

The Marxist-Leninist Theoretical Thinking of the PLA and Comrade Enver Hoxha on the Socialist Development and Transformation of Agriculture

By Nexhmedin Dumani and Zydi Pepa – Economists From Albania Today, 1984, 5

In all its policy pursued towards the question of the peasantry our party has been guided by the teachings of the classics of Marxism-Leninism, which it has implemented, defended and further developed in conformity with the concrete socio-economic conditions of our country.

Comrade Enver Hoxha has summed up the history of the centuries-long struggles, the socio-economic situation of the country in general and of the peasantry in particular, therefrom he reached the important conclusion that despite the backwardness of the agrarian relations, our country had "...a most revolutionary peasantry which has always been at the forefront of the struggle for the land, for freedom and independence."¹ He has pointed out the important progressive role of the peasantry in the struggle for freedom, independence and social progress, estimating the great revolutionary energies that lay latent in the ranks of the Albanian peasantry, "in favour of that class which had the peasantry on its side".² This definition was basic in the work of the Party for the building of the strategy and tactics in the National Liberation War and in construction of the socialist society.

In the conditions in which the working class constituted a very small section of the population, the effort to secure a powerful revolutionary ally, as was the numerous working peasantry had special and decisive importance for the fates of the National Liberation War. On this basis the Party created the political-military alliance of the working class with the working peasantry during the war. The Party instructed that special importance must be attached to the Party work in the countryside, because the peasantry constituted the majority of our people, therefore the countryside should be the source of the main forces for the liberation war.

The political-military alliance of the working class with the peasantry, created during the National Liberation War, was further strengthened and consolidated after the liberation of the country also in the economic field, which after the triumph of the people's revolution was the main field of the struggle. All the measures adopted by the Party after the liberation of the country for the revival of the economy, the implementation of the Land Reform and the socialist transformation of agriculture, have been guided by Comrade Enver Hoxha's teaching that, "socialism is not built only in the town, just for the working class, but also in the countryside and for the peasantry as well."³ This thesis of principle has been and remains one of the most important links which has guaranteed the successful construction of socialism in our country.

At the liberation of the country agriculture, like all the other sectors of the economy, was in a state of marked backwardness. Only 10.2 per cent of the arable area was cultivated and 10 per cent of this was irrigable. In the structure of crops, cereals occupied 83.5 per cent of the acreage and Albania still never secured all the bread grain supply for the people. The land was worked with primitive methods; mechanized means, chemical fertilizers, insecticides, selected seeds, etc., were almost unknown. The motor draught power accounted for just 0.8 per cent of the total draught power of the country.⁴ The best lands and most of the land was in the hands of big landowners, the landed bourgeoisie and the landowner-

bourgeois state, which jointly owned 39.8 per cent of the acreage of arable land, at a time when 13.9 per cent⁵ of the peasant families of the country were landless.

In these conditions, the primary problem was the revolutionary transformation of the old agrarian relations, because “Democracy cannot be otherwise conceived, because there is no democracy without carrying out large-scale social, economic, political and cultural reforms and, in the first place, without carrying out the Land Reform, especially in a country like ours, in which feudalism existed in its most savage form, in which the peasants were exploited by the landowning beyes.”⁶ In the conditions of our country the carrying out of the land reform was an imperative dictated by the need to solve the antagonistic contradiction between the working peasantry and the big landowners. That was a major democratic transformation that remained to be done in agriculture.

The classics of Marxism-Leninism have defined two roads for the solution of this problem: either through the nationalization of the whole of the land, or through the confiscation of the lands owned by the big landed proprietors and their distribution to the landless and land-poor peasants for their personal use. They have pointed out that the nationalization of the land is a social condition necessary for ensuring the development and progress of agriculture. Lenin wrote that the land should become the property of the whole people...⁷ On the other hand, Lenin pointed out that in the conditions of the countries in which the feeling of the private ownership of the land is strong, the proletarian state should not liquidate the private ownership of the land immediately.

From the analysis of the socio-economic relations which dominated in our countryside, the Party and Comrade Enver Hoxha reached the correct conclusion that in the conditions of our country it was better to apply the method of the confiscation of the land of big proprietors and its distribution to the landless and land-poor peasants for their personal use, through the enactment of the land reform.

The carrying out of the Land Reform according to the principle “the land belongs to the tiller”, prohibition of the buying, leasing, alienation, mortgaging and transfer by deed, etc. of the land, all this constitutes a creative implementation of the fundamental theses of Marxism-Leninism on this problem. Comrade Enver Hoxha says: “We did not proclaim the nationalization of the land because this would not be understood correctly by our peasantry, in which the petty-bourgeois feeling of private ownership of the land was very strong. We promulgated some laws to the effect that the peasant had not the right to alienate the land, thereby he was barred from the right to sell, to exchange, and transform it. Thus, although we did not proclaim the nationalization of the land de jure, we had nationalized it de facto with the gradual measures we took”.⁸

The Land Reform was a genuine agrarian revolution both in content and form, and in the methods of its implementation, because it definitively liquidated the leftovers from feudalism in the economy.

The Land Reform in our country was a deep-going reform of the kind that can be carried out only when the working class is in power. It was carried out within a short time, in a revolutionary way and through revolutionary methods and in the conditions of a stern class struggle. It was carried out by the working masses of the countryside, led by the working class and its Party. In the Land Reform the peasants “...saw that in fact they were in power, that the Party and the state showed a great care for them, were interested in them. This encouraged the peasant who realized his own strength, built up the confiscation that just as

he had won in the war under the leadership of the Party, so he could score other successes with the Party in the leadership.”⁹

All this made the Land Reform an important preliminary measure for the socialist transformation of agriculture. The Law on the Land Reform specifies that no one has the right to sell or buy the land. This was a question of principle on which the future collectivisation of agriculture would be based.

Carrying out of the Land Reform created the condition to begin the socialist transformation of the countryside. The only road for socialism to be built in the countryside was the establishment of the socialist relations of production, the replacement of the private ownership of the land by the large-scale socialist ownership. The Party of Labour kept in mind the teachings of Lenin who said that “the distribution of the land to the peasants in a good beginning. It must be used to show that the land can be taken from the landowners and be transferred to the hands of the peasants. But this is not enough. The way out is the collective work of the land.”¹⁰

The building of socialism necessarily requires the socialist transformation of agriculture, too. Comrade Enver Hoxha says, “The Party is aware that our state cannot base itself on two different economic bases for a long time: on the socialist sector of the economy in the towns and on private sector of small producers in the countryside. Therefore, the creation of the socialist sector also, in agriculture is an historical necessity for the triumph of socialism.”¹¹

The transformation on a socialist basis of the small private economies cannot be realized by the same methods and means and on the same roads as those through which the socialist socialization of the main means of production was carried out in industry. Therefore, the Party instructed that it would be extremely dangerous to proceed with the creation of the socialist sector in the countryside along the same lines as in the towns, through the expropriation of all the economies of small-scale peasant producers. From the start, basing itself on the immortal teachings of the great Lenin, the Party has stressed that the building of socialism in the countryside would be carried out by gradually organizing the small peasant economies into large-scale collective economies, on the basis of the peasants’ free will, on the road of the socialist transformation of agriculture.

The road of the expropriation and nationalization of the means of production, which was property of small producers is unacceptable, not only in the beginning, when the working class has just taken political power, but also in the further process of the socialist construction. This road leads to the weakening of the alliance of the working class with the peasantry.

On this very important question, the Party of Labour and Comrade Enver Hoxha based themselves on the teachings of V. I. Lenin, who has pointed out that in the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of the existence of the socialist social ownership of the main means of production, co-operation is the most suitable, the most acceptable, the most understandable, the most advantageous road for changing the small-scale private economies into large-scale socialist economies.

The forty-year long experience of the construction of socialism in our country has confirmed that the socialist transformation of agriculture cannot be realized without ensuring the leading role of the working class and its Party, because it is the party which makes the peasantry conscious of the need to set out of its own will on the road of collectivization, which transforms the consciousness, the world outlook and

psychology of the peasant, and which constitutes the guarantee for the success of this revolutionary process. For this reason, from the first steps taken for the collectivization of agriculture, Comrade Enver Hoxha instructed, “The conviction of the poor and middle peasants about the need for passing from the individual small-scale economies, over to the large-scale united cooperativist socialist economies and about the advantages of the latter will be achieved only through a great deal of political and organizational work by the organs of our Party.

“Without ceaseless work in this direction, even if the cooperatives are set up, they will be dissolved again or will always remain weak.”¹²

The ensuring and continuous strengthening of the leading role of the Party both during the creation of the cooperativist order and in the continuous strengthening of the socialist relations in them is considered by the Party as a vital necessity for carrying out the revolution and building socialism in the countryside.

The classics of Marxism-Leninism have stressed that the transition to the collective work on the land can be done only on a voluntary basis, that the duty of the working class, which has state power in its hands, towards the small and middle peasants, is first of all, to ensure that their private mode of production and their private ownership should become collective, not by compulsion, but through the example and by giving them social assistance for this purpose. Taking account of these teachings, the Party of Labour instructed since 1947 that the question of the peasant working cooperatives is an important and delicate question, too, and the peasants should by no means be compelled against their will to join the cooperatives, because not only is this not advisable but it is also harmful. The peasant must be convinced about joining the cooperative on his own.

Both during the setting up of the agricultural cooperatives, and later, in the process of the improvement of the socialist relations of production in the countryside, in the great work for the unification of the agricultural cooperatives, the transformation of some of them into higher-type cooperatives and some higher-type cooperatives into state farms, in the improvement of the forms of organization anti management, etc., the PLA has relied on the will of the peasantry. On the other hand, it has combated the views of all kinds of revisionists, who misinterpreting this Leninist principle, raising it to a fetish, wanted to leave the process of the socialist collectivization of the countryside completely to spontaneity, subject to the operation of the laws of market relations.

Speaking of the necessity of combining the principle of voluntarism in the process of the collectivization of agriculture with its conscious direction by the Party, Comrade Enver Hoxha points out: “...we may be told that by planning the collectivization of agriculture we are violating the Leninist principle of voluntarism. We are not violating this principle in any way.... Hence, without violating the Leninist principles on collectivisation, we may make forecasts and so collectivization proceed according to plan in the plains.”¹³

As our experience has confirmed, the socialist collectivization of small producers in the countryside is carried out through the class struggle, which has its objective causes and serves as the main motive force in this process. The Party has pursued a revolutionary class policy in the waging of the class struggle in the countryside in the right direction. After analysing and correctly determining the social groups of the peasantry, the Party relied on the poor peasants in alliance with the middle peasants, and took measures for the political isolation, economic restriction and liquidation of the rich peasants (kulaks).

Basing himself on the teachings of Lenin on the criteria of identifying the kulaks as a class, Comrade Enver Hoxha formulated the characteristics of the kulaks in Albania. This formulation served as the basis for building up the policy of differentiating the social groups and for waging the class struggle in the countryside. In connection with this problem, he says: “The Land Reform in most cases left the kulak only part of his lands, which is equal with the acreage which the middle peasant had. But we can in no way distinguish the kulak by the acreage of land he possesses today; a kulak is said to be such judging from the means of production, the draught animals, implements or work, he has the house in which he lives, the size of his stalls, barns and granary, etc. But the main characteristic remains what Lenin says: “The exploitation of hired labourers or servants who the kulak employs even for a short period...” The kulak is also identified on the basis of his distant and recent past, the views he held in the past, his relations with the beys and his men, his old possessions, the means of production, his trade and speculation on the black market. The past does not exonerate the kulak, this must not be neglected when we describe him as such.”¹⁴

The struggle against the kulak should be waged correctly without confusing him with the middle peasant or taking the middle peasant for a kulak. Comrade Enver Hoxha has stressed, “It is a grave mistake to allow any weakening of the stern class struggle in the countryside, however, it is another just as grave mistake to qualify the middle peasants, who should be the allies of the poor peasants in the struggle against kulaks, for what they are not – as kulaks.”¹⁵

From the 1st Congress the Party issued the directive: “Cooperation is a new sector of the agricultural economy on a socialist basis. The Party and the state will do everything to enlarge it with all-round material, organizational, instructive and political cultural assistance.”¹⁶

The PLA not only has given this sector all-round aid, but has considered that the aid to be given this sector is a great political matter, because through this aid the further strengthening of the alliance of the working class with the working peasantry is ensured, the hegemonic role of the working class is guaranteed in practice, the working peasantry is drawn on to the road of collectivization and strengthening of the cooperativist order.

In order to give practical solution to the requirements deriving from this principle, the PLA orientated the development of the national economy towards the development of industry with priority and within it to the branches of heavy industry, because the latter is in a position to create the possibilities for the town to give thorough technical and social aid to the backward and fragmented country, to create the material basis for a very considerable increase of the productivity of labour in agriculture and in the peasant economy, in general, thus stimulating the small peasants, through the strength of the example, to go over to the large-scale collective agriculture with machines.

By accepting the great role of the development of industry in creating the material-technical base of agriculture, in the socialist transformation of the countryside, by taking measures for its development and strengthening, the PLA has at the same time, combated the views of the Yugoslav revisionists who claim that the collectivization of agriculture should begin after the complete industrialization of the country. These views of the Yugoslav revisionists, which are a variant of the anti-Marxist thesis that socialism emerges spontaneously due to the high level of development of the productive forces, are aimed at importalizing the domination of capitalist relations.

In order to assist the cooperativist sector, our socialist state has adopted all-round measures for the creation, extension and strengthening of the machine and tractor stations with agricultural machines, cadres and specialists. The state participates with its means in large-scale investments for land improvement schemes, irrigation, draining, opening of new lands, the systematization of the land, the linking up to all villages with telephone, the development of education, culture and health services in the countryside, which favour the development of the agricultural cooperatives.

But the PLA and Comrade Enver Hoxha have continuously demanded that the state aid for the development and strengthening of the cooperativist order should be correctly understood from its political aspect, because, here too, as for any other problem, the decisive thing is the collective work of the peasants, reliance on their own forces. The PLA has combated the concepts that the agricultural cooperatives should expect everything from the state.

The correct definition of the most suitable form of collectivization and the stages through which this problem would be solved, have great theoretical and practical importance for the socialist transformation of the small and middle producers of the countryside.

While attaching importance to the lower forms of cooperation, such as those in the field of circulation (buyers and sellers' cooperatives), which played an important role in the preparation of the conditions for passing over to higher forms of cooperation, for disseminating the idea of collectivization in the field of production among the ranks of the peasantry, the PLA and Comrade Enver Hoxha have at the same time, orientated the collectivization of agriculture towards the agricultural cooperatives of production. The general acceptance by the peasantry of the Party's orientation for passing over directly to the stage of the agricultural cooperatives of production, as Comrade Enver Hoxha has said, was determined by the fact that the working peasantry had created a lofty political consciousness and had unshaken confidence in the correctness of the line of the Party, confidence which was created during the National Liberation War and later through the measures which the Party adopted in favour of the peasantry, such as the Land Reform, etc.

Besides deciding the suitable form of cooperation, the PLA has also correctly determined the stages through which this process was to be carried out, as well as the tasks that must be confronted and measures that must be taken in each stage. By dividing the process of collectivization in our country into two main stages, which cover the periods 1946-1955 and 1956-1967, the PLA and Comrade Enver Hoxha had to fight both the views for unduly hastening the setting up of agricultural cooperatives, and the views which tried to inhibit this process in an artificial manner. It is a fact that among the countries where the regime of people's democracy was established after the Second World War, Albania entered sooner, with greater determination and consistently, on the road of the socialist transformation of the country. But in this rapid advance it did not discard anything of the Leninist concept of the stages of the revolution. The only thing we discarded were the Yugoslav theories together with the sinister aims which were hidden behind them, and which we foiled.

The Party defined correctly the slogan of the first stage, according to which in the collectivisation of agriculture, "...we must neither hasten, nor mark time", with the aim of ensuring the economic-organizational strengthening of the agricultural cooperatives so that they showed in practice their indisputable superiority over the individual peasant economy, and gain the necessary experience to proceed more rapidly with the socialist collectivisation of agriculture in general. Comrade Enver Hoxha

has stressed, “Our task... is to strengthen the existing cooperatives, and not to increase them, that is, our aim is not quantity but quality. The rapid increase of numbers brings great dangers if we do not prepare the ground well and do not lay sound bases for this.”¹⁷ From the year 1946 to 1955 there were 318 cooperatives comprising 9.8 per cent of the peasant families and 11.4 per cent of the arable land.¹⁸

The 3rd Congress of the PLA, held in May 1950 set the task for the collectivization of agriculture in general to be completed within the 2nd Five-Year Plan, primarily in the plains zone and partly in the hilly zones. The number of new agriculture cooperatives set up in 1956 was 563, or about twice as many as had been set up in the first preparatory stage. Until 1959 about 83 per cent of the arable land in the possession of the peasants was collectivized.¹⁹ The year 1960 marked the successful conclusion, in general, of the socialist collectivization of the small and middle producers, the establishment of socialist relations, the building of the economic base of socialism, in the countryside. After 1960, collectivization was extended in the mountainous zones, and finally covered the whole country in 1967.



The successful conclusion of the socialist collectivization of the small and middle producers of the countryside in Albania was the second revolution, the most radical revolutionary change in the socio-economic relations in the countryside. It liquidated the basis of the antagonistic contradictions between town and countryside, opened the road for the development of agriculture at rapid rates along with industry, for raising the material and cultural level of the peasantry, for strengthening and consolidating the alliance of the working class with the working peasantry, for solving the contradiction between the political superstructure and the economic base.

Analysing the economic and social situation of the countryside after the completion of the socialist collectivization of agriculture, the PLA reached the correct conclusion that the establishment of the socialist relations in the countryside does not mark the ending of the socialist transformation of agriculture, that this is a long process which comprises a series of revolutionary changes of a social, economic, technical, cultural and ideological character. In these conditions the problem of the further deepening of the socialist transformation of agriculture was an objective necessity which was dictated by the new stage of the historical development of our country – the complete construction of the socialist society.

After the collectivization of the whole countryside, it was necessary to proceed uninterruptedly with the improvement of the socialist relations of production with revolutionary methods, to ensure an impetuous development of the productive forces, the material-technical base of agriculture. Therefore, the 4th Congress of the PLA orientated the development of agriculture on the road of intensification.

Conceiving the intensification of agriculture as a planned rational and harmonized development on scientific bases of complex factors – human, material, agro-technical and natural, which condition the agricultural production, the Party and Comrade Enver Hoxha have correctly determined the priorities of its development of the zones, sectors, branches and crops in conformity with the development of agriculture and the tasks it has had in each stage of the country's socio-economic development. In this way, by giving priority to the intensification of the plains zone, the Party has not neglected the hilly and mountainous zones. On the other hand, while giving priority to the production of bread grain, it has, at the same time, fought for and measured the complex and harmonious development of the agriculture and the tasks it has had in each stage of the country's socio-economic development. In this way, by giving priority to the intensification of the plains zone, the Party has not neglected the hilly and mountainous zones. On the other hand, while giving priority to the production of bread grain, it has, at the same time, fought for and secured the complex and harmonious development of the agricultural production on a broad front.

The process of the intensification of agriculture in our country, with the main part of the population and work force situated in the countryside, when our country has already set out on the road of its transformation into an industrial-agrarian country with developed industry and advanced agriculture, constitutes another important contribution to the theory and practice of the socialist transformation of agriculture and of the socialist construction of the country in general.

In opposition to the practices of the capitalist and revisionist countries, in which the intensification of agriculture has been accompanied with the mass depopulation of the village, in our country the intensification of agriculture is conditioned by a high level of population of the countryside. Comrade Enver Hoxha has said: "We march on the road of the intensification of agricultural production in the conditions when we continue to increase the work force in agriculture from the population of the

countryside and partly from that of the towns. Likewise, we are implementing with success the policy of the continuous narrowing of the distinctions between town and countryside. Advancing on this road is a great success in the interest of the whole society, a thing which does not occur anywhere else in the world, where the village population is drained and agriculture is degrading.”²⁰

By giving priority to the development of the productive forces through the intensification of agriculture, the Party has emphasized the need to continuously improve the socialist relations in the countryside in a revolutionary manner.

The PLA and Comrade Enver Hoxha have consistently followed the dialectics of mutual connections between the forces of production and the relations of production, have taken timely measures and defined correct directions for the improvement of these relations in all their aspects and constituent elements. In this aspect, our Party has remained loyal to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and has explored new roads and paths.

The classics of Marxism-Leninism have stressed that the complete construction of socialism in the countryside requires the transformation of the group ownership into state ownership. In this direction, the teachings of Comrade Enver Hoxha about the setting up of the higher-type agricultural cooperatives, the criteria and the conditions required for the agricultural cooperatives to be changed into state farms, as well as those which have to do with the treatment of the problem of the cooperativists personal plot and personal livestock as a special kind of personal property in socialism, have special importance in theory and practice.

In order to realize these important tasks our Party has proceeded carefully, in conformity with the development of the productive forces in general and those of the countryside in particular, in order to prepare the necessary socio-economic and ideological-political conditions. Thus, along with the process of the socialist collectivization of small and middle producers in the countryside, the Party adopted measures to raise the socialization of the group ownership to a higher level, through the voluntary union of the agricultural cooperatives. This process developed gradually, in struggle against the tendencies to hastening it unduly and giving priority to the plains zone in the beginning, and to the hilly-mountainous zones later.

A further step ahead in the improvement of the socialist relations of ownership in the countryside was the creation of the higher-type cooperatives. The setting up of such cooperatives marked a new step on the road of the changing of the cooperativist ownership into the ownership of the entire people. At the 6th Congress of the PLA Comrade Enver Hoxha stressed: “The creation of the higher-type cooperatives has great theoretical and practical importance for the present and future of our socialist agriculture – the complete construction of socialism in the countryside.”²¹ The theoretical importance of the creation of the higher-type agricultural cooperatives lies in the fact that with them a new higher form of the development of the ownership of the group was discovered. The transition of the agricultural cooperatives into state farms cannot be realized without going through another form more advanced than the ordinary type of the agricultural cooperative.

The PLA and Comrade Enver Hoxha orientates that, in the beginning, the higher type cooperatives should be created from the stronger cooperatives of the plain zone, because precisely in this group of economics of the plains the condition had matured for such a change and because they could prove their superiority

as a new higher form of the development of the group ownership. The result achieved in these years by the higher type cooperatives proved in practice the correctness of the line of the Party. In the 7th Five-Year Plan they have extended in other zones of the country, thus becoming a massive phenomenon in the process of the building of socialism in the countryside.

A distinguishing feature of the higher-type cooperatives is that the state participates with non-return investments in the objects of the productive sphere, thus becoming co-owner with the cooperatives, creating in this manner a combination of the two forms of socialist ownership.

The ideas and teachings of Comrade Enver Hoxha on the conditions which the higher-type cooperatives should meet in order to be transformed into state farms, the most appropriate time of their conversion into state farms, the solution of the problem of the cooperativists pay, the objects comprised in the payment system, the occupation with work of the additional work force in these cooperatives, the problems which have to do with the cooperativists' personal plot and livestock in the cooperatives which are to be changed into state farms, etc., have theoretical and practical importance for the further development of the process of the socialist transformation of agriculture.

Another important factor for the improvement of the relations in the field of ownership in the countryside, are the measures the Party has adopted for the reduction of the cooperativists' personal plot of land and the formation of collective herds from the cooperativist personal livestock. The cooperativists' personal plot of land, as an economic fact, emerged together with the collectivization of agriculture. The cooperativists' personal plot is a compensating auxiliary economy of a temporary character, for personal consumption. With the ever better fulfilment of the needs of the cooperativist families, with the raising of the level of their well-being, the cooperativists plot should be gradually reduced until it disappear completely in a given stage. Comrade Enver Hoxha says: "If we achieve abundance in the cooperative, that is, if the peasant sees that he gets most of the income from the cooperative and not from the cooperativists' personal plot and when he actually, and not in words, has the possibility to buy milk, meat, vegetables, fruits, etc. from the cooperative only then he will realize that his own personal plot is a stumbling block."²²

In our country the personal plot of the cooperativists has kept shrinking, with the result that the role of this economy as complementary to the needs of the cooperativist family has also been limited.

The modern revisionists, with the Soviet revisionists at their head, consider the cooperativists' personal plot not only as a fact that does not tend to disappear, but, on the contrary, regard it as an indispensable phenomenon which must be further developed and extended, not only in the countryside but also in the towns. At the 8th Congress of the PLA, Comrade Enver Hoxha has pointed out: "In the Soviet Union and elsewhere, the existing form of collective capitalism is now associated, to a large degree, with direct forms of private property. The individual private economies are regarded by the revisionists as a main source for the production of meat, milk and other agricultural products, moreover, they are even being given the animals of the kolkhozes and sovkhoses to feed and raise, thus liquidating any trace of the socialist system in the countryside. This is the course that has led the agriculture of many of these countries, in which the shortage of food and agricultural raw materials has become one of the most serious problems for the life of the working masses today, into a profound crisis."²³

The perfecting of the relations of distribution, and especially those which have to do with the remuneration of work, occupy a special place in the work of the Party for the further strengthening and deepening of the process of socialist transformation of agriculture. Assessing correctly the decisive role of production as the basis on which the standard of living is raised, the Party has, at the same time, assessed correctly the active role of distribution over production and consumption, therefore, it has continuously paid great attention to it. In all the stages of the socialist construction of the countryside the Party has established such forms of distribution which respond to the development of the productive forces and the degree of consciousness of the working people of agriculture. It has devoted special care to perfecting the distribution of agricultural and livestock production, of bread grain in particular, maintaining correct proportions between the needs for the extended reproduction, the general needs of the state and the needs for the cooperativists' personal consumption. Alongside these, attention has been attached to the distribution of the incomes realized in the agricultural cooperatives, dividing it into accumulation fund and consumption fund. It has fought the manifestations of creating the accumulation fund at the expense of the consumption fund, as well as the manifestations of the creation of the consumption fund at the expense of the accumulation fund, and the unjustified use of the fund of accumulation for building untimely projects, etc. The Party, with its correct, farsighted policy, has brought about the uninterrupted development of the cooperativist order and the uplift of the material and cultural well-being of the working peasantry.

Special care has been devoted to improving the remuneration according to the amount and quality of the work done. The forms of remuneration of work in agriculture have been improved continuously. The form of remuneration in kind for the cooperativists was overcome, and we are gradually proceeding to the elimination of the work-day as a measure of compensation, through its replacement with payment against work quota.

The uninterrupted development of the productive forces in agriculture, the deepening and intensification of agricultural production all over the country, in general, and in the plains zones, in particular, the combination of the state relations with those of the agricultural cooperatives has been considered and treated in close connection with the needs for the further improvement of the relations of exchange. Simultaneously, the uninterrupted improvement of the relations of exchange is necessary for opening the road more broadly to the development of the productive forces and the preparation of the conditions for the gradual transition to the voluntary transformation of the group property into the property of the entire people in a natural manner. The improvement of the relations of production in the countryside in the field of exchange, as in all other fields, is handled in such a manner as to ensure the gradual extension of the sphere of the relations of state ownership and the narrowing of the sphere of the relations of cooperativist ownership.

The important ideas Comrade Enver Hoxha has given for the passing, to a more extensive and higher scale, over to concentration and cooperation, the application of agricultural-crop rotation not only inside individual agricultural economies, but also in groups of economies, even beyond the limits of present-day administrative divisions, the gradual transition of planning in the agricultural cooperatives included in the zone of priority intensification from the form of recommendations to the form of directives, the unification of the system of planned indices of the agricultural cooperatives with those of the state farms, the strengthening of state check-up on the process of the fulfilment of the plan, on the utilisation of incomes, on expenditure, etc., the improvement of the forms of internal organisation of work and production in agricultural cooperatives towards the forms which are used in the state sector of agriculture,

the deepening of specialization through the elimination of some activities which are carried out by the cooperatives and some other enterprises, the improvement of the distribution of agricultural production among the districts and within the districts, etc., these constitute some important theoretical and practical directions in the field of the improvement of the relations of management and organization of work and production in the countryside.



*Terraces of fruit trees – vines, olives, citruses and agricultural crops
are cut out on the slopes of the hills and mountains of Albania*

The results achieved by the Albanian agriculture show in practice the correctness and vitality of the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, the correctness of the line and policy worked out and pursued by the PLA and Comrade Enver Hoxha for the socialist transformation and development of the countryside.

At the 8th Congress of the PLA, Comrade Enver Hoxha said: “The revolutionary transformations and the progress achieved in agriculture represent one of the greatest victories of the line and policy of the Party for the construction of socialism. The fact that during nearly four decades of the people’s state power agricultural production in general in our country has continued to increase about two times more rapidly than the population, that the real per capita income of the peasantry has gone up to 10 to 20 per cent from one five-year plan to another, that now, as compared with 1960, agricultural production has increased 1.7

times per unit of arable land and 1.6 times per agricultural worker, is clear evidence of the correctness of this policy.”²⁴

1 *Enver Hoxha, Works, vol. 22, p. 371, Alb. ed.*

2 *Enver Hoxha, Works, vol. 17, p. 434, Alb. ed.*

3 *Enver Hoxha, Report to the 7th Congress of the PLA, p. 64, Eng. ed.*

4 *Statistical Yearbook of the PRA, year 1973, pp. 113, 119, 171.*

5 *Statistical Yearbook of the PRA, year 1959, p. 84.*

6 *Enver Hoxha, Works, vol. 3, p. 86, Alb. ed.*

7 *V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 27, p. 538, Alb. ed.*

8 *Enver Hoxha, On the 7th Five-Year Plan, p. 415, Alb. ed.*

9 *Enver Hoxha, Works, vol. 5, p. 343, Alb. ed.*

10 *V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 28, p. 188, Alb. ed.*

11 *Enver Hoxha, About Socialist Agriculture, vol. 1, Tirana 1980, p. 445, Alb. ed.*

12 *Enver Hoxha, Works, vol. 5, p. 353, Alb. ed.*

13 *Enver Hoxha, Works, vol. 13, p. 106, Alb. ed.*

14 *Enver Hoxha, Works, vol. 6, p. 17, Alb. ed.*

15 *Enver Hoxha, Works, vol. 9, p. 66, Alb. ed.*

16 *Enver Hoxha, Works, vol. 5, p. 345, Alb. ed.*

17 *Enver Hoxha, Works, vol. 8, p. 202, Alb. ed.*

18 *Statistical Yearbook of the PRA, year 1958, p. 55.*

19 *Statistical Yearbook of the PRA, year 1960, p. 87.*

20 *Enver Hoxha, Reports and Speeches 1980-1981 p. 187, Alb. ed.*

21 *Enver Hoxha, Report to the 6th Congress of the PLA, p. 81, Alb. ed.*

22 *Enver Hoxha, Works, vol. 18, p. 344, Alb. ed.*

23 *Enver Hoxha, Report to the 8th Congress of the PLA, p. 41, Eng. ed.*

24 *Ibidem, pp. 28-29, Eng. ed.*

