EDITORIAL

“STATE SOCIALISM.”

By DANIEL DE LEON

A CALIFORNIA correspondent is intensely anxious to know whether Marx and Engels were “State Socialists,” also whether the Editor of the Daily People is a “State Socialist.”

No Socialist is a “State Socialist.”

“State Socialism” is a concept that flows from pure and simple political Socialism. It is a concept that ignores the necessity of the Union in the achievement and perpetuation of the revolutionary act. In short, or to compress a good deal in a few words, “State Socialism” ignores the origin of the state; hence, the inevitableness of the State’s downfall; hence, and finally, the inevitableness of governmental structure, that breaks loose with the structure of State Rule to make room for the structure of Industrial Administration. The Socialist Republic, labored for by the Socialist and pointed to by Marx and Engels, is, accordingly, something wholly different from State Socialism.

Elsewhere in this issue we re-publish the article “A Brace of Specimens, Even Neater,” in which the New Yorker Volkszeitung and its then English poodle, The Worker were scourged for their misquoting of Marx upon the important subject of Unionism. By re-publishing the article the minds of many readers will be timely refreshed upon Marx’s interview with Hamann. The article serves the additional purpose of clarifying the subject of “State Socialism.” The Socialist Commonwealth whose existence, according to the words of Marx, requires the class-conscious Union as a condition precedent, that Commonwealth marks an era that hearkens back to that of primitive Communism, an era when the State was not known, and was unknowable—as unknown as slavery.

Indeed, “State Socialism” is a contradiction in terms. We shall either have
Socialism—and that means that the State shall have vanished; or we shall preserve
the State, and then we shall have no Socialism.