12, 1985

My pen has never felt so heavy as it does now. My mind, too, seems to be balking. Our teacher, our friend and elder brother, Enver Hoxha, died last night. This is an incomparable loss for the Albanian nation. I, personally, have lost not only my glorious leader, but also my dearest friend, my patient educator. I do not exaggerate when I say that I owe everything in my formation, progress and upbringing to him, to his care and encouragement.

On April 10, I stayed in Comrade Enver's house until midnight. I was advised to rest a little to recover from the physical fatigue and spiritual exhaustion of the last few days. Only a short while later, at a quarter past two in the morning of April 11, my phone rang. It was Comrade Enver's doctor, who said tersely:

"He's dying. We have just told Comrade Nexhmije."

I got up with great grief in my heart. In five minutes I was at his side, but he was dead. He did not open his eyes, did not speak, nor did he smile at me, as he used to whenever I went to visit him. The heart of Enver Hoxha had stopped forever.

Nexhmije, Ilir, Sokol, Pranvera, Haxho, Sano, Teuta, Liliana and Klemi were there, and we wept together for our beloved Enver, the man nearest and dearest to us, who would be with us, speak with us, and make us happy, no longer.

The doctors, the nurses and others who had toiled to exhaustion during those days seemed paralysed with grief. I do not like to recall those moments of boundless grief...

I informed the comrades of the Political Bureau at once, and they arrived quickly, one after the other. Each one of us was overcome with great sorrow. We lacked the strength to comfort one another. But time would not wait. We pulled ourselves together, gritted our teeth and kept the pain of our sorrow to ourselves.

After expressing our condolences to Nexhmije, we held a short meeting of the Political Bureau, at which we decided on the announcement we would have to make to the people and the Party, the

measures to be taken for the creation of the funeral commission, the proclamation of the days of national mourning, etc. We were unanimous that his body should lie in state in the hall of the Presidium of the People's Assembly for the paying of homage to him for three successive days, that the funeral would take place on April 15, while the period of national mourning would last until April 18, 1985. We also decided that Enver's body should lie in the Cemetery of the Martyrs of the Nation, as he had wished, among his wartime comrades.

April 15, 1985.

The grief of the people, our grief, reached its culmination today. We bid farewell to Enver.

From April 12, until today, April 15, the body of Comrade Enver lay in state in the hall of the Presidium of the People's Assembly, where an endless procession of people paid homage to him. Hundreds of thousands of people filed past his body. They filed past, full of honour and respect for his glorious work, with great love for the founder of the new Albania, with tears in their eyes and even weeping openly for the comrade and friend of the common people. Delegations of representatives comprising 50 to 100 people each came from the districts to honour Enver and bring the Party the loyalty of the people.

The homage paid to Enver was majestic, but it was simple and sincere, combining grief and pride. The people expressed their feelings with the greatest sincerity. They entered the hall with clenched

fists raised in salute, stopped before the coffin, wept and clung to one another and spoke of their grief, even to strangers.

Everywhere the great grief has been turned into strength. There have been innumerable letters, messages and telegrams of condolences from the working people, the communists, the youth, the veterans of our country, the Albanians living abroad and many foreign friends. They reflect a powerful outburst of the people's feelings for Enver, but also their great patriotism and determination. All the messages and telegrams reflect their boundless loyalty to the Party, their readiness and determination to follow the road and teachings of Comrade Enver Hoxha.

This same spirit pervaded the meeting of the special Plenum of the Central Committee, held on April 13. This was the first meeting we have held without Enver Hoxha. Profound silence reigned in the hall. In the faces of the comrades, together with their grief, one could see the strength of the conviction in their hearts about the brilliant future the Party had planned under the leadership of Comrade Enver. Their eyes expressed their determination to apply his teachings without interruption and in any circumstances.

In this atmosphere of general sorrow, acting on the instructions of the Political Bureau, I opened the meeting, and after we had stood in silence for several minutes to honour the memory of Comrade Enver, I began to speak:

“Dear comrades, on our shoulders, the shoulders of the Central Committee of the Party, a very heavy burden has fallen. We have to carry social-

ism forward, to strengthen and defend our Homeland without Enver Hoxha, without his very valuable daily advice, but with the same persistence as we displayed under his leadership.”

These words gave me strength, aroused my spirit and enabled me to somewhat quicken my rhythm. The short speech I made about the life of Comrade Enver, about the role he has played in the history of the new Albania and the decisive contribution he has made in every major event and in every stage of our revolution, sounded like a call to mobilize our strength, to advance with confidence and optimism on the road of Enver.

The Plenum took several decisions to immortalize the work and name of Enver Hoxha. It unanimously approved the proposal of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Party that the University of Tirana, the Pioneer’s Organization, the Seaport of Durrës and the Higher-Type Cooperative of Plasa in the district of Korça, should be honoured with his name. Likewise, it was decided that monuments to Enver Hoxha should be erected in Tirana, Gjirokastra and Korça.

Comrade Adil Çarçani, speaking on behalf of the Political Bureau, proposed me as First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party, and the Plenum elected me to that post. Of course this is a great honour, a great trust and a grave responsibility for me. That is what I said to the comrades of the Plenum.

“Enver Hoxha,” I told them, “is irreplaceable. No one can perform this task in those dimensions and with that wisdom with which he performed it. Nevertheless, the united strength of the Party and

the joint thinking and action of the Central Committee and the Political Bureau can compensate to some extent for the great loss we have suffered. Therefore," I said in conclusion, "with the sincerity of a communist, I ask for your help and cooperation. Let us strengthen our unity, stand by one another, combine our forces and ideas and, with confidence in the Party and the people, follow the course which Enver set for us."

Then I went on to stress: "The loss of Comrade Enver is great, but the Albanian communists can and will face up to it. We must find the energy to turn our grief into strength, and Enver Hoxha himself has made this possible for us. He left us a Party purged of any evils; he left us an Albania with a powerful economy without debts; he left us his teachings, instructions and tasks for every sphere of life and development. The present moments require that we strengthen the Party and ceaselessly temper its unity; strengthen the links with the people, where our strength lies; guard the freedom and independence of the Homeland like the apple of our eye from various enemies.

"Once again," I said, closing my speech, "I promise you that I will strive to justify your trust by remaining loyal to the line of the Party, by learning from Enver Hoxha, by relying on the Party and the people, and on your help, dear comrades.

"Long live the Party!

"Party-Enver, we are ready any time!"

With this militant slogan I ended my speech.

After the meeting of the Plenum, I proposed to the comrades that all of us go together to pay homage to the founder of the Party, the leader of the

National Liberation War, the architect of the new Albania.

Over the body of Comrade Enver, I made this solemn pledge on behalf of the comrades:

“We, your comrades and co-fighters,” I said addressing him, “have had the custom to report to you on each task accomplished. But today we have come to swear before you that we, the comrades of the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Party, the entire Party and our whole people, will proceed on your road and according to your teachings, that we will carry forward the great work that you have accomplished, beloved and unforgettable Comrade Enver.”

Following this, all the comrades raised their clenched fists and declared in unison:

“We swear it!”

April 16, 1985.

Comrade Enver enjoyed the sincere, boundless love of every Albanian, from the old folk to the children, of the veteran and fighter of the first hours, the peasant who got the land and the worker who became the master of factories, of the women, our noble Albanian mothers and sisters, and our entire heroic youth.

Comrade Enver was in the heart of every Albanian because socialism has brought blessings, joy and happiness to every family. And our people identify socialism with the Party, with Enver. That is why young and old were so deeply grieved, so sad, because they had lost the one dearest to their

hearts. They wept, wept copiously. "There have been more tears than rain these days," said a woman from Myzeqe. "We are filling the dam of the Koman hydro-power station with tears," said its builders. And these forceful expressions were not merely poetical.

The people wept for Comrade Enver as they weep for a loved member of the family. When the collective of the clothing enterprise in Kruja was told the sad tidings, all the women said:

"Allow us to weep for ten minutes, and then we shall consider what to do from now on."

Just as families do when somebody dies, according to the folk custom.

The people, both men and women, and the youth, displayed their high political level. We, the Central Committee of the Party, immediately felt their solidarity, their support, their courage and determination to follow the road of the Party. These days of national mourning are being observed in every Albanian home, and they are being observed with dignity. It is an exceptionally great grief, but a grief that has brought people closer together, a grief that has strengthened their unity and increased their love for the Party and socialism. It is a deep but silent grief which young and old are able to control and, moreover, to turn into an impetus for work for the general good.

The funeral took place yesterday on April 15. We walked behind the hearse from the building of the Presidium to Skanderbeg Square where the memorial meeting was to be held. A gentle rain fell quietly. It seemed as if nature, too, was weeping, but no one moved. Thousands upon thousands of

people lined both sides of the road. Sadly, they bid Enver farewell. But how majestic these people were! They were parting with their great leader with the same love with which they had applauded him ardently, eyes shining with joy, when he smiled at them from the tribune, but now with deep grief in their hearts, faces and eyes, always with profound respect and dignity. The entire ceremony was simple, humane, family-like. Family-like because the people were parting with their finest son.

Comrades from several Marxist-Leninist parties came of their own desire to pay homage to Comrade Enver and take part in his funeral. The outstanding fighter of the Greek anti-fascist resistance movement, Manolis Glezos, came too. I met them yesterday together with Comrade Nexhmije, Comrade Adil and others, before starting out for Skanderbeg Square.

The speech I delivered at the funeral meeting was listened to with great attention. The people were grieved but serious, contained. Tears could be seen on their faces, but their confidence and determination to march forward and their love for the Party showed clearly too. I tried to control my emotions during the speech and succeeded more or less. By the end, however, I was almost choking with emotion and my voice began to tremble.

When the speech ended, a group of pioneers chanted the slogan, "Party-Enver, we are ready any time!" This slogan is immortal. It expresses the will of the people to follow the road of the Party, and is a great political and moral support. We saw this support also in the raised fists of the citizens. "We are with you, with the Party in this difficult situa-

tion," they told us. We thank the people!

Another moment of the funeral is fixed in my mind. We were just turning into the Labinot Road, at a slow pace and in solemn silence. The eyes of the people were filled with tears and grief. There, standing above them, was the monument of the Unknown Partisan, dripping with rain, like tears for the Commander from whom we were parting. But even in his grief the partisan was not giving up. On the contrary, it seemed as if his whole being was issuing the call: "Forward comrades! Our struggle goes on!" At those moments, this monument seemed to me more meaningful than ever before.

The ceremony at the cemetery was simple, too, just as Enver had wanted it to be. We sprinkled handfuls of his mother soil, indeed, the soil of Gjirokastra, over him, laid flowers of Albania on his grave and we shed tears to express our boundless love for the most beloved man, for whom we will commemorate only one date — that of his birth.

* * *

In the history of our people, there is no other figure to whom so many songs have been dedicated as there have been to Enver Hoxha. And as is known, the people do not dedicate songs for nothing. You have to deserve them because songs embody the spirit and love of the people and express their maximum honour.

Not just in the figurative but in the direct meaning of the word, the song of the people is the first and most perfect monument dedicated to the figure of Enver. It was not necessary to take decisions

about erecting this monument. The great events, the great revolutionary achievements of the epoch of socialism, the courageous challenges of the Party and Enver in the face of betrayals, the grief-stricken hearts of the people in April 1985, gave the order for the erection of this monument.

The people have chosen the quintessence of their art for Enver Hoxha because their love for him was the most sincere, ardent love, the greatest love of all. We can say with full conviction that the most popular song, the one widespread among the masses in our country is “Enver Hoxha, long life to you!”

At weddings, family and other celebrations, there is always someone who quite naturally starts singing the first lines:

*Enver Hoxha took up the fight
Once again to put things right...*

And immediately, all the others take up this monumental song, just as they do the partisan marches.

The folk songs about Enver are sung not only in the regions where they were created, but also in other zones. Those who do not have the tradition of polyphonic songs may not sing the Labëria songs, but they know the song “Speak up Comrade Enver,” and they take it up and sing it in parts. Those who are not acquainted with the homophonic style may not be able to sing many such songs, but they like those dedicated to Comrade Enver and sing them without going out of tune. The songs about Enver are songs that unite people.

Several national folklore festivals could be held simultaneously with the verses written by the people about Enver Hoxha in the days of national mourning. The authors of these works numbered in the thousands. Most of them were writing for the first time, but this did not stop them pouring out a wonderful art, using figures from which the most distinguished poets could learn.

*Eleventh of April, why dawned this day?
Bringing such sorrow and dismay.
The sea in frantic waves rears up,
Beats against rocks and dissolves in tears.*

Many of the folk verses of those days were written in moments of a grief equal to that caused by “all earthquakes and calamities taken together,” as one rhapsodist put it in his letter to the Central Committee of the Party. But they are not verses of despair. The purpose of this art is not to sadden people. The people had something else in mind those days when they wrote their verses. They were well aware that the physical loss of Comrade Enver was irreplaceable. But they knew also that the song was one of the best ways to keep his memory alive. The more songs there were about Enver Hoxha, the more remote the idea of his death became. It is not accidental that most of the poems of those days were not written as laments, elegies or epitaphs. They were written as songs. A rhapsodist from Mirdita accompanied his poem with a letter in which he wrote: “When ends the pain of mourning, the strings of my lute I’ll be tuning.”

We like to hear the songs about Enver on ordi-

nary days and especially at celebrations and special events, at work or at home, wherever we may be, because it seems as if he is still among us. I will not forget the telegram from a citizen of Tepelena, who, bearing in mind the strength of art, of the art which makes heroes immortal, said: "The people did for Enver Hoxha what medicine could not do."

It is an outstanding tradition of our people to honour their heroes, their wise men and their leaders with songs. No early chronicles or biographies written in Albanian about Skanderbeg have been preserved, but the folk songs about him have been handed down from generation to generation.

In their songs about Enver, the people depict the figure of a new kind of leader. In these songs Enver Hoxha is a leader and an ordinary son of the people, a thinker and inspirer of great changes, a man who dedicated his whole life to the Albanian people.

Enver Hoxha has shown us the road we must follow. Our people quickly rallied round to shoulder the great and difficult tasks which the Party and its leadership had to accomplish after the loss of April 11, 1985. The people believed in the socialist continuity.

There is a moment from my visit to the district of Mirdita in February 1986 that sticks in my mind. After the meeting of the plenum of the party committee of the district, I went to the copper metallurgical plant in Rubik. There I met the miners and the smelters who spoke about many problems of their work. Just as I was about to take the floor, a young man stood up and said:

"Excuse me, Comrade Ramiz, let me say some-

thing first. I thank the Party for raising Enver Hoxha so high. It warms our hearts to hear that everything the leadership does starts from and finishes with Enver. You have us behind you!"

The advice this young man gave us was clear. Continuity is the touchstone. He rejoiced over the Marxist-Leninist consistency of our Party. The entire people rejoice over this. In all the contacts we had with the masses in the period immediately after the loss of Comrade Enver, we saw what a great force the love and support of the people represents. Precisely at those moments when we, the comrades of the leadership, went to meet the working people to console one another and when the enemies were in full cry with insinuations about what road Albania would take, the people buried their grief and burst into indescribable enthusiasm.

The 9th Congress of the Party has been described as the congress of continuity. In fact, all our congresses have been congresses of continuity. But we emphasized this once again precisely to stop the insinuations and illusions of the various hostile circles in the world which wished for and predicted "the Albanians' deviation from the line of Enver Hoxha." When we vowed before Enver that we would follow his road, we vowed to follow the road on which we embarked on November 8, 1941, the road which brought us the liberation of the Homeland and ensured the construction of socialism, the road to a better and more prosperous future, the road on which our Marxist-Leninist Party leads us.

Continuity on the road of socialism and continuity on the road of Enver are one and the same

thing. We know that it is not easy to follow this road. We are well aware that to be a banner-bearer of the implementation of the teachings of Enver Hoxha you have to be revolutionary in every action, to be innovative, courageous, creative and a dauntless fighter. And our people and Party will march forward resolutely to achieve victory after victory.

The epochs give birth to leaders such as Enver Hoxha, and they have epoch-making dimensions. Just as historical epochs are never forgotten, so their heroes survive and are honoured and respected forever.

For 500 years on end, our people have kept alive the legendary figure of Skanderbeg and have been kept alive by it. Just as the battles and deeds of Skanderbeg inspired the Albanians' patriotism and spirit of resistance even in the most dramatic moments of the life of the nation, so the name and work of Enver Hoxha will remain through the centuries a banner of the struggles of our people for socialism and the prosperity of the Homeland.

With his majestic work, Enver Hoxha will always inspire the communists and the people to great deeds, to ceaseless progress. He will always be present in the joys and worries of our society. The present and future generations will be guided by his teachings. Facing any major problem, facing any difficulty or obstacle, they will seek the advice of Enver.

And Enver will help them. He will give them the answers through his work.