

Lenin demonstrates that the double power characteristic of State structures (as a factor of cohesion in formation's unity and as the place in which the ruptural situation of this unity, or in which contradictions of instances are condensed) constitutes one of the essential elements of the revolutionary situation. That is why he considers the basic problem of every revolution to be that of State power. In this case, the objective of political practice is the State as a factor maintaining the cohesion of the unity of the formation. Political practice produces transformations, the objective of which is the State as the nodal structure in which this unity breaks, in so far as it is a cohesive factor. It is in this sense that the State can be viewed as a factor for producing new unity and new relations of production; that is, a new historical phase.

It is only through dialectical materialism that the State can be comprehended this way: simultaneously, a factor of cohesion of a formation's unity and the place in which the contradictions of the various levels of a formation are condensed; and therefore, the place in which we can break the unity and articulation of a formation's structures.

As Poulantzas precisely puts it:

"It is from this relation between the State as a cohesive factor of a formation's unity and the State as the place in which the various contradictions of the instances are condensed, that we can decipher the problem of the relation between politics and history. This relation designates the structure of the political both as the specific level [instance] of a formation and as the place in which its transformations occur: it designates the political struggle as 'motive power of history' having as its objective the State, the place in which contradictions of instances...are condensed." 85

Inside the structure of several levels dislocated by uneven development, the State has the particular function of constituting the factor