

On Engels' Critique of Capitalist Modernization and Its Contemporary Implications

—Based on a Comprehensive Analysis of Engels' Major Works

HanFei Wang

Southwest Jiaotong University, Chengdu, China

Abstract: As a proletarian revolutionary closely linked to industry and commerce, Friedrich Engels had profound practical experience with the advanced productive forces of capitalist society. By criticizing capitalism for its historical crimes, he completed a dual transformation, which enabled him, alongside Karl Marx, to transcend the utopian critiques of capitalism raised by earlier socialists. In their critique of capitalist society, they elucidated the path of transformation, general characteristics, and prospects of a new social formation, thereby charting a course and direction for the cause of proletarian liberation. An analysis of capitalist modernization and its developmental trajectory in Engels' key works from different periods helps to form a Marxist holistic understanding of the theoretical evolution of scientific socialism and the scientific socialist essence of socialism with Chinese characteristics. It also facilitates a deeper interpretation of the features of the Chinese path to modernization and its transcendence over capitalist modernization, offering significant insights for upholding and developing socialism with Chinese characteristics.

Keywords: Friedrich Engels; Capitalist Modernization; Chinese path to modernization; Engels' Critical Theory



Copyright © 2026 by author (s) and SciScan Publishing Limited

This article is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/). <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Engels was born into a factory owner's family in Barmen. He engaged in capitalist industrial and commercial activities for a long time in Germany and Britain, and even traveled to the Americas to study the latest development of capitalism. In his later years, he foresaw the latest trend of free capitalism evolving into monopoly capitalism, making him both a witness and participant in capitalist modernization. Marx and Engels jointly established and developed Marxism, offering profound critiques of the flaws in capitalist modernization across economic, political, and ideological dimensions. While recognizing the consistency of their critical stances and methods towards capitalism, we should also acknowledge Engels' independent theoretical discoveries in the course of his ideological transformation, as well as his unique contributions to the critique of capitalist modernization. Analyzing Engels' critiques of capitalist modernization in his key texts from different periods, along with the evolution of his critical approach, helps us understand the formation and development of Marxist classical thinkers from their theoretical origins. This understanding enables us to more

Author Introduction: Hanfei Wang is a master's student majoring in Marxist Theory at the School of Marxism, Southwest Jiaotong University. His research focuses on Party building.

Article Citation: Wang, H. F. (2026). On Engels' Critique of Capitalist Modernization and Its Contemporary Implications—Based on a Comprehensive Analysis of Engels' Major Works. *New Exploration of Ideology and Politics*, 8(2), 238–247.

concretely comprehend China's modernization path and draw scientific insights from the ideas of these classical thinkers.

1 The Change of Engels' Critical Position on Capitalist Modernization

Reviewing the development course of Engels' thought and the history of Marxism, we can see that Engels' criticism of capitalist modernization has a process of maturity and development. The evolution of Engels' stance can be characterized by two primary shifts: from the humanitarian critical stance of progressive thought to the philosophical criticism of communism, and from the philosophical criticism of communism to the scientific criticism of socialism.

1.1 From Humanism to Utopian Communism

Engels' transition from humanism to utopian communism spanned three distinct periods: Bremen, Berlin and Britain. Influenced by the liberal ideas promoted by the "Young Germany" group, Engels gradually distanced himself from religious piety during his time in Bremen. *Letters from the Wuppertal Valley* stands as one of the most critical works from his youth. In this document, Engels condemned the inhumane exploitation of workers by factory owners, while religious superstition served as their moral shield. He revealed the hypocrisy of the industrial elite, which reflected his clear humanitarian stance in his early years. Engels fiercely criticized the factory owners' anti-humanitarian practices and the prevalence of religious mysticism, which had reduced the living conditions of the people in Wuppertal to a dreadful state. His critique of religious superstition and capitalist factories further awakened his ideological consciousness through profound ideological struggles. Strauss's seminal work, *The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined*, a representative figure of the Young Hegelians, prompted Engels to depart from the Young German School and embrace the Young Hegelians. During his auditing period at the University of Berlin from late September 1841 to early October 1842, Engels actively participated in Young Hegelian activities and criticized Schelling's philosophy of revelation. Like Marx, Engels shared certain common ground with the Young Hegelians in inheriting Hegelian philosophy. At the same time, both opposed their tendency to indulge in empty theorizing and abstract criticism, while avoiding practical issues. Engels' youthful focus on the social reality foundation and the influence of Hegelian philosophy's revolutionary core laid the groundwork for his shift from humanitarian progress to communism. Besides Hegel's philosophy, Engels was also deeply influenced by utopian communism, including the communist thought of Hess. Unlike Marx, the young Engels transitioned to communism more directly.

1.2 From Utopian Communism to Scientific Socialism

In the 1840s, certain factions within Hegelian philosophy inevitably advanced their philosophical conclusions toward communism. Given Hess's close ties with the *Rheinische Zeitung*, it was evident that the vanguard of the Young Hegelians would be influenced by Hess's communist ideology, with Marx and Engels being its most prominent representatives. However, regardless of the specific communist doctrine Engels embraced at this time—whether derived from his earlier writings—his stance had evolved beyond mere humanistic criticism of capitalist evils to embrace a more pragmatic form of communism. His worldview also gradually broke free from Hegelian idealism. Engels' true transcendence of religious theology was achieved during his military service in Berlin through reading Feuerbach's *The Essence of Christianity*. In November 1842, Engels immersed himself in commercial practices in Manchester, gaining firsthand insight into the living conditions of Britain's most advanced capitalist workers. Through studying

classical political economy and utopian communist works, he leveraged communist theory to more thoroughly reveal the production relations and class antagonisms in capitalist society. This approach went beyond conventional moral criticism, reflecting Engels' persistent focus on the material realities of society. He analyzed British social relations, examined the political parties and their represented social classes, and recognized that the root of their contradictions and struggles lay in their respective material interests. During this period, works such as *Progress in Social Reform on the Continent* and *Outlines of a Critique of Political Economy* best exemplified Engels' evolving stance.

Engels strove to explore the social historical roots of communist thought, regarding it as an inevitable trend in the future social transformation rather than a religious or utopian moral utopia or social blueprint. In *Outlines of a Critique of Political Economy*, Engels critiqued the core categories of bourgeois political economy by examining the mode of material production, revealing its class nature and limitations. Engels not only exposed the contradictions and immorality of the capitalist system in *Outlines of a Critique of Political Economy*, but also recognized the historical inevitability of social revolution occurring within capitalism in accordance with laws. He pointed out that cyclical economic crises are essentially the externalization of the contradiction between productive forces and production relations, which will inevitably lead to social revolution. The article *The Condition of England—A Review of Thomas Carlyle's Past and Present* focused on criticizing Carlyle's idealistic religious views and heroic historical perspective, elucidating the essence of religion and the fundamental path to its elimination. It profoundly analyzed and revealed the decisive role of material interests in social development and the great historical role of the proletariat. Engels' summary of the views of utopian communism, his criticism of the capitalist mode of production and his revelation of its inherent contradictions have gone beyond the general utopian communist thinkers. Engels' two seminal works, *A Contribution to the Critique of National Economics* and *The British Condition: A Review of Thomas Carlyle's Past and Present*, published in the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*, marked the completion of his "two transformations" (the two fundamental transformations). His practical struggles and theoretical achievements demonstrated that through persistent exploration, Engels realized a fundamental turn from historical idealism to historical materialism, and from revolutionary democracy to communism. These "two transformations" laid the theoretical and principled foundation for Engels' thorough scientific critique of capitalist modernization.

2 Theme of Engels' Critique of Capitalist Modernization

In the process of realizing the "two transformations", Engels consistently focused on the impact of capitalist development across economic, political, and ideological spheres. After establishing the worldview and stance of scientific socialism, his critique of capitalist modernization deepened further. In *Progress of Social Reform on the Continent*, Engels argued that Britain advanced toward communism through practice, France through politics, and Germany through philosophy. In the works of Marx and Engels, the modern state often refers to the capitalist state apparatus, and modern society to capitalist society. Thus, Engels' critique of capitalist modernization can be summarized into three major themes: critique of the mode of production, critique of the political state, and critique of ideology.

2.1 Critique of Production Mode

The capitalist mode of production engenders alienation and the alienation of human existence. The root of all

working-class suffering lies in capitalist society. Engels emphasized that the miserable plight of the working class stems not from individual flaws but from the capitalist system itself. Although *The Condition of the Working Class in England* does not explicitly use the term “alienation”, it exposes the inhuman living conditions of the working class under capitalist production, rich in alienation concepts. In this work, Engels comprehensively depicts the harsh living conditions of the working class, their low moral standards, and the bourgeois class’s adherence to self-interest, among other manifestations of alienation (Engels, 1957). Engels argued that poverty and the compulsory nature of labor were the direct causes of worker alienation. For the British working class at the time, basic survival needs remained unmet, leaving no room for enjoyment or creativity in life. With no alternative means of livelihood beyond selling their labor, workers had no choice but to endure the harsh and oppressive working conditions in capitalist factories—a reality they accepted under the pressure of social survival.

The capitalist mode of production has intensified ethnic oppression and the urban-rural divide. In *The Communist Manifesto*, Marx and Engels pointed out: “The bourgeoisie has subjected the countryside to the rule of the towns. It has created enormous cities, has greatly increased the urban population as compared with the rural, and has thus rescued a considerable part of the population from the idiocy of rural existence. Just as it has made the country dependent on the towns, so it has made barbarian and semi-barbarian countries dependent on the civilised ones, nations of peasants on nations of the bourgeoisie, the East on the West.”(Marx & Engels, 1976) Marx and Engels pointed out that the opposition between urban and rural areas has its roots in the social division of labor formed by history. However, the root cause is still the problem of ownership, and the opposition between urban and rural areas can only exist in the scope of private ownership. Engels pointed out in *The Housing Question*: “Far from being able to abolish this antithesis, capitalist society, on the contrary, is compelled to intensify it day by day.”(Engels, 1976) The bourgeoisie, according to their own will and image, has drawn all nations into the capitalist mode, compelling those unwilling to perish in bourgeois states to transform themselves through this system. While the expansion of capitalist production enabled Europe’s major capitalist powers to establish colonial rule over the world, oppressed nations like Poland and Ireland in Europe suffered devastating consequences. Moreover, the bourgeoisie actively incited ethnic conflicts and massacres to divide the working class.

The capitalist mode of production has deteriorated the natural ecology and living environment. In his seminal work *Letters from the Wuppertal Valley*, Friedrich Engels identified the detrimental effects of capitalist production on both natural and living environments. The Wuppertal River, dyed red by textile mills, became a living hell where workers endured extreme conditions, suffering from respiratory diseases and other ailments. Engels argued that the bourgeoisie was unable to eliminate the abysmal living conditions of the working class but only transferred these social contradictions to other regions. Drawing on his observations in England, Engels systematically clarified the responsibility of the capitalist mode of production for the degradation of workers’ living environments “The same economic necessity which produced them in the first place produces them in the next place also. As long as the capitalist mode of production continues to exist, it is folly to hope for an isolated settlement of *The Housing Question* or of any other social question affecting it.”(Engels, 1976)

2.2 Critique of the Political State

The bourgeois state is a state with false universality. The enslavement of individuals in a capitalist society is disguised, ostensibly taking the form of the utmost freedom. Still, in essence, it represents the expansion of

bourgeois property and other alienating factors. Even democratic states are merely illusory communities, beneath which the actual class struggle unfolds. A bourgeois state that has abolished legal privileges is not a social community, but merely a “community” of bourgeois interests. As pointed out in *The Communist Manifesto*, since the disintegration of primitive society, the history of all societies has been the history of class struggle (Marx & Engels, 1976). Like all previous social formations, capitalist society has not eliminated class antagonism, but merely replaced old forms of class opposition with new ones. Moreover, capitalist society has split into two directly opposing classes: the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. With the spread of democratic rights, men in a capitalist society have essentially gained voting rights based on property. The bourgeois state formally adopts a one-person-one-vote system, allowing all voting-capable bourgeois and proletarian citizens to participate in political life, thereby creating the illusion that the state is a tool for class reconciliation. Engels profoundly criticized the false form of bourgeois democracy, maintaining a consistent view in both his youth and later works: the equality of democracy is utopian, and pure democracy cannot eliminate societal ills.

The bourgeois state is essentially a tool for the violent suppression of the proletariat. The Industrial Revolution maximized the development of bourgeois wealth and power, establishing the bourgeoisie as the ruling class domestically. In representative states, the bourgeoisie secured a de facto political monopoly. The state apparatus essentially serves as a tool to suppress the oppressed and exploited classes. The political power and legal systems of bourgeois society were originally designed to protect the property-owning class against the proletariat. Whereas feudal states served as institutions for aristocrats to suppress peasants, modern bourgeois representative states function as tools for capital to exploit wage labor. The state is not a superordinate force over society but an inevitable product of the socio-economic base. The brutal suppression and bloodshed suffered by the proletariat following the failure of the June 1848 Revolution demonstrated the frenzied and brutal means the bourgeoisie would employ to retaliate against the proletariat. The suppression of the proletariat by the bourgeois state reached new extremes after the failure of the Paris Commune. In summary, whether in democratic republics or monarchies, the state is ultimately a machine for one class to suppress another.

The bourgeois state relies on reformism to deceive, bribe, and co-opt the working class. While maintaining its dictatorship over the broad masses of laborers, including the proletariat, the bourgeois state also makes partial concessions under pressure from revolutionary mass movements, formally recognizing the outcomes of struggles through legal means. Within the bourgeoisie, some individuals propose their own socialist ideas to reform capitalist society while attempting to eliminate its ills without completely abolishing private ownership. To suppress scientific socialism and prop up reformist elements onto the public stage, the bourgeoisie uses newspapers and public platforms to propagate reformist ideologies. The bourgeois reformist offensive has shaken and even led to defections among ideologically unstable proletarian factions. Propaganda spread by infiltrated reformists further divides and destabilizes the proletarian front. Engels firmly stood on the Marxist position in opposing Lassalle’s “state socialism”, Dühringism, and reformist tendencies within the Second International, criticizing this “socialism” that attempted to reconcile contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

2.3 Ideological Criticism

The bourgeoisie distorts private ownership and its derived ideas into an eternal, super-class category. By controlling both material and spiritual production means, they present their own interests as the common interests of society, thereby endowing their thoughts with the form of universality. In *Anti-Dühring: Herr Eugen Dühring's Revolution in*

Science, Engels criticized Dühring's fallacy of packaging ideas under specific historical conditions as "eternal truths". Engels argues that people's ethical concepts are always shaped by economic relations of production and exchange, making all previous moral theories ultimately products of their respective social and economic conditions. Since society continues to operate through class antagonism, morality remains class-based—humanity has yet to transcend class-based morality in a class society. Only after the elimination of class antagonism can the transcendence of class and the real morality of human beings become possible (Engels, 2022).

The bourgeois ideology has fueled the deterioration of social morals. The bourgeois society, built upon the poverty and suffering of the working masses, has failed to realize the ideals of rationalism but instead allowed the spread of bourgeois egoism. From Engels' observations during his youth in England, it becomes evident how the corrupt state of the bourgeoisie as the dominant social force, along with their conservative, narrow-minded, and selfish stance, has led to the widespread deterioration of social morals. In the eyes of the bourgeoisie, nothing in the world exists except for money. Every aspect of bourgeois life—from interpersonal relationships to language expression—is permeated with a naked money-centric spirit. The exploitation, enslavement, and contempt of people with low incomes permeate all ideologies within bourgeois society, from Malthusian population theory to legal thought. As representatives of social civilization, the bourgeoisie indulge in a decadent lifestyle. The harsh living conditions imposed by the bourgeoisie on the proletariat reduce the proletariat to indulging in vulgar desires, thus driving up the social crime rate.

The bourgeoisie attacks communism from their narrow point of view. Marx and Engels pointed out in *The Communist Manifesto*: "In bourgeois society, capital is independent and has individuality, while the living person is dependent and has no individuality." (Marx & Engels, 1976) Communists aim to abolish the so-called freedom of capital to exploit and enslave labor. Thus, the private property they seek to abolish includes bourgeois assets and ownership structures that the majority of society members have never possessed. The very crimes and moral decay that bourgeois society fosters are precisely what it promotes. While hypocritically condemning the proletarian class's the distorted living conditions of the proletariat, the bourgeoisie indulges in extravagant material pleasures.

3 Limitations of Capitalist Modernization and the Chinese path to modernization's Transcendence of Capitalist Modernization

3.1 Limitations of Capitalist Modernization

Capitalist modernization is essentially a modernization driven by the logic of capital, and the capitalist mode of production determines that capitalist modernization has inherent and insurmountable contradictions. Capitalist modernization is the modernization of capital supremacy and polarization. The enormous productive forces created by capitalist society cannot be fully exploited to advance social and human progress. Instead, they have become instruments for capital accumulation and means of bourgeois indulgence, thus widening the income gap within the capitalist system. To date, capitalist modernization has only produced a small high-income bourgeois elite in developing nations, while creating a few affluent regions amidst global poverty. Capital's worldwide expansion has neither addressed social issues in developing countries nor improved conditions in capital-exporting nations. Conflicts and tensions within capitalist societies—whether in developed or developing countries—have intensified. From the three major labor movements in 19th-century Europe to the 21st-century Occupy Wall Street Movement, these events vividly reflect the sufferings and

profound grievances of the underprivileged in advanced capitalist nations.

The aggressive expansion of the capitalist system through violence accompanies the modernization of capitalism. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels depicted the world order in the post-Industrial Revolution era, characterized by Western dominance over the East and North over the South. This Western-centric global framework fostered Western hegemony and the doctrine of Western institutional superiority. Through direct regime overthrow or opposition interference, Western powers repeatedly obstructed developing nations from pursuing diversified development paths, ultimately aiming to establish a hegemonic system that monopolizes modernization achievements.

Capitalist modernization is inherently unjust. At its core lies the injustice of legal rights and factual injustices, manifesting capitalism as a systemic injustice. As the dominant socio-economic system in the world, capitalism not only directly threatens human progress but also jeopardizes human survival. The neoliberal capitalist-dominated world order has already posed a real threat to the continuity of human civilization. Under capitalist conditions, moral restraints are confined to abstract forms, exhibiting false characteristics. The freedom and equality promoted by capitalist civilization serve as a facade to conceal inequality and exploitation. Modernization symbolizes human societal progress, yet the bourgeoisie's fundamental purpose in driving modernization is not to benefit humanity but to establish a ruling order and exploitative structure where developed nations oppress developing ones. Modernization should promote the all-round development of individuals, but it has created "material dependency". While enriching people's material and spiritual lives, it has also caused alienation and spiritual emptiness. Therefore, capitalist modernization is also a modernization fraught with justice paradoxes.

3.2 Chinese path to modernization Transcends Capitalist Modernization

The Chinese path to modernization has transcended the capitalist modernization paradigm that prioritizes capital. Capital exercises a dominant power over labor and its products, with capital supremacy being the primary pursuit of the capitalist system and capitalists. In contrast, the Chinese path to modernization takes people-centered development as its core value of institutional construction, reflecting the socialist principle of "people-first" values. As a socialist modernization, it consistently prioritizes "people-oriented" principles, regarding people's wellbeing as its fundamental starting point and ultimate objective of modernization. This approach highlights the advantages of the socialist system and its people-oriented value orientation in the new historical phase.

The Chinese path to modernization has achieved a transcendence of the hegemony of capitalist modernization systems. Institutional hegemony refers to the view held by capitalist countries that bourgeois democratic systems and market economy models are universally applicable templates for modern institutions. After the Cold War, this institutional universalism further translated into the policy practices of the "end of history" and the "Washington Consensus". A few capitalist countries monopolized the discourse on modernization, clinging to the illusion that "modernization equals Westernization" and "Western civilization equals modern civilization". The great practice of the Chinese path to modernization has shattered the false myth that "modernization is equivalent to Westernization", not only providing the world with a new model of modernization but also providing Chinese solutions to such challenges as upholding long-term peace and stability, eradicating extreme poverty, promoting common development, and addressing climate change.

The Chinese path to modernization has transcended the unjust values inherent in capitalist modernization. Marxism directly addresses the structural and production mode essence of capitalism, exposing its exploitative cruelty and

coercive nature while analyzing the comprehensive injustice in capitalist society's fundamental, moral, and institutional aspects. Capitalist society is rife with moral decay and bourgeois hypocrisy. Laws, morals, and religion embody bourgeois prejudices, with bourgeois interests lurking behind these biases. The characteristics and essential requirements of the Chinese path to modernization elucidate the rich connotations and practical paths of upholding fairness and justice from multiple perspectives, integrating social fairness and justice into the processes of wealth creation and distribution. This embodies the unity of equal opportunities and outcomes, as well as procedural and substantive justice.

4 The Enlightenment of Engels' Criticism of Capitalist Modernization

Chinese Communists are faithful inheritors of Marxism. When criticizing the old society, the classical Marxist writers also described the general characteristics and development prospects of an ideal new society. Understanding Engels' critique of capitalist modernization helps us grasp the scientific connotation of the Chinese path to modernization, correctly comprehend the essence of scientific socialism in China's socialism with Chinese characteristics, and acquire the intellectual wisdom to advance the Chinese path to modernization.

Serving the people constitutes the cornerstone of modernization. The Chinese path to modernization is a people-centered approach that transcends the logic of capital accumulation, capital materialization, and capital power. Its goal goes beyond material prosperity to creating opportunities for the free and comprehensive development of individuals. In this model, people's livelihood takes precedence. The essence of modernization lies in human development. Fulfilling the people's aspirations for a better life is the fundamental mission of the Communist Party of China and the starting point of modernization efforts. Only by adhering to a people-centered development philosophy—ensuring development serves the people, relies on the people, and shares its fruits with the people—can we establish a sound development and modernization perspective. Rooted in the principle of putting people first, the Chinese path to modernization prioritizes high-quality development as the primary task in building a modern socialist country. It promotes whole-process people's democracy, enriches the spiritual world of the people, and achieves common prosperity for all. The Chinese path to modernization is socialist modernization, not any other form. Socialist production aims to enhance people's material and cultural living standards and meet their needs for a better life. Since the 18th National Congress of the Communist Party of China, the Central Committee with Comrade Xi Jinping at its core has continuously advanced people-oriented reforms. In this process, sustained efforts have been made to ensure childcare, education, employment, healthcare, elderly care, housing, and support for vulnerable groups, fully demonstrating the Communist Party's original mission and people-first ethos.

We must adhere to a modernization that pursues harmony between humans and nature. Human society's existence and development are rooted in the natural world, where labor and nature jointly form the source of wealth. Through human activities, nature has gradually been marked by human influence. In *Dialectics of Nature*, Engels argued that the capitalist production mode, pursuing profit maximization, leads to excessive exploitation and consumption of natural resources, thereby damaging the ecological environment, disrupting the balance between humans and nature, and creating alienation. Only by abolishing the capitalist mode of production and establishing a socialist one can human beings achieve harmonious coexistence with nature. The capitalist production model disrupts the natural material cycle between humans and nature, exacerbating ecological crises. Chinese path to modernization explicitly advocates "harmony between humanity and nature" as one of its core

principles, representing a conscious practice of Engels' ecological philosophy and adaptation to contemporary development. Modernization should not be about conquering nature but exploring harmonious coexistence. To resolve the current conflict between humans and nature, we must adhere to the principle that "lucid waters and lush mountains are invaluable assets", abide by ecological laws and coordinate economic development with ecological conservation. This requires achieving organic unity between socioeconomic and ecological benefits, leveraging institutional advantages, implementing sustainable development strategies, promoting comprehensive green transformation, and building a modern society where humanity and nature coexist in harmony.

Adhere to modernization that seeks progress for humanity. On one hand, capitalist modernization created the world market, greatly promoting the exchange and communication between different nations and peoples; on the other hand, it used bloody colonialism and hegemonism to sacrifice the interests of the majority of humanity for the interests of a small number of countries for the benefit of individual countries and national blocs, making the entire human society bear the cost of development. Contemporary economic globalization is essentially a new round of global expansion by developed capitalist countries, an extension of the logic of capital appreciation worldwide. Unequal and unjust economic globalization has not brought universal peace and prosperity, but rather deepened the opposition between upstream and downstream countries in the industrial chain, as well as between developed and developing countries. Promoting the building of a community with a shared future for humanity is not only a strategic choice for China to address the challenges of the times, but also an essential requirement of the Chinese path to modernization. In the historical process of realizing the socialist modernization of China, the Communist Party of China not only has the "China Dream" of achieving the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation, but also the "World Dream" of striving for the cause of human progress. This dream is to build a community with a shared future for humanity together with the people of the world on the path of China's peaceful development. The path of China's path to modernization is to unswervingly follow the path of China's peaceful development, and to unswervingly advance the building of a community with a shared future for humanity together with the people of all countries in the world.

5 Conclusion

Socialism has never failed China, and China has never strayed from socialism. The historic achievements of Chinese path to modernization and its historical contributions to the progress of human civilization to the development of human civilization are the most powerful proof of Marxism. The Chinese path to modernization, which is committed to achieving common prosperity for all and adheres to the path of peaceful development, has created a new form of human civilization and presented a new vision of development to the world. The Chinese path to modernization inherits and innovates the principles, positions, and methods of Marxist classic writers, and also transcends capitalist modernization. The success of the Chinese path to modernization practice has shattered the myth of "modernization equals Westernization" and the wrong conclusion of the "end of history", demonstrating the superiority of the socialist system and the true power of Marxism. Chinese path to modernization not only provides a new choice for humanity to achieve modernization but also enhances the global influence of Marxism in addressing the questions of China, the world, the people and the times.

References

- [1] Engels, F. (1957). The Condition of the Working Class in England. In K. Marx & F. Engels, *Collected Works of Marx and Engels* (Vol. 2). People's Publishing House.
- [2] Engels, F. (1976). Socialism: Utopian and Scientific. In K. Marx & F. Engels, *Selected Works of Marx and Engels* (Vol. 3). People's Publishing House.
- [3] Engels, F. (2022). *Anti-Dühring: Herr Eugen Dühring's Revolution in Science*. People's Publishing House.
- [4] Marx, K, & Engels, F. (1976). Manifesto of the Communist Party. In K. Marx & F. Engels, *Selected Works of Marx and Engels* (Vol. 1, p. 112). People's Publishing House.