

**UNION OF OPPOSITES
IN THE DISTORTION OF
HISTORICAL MATERIALISM**

Kivilcim Publications

Kıvılcım Publications

Turkish Edition: July 2005

Second Printing: July 2006

**The “Part I: The “Real Revolutionary Character” of
C. Bettelheim” has been translated into English from the
Turkish edition**

First English Edition: April 2011

Proprietor: Kıvılcım Ltd

Şht. Arif Diktepe Sok.

No: 10/A Ortaköy, Lefkoşa, Kıbrıs

Tel: 0392 22 70 680

Fax: 0392 22 70 681

CONTENTS

PART I:.....	4
THE “REAL REVOLUTIONARY CHARACTER” OF C. BETTELHEIM.....	4
- I -.....	5
1— <i>From the Primacy of Productive Forces to the Primacy of “Social Relations”</i>	6
2— “Sources” of the Professor’s Old False Opinions? ...	9
3— <i>How was C. Bettelheim Saved?</i>	10
4— “What is to be Done?” of C. Bettelheim.	12
-II- THE THESIS OF C. BETTELHEIM	14
-III- MEANING OF THESES OF C. BETTELHEIM	18
A— ON PRODUCTION	18
1— <i>Dialectics of Productive Forces—Relations of Production</i>	22
i— Affirmative-Negative (Positive, negative). Primary, secondary. Base, consequence.	22
ii— The Reciprocal Action	23
2— <i>The Dialectics of C. Bettelheim</i>	25
B— ON CLASS STRUGGLE.....	27
i— <i>Relations of Reflection</i>	28
ii— <i>Reflected and its Reflection</i>	29
iii— <i>The Dialectics of C. Bettelheim</i>	31
C—THE “SOCIAL RELATIONS” OF C. BETTELHEIM.....	33
D— RELATIONS OF PRODUCTION AND THE LAW.....	36
E— REFERENCES TO MARX AND LENIN	40
F—THE ENDLESS CLASS STRUGGLE OF C. BETTELHEIM.....	47

PART I:
**THE “REAL REVOLUTIONARY
CHARACTER” OF
C. BETTELHEIM**

THE “REAL REVOLUTIONARY CHARACTER” OF C. BETTELHEIM

In this article, we will discuss the preface dated January 1974 of Professor Charles Bettelheim that he wrote for his book entitled “Class Struggles in the USSR: First Period 1917-1923”

Those who are interested in the life story of the Professor, while he was in USSR in 1936 during the famous trials, about how deeply he felt of the tremendous fears that dominated the Soviet people, for those who want to learn about this story, a bad translation of the preface is available in [Turkish] “Birikim, Issue 30-31, August-September 1977, page 65-87.

We are concerned with our professor’s views and the changes in his views. Let us take a look at them:

- I -

*1— From the Primacy of Productive Forces
to the Primacy of “Social Relations”...*

“The chief shortcoming of my writings of 1962-1967 lies in the fact that what is there treated as something dictated by objective requirements is essentially related to the level of development of productive forces. Although the concept of “the nature of the productive forces” is mentioned in these writings, the precise significance of the concept is not developed. Consequently, it is not made clear that the main obstacle to a socially unified policy (of which the economic plan can only be the means) consists not in the level of development of the productive forces but rather in the nature of the **dominant social relations**—that is, both in the reproduction of the capitalist division of labor and **in the ideological and political relations** which, while being an effect of this division, also constitute the social conditions for this reproduction (by causing individuals and enterprises to “function” as “subjects” which accord priority to their own interests over the collective interest: the latter, moreover, possibly being only momentary or illusory if it is not identified with the demands of a policy that really works to create the conditions for the disappearance of antagonistic class interests.

What therefore fails to come out clearly in the writings collected under the title **The Transition to Socialist Economy** is that the development of the productive forces can never, by itself, cause the capitalist forms of the division of labor, or the other bourgeois social relations, to disappear. What is not said is that only a **class struggle** developing under the dictatorship of the proletariat and correctly led—thanks to scientific experimentation on a mass scale and to theoretical analysis—can bring about the disappearance of **capitalist economic relations**, by attacking the capitalist division of labor and, at the same

time, the ideological and political relations that make it possible for relations of exploitation and oppression to be reproduced.

In *Economic Calculation and Forms of Property*, in which I mentioned that I was preparing an analysis of the Soviet social formation, I began to turn away from my previous problematic, in which the disappearance of commodity and money relations and the progress of socialist planning tended to be seen as dependent above all on the development of the productive forces (this development being conceived, moreover, in somewhat unilinear fashion), and not, first and foremost, on the revolutionization of social relations." (Ibid, page 14-17)

"In *The Transition to Socialist Economy*, which brings together a series of writings produced between 1962 and 1967, I applied myself to showing the connection between the existence of commodity and money relations, in Cuba as in the USSR, and of units of production which function, de facto, in relative independence of each other (despite the working of an economic plan), thus operating as "economic subjects." [6.] (ibid., page 16)

What does our Professor says in his writings of 1962-1967? That, these writings came after the following happened:

i- Khrushchev and his gang appeared on the scene, as agricultural "masters" and accusing everyone for disobeying the party rules,—for example, for failing to comply with the decisions of the Congress of the CPSU and for not deciding things collectively—, and contrary to the decisions taken by the XIX. Congress of the CPSU in the field of agriculture immediately gone on "to plough the Virgin Lands", thus derailing the Soviet economy;

ii- The machine tractor stations, the most important instruments of production used in agriculture, were sold to collective farms. This act expanded the commodity and money relations, instead of narrowing it; having these means of production in the hands of socialist state permitted their rapid

developments, their sale to kolkhozes t prevented this; and thus transformation of kolkhoz into solkhozes were prevented ...;

iii- on top of the inevitable results of these acts, measures were taken to make central planning impossible, to transform centralised and interconnected production units into “independent subjects”; profitability for these units being used as a means of financial control instead of the higher , national level of profitability to which the profitability of the individual units must be subservient...

iv. On top of all these, and in relation to all these, increasing the relative weight of light industry each passing day while rhetorically appearing to accept the thesis of the primacy of heavy industry...

After Khrushchev and his gang came to power and have done all that and more, our professor comes along and explains us the situation of the Soviet Union between 1962-1967 with the “level of productive forces”; thinks that socialism would sort out all its shortcomings by just “the development of its productive forces”. These are his old views as explained by him.

We have not personally examined all his works referred by him in explaining his views. Let us add: we have no intention to do so either!

In other words, while the direct aim and the results of Khrushchevites’ measures is to change the relations of production, to hamper the workings of the laws of socialist economy and thus causing havoc in economy, and even producing their first results for all to see in the form of increase of prices rather than decrease of prices as socialism demands, while all these are happening our professor has seen and still sees, all the developments, all the problems in the Soviet economy, as a result of, being dependent on “first and foremost of the development of the productive forces”.

Then...

Then, let there be light he said, and there was light! A new day was born and the thoughts clarified. Now, all the problems were to be seen “first and above all in social relations”, in “their nature,” in their “revolutionisation”!

The succession of this “leap” in understanding of Marxism achieved by our Professor from the decisiveness and the primacy of productive forces to the decisiveness and the primacy of social relations, is very interesting indeed:

First, while the Khrushchevites were turning everything upside down, what is determinative, the essential is the primacy of productive forces; and then, after all that, and now, and most likely to help contribute to turn everything upside down, what is determinative, the essential is the primacy of “social relations”...

Let the reader learn thoroughly what these social relations are. Otherwise, they will never understand our professor. What are these social relations? For the time being they are, the capitalist division of labour, ideological division of labour and the ideological and political relations.

Although our professor found the ‘True Path’* now, to whom falls the responsibility for these old and false opinions?

2— *“Sources” of the Professor’s Old False Opinions?*

“As mentioned earlier, the simplified Marxism from which I tried to break free was not something personal to me: it had become that which the European sections of the Third

* A pan to Turkish right wing “True Path Party”.

International, departing further and further from Leninism, had caused to prevail in Europe, starting in the early 1930s, at the time when I began to think about the problems of socialism.” (ibid., page 19)

“The explicit revival of economic theses which was expressed in a particularly systematic way in the writings mentioned above [*Stalin’s writings—My Note*] needs to be considered in two aspects—as the result of a profound evolution of Russian society and the Bolshevik Party, and in connection with the new authority acquired by these theses through their having been expounded by Stalin.” (ibid., page 37)

In short, the cause of all ills is the “economism”, “mechanical approach”, etc..., that was led by Stalin.

Of course, from this malady of economism suffer only the European parties, including the CPSU. Not a bad word is uttered against the Asian parties.

Why? Let us now have a look at how our professor got rid of his illness of economism, and then we will understand.

3— How was C. Bettelheim Saved?

“If in 1962-1967 I did not set out the formulations which I now put forward, this was because I was still strongly influenced by a certain conception of “Marxism” which has been widely prevalent in Europe, and which is nothing but a special form of what Lenin called “economism.”[8] It was the lessons to be drawn from the Cultural Revolution in China that enabled me to carry further my break with economism and so to re-establish contact with the revolutionary content of Marxism, a content masked and “overgrown” by the long years of economic practice that have characterized the European labor movement.[9] (ibid, p. 16-17.)

As I have said, it is in the course of these last few years and, in part, through thinking about the Cultural Revolution and its significance, that I have come to take account more systematically of what is implied by rejection of the “problematic of the productive forces,” that is, of a conception which unilaterally subordinates the transformation of social relations to the development of the productive forces.” (ibid, p.16- 17.)

“Footnote 2

La Transition vers l'économie socialiste and *Calcul économique et formes de propriété*. These two books also bear the marks of two great social and political experiences—the Chinese and Cuban revolutions, which I have followed closely since 1958 and 1960, respectively— and also of the revival of Marxist thought in France. This revival has been connected especially with the increasingly widespread influence of Mao Tse-tung's ideas and has been affected by the break made by L. Althusser and his associates with the “economic” interpretation of Marx's *Capital*.” (Ibid., p. 48)

The ideas of Mao Tse-Tung, the lessons of the Cultural Revolution and the contributions of L. Althusser... Here, the paths of C. Bettelheim's emancipation passes through these. And his partnership with the Chinese Communist Party against the teachings of Stalin is symbolizes in the following words:

“It is understandable that the Chinese Communist Party considered itself justified in saying, in the publication *On Khrushchev's Phoney Communism and Its Historical Lessons for the World*: “Stalin departed from Marxist-Leninist dialectics in his understanding of the laws of class struggle in socialist society.”

See that.... What then, is to be done?

4— “*What is to be Done?*” of C. Bettelheim.

“Three of the fundamental theses of the congealed Marxism with which one must break in order to restore a true revolutionary character to historical and dialectical materialism concern (1) the basis of class relations, (2) the role of the productive forces, and (3) the conditions for the existence of the state and for its “withering away.” I shall say just a few words about these three theses and their objective ideological and political functions.” (ibid., p. 20)

Therefore, one should definitely break away from these theses of “solidified Marxism,” “simplified Marxism”, “economism”, that contain “mechanical” approaches and thus restore “the true revolutionary character” of the historical and dialectical materialism. However, what one should understand from restoring this “real revolutionary character”?

“Footnote 11:

Re-establishing contact” with the revolutionary content of Marxism obviously does not mean “finding afresh” theses that Marx and Engels allegedly formulated nearly a century ago, before the lessons were available that we can draw today from the class struggles which have taken place since then. “Reestablishing contact” means getting rid of conceptions that are wrong in content (even though they may have seemed true at a certain period) and thus obstruct the development of Marxist theory on the basis of the concrete analysis of class struggles and their effects. As Lenin wrote, discussing the attitude of revolutionary Marxists to Marxist theory: “We do not regard Marx’s theory as something completed and inviolable; on the contrary, we are convinced that it has only laid the foundation stone of the science which socialists *must* develop in all directions if they wish to keep pace with life” (“Our Programme,” in *CW*, vol. 4, pp. 211-212). (Ibid., pp. 49)

What interesting remarks...

The very thesis of “solidified Marxism” that our Professor deems necessary to completely break away from, are precisely “the foundation stones” of Marxism. “Developing Marxism” in relation to these points may consist in displaying the correctness of these foundation stones and that only and only on the basis of new historical data, or on the basis of new developments which would further display the correctness of these foundation stones, without touching them, without changing them, explaining these foundation stones in a variety of different ways.

It is exactly for this reason that after submitting his views on the First thesis, our professor says:

“The above is nothing new, but quite literally, a return to Marx and Lenin” (ibid., p. 22)

So, “economism” led by Stalin, strayed from the basic fundamentals put forward by Marx and Engels more than hundred years ago, and yet these seemed correct to those caught in this current of “economism”, these deviations seemed correct to them. Thus, what appear to be true, but are deviations from Marx and Engels, are, of course, pushed aside. Very well, but why then these remarks about “development”? Why are these references made to the experiences of class struggles that have taken place from the days of Marx to this day?

Obviously, our Professor is hiding something amongst this very flexible verbiage. Do you think what is being hidden is the changing of the foundation stones by our Professor

Let us have a look at that now.

-II-

THE THESIS OF C. BETTELHEIM

“Class relations and legal forms of ownership

The first thesis with which one has to break is that which makes a **mechanistic** [*my italics*] identification of legal forms of ownership with class relations, particularly where the transition to socialism is concerned.

This thesis was explicitly expounded by Stalin in his report on the draft constitution of the USSR, presented on November 25, 1936, to the Seventh [*must be 8th—my note*] Congress of Soviets of the USSR.

In his report, Stalin summed up the transformation of forms of ownership that had taken place in Russia during the period 1924-1936. He showed that in this period legal private **ownership** of the means of production and exchange had been practically abolished, and replaced by two other forms of ownership—state property, which predominated in industry, transport, trade, and banking; and collective-farm property, which predominated in agriculture; and he concluded: “The capitalist class in the sphere of industry has ceased to exist. The kulak class in the sphere of agriculture has ceased to exist, and the merchants and profiteers in the sphere of trade have ceased to exist. Thus all the exploiting classes have now been eliminated.”

According to this report, there were now only the working class, the peasant class, and the intelligentsia, who “must serve the people, for there are no longer any exploiting classes.”

....

Life has made it its business to show, or rather to recall, that changes in legal forms of **ownership** do not suffice to cause

the conditions for the existence of classes and for class struggle to disappear. These conditions are rooted, as Marx and Lenin often emphasized, not in legal forms of **ownership** but in *production relations*, that is, in the form of the social process of appropriation, in the place that the form of this process assigns to the agents of production—in fact, in the relations that are established between them in social production.

The existence of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of state or collective forms of property is not enough to “abolish” capitalist production relations and for the antagonistic classes, proletariat and bourgeoisie, to “disappear.”...

It is because the task of the socialist revolution is not confined to transforming legal property relations, and that what is fundamental is to transform **social relations as a whole, including production relations, [my italics]**... Thus, the transition to socialism inevitably occupies a long period of history, and cannot be “accomplished” within a few years.” (ibid., page 20-22)

“The primacy of the development of the productive forces

A second thesis characteristic of the simplification of Marxism, which tended to impose itself during the 1930s in the European sections of the Third International, was that of the primacy of the development of the productive forces....

In a very general form, Stalin set the thesis according to which the productive forces are the driving force of history forth in his essay of September 1938 entitled “Dialectical and Historical Materialism,” in which he wrote. “First the productive forces of society change and develop, and then, *depending on these changes and in conformity with them*, men's relations of production, their economic relations, change.”

The thesis thus formulated does not deny the role of the class struggle—in so far as there is a society in which antagonistic classes confront one another—but relegates this to the secondary level: the class struggle intervenes essentially in order to smash production relations that hinder the development of the productive forces, thus engendering new production relations which conform to the needs of the development of the productive forces.

...

One can certainly find passages in Marx which suggest a similar problematic: but his work as a whole shows that, for him, *the driving force of history is the class struggle*, and that, as long as classes exist, it is through conflicts between classes that **social relations** [*my italics*] are transformed; it shows also that socialist social relations can arise only through class struggle. Similarly, Lenin would never have been able to formulate his theory of “the weakest link in the imperialist chain”—the theory which explains why a proletarian revolution could take place *in Russia*—if, like the Mensheviks, he had held to a conception which put the main stress on the development of the productive forces, since, according to this conception, a proletarian revolution could not happen elsewhere than in the most highly industrialized countries.

The thesis of the primacy of the productive forces prevents one from using rigorously the concepts of historical materialism, and leads to incorrect political formulations, such as this one, put forward by Stalin in the above-quoted essay: “If it is not to err in policy, the party of the proletariat must both in drafting its programme and in its practical activities proceed primarily from the laws of development of production, from the laws of economic development of society.”^[24] The conception of the productive forces developed in this way certainly gave rise to a number of difficulties when it came to fitting it into the theses of historical materialism as a whole;

but it was a necessary corollary to the thesis about the disappearance from the USSR of exploiting classes, and therefore also of exploited ones.

The connection between these theses is seen, for example, when Stalin writes that, “the basis of the relations of production under the socialist system ... is the social ownership of the means of production. Here there are no longer exploiters and exploited . . . Here the relations of production fully correspond to the state of productive forces ... ”

...

Ideologically and politically, these two theses on the disappearance of exploiting and exploited classes in the USSR and on the primacy of the development of the productive forces, have contributed to blocking any organized action by the Soviet proletariat to transform the **production relations**—**[my italics]**, that is, to destroy the existing forms of the process of appropriation, the basis for the reproduction of class relations, and build a new process of appropriation, excluding the social division between the function of management and that of execution, the separation between manual and mental labor, and the differences between town and country and between workers and peasants—in short, to destroy the objective basis for the existence of classes. ...” (ibid. pp. 23-25.)

As it can be seen, although our professor talks about going back to Marx and Lenin, he comes out with interesting **interpretations** of Marxism. He offers interesting interpretations of the foundation stones of Marxism.

Under these conditions, the most appropriate method is to look at the foundation stones of Marxism, and see if they need to be changed. Only then, may we clearly comprehend his logic or absence of any logic.

-III-

MEANING OF THESES OF C. BETTELHEIM

Although C. Bettelheim promises to restore the true revolutionary character of the dialectical and historical materialism, and although he has undertaken to clear the ground from economist weeds so that we can use the concepts of the dialectical and historical materialism properly, with a fighting spirit, we find all these conceptions quite difficult to comprehend— it must be because we have ourselves been extremely influenced by the concepts of this infamous economism of Stalin. Therefore, when considering the views of our professor we shall act in accordance with the principle “repetition is the mother of learning” and shall repeat our views about the foundation stones of Marxism and of course, we shall look at whether these old views need to be changed or not. It will then be easier to comprehend our professor.

A— ON PRODUCTION

Material life of society, its existence is primary. Spiritual life of society, the ideological life is secondary, is a derivative, a reflection of this material life.

There are many elements of the material life of society. Nevertheless, among them production determines the physiology of the society and in the final analysis the ideological life of society.

When we consider production, we see that it is a **union** of productive forces and relations of production. That is, production is possible only through a relationship between the productive forces and the relations of production, which relation we shall not currently determine. In order to determine the characteristics of the relationship between the productive forces and relations of production, we will firstly consider the two sides of this relationship separately:

Productive forces: Productive forces, considered in isolation from the relations of production, that is, in isolation from the social forms and characteristics which they gain during the process of production due to their relation to the relations of production, they present to us the relationship of humans with nature

Productive forces are made up of following factors:

“The elementary factors of the labour-process are 1, the personal activity of man, *i.e.*, work itself, 2, the subject of that work, and 3, its instruments.” (Karl Marx, Capital Volume 1, Part 3: The Production of Absolute Surplus Value, Chapter 7: The Labour-Process and the Process of Producing Surplus Value, Section 1: The Labour-Process or the Production of Use-Values, p.157, Fourteenth Edition, William Glaiser, Ltd., High Holbron London, 1912)

Of these (2) and (3), *i.e.*, subject of production together with the tools of production, are also called means of production. People using the tools of production for the purposes of production change the subject of production. The humans’ individual activity, the activity to change the subject of production by using the tools of production, is (1), *i.e.*, the “work itself” - when taken socially, this is the humans, the toilers who have a certain production experience and a certain

capacity of work skill, who are the fundamental productive force of society.

In other words, the productive forces are made up of the means of production that consists of the subjects of production and the instruments of production and of humans who produce by working with and on the means of production.

The developments in production considered independently from the relations of production, from their social forms, consists of technical and organisational developments in production and parallel to these developments, in the development of people's work skills. A continuous development in the instruments of production, in the subjects of production modified using these instruments of production and in the work skills, productive capability of people engaged in production using these instruments of production.

Relations of production, confers some features to productive forces; features which are not in their nature. As long as these features are not taken into account, we can analyse the developments of productive forces completely independent of the relations of production and we can do so in detail.

What are the developments in the instruments of production, what are the developments in the subjects of production ("raw materials"), how is production organised in the places of production subject to these developments... we can examine all these without the need to refer to the relations of production. All these form the various subjects of natural sciences, technology and management.

Production relations: production, the struggle of man with nature for the purpose of production, his use of it—relationship of men with nature—cannot be conducted by individuals on their own, by individuals who are independent of each other. Production is a social activity, which is carried

out by people jointly, and thanks to the social relationships they establish with each other during and through this activity. That is why production is always social production whatever the conditions under which it is conducted. This also means that production can only be conducted within the framework of certain relationships, which arise amongst the people.

Relations of production provide us with the relationships formed mutually between the people in the production process, the relations between people. These relationships can be relationships of mutual aid amongst people free from exploitation; can be relationships of domination and submission; or can be a form of transition from one type of relation of production to another.

Whenever we attempt to examine as to what kind of a relationship is the relations of production that is defined as the relationships formed mutually by men in the process of production, we immediately see that we have to take into consideration the means of production. Because, the relationships entered by men in the production process can only be determined by their relations to the means of production. Who are the owners of the means of production; who controls the means of production, the whole society or some individuals, groups or classes who use the means of production to exploit some other individuals, groups or classes?

It can thus be observed clearly that the continuity of development in the productive forces, leaves its place to the continuity of destruction in the case of the relations of production. Why these destructions occur, what is the old relations of production, why was it replaced with this new relations of production... all these cannot be taken into consideration and cannot be understood without referring to the developments in the productive forces. Without referring to the state of the productive forces, to the developments in the

productive forces, not even one word can be said about the state of the relations of production and their destruction; they cannot be understood at all. However, the relations of production that can be understood thanks to this link, and on their own, form the subject of political economy. The subject of political economy is the relations of production. Moreover, what is meant by the economic structure of society is precisely the relations of production. In class societies, the relations of production are the relations between classes. As owners of the means of production, the capitalists, those who do not own the means of production, the proletarians and the capitalist society which is formed through the relations between them.

1— Dialectics of Productive Forces—Relations of Production

Production, just like everything else, is a relationship. For this reason, it has two opposite sides. Production is a relationship between these two opposite sides. Productive forces (the men's relationship with nature), and relations of production (relationship between men themselves).

i— Affirmative-Negative (Positive, negative). Primary, secondary. Base, consequence.

We have examined above the two aspects of production separately and in a certain context. Doing this we have noted that:

The productive forces demonstrate a continuous development. The productive forces can be examined in detail without reference to the relations of production.

The relations of production, on the other hand, demonstrate a continuous destruction and without reference to the productive forces we cannot have any opinion about the relations of production.

Only these would have been more than enough to prove to a person who declare high and loud that he will restore “the true revolutionary character of dialectics” that: in this relationship the productive forces is the affirmative side, the primary side, the base. Relations of production on the other hand, is the negative, destructive side, secondary, the consequence, a derivative of the productive forces.

ii— The Reciprocal Action

Opposites reciprocally affect each other. Those idiots; the masters of dialectics who just see this reciprocal action and do not bother to look beyond this, at one time talk of the determining influence of one of the opposites, and at other times talk of the determining influence of the other of the opposites in this reciprocal action of the opposites. That is they get lost in a vicious circle. However, the reciprocal action of the opposites can only have a meaning and can only be understood within the framework of the relationships we have dealt with before. Those who get stuck on the reciprocal action between opposites and do not bother to find out what kind of a base this reciprocal action arises on, can never comprehend this reciprocal action itself.

Productive forces develop if the framework of the relations of production within which they function is suitable to their development, if these relations of production are suitable to the quality of productive forces. However, precisely due to this development, because of this primary development of productive forces, this development that occurs while relations

of production has not changed, has not developed, and as a result remained as before, gives rise to a discrepancy, to unsuitability between the productive forces and relations of production. The effect of the relations of production, which have not developed and remained as before, is not an effect that supports the development of the productive forces, but, on the contrary, becomes an effect that hinders their development. The elimination of the discrepancy created by the development of productive forces while the relations of production remains the same as before, the formation of relations of production suitable to the advanced productive forces becomes a necessity. That is what happens. The old relations of production are destroyed. New relations of production are formed suitable to the productive forces, which have developed before the collapse of the old relations of production. As the new relations of production are suitable to the developed productive forces, to the quality of the new productive forces, its effects on productive forces are once more positive and positively influence their further development. Until the same problems arise once again.

In short, what develops first, what is primary is the productive forces. What is then destroyed, what is secondary, is the relations of production that changes to suit to the demands of the productive forces.

Only when the relations of production which are in reciprocal action with the productive forces are suitable to the nature of the productive forces can they influence their development in a positive direction. And they do so influence them.

And the opposite. When the relations of production are not suitable to the nature of the productive forces it can only influence their development in a negative direction. Therefore, their destruction and replacement become a necessity.

2—*The Dialectics of C. Bettelheim.*

Our professor explains to us that he has written articles about the problems of the socialist economy between 1962-67 and that in his writings he has linked the problems of socialist economy to the backwardness of the productive forces—because he sees the productive forces as primary, determining.

After Khrushchev sold the MTI's to the Kolkhozes which Stalin considers to be a step backward; after he made the profitability of the enterprises the basis of economy, although it is no more than a sub-section of the national profitability, and the the main task of which is to monitor the work of the enterprises ... after, that is, the Khrushchevites, instead of developing the relations of production in accordance with the development of productive forces, and thus striking a hammer blow to the development of the productive forces, our professor, in the name of primacy of the productive forces, keeping a blind eye to all these, linked all the problems of the Soviet economy to the backwardness of the productive forces. Now, by assimilating the Chinese experiences he arrived at a total opposite position. Not the primacy of the productive forces, but primacy of social relations. From under this primacy of social relations many a hidden gems will appear. Here, though, just the following must be stated:

Our professor's "social relations" alongside the ideological and political relations includes the **division of labour** and **the relations of production**. What our professor understands from the relations of production is a problem in itself. We shall look into this later on. However, as we are not a very knowledgeable Marxist like our professor, and for now, we will assume that he does not understand the same thing as what should everyone, every simple man must understand from the relations of production. Otherwise, it becomes rather impossible to advance in any way at all.

Because, if we do not presume thus, we come across the following impossible position. In a subject matter that forms one of the founding stones of Marxism, that is, the relations of the productive forces to the relations of production, one of the definite conclusions of Marxism, that is the primacy, priority of the productive forces in this relationship, our Professor is proposing the primacy, priority of the relations of production which he considers to be a part of the social relations.

Thus, our professor turns upside down, revises one of the foundation stones of Marxism.

We are here blaming C. Bettelheim with airing a revisionist thesis although he never yet mentioned it.

Because he has so far never defended the primacy of relations of production by putting the productive forces and the relations of production in opposition to one another.

What does he do?

He attacks the political-ideological relationships, through the class struggle.... and thus changes the economic relations

What does he do?

He opposes the productive forces to a category of his invention which he calls social relations and in this opposition he defends the primacy of the social relations. What does this category of social relations contain? It contains the class struggle that is a political category, it contains the political-ideological relations and it contains the relations of production that is an economic category, that is it contains everything under the sky.

We rely on the understanding of these, and we rely on the concepts and conclusions of historical materialism to which our author promised to restore its revolutionary character, we are forced to adapt our professor to them, and only thus can we uncover and expose his revisionism.

Let us continue. Because, although the revisionism of C. Bettelheim has already showed up, the interesting features of this revisionism still remain hidden.

B— ON CLASS STRUGGLE

Material life of society, its existence is primary. Spiritual life of society, the ideological life of society is secondary, a derivative of, a reflection the material life of society.

There are many factors of the material life of society. Nature, geography, population, production, etc. However, amongst the factors of the material life of society and in the final analysis, the production is the factor, that determines the spiritual life of society.

When we considered production, we saw that this is a relation, has two opposite sides and analysed some aspects of this relationship of opposites.

When we consider the life of the society, we come across a similar situation. The social life is also made up of a relationship between two contrasting types of social lives.

The material life of society and the spiritual life of society.

The factors of the spiritual life of society are also many and different:

The whole world of ideas; political, legal, philosophical, literary, artistic ... and all the institutions and organisations established in accordance with these....

What is class struggle? Class struggle is politics.

The relations of production and the relations of distribution, determined by them, determines the economic structure of society, its physiology.

As much as the relations of distribution embody differences in accordance with the demands of the relations of

production, the physiology of society express class differentiation. The relations of production leads to a specific relations of distribution, thus a physiology of society suitable to this relations of distribution is formed. The division of society into classes is a result of the relations of production and distribution (and so is the family organization that is part of the physiology of the society).

To the extend that the relations of production lead to social and class differentiations, social production is nothing but the relationship between the classes.

After all this, let us consider this relationship between opposites, which we have analysed as part of our study of production, in another way, by looking into the relationship between the material and spiritual life of society.

i— Relations of Reflection

The relations, which are included in the category of reflection, are the relations of the world of shadows, the world of lights, turned upside down having passed through a lens, the world of reflections, reflected by a mirror. They are relations of the world of images. A world of relations where everything stands on its head, everything is turned upside down.

Political relations, political struggle, class struggle belongs to such a world of relations.

Political struggle, class struggle is a struggle carried on in such a world.

Economic structure of society forms the classes, the interests of which clash, and force them to fight each other.

However, this struggle between classes, conducted for the economic interests, cannot be carried out in the economic sphere **directly** as a class struggle. This struggle between

classes can only be carried out in an **indirect** way, assuming the form of political struggle and being fought in the political arena. This struggle, the class struggle, can only be carried out in a world where the already existing economic interests assume the form of political ideas and political organizations, that is in a political world.

That is why, those who just look at the world of politics, and do not comprehend this world as a world of shadows, images, reflections, do not comprehend the need to find out images of what, reflections of what this world is made up of, that is, those who do not comprehend the economic origin and the economic source of the political struggle, think that history is the product of the political ideas and political organizations, and moreover of the “great” people.

The world of politics is a world of shadows, a world inhabited by shadows of the world of economics.

The world of politics is a world of reflections, a world inhabited by the reflections of the world of economics.

The world of politics is a world of lights which have passed through a lens, a world of lights the source of which is the world of economics and which have passed through a lens.

ii— Reflected and its Reflection

A reflection does not have a life, a movement that is **independent** of the life and movement of that of which it is a reflection. After all, it is a reflection, a product, a derivative, a shadow of something else. It is clear that its life independent of that thing is impossible.

However, once a reflection appears, it may also have a movement with its own specific features, its own movement **relatively independent** of the thing it was reflected from.

A movement of reflection that cannot be independent of the thing it was reflected from, a movement of reflection which in the final analysis has to comply with the demands, the changes, the developments of the thing it was reflected from, a movement of reflection that has a relative independence of that of which it is a reflection. Because the reflection has its own relatively independent movement from the thing that gave it birth, that has caused its appearance, once this has happened, once the reflection has emerged, also means that it may influence and do actually influence the thing it is a reflection of.

The reflected forms its reflection and once this reflection is formed, a **mutual interaction** arise between these two. Considered within this mutual interaction, now the reflected is seen as the cause while its reflection as an effect; then, later, the reflection is seen as the cause, while the reflected is seen as the effect. Cause becomes effect and effect becomes cause. As long as the interaction continues, the transformation of cause and effect from one to other also continues and the individual is lost within a vicious cycle of mutual interaction, and cannot explain the relationship between these opposites. To break the vicious circle of mutual interaction, what is reflected, what is reflection, what is the foundation, what is its product must be determined.

The reflected is the economic infrastructure that reflects itself in the political ideas and political structures. Reflection is the political superstructure, which is the reflection of the economic infrastructure. The movement of the political superstructure is not independent of the movement of the economic infrastructure. The political superstructure does not have an independent development, an independent life because it is a product, a derivative, a reflection of the economic infrastructure. Yet, once a political superstructure is born, it also gains its own relatively independent movement, its own

relatively independent life and affects the economic infrastructure.

The political superstructure may affect the economic infrastructure in three different ways:

(1) In the same direction as the line of development of the economic infrastructure

(2) In opposite direction to the line of development of the economic infrastructure

(3) Applying a line formulated by the political structure as distinct from the specific lines of development suggested by its economic infrastructure.

From these, (3) has to transform into either (1) or (2). In the final analysis, (2) has to perish, leaving its place to (1).

iii— The Dialectics of C. Bettelheim

Our Professor places the productive forces and the class struggle in opposition to each other. Moreover, he examines the problem within the framework of what the driving force of history is, not within the framework of which one of these opposites he would give priority to. He says the driving force of history is class struggle. This is all very well, but what is the “driving force” of the class struggle?

To better understand the logic of our professor, let us go further back from where he rejected the primacy of the productive forces and proposed the class struggle as the motive force.

Going thus further back we see that our Professor had previously proposed the following: to use the class struggle to attack the political-ideological relations and thus, thanks to these, to change the economic relations. In other words, first the class struggle, then economic changes...

In fact, this view that the class struggle is the primary, is the first, and the economic relations is the successor, is the secondary, are very clearly formulated and put forward as “the primacy of the social relations”.

Our Professor puts the productive forces and the “social relations” against each other, in opposition to each other and in this relationship grants to social relations priority, primacy, being first, being the predecessor. In addition, to the extent that the social relations include the “political-ideological” relations, our professor demands that the political superstructure should have the priority, not the economic infrastructure.

For our professor, the reflected is not the economic infrastructure; it is the political superstructure, the class struggle.

Thus, our professor inverts another one of the foundation stones of Marxism, places it on its head and revise it.

Thus, we encounter an interesting result of the promise of our professor of return to Marx.

If the class struggle is primary, the first... If the class struggle itself is the source of the changes to the economic relations... where does this class struggle originate? Where is its origin? What has lead to the class struggle?

Our professor cannot ask such questions, because for him, the source, the origin of economic changes is the class struggle, it is the class struggle which leads to economic changes, here can be found the origin of the economic changes. Thus, the class struggle of our professor has to become a class struggle that is groundless, with its feet in the air, a class struggle that falls from the sky. And, it is thus.

It turns out that, our professor during his attempt to return to Marx could not help himself and stop at Marx and went so far back as to his French ancestors, to the pre-Marxist historians. The definite result of the promise of our professor to return to Marx is nothing but this.

C—THE “SOCIAL RELATIONS” OF C. BETTELHEIM

What are the “social relations” of our professor?

Division of labour, relations of production, political-ideological relations and therefore the class struggle. All of these.

That is, the economic and political concepts have been dumped together. Economic and political concepts have been unified absolutely. They are altogether the “social relations”.

Anything wrong in this? No.

Are not relations of production, these economic relations social relations? They are social relations.

Is not the class struggle, these political relations, social relations? They are social relations.

Then there should not be a problem at all!

Nevertheless, there are problems. That is because; the communal (social) life is divided into two. Failure to take into consideration this division into two, not to do this very “simple” thing, is pregnant to a pile of problems.

Precisely because of this, when our professor declares the productive forces and social relations as two opposites, and places one face to face with the other, we end up with a pile of problems.

The opposition between the productive forces and relations of production is an opposition that is specific to economic life of society. In this opposition what is the primary, what is derived from the primary, what is secondary must be determined. Does our professor address this opposition? Far from it. However, what does he do? He puts against each other

the social relations within which he has included the productive forces and production relations, and then he gives the primacy, the priority to the social relations; therefore, and when the relation of the productive forces and relations of production is considered, the relations of production is declared to be the primary, while the productive forces are declared to be a derivative of the relations of production.

This was the first revision of our professor, which we have identified; the first example of standing Marxism on its head. Exposing this revision of Marxism was quite easy. Because our professor has put against each other the social relations which includes the productive forces and relations of production and had granted priority to social relations. Things were a little bit confused when the relationship between the economic infrastructure and the political superstructure was considered. Why?

Because, the economic infrastructure is the relations of production. The relations of production determine the relations of exchange and distribution, that is, all the economic infrastructure of society. In other words, the economic infrastructure of society means the relations of production.

However, our professor have dumped the economic and political relations together, unified them absolutely, called them the “social relations” and put them in opposition to the productive forces.

Therefore, within this opposition, within the opposition of the productive forces and the social relations, it is impossible to understand the views of our professor regarding the relationship between the economic infrastructure and the political superstructure. To understand this, there is a need for something more. That is, the views of our professor regarding the relationships between the elements that he considers within the framework of social relations must be known. Due to this need, we had to refer to our professor’s idea of the changing

the “economic relations.... by attacking the ideological and political relations, ... using the correctly led class struggle” and by relying on this idea of his we proved that when considering the relationship between the economic infrastructure and the political super-structure, he supports the idea of the priority of the political superstructure.

This was the second revision of our professor, which we have identified; the second example of standing Marxism on its head. In order to expose the understanding of our professor, firstly, we had to start from his melting of the economic and political concepts in the pot of social relations, and uniting them in absolute terms in this pot of social relations. Then, we had to move by looking into how he separated and isolated these concepts from each other, which he melted in the pot of social relations in the first place, and how he considered the relationships between these “social relations” within this isolation. And yet again and once more, this opposition between the productive forces and the political relations (social relations) has appeared in front of us. Our professor has refused the priority of the productive forces. Instead of placing the economic infrastructure (relations of production), and the political superstructure (class struggle) against each other, he placed the productive forces and the class struggle against each other and refused the priority of the productive forces. To the extent that the productive forces are precedent of the relations of production and the relations of production are precedent of the class struggle, it has been proven once again that our professor rejects the priority of the economic infrastructure.

Therefore, an idea in the huge mass of no ideas of our professor has clearly started to show itself.

Relations of production.

The productive forces, and the social relations, which are a sickening mixture of the economic and political relations are put against each other.

The productive forces and the class struggle are put against each other.

Where is the place of the relations of production? There is none!

This is obviously a very wrong conclusion.

Relations of production have its place: it has a place as a part of social relations which are an opposite and a precedent of the productive forces, and it has a place as a derivative, as a reflection of the class struggle within these social relations. Just as this class struggle is a class struggle lacking its economic foundation, with its feet in the air, so do these relations of production, considered not as a derivative of the productive forces but as its precedent, also exists as relations of production with its feet in the air.

Let us now see how the relations of production fair in this world of C. Bettelheim, which stands on its head.

D— RELATIONS OF PRODUCTION AND THE LAW

C. Bettelheim under the title “class relations and legal forms of ownership”, said:

“Changes in legal forms of ownership is not sufficient for the disappearance of the conditions of existence of classes and class struggle”, because “the origins of” the existence of classes and class struggle... “lies in the relations of production.”

The origins of the conditions of existence of classes and class struggle are in the relations of production. That is very true. Let us forget about such the elasticised concepts as “adequacy”. The stupidity of the logic of I made changes to law, therefore I abolished the classes, while the relations of

production remain the same, is clear to all. How correct a determination it is to say how stupid a logic it is to claim such a thing.

What is happening? Have we said that a great Marxist said thing, which he did not in fact say? Did we, due to our own “mechanical materialism”, throw at this great “dialectical materialist” the mud of reversing Marxism, which he does not actually do???

Let us see.

Until now, we have not directly touched upon Stalin’s words and views. Now, it is both mandatory, and very useful.

Our professor talks about Stalin’s famous speech on the Stalin’s Constitution. Let us first of all have a look at what Stalin said and how:

Firstly, Stalin records the changes in the Soviet economy, and accordingly in the class structure of Soviet Union.

“Such, in the main, are the changes which have taken place in the sphere of our *economy* during the period from 1924 to 1936.

In conformity with these changes in the economic life of the U.S.S.R., the *class structure* of our society has also changed. “(Leninism, J. V. Stalin, On The Draft Constitution of the USSR, II. Changes in the Life of the USSR in the Period from 1924 to 1936, p. 380-405, Eng., 1942 Edition, International Publishers, New York.)

Then he examines how these changes are **reflected** in the new Constitution.

“How are all these changes in the life of the U.S.S.R. reflected in the draft of the new Constitution?

... In drafting the new Constitution, the Constitution Commission proceeded from the proposition that a constitution must not be confused with a program... Whereas a program speaks of that which does not yet exist, of that which has yet to

be achieved and won in the future, a constitution, on the contrary, must speak of that which already exists, of that which has already been achieved and won now, at the present time. A program deals mainly with the future, a constitution with the present.

...

Thus, the draft of the new Constitution is a summary of the path that has been traversed, a summary of the gains already achieved. In other words, it is the registration and legislative embodiment of what has already been achieved and won in actual fact." "(Ibid., p. 380-405.)

What does Stalin's say?

First, economic relations have changed; hence, the class structure has also changed. Now the time has come to reflect these in the political superstructure, the law, the constitutional law. The time has now come to record legally the changes already emerged in economic and class structure.

First, the economic infrastructure changes, then in accordance with the demands of this change the political superstructure is changed.

Now let us consider to what our professor is doing...

We have mentioned above what Stalin has done. It must be clear even to the world's most stupid man, and yet, C. Bettelheim is a great person who has undertaken to return the true revolutionary character to the dialectical and historical materialism... However, look at him now see what he has made Stalin do: It turns out that Stalin had explained the changes in the "legal forms of ownership", i.e., the changes in property relations that came into being between 1924-1936, then, and on the basis of these changes he declares that "antagonistic classes" and "capitalist relations of production" have disappeared.

What is this?

This is to reverse Stalin's approach, make it stand on its head, and declare it is Stalin's approach.

What is this?

It is to declare the approach of C. Bettelheim, who turns the fundamental theses of historical materialism upside down as Stalin's approach.

Our professor claims that Stalin begins with legal changes and declares the old class and the old relations of production to be no more because of these legal changes. But it is him who propose to starts with "the class struggle", using the calls struggle attack the ideological-political relations, thus attack the legal relations...and thus change the relations of production.

The approach that he attributes to Stalin is exactly his own logic. So much so that, he does criticise Stalin as to why he is making changes in law while the relations of production remain the same. Why? Because, his own logic requires him to act exactly in that way. He does not criticize that laws cannot be changed while the old relations of production remains the same, his critic is that the legal changes are "not adequate". Here is the wisdom of this elastic "not adequate", which has no place here. For C. Bettelheim, it is quite normal to make changes in law, in property relations while the old production relations continue as before. However, this is "not adequate". to change the relations of production, to change classes, Why? Because first comes political change, then the changes to the "relations of production" and to classes. Well, the law has changed, but... the time has not yet come to destroy the antagonistic classes, to destroy the capitalist production relations. They will disappear sometime "later". First, the relations of production and the classes "will be destroyed" legally, then... the not legal, the "real" relations of production and classes will be destroyed.

Therefore, there was no need to our initial fear of making a mistake. Our professor continue to think with the logic we have

identified, moreover, he makes Stalin do things in line with his own reverse logic, moreover, he accuses Stalin of going even further than himself, that is, thinking that by making legal changes he has also destroyed the old economic and class structure as well.

Good, but what about those correct views of C. Bettelheim, which we have identified?

What about those correct views that the origins of the existence of class struggle is in the production relations, that is in the economic relations?

Either these are correct views which contradicts the whole logic of our professor, or these are views which do not contradict the logic of our professor, they are only correct in appearance, but in fact they are totally wrong and they are wrong views formulated in accordance with the demands of the logic of our professor.

As these views correct in appearance were put forward at a place where the whole system of logic of our professor was defended, let us for the time being decide that the second choice would be the only way out of this dilemma and let us continue.

E— REFERENCES TO MARX AND LENIN

References to Marx and Lenin by Our professor who promised to return to Marx and Lenin are very limitedly. Let us take a look at to these limited references:

1— In order to justify his views expressed under the title “the priority (primacy—my note) of the development of productive forces”, he refers to Marx in a footnote.

“Footnote 37: *ibid.*, p. 244. Everybody knows that Marx in his “Critique of the Gotha Programme” mentions about the “bourgeois limitations” which affects the distribution of goods during the “first phase of communism”, but, this “limitation” is not linked to the level of productive forces, but to the “slavish dependence to the individual’s division of labour” and the social relations which prevents the development of the productive forces suitable to them. (Marx and Engels, Selected Works in 3 Volumes, V. 3, p. 18-19.)”

According to our professor, what does Marx do?

As regards the first stage of communism, he links the bourgeois constraints which continue their existence in the sphere of distribution, not to the “level” of productive forces, but to the division of labour and to the “social relations” which correspond to these.

“Everyone knew” all of these, he says. They do, they do. We also know that they do. But still, let us read Marx.

“... Right can never be higher than the economic structure of society and the cultural development thereby determined (underlined by us).

... after labour, from a mere means of life, has itself become the prime necessity of life; after the productive forces have also increased with the all-round development of the individual, and all the springs of co-operative wealth flow more abundantly—only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be fully left behind...” (Critique of the Gotha Programme, London, Lawrence & Wishart Limited, p.14)

The bourgeois limitation, which is mentioned by our professor, is a bourgeois right that inevitably exist in the field of distribution and in the first stage of communism. Under bourgeois conditions of production this right, this principle of equal right and its practice are in contradiction. In the first

stage of communism, this principle and its practice are no longer in contradiction.

What determines the right? Economic structure of society—and the level of culture of society, which is determined by this economic structure.

When can communism put an end to the bourgeois right, overcome its narrow limits?

After the productive forces have increased, and after all the springs of co-operative wealth have flown more abundantly, and only and only after then, after succeeding this... (This also means the development of people's production skills, production knowledge, the development of individuals who are part of the productive forces.) Therefore, when the cultural development, which is determined by the economic structure, and the development of the consciousness which follow from behind the economic development, makes it possible, then the narrow limits of the bourgeois right, the bourgeois law will be left behind.

However, our professor find the necessary element to overcome the narrow limit of bourgeois right, in his own invention, in the "social relations" and since all these are invented to deny the primacy of the productive forces, instead of the primacy of the productive forces in overcoming the narrow limits of bourgeois right, the primacy of "social relations" thesis is put forward, and without the list bit of shame Marx is declared to be saying this.

The same thing befell to Lenin as well:

According to our professor, Lenin has produced the thesis of the weak link of imperialism by denying the thesis of the primacy of the productive forces. He says that it is the economists who defend the thesis of the primacy of the productive forces; had Lenin acted like the economists and defended the thesis of the primacy of productive forces, he

would never had been able to formulated the thesis of the weak link of imperialism

While the economists have such enemies, what need do they have of having friends...

When the subject matter is productive forces, the difference between Marxism and Economism is not in the thesis of the priority of productive forces. The primacy, the priority of productive forces is the *abc* of Marxism. There is not even an atom difference between Economism and Marxism in regard to this subject. The differences start when conclusions are drawn from this. It starts in the political and economic conclusions drawn from this. One can get this or that correct teaching of Marxism and come to thousands of wrong conclusions and who does not know that history is full of such examples. We cannot say our professor... because in the final analysis all he does is to distort the teaching of Marxism about “politics as the determining factor”

In this context, it would be sufficient to say this about our professor’s objection to the demand that the proletarian party in its programme and practice must, first of all, act in accordance with the laws of development of production: a “party of the proletariat”, dear professor, that does not act accordingly is a contradiction in terms. Is it not so... if one is not going to act in accordance with the laws of economic development, if they will not be obeyed, if these will not form the basis of one’s actions... why then establish “the proletariat” party...

2— Our professor refers to Lenin in one of his the dip notes in order to justify his views which he advocates under the heading “Class relations and legal forms of ownership”

“Footnote 16: ““Classes are large groups of people differing from each other by the place they occupy in a historically determined system of social production, by their relation (in most cases fixed and formulated in law) to the means of

production, by their role in the social organisation of labour, and, consequently, by the dimensions of the share of social wealth of which they dispose and the mode of acquiring it. Classes are groups of people one of which can appropriate the labour of another owing to the different places they occupy in a definite system of social economy.” (Lenin, ‘A Great Beginning’, Collected Works, Volume 29, p. 421)

It can be seen that, Lenin says that although it may be (our underline—*Ed.*) observed that the place of different social classes are “identified and formulated by the law”, he mentions that as a probability (our underline—*Ed.*) The presence of the “legal relations” for the productive forces does not enter into the real definition (our underline—*Ed.*) of classes “ (Ibid, p. 49-50.)

What is our professor trying to do in the name of the “real definition” of classes?

To tear away the “legal relationship” to the means of production from the definition of human societies, of classes formed in accordance with their “relations to the means of production”, in accordance with the relations of production and therefore from the definition of the relations of production. The opposite of the real definition of classes, the opposite of which is not given, the “none-real” of which is not given, is the “legal definition” i.e., the definition that addresses the property relations. Our professor is trying to tear away absolutely the property relations from the definition of relations of production and classes. That is why he is making Lenin to say things, which he never did... By saying that Lenin “mentions legal relationship to the means of production as a probability”

Are production relations and their legal expressions, their legal reflections different things from each other? Of course, they are different things; moreover, they are opposite things. One is economic, the other legal and political concepts. One is the relations of production, and the other property relations. These are not the same concepts; moreover, one is the other's

reflection, as the property relations are the reflection of the relations of production, there even may arise a huge gap between them. In their development property relations can fall behind the relations of production, moreover they do fall behind the relations of production. That is why Lenin does not refer to, “their relation to the means of production” always “fixed and formulated in law”, he says, “by their relation to the means of production” “in most cases fixed and formulated in law”

However, is this contrast an absolute contrast, one that makes the other impossible, if one exists the other can not exist, metaphysical, an impassable contrast?

No. These opposites are linked to each other; one is the reflection of the other. Property relations are reflections of relations of production. Since social life is divided into two, divided into two as economic life and political life, since there cannot be a social life without these two aspects, two opposite sides of social life being together; moreover, the emergence of a gulf between these two live, the emergence of a gulf between the social relations of production and property relations makes social life impossible to continue without establishing and maintaining harmony between the two aspects of social life. Harmony among them is a necessity. “fixing and formulating in law” “their relation to the means of production” is a necessity, our Dear Professor, but never and never a probability. Therefore, exactly because of this reason and as the definition takes the most general, the most typical aspects of a thing into consideration, and as you say, “everyone knows” that, Karl Marx in his famous preface of “A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy,” says: “relations of production, or — what is but a legal expression for the same thing—the property relations.”

Therefore what does all this mean when our professor clearly strain himself to distort Lenin with an aim to tear away,

to separate absolutely the relations of production and property relations or classes and their “legal relationships” to the means of production, because all of this is exactly such an effort.

The correct view that the origin of the existence of classes and class struggle is in relations of production appeared in front of us as part of the logic of our professor, his logic, which makes the historical materialism, sit on its head.

The correct view that the relations of production and property relations, classes and their legal positions are different things has been presented to us as a view that also leads to the absolute separation of the relationship between these two aspects. In addition, this very same person combines this absolute separation and the absolute unity, the production relations and political relations into one as the concept “social relations”, and more, this very same person combines the economic and political relations into one as the concept “social relations”, and as such puts them in opposition to the productive forces.

Why?

If the law, the politics is not the reflection of relations of production and economic relations and it is a first, a primary in itself; if the ideological-political relations will be attacked using the class struggle and thus the economic relations will be changed; that is if the economic relations are a derivative of the political relations, that is, if the whole chain of the reasoning of our professor is correct, the difficulties of the reverse reflection makes it necessary firstly, the separation of the link between relations of production and the property relations, secondly, due to this separation and in order to hide the fact that a class struggle with its feet in the air is being proposed, makes the rhetorical, false defence of the relations of production as the origin of the classes and class struggle a necessity. In addition, this whole approach is necessary for our professor in his other

businesses.

F—THE ENDLESS CLASS STRUGGLE OF C. BETTELHEIM

Let us first of all think using C. Bettelheim's materialism:

Dictatorship of the proletariat has been established. Under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat "class struggle" is continued. Struggle between which classes? Antagonistic classes, the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

Because and even though the class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat is continued, even though the socialist property appears legally as a result of attacking the legal relations with this class struggle, the old relations of production, the capitalist relations of production and therefore the classes of capitalist relations of production, antagonistic classes, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie continue their existence. Only and only by continuing to attack the ideological and political relations using this class struggle, and when this struggle reaches a certain stage of a development, to be determined by our professor, for no one can know it, that capitalist relations of production and antagonist classes will disappear.

With this logic, this class struggle conducted with its feet in the air can still reach and end, however vague an end it may be.

Let us now add to this logic of our professor, his understanding of the relations of production as the origin of the class struggle and his separation of the relations of production and property relations.

Under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, using the class struggle you attack the ideological-political relations, therefore the legal relations, of which legal relations one should not establish a mechanical link with the relations of classes, with the real definition of classes, and with the relations of production, because the relations between them and legal relations is a probable relationship. Changing the property relations legally, making them the property of the state of the proletariat, making them socialist property does not change the real classes and relations of production, this is to be achieved later. Moreover, the conditions of existence of classes and class struggle lies in the relations of production. Since the class struggle is primary, first, essential, etc., one starts the process with it, and through these, using these economic relations, the relations of production are changed. However, what leads to the class struggle, what is its origin? Despite the changes to the property relations, it is the capitalist production relations that live a separate life from the property relations. Here is the origin of the conditions of existence of classes, the origin of the conditions of existence of class struggle. And also the class struggle is the first, the primary; in order to begin changing the relations of production, one should start the process with the class struggle... the origin of the class struggle is in the relations of production... one has to wage class struggle to end the relations of the capitalist production, very well, but one has to wage class struggle since one have not been able to finish off the capitalist relations of production,.....

Primarily, firstly, I must tackle the class struggle. The primary is the class struggle. That is the starting point in changing everything, including the relations of the capitalist production, that is it is the primary. I should start with that. Thanks to that, based on that I will change the economic relations, relations of production.

In addition, the origin of the class struggle is in the relations of production, in the relations of the capitalist production and antagonist classes, which I took over from capitalism. Then as long they stay, the class struggle is inevitable. Well, since their change will also come to fruition after the class struggle... neither the relations of capitalist production will end, nor the antagonist classes, nor the struggle between the antagonist classes...

The construction of socialism said C. Bettelheim would not happen as Stalin said, in just five minutes, it requires a very long time, it is a long process...

The publications of the Communist Party of China were talking at one point of needing 1000 years, or were saying something like "the Cultural Revolution will have to be repeated again and again"... C. Bettelheim also exhibited his essential logic when he is talking about the long time needed to build socialism...This socialism cannot be built before eternity comes to an end...