

Enver Hoxha

FOR THE FURTHER REVOLUTIONIZATION OF OUR SCHOOL

*Excerpts from Speech delivered at the meeting of the Political
Bureau of the Central Committee of the PLA*

March 7, 1968

Science must be liberated completely from theology.

Some say simply: «Why do we need these things at all?»

But such people do not understand that without learning these things, without dealing with them in various forms, from the lowest to the highest, it is impossible to impart a materialist philosophical world outlook to our people of socialism, and far from advancing, we shall fall back and be overwhelmed by ignorance, theology and bourgeois philosophy. Lenin expressed the idea that without sound philosophical arguments, neither natural science nor materialism are able to withstand the pressure of bourgeois ideas and the revival of the bourgeois world outlook. Our scientists of socialism must apply themselves patiently to study and be the most ardent supporters of Marxist philosophy, in short, must be dialectical materialists. The epoch of our Renaissance is a democratic revolutionary epoch, of great importance in the history and literature of our people, an epoch enlightened and guided by the illuminist ideas of our most outstanding men of that period, which has rightly been called the rebirth of the nation, its emergence from mediaeval-

feudal and imperialist darkness to light, to insurrection, to the fight for freedom, independence and democracy, for enlightenment and education.

In one of his works Engels has written about the Renaissance, not our Renaissance, but the «Cinquecento» (the period of the second half of the the 16th century). He says it was a brilliant epoch which brought forth prominent men, not only artists and painters but also scientists and philosophers who were burned at the stake by the church, physicists, astronomers and others who burst asunder the heavy mediaeval darkness, destroyed faiths and systems and gave a further impulse to economic, cultural and scientific development.

But the analysis Engels makes of the epoch of the Renaissance is a materialist dialectical analysis and not an idealist one, since the impulse the men of the Renaissance imparted to society was neither complete nor perfect, it would be transformed and developed further and local and general upheavals would occur in the development of human society and in the various sciences. New or complementary laws would emerge and, as Lenin says, these upheavals «in most cases give birth to major and minor reactionary philosophical schools and trends» [V .I. Lenin, «On the Importance of Militant Materialism», Collected Works, vol. 33. p. 254 (Alb. ed.)]

And only our materialist philosophy can disperse the fog of them and ward off the damage they bring.

It is precisely from this angle that our Party has viewed the epoch of our Renaissance, which must be reexamined more thoroughly from the viewpoint of dialectical materialism, so that this period will be transmitted to the school children, students, teachers, professors, and the people as clearly and correctly as possible, analyzed in a Marxist-Leninist way from both the social and economic, and the educational, cultural and historical angles, and not to suit the inclinations of this or that individual.

This must be done in this way.

The men of our Renaissance must be seen in the proper perspective, in the epoch in which they lived, worked and fought; their ideas, which were the product of the development of society of that epoch, and their immediate and long-term aims must be brought out. If matters are presented in this correct way, it will emerge that the men of our Renaissance were outstanding people with progressive ideas, were courageous revolutionary illuminists, burning with ardent love for their country.

They fought with rifle and pen for the freedom and independence of the people, for their awakening. All of these are their great positive aspects. All these attributes and characteristics of the Renaissance and of the men who led it we must present to the people.

But we must not forget for one moment that these men of our Renaissance also have their negative aspects, which must be subjected to our Marxist-Leninist criticism.

Their weaknesses lie in their philosophical concepts which are idealist. This is a heavy impediment, it is the philosophy of their epoch which is in contradiction and struggle with our ideology.

Should we keep quiet about this antagonism, about this merciless, life-and-death struggle we Marxists wage against idealist philosophy, against religion and religious beliefs? Should we consider the ideas of the men of our Renaissance inviolable, taboo, just because they have expressed them? Can we co-exist with these ideas at a time when we are waging a stern fight against theology, religion, the churches and mosques, the priests and hodjas? Can we exalt those parts of the work of Naim Frashëri where he expresses his Bektashi philosophy, or of Mjeda where he speaks of Christian theology, or of Çajup where he says, for example, that Baba Tomorri is «the throne of God», etc. and feed all this to the people as ideological nutriment, simply because they are men of our Renaissance, great men who laid the bases of and developed our written language, because their political verses are beautiful and rich in delightful figures?

No, as Marxists and in the interest of the people and socialism, we must combat these negative aspects. In ideology we cannot make concessions to the beauty of verse or the language. The assessment Engels made of Luther's language as the basis of the German literary language did not in any way prevent him from judging the role of the Reform, before and after the Peasant Revolt in Germany, in its true light and exposing it as reactionary.

Therefore, for us, too, the question of textbooks on all these subjects, and especially on literature, within and outside the school, must be subjected to a thorough analysis and examination from the angle of our philosophy.

The question I raise about the men of our Renaissance must be understood and solved correctly. It is impermissible and not Marxist to obscure this epoch. We must make selections on sound criteria from the works of the authors of our Renaissance for the different categories of schools and the public, eliminating the negative passages without hesitation, for if you give the children of the 8-year schools poems and writings of an author of our Renaissance in which he speaks of God, and on the other hand you praise this author highly, then you have also exalted his idealist, deistic or polydeistic philosophy. No matter how much you criticize it, the school child will not understand you, will not understand what you are eulogizing and what you are criticizing. In the higher schools, however, their texts can be more extensive, but never without serious Marxist-Leninist criticism of their idealist views. On the other hand, we must be on our guard against the idealization and cult of the men of our Renaissance. We must view this question from the angle of our Marxist-Leninist philosophy. Since the time of our Renaissance, colossal changes have taken place in our country in the economic, social, cultural and educational fields.

Albania is no longer what it used to be, nor are its economy, culture, education, language, regime, politics or ideology. According to the law of materialist dialectics, everything has changed and is in the process of change. If you do not keep all these changes in mind, if you exalt one and forget the others, if you live only with the old and forget the new, if you think that the old alone should influence the new and that the new plays a minor role, then you are heading into a blind alley. While bearing these things in mind, we must combat any tendency to belittle the literature of the period of people's power. The doors of our schools should be flung open wide to this new literature of socialist realism, for it reflects the sentiments and efforts of a glorious new epoch and can and should assist the all-round education of the masses with the lofty ideals of socialist and communist society.

The other periods of the development in thinking, in science and literature, in art and music which are portrayed in textbooks, should also be examined with these same criteria. As I said earlier, in the textbooks these must be complete, but we must not permit the exaggerated mania of certain prominent erudites who are unduly keen to teach pupils, within a short period, all these things which they themselves took a whole lifetime to learn.

