

# On the Transcendence of Marxist Cultural View over Cultural Evolution Theory and Cultural Relativism

Jiaxin Yang

Shaanxi University of Technology 723001, China

---

**Abstract:** For a long time, the discussion and debate on the theory of cultural evolution and Cultural relativism have run through the development of cultural theory, and profoundly affected the development of cultural theory. The theory of cultural evolution emphasizes the monism of culture, that is, the development and progress of culture. However, it ignores the objective facts of cultural diversity and diversity, which makes it an excuse for cultural hegemonism. Cultural relativism emphasizes the diversity and diversity of culture, which can offset the negative side of cultural centralism. However, due to the lack of a deep understanding of the nature of cultural development, it leaves room for Nihilism and conservatism. The Marxist view of cultural progress provides a transcending path for bridging the contradiction between Cultural relativism and cultural evolutionism. It aims at human freedom and all-round development, and points out that the contradiction between cultural progress and Cultural relativism can only be reasonably solved in the overall practice of human beings.

**Keywords:** Marxist cultural view, Cultural Evolution Theory, Cultural relativism.

---

## 1. Introduction

As the two most representative and tit for tat cultural trends of thought, the conflict between cultural evolutionism and Cultural relativism not only profoundly affected the development of cultural theory, but also constantly constructed people's understanding and identification of their own culture. Cultural evolutionism emphasizes the development and progress of culture, but ignores the objective facts of the existence of cultural diversity, so it often becomes an excuse for cultural hegemonism or cultural centralism in reality; Cultural relativism emphasizes the diversity and difference of culture, but ignores the essence of cultural development, so it often falls into the quagmire of Nihilism and conservatism. The Marxist view of cultural progress has made considerable contributions to bridging the differences between Cultural relativism and cultural evolutionism. It aims at the freedom and all-round development of human beings, and points out that the contradiction between cultural progress and Cultural relativism can only be resolved in the overall practice of human beings.

## 2. The Struggle between Two Cultural Logics: The Collision between Dominant Logic and Conservative Logic

From the perspective of social history, consciousness and consciousness are the characteristics of human activities. Any behavior of a person requires a certain concept as its basis, which constitutes the consistent internal logic of their behavior. For a group, this logic can be expressed as a "consensus" of ideas, or rather, the culture of the group. The homogeneity of group members' behavior, the publicity of communication rules within the group, and the consistency of group value judgment all originate from this "consensus" cultural logic. In a society, group communication is the same, and worldwide, communication between countries is no different.

The Cultural conflict in the past international exchanges can generally be summed up in two cultural logics: cultural evolutionism (hegemonic logic) and cultural Relativism (logic abiding). As one end of the wave of globalization, where developed and developing countries are at odds, the tension of debate and confrontation between the two has always torn the global cultural landscape into two parts that are difficult to integrate, manifested as calls for globalization and anti globalization. However, from the perspective of the reality and future prospects of globalization, neither of them can form the necessary unified cultural value core for further development of globalization, nor can they guide the establishment of a new global cultural order [1].

### 2.1. Cultural Evolution Theory and Its Proposition

Cultural evolution theory is the result of the introduction of Darwin's biological evolution theory into the cultural field in the 19th century. It is divided into two stages: classical cultural evolution theory and new cultural evolution theory. The former believes that there is a fixed sequence of single line evolution from lower to higher levels in human social culture, while European culture is the pinnacle of the entire human cultural evolution sequence. The latter attempts to avoid the criticized biological evolution thought of classical cultural evolutionists, while inheriting and highlighting its "Western centrism" thought, believing that the higher the degree of evolution of a culture, the stronger its universality, and the more advantageous it is to replace and assimilate its local culture in various environments. They believe that Western culture is the highest form of cultural evolution and has a superior assimilation advantage over all non Western cultures. In terms of Value judgment, it believes that its conquest of various domain based cultures is actually a kind of "good deed" to help it evolve to an advanced stage.

Cultural evolution theory was exploited by colonialists for emphasizing the centrality and dominance of Western culture, attempting to promote Western culture as the only remaining model in human cultural theater. Globalization has become a comprehensive Westernization process in which various

cultures gradually tend towards homogeneity. The logic of the strong in culture corresponds to the logic of the robber in economy.

## 2.2. Cultural relativism and Its Proposition

Cultural relativism insists on the diversification of cultural values. Any culture has its own unique value. It is not allowed to judge another culture by any so-called absolute and universal cultural value standard. Cultures are equal and there is no distinction between good and bad. Benedict pointed out that diverse cultures are incommensurable, and Westerners live in a pan global culture, adopting an attitude of hoping for conformity in the face of each different culture. The real key lies in the infinite range of possible human customs and motivations at all levels of culture, from simplicity to complexity. The wise are those who insist on a great tolerance for the vast differences between them. It can be seen that Cultural relativism recognizes the rationality of cultural differences, while criticizing the use of a culture to deny heterogeneous cultures. Each cultural type is an adaptive whole to different environments, each with its own uniqueness and rationality. The Eurocentrism of cultural evolutionism was strongly attacked by them.

Cultural Relativism received a positive response in the third world because of the cultural colonization in the western world. The third world countries generally accepted cultural Relativism to fight against the evolutionary logic of cultural colonization.

## 2.3. The “Gordian knot” of human cultural development

Humanity has become a community with a shared destiny and closely related interests. Economic and trade exchanges are unprecedentedly inseparable, and political exchanges are unprecedentedly active, but there are still barriers to cultural exchange that are difficult to overcome. The most important cultural Communication disorder is the collision between cultural evolutionism and Cultural relativism. In fact, the theory of cultural evolution and the Cultural relativism are both one-sided, so it is difficult to reach a consensus.

The theory of cultural evolution emphasizes the unity and development of culture, proclaiming that there is a vertical sequence of cultural evolution, canceling the horizontal differences and particularities between cultures with homogeneity, and advocating the superiority of Western culture in the hierarchical sequence of cultural evolution. This zero sum game of hegemony logic can easily become a defense tool for colonial behavior, and historical facts have proven that this is indeed the case.

In fact, Cultural relativism is a natural stress result of cultural evolutionism accompanied by colonial behavior. Faced with the powerful advantages of colonizers, backward countries have a huge sense of cultural crisis, striving to ensure the survival rights of their own culture. Therefore, to some extent, Cultural relativism has tried to dispel the discourse hegemony of Western centrism and played a positive role in maintaining the unique position of the national culture of developing countries, It reflects a kind of Cultural conservatism [2], which offsets its positive consequences.

Measured by the common values of all humanity, such as “peace, development, fairness, justice, democracy, and freedom”, the key to these two lies precisely in the lack of mutually recognized standards of human common values, overemphasizing the relative advantages or unique values of

one’s own culture, and still seeking solutions to human cultural development problems with a traditional and confrontational Cold War mentality. One is to promote hegemony, while the other is difficult to progress. This divergence can be seen in the constant noise between globalization and anti globalization, as well as between Davos and anti Davos.

Whether China, with Marxism as its fundamental guiding ideology, agrees with the former, depends on the latter, or chooses and adheres to a unique path of cultural development, fundamentally depends on the coordinate positioning of Marxist culture based on China’s national conditions.

Marx has been regarded as the pioneer of cultural evolutionism for a long time. After sorting out his relevant thoughts, we can confirm that this is a misreading of Marx. Marx is a “cultural Progressivism”, but not a cultural evolutionist. His position of cultural Progressivism transcends the above two cultural logics. It is precisely because the sinicized Marxism adhered to by the CPC not only inherits the profound blood of the Chinese nation’s “sinicized” traditional culture, but also contains the “imported” western cultural genes contained in Marxism itself, so it can build the intersection of Chinese and western cultural traditions in reality. As the trend of economic globalization from single dimension to overall globalization has become more and more obvious, and the achievements of Socialism with Chinese characteristics have become increasingly attractive, countries around the world have to re-examine the irrationality of traditional “hegemonic logic” and “logic abiding”, This makes it possible for the cultural logic of Marxism’s cultural Progressivism (“harmony logic”) to become a “Community of Common Destiny” in reality.

## 3. The Possibility of Logic Synthesis and Transcendence of Two Cultures: Marxist Cultural Progressivism

The theory of cultural evolution and the Cultural relativism stick to each other’s ends, both of which are destructive, more digestible and less constructive, and have no ability to promote the value core of global cultural unity, positive global cultural interaction norms and the formation of a new cultural order. This creates a need for the publicity of Marx’s “cultural Progressivism”, a new cultural concept that transcends both.

Cultural Progressivism has at least four connotations:

Firstly, it believes that human progress should have a certain level of humanitarianism, moral judgment, and aesthetic significance.

Secondly, it is premised on the analyzability of culture, advocating for the openness of culture, and advocating for the active exchange, interaction, and integration of various ethnic cultures.

Thirdly, in terms of cultural measurement standards, it emphasizes the transcendental, utilitarian humanitarian, and moral judgment nature of progress; At the same time, it is believed that with the improvement of cultural awareness and intercultural communication, different cultures can understand and communicate with each other, and generate a “consensus” value that covers the special values and common needs of various ethnic groups. It should be emphasized that different cultures, due to their inherent genetic and traditional diversity, cannot be “homogenized” like material interests, nor can they be simply “generalized” like numbers. Therefore, this “universal value” that covers the special values and

common needs of various ethnic groups can only be based on full communication among various cultures, A cluster of “cultural star clusters” formed with “consensus” as the core that conforms to the values of all humanity can only be a form of “inclusion”, not “identity”.

Finally, the ideal of cultural Progressivism is to promote “world culture”, which will be the harmonious coexistence of cultural diversity, but also the independent unity of cultural convergence.

We can analyze Marx’s relevant thoughts from the perspectives of the opposition between cultural evolutionism and Cultural relativism, the relationship between culture and people, the ideal of human development, the theory of Human history, and the position of cultural colonialism and Cultural conservatism, and draw the conclusion that Marxism is cultural Progressivism in terms of cultural development.

### **3.1. Marxism transcends the opposition between cultural evolutionism and Cultural relativism**

Cultural evolutionism and Cultural relativism “are essentially based on the basic spirit of western civilization - technological rationality and humanistic trend of thought” [3]. The split of these two spirits reflects the split between man and nature, society and nature, as well as the split between natural science and “human related” social science. The core of cultural Relativism is similar to humanism in the cultural field. It advocates the unique value of individuals and also emphasizes the rationality of respecting the value of different cultures. People have no status, and culture has no advantages or disadvantages. Primitive and modern, backward and advanced are not synonymous, each culture has its own ability and value orientation to adapt to the society it is rooted in. [1] The theory of cultural evolution is the manifestation of Rationalism in the field of culture. Taking natural science as the root cause, it fell into the narrow Utilitarianism standard, advocated western centrism, and advocated the survival of the fittest in culture.

In the expression of his social ideal, Marx just integrated and transcended the two spirits of Western civilization, the basis of cultural evolution and Cultural relativism. He advocates bridging the long-standing division between the two and achieving unity in the future ideal society and ideal individuals. He pointed out: “This kind of communism, as completed naturalism, is equivalent to humanism, and as completed humanism, is equivalent to naturalism. It is the true solution to the contradictions between humans and nature, and between humans and humans [4].

Regarding society and nature, Marx believed that “society is the essential unity of human and nature, the true resurrection of nature, the naturalism of human realization, and the humanitarianism of nature” [4]. Regarding the relationship between natural sciences and social historical sciences, Marx pointed out that “history itself is a realistic part of natural history, that is, a realistic part of the process of nature becoming human” [4]. Natural science and human science will be unified into one science. From this, it can be seen that Marx bridged the ideals of the two major spiritual divisions in the West. This unity in the cultural field is the basis for the integration of cultural evolutionism and Cultural relativism.

### **3.2. Cultural Progressivism’s integration and transcendence of two cultural logics**

Both the Cultural relativism and the new theory of cultural evolution recognize that, in a certain sense, culture is human existence itself. As the essence of human existence, culture is the expression of human ontology. Culture and human existence are unified, and human ontology is the essence of culture. By attributing human characteristics to “free and conscious activities,” Marx pointed out that humans possess the metaphysical essence of constantly transcending reality, transcending freedom, and moving towards freedom. From this perspective, human beings are idealistic beings, and their essence naturally contains dimensions of transcendence and development that constantly sublate reality and self. Since culture and people are unified, human development determines the fact of human cultural progress. Therefore, culture must have developmental and contemporary characteristics, and there is a process of evolution. The theory of cultural evolution has certain rationality.

The culture of a certain era or nation is a reflection of human reality, which is the production and communication methods formed by people in different environments, that is, the way human life unfolds - the way of practice. What they are, this is consistent with their production - both with what they produce and how they produce it. The mode of production determines the actual living conditions of humanity, thus determining the basic form of human culture. And there are inevitably differences in production methods among different ethnic groups and eras, which determines that the existence of cultural differences among different ethnic groups and eras is a reasonable objective reality. Therefore, cultural Relativism also has its rationality.

From the perspective of the relationship between man and culture, Marxism takes into account both the metaphysical nature of man and the reality of existence, thus it can be confirmed that culture also correspondingly has two dimensions: progress and reality, should be and should be. In fact, Cultural relativism and cultural evolutionism capture one aspect of human culture from the perspectives of synchrony and diachrony.

### **3.3. Marxism’s “Human history” thought contains the content of “world culture”**

Marx and Engels always stand in the perspective of all mankind to examine historical issues, which determines that their theory must surpass ethnocentrism. Marx pointed out that human history will inevitably move from regional history to Human history, and the development of productive forces has led to the expansion of exchanges between regions and ethnic groups in the world. With universal communication, the development of production, economy, and politics among ethnic groups will be integrated, and the dependence of each ethnic group will continue to increase. As economic and political co travelers, culture will also move towards a unity that integrates various differences. Different cultures can understand and integrate with each other, and in this process, a consensus value that covers the special values of each ethnic group and the common needs of humanity will be generated. In this process, “the degree of liberation of each individual is consistent with the degree of complete transformation of history into Human history” (note: Marx added a marginal note: “On the production of consciousness”. -- Editor’s note). As for the real spiritual wealth of an individual, it is

completely dependent on the wealth of his real relationship, which is very clear according to the above description “[5]. In this process of globalization, any culture, as a product of human spiritual production, will inevitably interact with other cultures in the entire world, ultimately forming a consensus type of subculture - world culture. It is neither a textbook version of Western culture nor a unique form of cultural stubbornness among different ethnic groups. It will be a “consensus” for various cultures to understand and learn from each other.

### **3.4. Marxism has always opposed cultural colonialism and Cultural conservatism**

From the perspective of all humanity, Marx believed that people of all ethnic groups and countries are equal, and there is no distinction between good and bad races. When examining Britain’s colonial invasion of India, in response to the prevailing opinion at the time that “Europeans were ethnically superior to Indians, and therefore Britain was using bourgeois civilization to transform backward India”, he believed that Indians were not inferior to Europeans, and the Indian people were elegant, brave, and possessed a calm and noble character, even possessing an elegant and noble character superior to Europeans.

Marx then attacked Culture of the United Kingdom colonialism. In *The Rule of Britain in India*, he pointed out that British aggression had destroyed India’s ancient culture, but it did not make any progress in its construction, which led to “Indians lost their old world and did not gain a new world... so that Hindustan under British rule broke ties with all its ancient traditions and all its past history” [5]. This is clearly a strong condemnation of cultural colonialism.

Marx historically pointed out that while Britain committed many crimes due to its pure pursuit of interests, it unconsciously acted as a tool of history. The British invasion in India objectively contributed to the revolution of India’s old closed system, and was the largest and only social revolution in Asia that had never been heard of before. For India, which upholds Cultural conservatism, this will certainly promote its new development in all aspects. Although in Marx’s view, it will take some time for Indians to reap the “fruits of new social factors” brought by the British bourgeoisie [5], “however, we can confidently expect that in the relatively distant future, this huge and attractive country will be rebuilt” [5]. It can be seen that Marx had a positive attitude towards the “revolutionary” impact caused by the British invasion (rather than the invasion and conquest itself), while he had a negative attitude towards the Cultural conservatism and isolation of India and China, the “kingdom of heaven” at that time; The word “reconstruction” also shows that Marx did not expect Culture of India to embark on the road of overall westernization. Although Marx denied “colonial conquest”, he advocated for the “mutual influence” between different ethnic cultures. He advocated that all ethnic groups should adopt an equal and open attitude in their cultural attitudes.

It can be seen that on the issue of human cultural development, Marxism advocates cultural Progressivism. Marxism actively advocates for the coordinated progress of cultures of various ethnic groups in the world, affirming the significance of cultural exchanges (in any form) in promoting cultural progress, but also strongly criticizes the imperialist behavior of “cultural aggression” under the name of “cultural assistance” and “cultural salvation”. In other words, what

Marxism advocates is actually a kind of “harmony logic” between various cultures. As a theory of cultural Progressivism, the spread and creative development of Marxism in China has created the necessary premise for China to put forward the proposition of “Community of Common Destiny” in the context of contemporary globalization, and has also provided Chinese solutions and Chinese wisdom for the construction of the cultural logic of “Community of Common Destiny” [6].

## **4. Harmonious Resonance Between The “Harmony Logic” of the Community of Common Destiny and Chinese Marxism**

The concept of “Community of Common Destiny” is based on the development trend of globalization, and its international promotion depends on its position in the world cultural pattern. The main connotation of the Community of Common Destiny can be summarized as a new concept of win-win cooperation, a new security concept of common security, a civilization concept of inclusiveness and mutual learning, and a global governance concept of joint consultation, construction and sharing. [7] This connotation clearly indicates that the cultural logic required by the “Community of Common Destiny” is not the “hegemonic logic” that is exclusive, nor the “logic abiding” that is incomplete. It must be the “logic of peace” that is based on consensus and centered on common values. It is a decentralized intercultural discourse between the first developing countries and the second developing countries, It is also the principle of subjectivity in the deconfliction of human groups between Eastern and Western nations.

The proposition of “harmony logic” is that there is no absolutely homogeneous sequence in the development of human culture, and the “sample” of any regional culture will cause disaster for imitators; But there is a difference between advanced and backward human cultures, and any culture has the right and obligation to participate in dialogue and seek development. The human cultural exchange led by “harmony logic” should be centered around the common interests and values of all humanity, and under the premise of mutual respect, all ethnic groups should have equal and fully expressed rights. Through sufficient communication, consensus can be reached, and on the basis of mutual learning and identification, crises can be shared, dividends can be shared, development can be achieved, and prosperity can be achieved together. In human memory, conflicts between nations, confrontations between nations, racial exclusion, and even religious massacres are inseparable from human history. To some extent, these root in the differences in communication principles, core concerns, and value evaluation standards between macro entities such as nations and nations. The fusion of Marxism’s own western cultural genes and the traditional Chinese cultural heritage inherited by the CPC makes the proposition of a community with a shared future for mankind and its “harmony logic” proposed by China unique and historically inevitable.

#### **4.1. The “peace logic” of the Community of Common Destiny will reshape the basic principles of state exchanges and the consensus basis for the convergence of the new international order**

Since modern times, with the formation of a national State formation, science and technology have made rapid progress. In this process, the expansion of Instrumental and value rationality and its coverage of value rationality have made the word “modernity” criticized by many theorists later. It is deeply pessimistic because it generally causes “loss of value” and “loss of meaning” in the West. The embodiment of this Instrumental and value rationality in the social and historical field is the prevalence of Social Darwinism. In terms of the cultural logic expression of national communication, it is the monopoly of the “cultural evolutionism” accompanied by the western centrism and the natural resistance of the “Cultural relativism” inspired by it. In previous exchanges between countries, the interaction behavior between countries was basically guided by the jungle principle of prioritizing the strong. The early wave of globalization, where Western values were prioritized, was not a blessing for all countries, and even international organizations such as the United Nations were not always representatives of justice and justice. Each country, region, and ethnic group has its own core concerns, but these needs cannot be effectively communicated and understood due to the imbalance of the communication field (unequal discourse power between developed and developing countries), the asymmetry of communication principles (actual inequality in the status of countries in international communication), and the unfairness of the international order (constructed around the principle of Western value priority). Therefore, Confrontation and conflict, bullying and coercion have become common patterns of behavior in communication between countries.

In the future, the wave of globalization will sweep across countries around the world, and no country can stand alone from this big background. The “Community of Common Destiny” advocated by China indicates that the international community is essentially an “international public sphere” in which all countries participate. In this debate, every country willing to participate in communication as a subject has the equal right to express its own demands and wishes, and also has the obligation to listen to and respect others. On this common stage of international exchanges, the traditional principle of prioritizing the weak over the strong will become a relic of history. The proposal of the “Community of Common Destiny” is fundamentally a subversion and destruction of the previous principles of international exchanges. The practice of the “The Belt and Road Initiative” has initially demonstrated the universality and growth of the principles of equality, mutual benefit, cooperation and win-win under the guidance of the “peace logic” advocated by China, which will certainly lead to the trend of reflection and destruction of the old international order by all major countries [8]. This kind of reshaped national communication behavior advocated by China will care for the interests and demands of all relevant countries, resolve disputes and differences through equal consultation, communication and dialogue, and ultimately use the true “consensus” achieved as a solid foundation for the construction of a new type of interstate relations and international order.

#### **4.2. The “harmony logic” of the Community of Common Destiny can refine the common value standards among countries in the future**

The traditional ethics founded by Aristotle believed that the good pursued by members of society is happiness, that is, living a good life. How can we live a good life? The good of an individual’s life lies in two dimensions, namely the cultivation of good morality and the realization of common good. In the words of contemporary philosopher Habermas, it refers to the management of an individual’s good life and the construction of a good social order, and the two are internally consistent and complementary to each other. Therefore, in the traditional perspective of ethics, there is consistency between the values of micro individuals and the values of macro collectives, as well as between individual morality and collective morality.

However, the popularity of Instrumental and value rationality in modern society, the opposition of ideology, and the collectivized operation and international expansion of capital have torn the value consistency standard between such micro individuals (or small groups) and macro collectives, and individuals are often trapped in the conflict between the evaluation of self-centered value and external collective value. For example, actions considered good within a group may be considered evil outside the group, and actions considered good to others may be considered the greatest evil in the eyes of others. The loyalty of Nazi Germany soldiers on the battlefield of World War II and in the process of the Jewish Holocaust, the Soviet Union’s crushing of the revolutionary waves in Eastern Europe in order to maintain the balance of power, and the many local wars launched by the United States in the name of “human responsibility” and “liberation” all have internal and external Value judgment dilemmas. Benedict has long revealed in “The Chrysanthemum and the Knife” that even in developed countries such as the United States and Japan, there are significant cultural differences and conflicts, as well as completely different or even opposite value coordinates in terms of judgment standards. Historically, these cultural and value differences and misunderstandings among countries have become the norm, which has given the Human history a color of mixed ups and downs. In international social relations, this tearing is manifested as a conflict of values between national entities and between national groups and the overall international community.

Early globalization was a one-sided economic globalization led by developed Western countries. In this context, the establishment of international social values was not based on the number of national entities advocating a certain value, but rather on the level of economic and social development. In fact, it takes the economic interests of developed countries as the core, and the values of Western developed societies as the background, and vigorously promotes it, which in turn causes dissatisfaction and rejection from backward countries. So, with their respective economic interests as the most fundamental value connotation, countries speak to themselves, leading to the lack of a common cultural value coordinate in the international community.

Is it possible for the international community to share a common value coordinate that transcends differences in development levels and ideological barriers? The answer is yes. The reason is that the current globalization has evolved into a kind of overall globalization, and the “harmony logic”

contained in the Community of Common Destiny is the most appropriate expression of the common values of equal subjects of international exchanges in the context of this overall globalization. The most positive factor of Progressivism in the “peace logic” is to respect the right of each country’s subject to express and safeguard its own interests. At the same time, it also emphasizes the obligation of all countries to respect the interests of others and seek coexistence and common prosperity from the perspective of solidarity and destiny.

The proposal of the Community of Common Destiny is based on the accurate judgment that contemporary globalization has entered the overall globalization, which also means that globalization has moved from the early digestion logic to the positive constructive logic. Contemporary globalization also means that the “Universal value” dominated by the West has gradually been replaced by the “consensus” human “common value”. It means that globalization has transformed from a one-sided logic of capital expansion and human alienation to a logic of unified values for human survival and development). The Community of Common Destiny has freed the “face to face” of all civilizations from the only choice of confrontation and conflict, changed the jungle law of national exchanges, and rewritten the fixed historical script of the stronger and the weaker, providing the real reality of peace, development, fairness, justice, democracy and freedom. “Peace, development, fairness, justice, democracy and freedom are the common values of all mankind and the lofty goals of the United Nations.

### **4.3. The uniqueness and inevitability of sinicized Marxism and the “harmony logic” of the Community of Common Destiny**

It is unique and inevitable for China to propose and promote the “harmony logic” of a Community of Common Destiny. The uniqueness is based on China’s unique national conditions and historical circumstances, profound cultural traditions, and the inevitability is based on the CPC’s inheritance of the theoretical characteristics of Marxism, as well as its unique path of dissemination in China.

As previously analyzed, Marxism, as a cultural Progressivism that transcends the theory of cultural evolution and Cultural relativism, is neither a conservative conservative nor an exclusive radicalism. The foundation of Marx’s philosophical revolution lies in the establishment of the position of “practice”. It should be said that Marx’s inheritance of practical philosophy from ancient Greece and modern times not only rooted it in the long cultural traditions of the West, drew the source of life from the blood of Western culture, but also completed the sublation and transcendence of predecessors based on modern practical circumstances, becoming a widely recognized theory in the West that has had a huge and far-reaching impact on modern world reality. In this sense, Marxism belongs to the West.

However, when Marxism was introduced to China in the early 20th century, it embarked on a path of integration of Chinese and Western cultural spirits from the beginning. This integration was first reflected in the development and dissemination of Marxism in Japan. The effective integration of Chinese and Western cultural spirit can unleash a huge cultural driving force in practice, which is evident in the modern development history of Japan. The true contact and

dissemination of Marxism among Chinese people began in Japan. The thoughts of China’s first batch of Marxists, such as Li Dazhao, Chen Duxiu, Li Da, Li Hanjun, Lu Xun, etc., all grew up during their study in Japan. Japan has similar cultural genes to China. Its amazing development achievements in learning from the West in modern times attracted a large number of Chinese young patriots to Fusang in the early 20th century to find a way to save the country and the people. They were deeply influenced by Japanese Marxist scholars. Because of the origin of Culture of Japan and Chinese traditional culture, most Japanese Marxist scholars have profound knowledge of Chinese traditional culture. For example, the most prominent one, Mr. Hajime Kawakami, is very good at using the words of Confucius and Mencius to explain Marxist theory, and this feature has also been absorbed by the first group of Chinese Marxists deeply influenced by it. For example, Li Dazhao often quotes Hajime Kawakami’s remarks and analogies to promote Marxism. The combination of Marxism and Chinese traditional culture has become a major feature in the process of Chinese Marxist philosophy’s localization in China. Therefore, it can be said that when Marxism spread from Western Europe to Eastern countries, it was no longer a ‘pure Western doctrine’ [9].

In addition, the dissemination and development of Marxism in China are not limited to a certain unique and fixed model of Marxism, nor even limited to certain existing assertions of the founder of this theory. This is because the CPC has realized the transformation of its attitude towards Marxism from spontaneity to consciousness, from rigid copying to creative development and application in the practice of revolution and construction. The combination of China’s specific national conditions, specific problems and specific analysis, and keeping pace with the times, has also made Marxism, which originally belonged to the West, continue to be sinicized and become “Marxism in China”. In the new era, with the development of Socialism with Chinese characteristics, it further demonstrates the possible prospect and theoretical potential of becoming a real “Marxism in the world” in practice. In this sense, Marxism also belongs to China.

The thought of the CPC is rooted in the long traditional culture of the Chinese nation. It takes the “harmony” culture as the foundation, the “world outlook” as the mind, and the basic position, principles and methods of Marxism, so as to creatively put forward the idea of “a community with a shared future for mankind”. In terms of uniqueness, in history, no other culture in the world has the inclusiveness and assimilation of Chinese culture, and no other ethnic group can surpass Chinese culture in advocating the cultural concept of “harmony and harmony”. From the perspective of the historical destiny of China’s long culture, traditional culture, based on the Zhongyuan culture, has always been in communication and integration with multi-ethnic cultures. It has experienced the contention of Hundred Schools of Thought such as Confucianism and Taoism, the encounter of agricultural civilization and nomadic civilization, and the collision of modern Chinese and Western cultures. Through thousands of years and difficulties, it has been renewed, fully demonstrating the strong capacity of acculturation and inspiration of Chinese culture. From the perspective of inevitability, China’s history since modern times has empirically determined that China’s rise must reduce its own development costs, can only choose peaceful rise, must abandon antagonistic thinking and hegemonic thinking, and

avoid the Thucydides Trap, which also makes most countries can believe when accepting the concept of “Community of Common Destiny” and the “The Belt and Road Initiative” proposition, and ignore the psychological burden caused by Chinese Century’s rise. Taking Marxism as the guiding ideology, the CPC has grasped the most brilliant modern cultural achievements in western civilization. As the successor of Chinese traditional culture, the CPC has developed Marxism in the process of Chinese revolutionary practice, making the convergence and resonance of Chinese and Western cultures a reality, and laying a realistic foundation for the Community of Common Destiny. The cultural Progressivism inherited, adhered to, advocated and developed by Chinese Marxism is also bound to become the cultural logic of the Community of Common Destiny.

Undoubtedly, in today’s world where peace and development have become the theme and globalization is roaring forward, “harmony logic” is far more approachable than “hegemonic logic”, and also far more inspiring than “adhering to logic”. Any culture is more suitable for adopting an attitude of equal respect, active speaking, and communication and integration with other cultures, otherwise it can only be marginalized. Like Marx, from the perspective of all mankind, it is undoubtedly the cultural mission of the CPC in the new era to promote the formation of common human values, to promote the construction of “world culture” based on the common interests and ultimate concern of mankind, and to vigorously promote the “Community of Common Destiny” based on which human destiny is closely related, developed and shared, beautiful and common.

## References

- [1] Xiaodan S , Yisheng P .Chinese Traditional Costume Culture Inheritances Study from the Marxist Cultural View Perspective by Taking Cheongsam as an Example[C]//0[2023-07-03].
- [2] Johnston, William M .NON-MARXIST CULTURAL CRITICISM IN FRANCE: ANOTHER POINT OF VIEW[J].Contemporary French Civilization, 1977, 1(2):203-206.DOI:10.3828/cfc.1977.1.2.005.
- [3] Pradhan S .Marxist cultural movements in India : chronicles and documents[M].Santi Pradhan : distributor, Pustak Bipani,1985.
- [4] Yi-Lin P , University J N .The Cultural Thought of New Democracy and Its Contemporary Value——from the perspective of Marxist cultural view[J].Journal of Shanxi Youth Vocational College, 2019, (11)82.
- [5] Feng-Shuang W , Li-Wei S , University J .An Analysis of the Construction of University Culture Under the Guidance of Marxist Cultural View[J].Heilongjiang Researches on Higher Education, 2019, (11)112.
- [6] Tingting W .Contemporary Significance of Marxist Cultural Perspectives ——In the construction of cultural identity and cultural tourism Perspective, 2019, (11)122.
- [7] Meiqun H , Deyuan H .A Brief Discussion on the Marxist Theory of the Essence of Culture[J].Contemporary Social Sciences, 2019, (11)142.
- [8] Xuan W .Practice Logic of Cultural Ethics of Spiritual Welfare-On Marxist Philosophical Views in "Survival Security"[J].Journal of Hefei University of Technology(Social Sciences) , 2019, (11)162.
- [9] Molyneux J .A Visit to the Museum - notes on Culture and Barbarism[J].Irish Marxist Review, 2019, (11)152.