

Research on the Practical Paths of Comprehensive Rural Revitalization from the Perspective of the Sinicization and Modernization of Marxism

Yunlong Zhu*

School of Marxism, Qinghai University, Xining 810000, Qinghai, China

*Corresponding author: Yunlong Zhu, 1737852839@qq.com

Copyright: © 2025 Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), permitting distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is cited.

Abstract: Rural revitalization and common prosperity are crucial strategies in the new era, highly consistent with Marxist theories. Currently, rural revitalization faces challenges such as unbalanced urban-rural development and insufficient sustainable industrial capabilities. Prominent issues include unequal resource allocation, the “hollowing out” of rural areas, and industrial homogenization. To address these, guidance from Marxist systematic thinking is essential. This involves comprehensively promoting the “Five Revitalizations,” facilitating two-way flow of urban-rural elements, synergizing industrial integration with technological innovation to extend the agricultural industry chain, enhancing innovation in county-level government functions to optimize governance models, and refining top-level design using systematic thinking principles. Additionally, coordinated development of rural material and spiritual civilization can be achieved by improving talent policies and innovating cultural cultivation mechanisms, thus advancing balanced urban-rural development and realizing the goal of common prosperity.

Keywords: Rural revitalization; Common prosperity; Urban-rural integration

Online publication: October 20, 2025

1. Introduction

Marxist historical materialism points out that the ultimate goal of social development is to achieve the free and all-round development of individuals and social fairness and justice, which is highly consistent with the value pursuit of common prosperity; while rural revitalization, as the overarching approach to solving the “three rural” issues, is the only path to common prosperity. The phased goals of the rural revitalization strategy are deeply integrated into the historical process of common prosperity. The two share internal unity in strategic direction, implementation paths, and value orientation, collectively serving the grand blueprint of building a great modern socialist country. In-depth analysis of their internal connections and practical challenges is of great significance

for promoting the Sinicization and modernization of Marxism to take root in rural practices.^[1]

2. Challenges faced in the practice of comprehensive rural revitalization amid the promotion of sinicization and modernization of Marxism

2.1. The urban-rural development gap needs to be narrowed

Despite the accelerating pace of urban-rural integration in recent years, the long-standing dual structure has yet to fundamentally change the pattern of resource allocation favoring cities. In terms of educational resources, rural schools suffer from weak faculty, as a large number of excellent teachers have migrated to cities, making it difficult for rural students to access high-quality education. Although rural roads, networks, and other facilities have improved to some extent, there is still a clear disparity compared to the convenience and coverage in cities. Problems such as narrow rural roads, poor road conditions, unstable network signals, and slow internet speeds persist.

These issues have led to a continuous outflow of young and middle-aged labor to cities in pursuit of better opportunities, exacerbating the “hollowing-out” of rural areas. The disconnect in urban-rural industrial development has further widened this gap: rural areas are dominated by traditional agriculture, with lagging secondary and tertiary industries that have not formed a modern system, while urban secondary and tertiary industries are relatively mature. Problems such as unsmooth factor flow, unbalanced resource allocation, and slow financial reforms have resulted in the absence of an urban-rural industrial integration mechanism, further fragmenting economic ties between cities and the countryside.^[2]

The structural mobility of rural populations has further plunged governance subjects into a “participation dilemma”: the Seventh National Population Census shows that the proportion of people aged 60 and above in rural areas reached 23.81% (7.99 percentage points higher than in urban areas), and the “silver-haired trend” has significantly reduced villagers’ ability to participate in public affairs; while the “semi-urbanization” mobility pattern of migrant workers has led to an average of less than 2 returns home per year, with villagers’ trust declining by 41% compared to 2010 and their willingness to participate in public affairs decreasing by 63%. This situation fully reflects that the Marxist theory of “urban-rural integration” has not yet been fully implemented in practice, and long-term unremitting efforts are still needed to achieve balanced urban-rural resource allocation.^[3]

2.2. Insufficient capacity for sustainable rural industrial development

Currently, rural industries in some areas face prominent problems such as homogenization, short value chains, and weak risk resistance. In the field of rural tourism, some villages blindly follow suit, imitating others that have succeeded in developing rural tourism without deeply exploring their own characteristics. Behind this dilemma lies the issue of the role positioning of county-level governments in rural revitalization—some county-level governments tend to “focus on short-term project implementation rather than long-term industrial planning,” failing to effectively integrate resources to promote the integration of primary, secondary, and tertiary industries, leading to intensified industrial homogenization. This series of problems reveals that in the process of industrial development, some regions have not fully applied the Marxist method of “analyzing specific problems in detail,” failing to deeply study local resource advantages and market demands to form unique core competitiveness. At the same time, there is a lack of in-depth grasp of market laws, and blindness exists in industrial planning and development, making it difficult for industries to develop sustainably.^[4]

3. Pathways for promoting comprehensive rural revitalization under the guidance of the sinicization and modernization of marxism

3.1. Coordinating the promotion of the “Five Revitalizations”

Based on Marxist systematic thinking, constructing a collaborative mechanism for the revitalization of industry, talent, culture, ecology, and organization is an inevitable requirement for achieving comprehensive rural revitalization. Marxist systematic thinking profoundly reveals that things are organically interconnected wholes. In the rural revitalization strategy, the “Five Revitalizations” do not exist in isolation but are interdependent and mutually reinforcing, requiring a mechanism of mutual support and coordinated promotion. Driving integrated urban-rural development is key to strengthening the dynamic foundation of rural areas—by breaking the urban-rural dual structure and promoting the two-way flow of factors such as talent and capital, it can not only attract local talent who “were born in the countryside and understand it” to return for entrepreneurship but also introduce professional talent, fundamentally solving the problem of rural “hollowing-out”.

Industrial revitalization, as the foundation of rural revitalization, provides stable economic support for rural areas by developing characteristic industries, while creating favorable conditions for talent attraction, cultural inheritance, and ecological construction. Talent revitalization is the key to rural revitalization. It is necessary to attract returning talent through preferential policies and strengthen the cultivation of local talent, providing strong intellectual support for industrial development and rural governance improvement. Of particular importance is enhancing farmers’ digital literacy to meet contemporary needs—there is currently a serious mismatch between farmers’ digital capabilities and technological development, and digital knowledge training can enhance their ability to use intelligent technologies. This represents a concrete practice of the Marxist theory of “all-round development of humanity” in the digital era.

Cultural revitalization is the soul of rural revitalization. A good ecological environment can not only support the development of green industries but also significantly improve rural livability, attracting talent and resource agglomeration. Innovating farmers’ organizational forms is an effective path to strengthen subject identity—encouraging farmers to participate in economic cooperatives and promoting the transformation of small-scale peasant production to scale operation upgrades farmers’ subjectivity from individual to “village-community community”. Organizational revitalization is the guarantee of rural revitalization. Strengthening the leading role of grass-roots organizations can effectively coordinate various resources, ensuring that the “Five Revitalizations” advance in the correct direction and in an orderly, collaborative manner.^[5]

The key to rural talent revitalization lies in breaking the dual dilemma of “insufficient quantity and low quality.” Based on the Marxist theory of “all-round development of humanity,” it is necessary to establish a talent support system that matches the needs of rural revitalization. In terms of cultivation, the model of Japan’s “Agricultural College” can be referenced, combining vocational skill training with academic education to focus on enhancing farmers’ digital literacy and innovative capabilities. In terms of attraction, policy combinations such as “subsidies for talent returning to start businesses + activation of homestead qualification rights” can reduce the cost of talent return. Pilot data from a certain province show that systematic talent policies can increase the success rate of returning talent entrepreneurship by 40%, directly driving rural industrial upgrading.^[6]

A good ecological environment serves as the fundamental guarantee for thriving industries. Ecological agriculture promotes industrial upgrading through green transformation, while ecological culture injects diverse values into the rural economy. These three elements jointly drive a virtuous cycle of “ecology-economy-culture.” Industrial revitalization, as the foundation of rural revitalization, provides stable economic support for rural areas by developing characteristic industries and creates favorable conditions for talent attraction, cultural inheritance,

and ecological construction. Talent revitalization is the key to rural revitalization. It is essential to attract returning talent through preferential policies and strengthen the cultivation of local talent, providing robust intellectual support for industrial development and rural governance improvement. Ecological revitalization not only concerns environmental governance but also serves as the core driving force for transforming agricultural production into an ecological model. Through the development of integrated agriculture, forestry, and animal husbandry, as well as creative agriculture, a win-win situation can be achieved in both ecological protection and industrial value-added. A good ecological environment can not only support the development of green industries but also significantly enhance rural livability, attracting talent and resource agglomeration. Organizational revitalization is the guarantee of rural revitalization.^[7]

3.2. Promoting the coordinated development of industrial integration and technological innovation

Rural industrial revitalization requires breaking through the bottleneck of a single - structure and constructing a development model driven by the dual engines of “integration of the three industries” and technological innovation. International experience shows that agricultural modernization and industrial integration are the core paths to rural economic diversification. By guiding agricultural scientific and technological innovation, the extension of the industrial chain to high - value - added links can be accelerated. “ Within this framework, rural industrial revitalization needs to establish a transmission mechanism of “technological innovation - industrial integration - farmers’ income increase.” On the one hand, relying on platforms such as agricultural science and technology parks, digital technology should be deeply integrated with traditional agriculture to develop smart agriculture. On the other hand, by learning from the integration model of “agriculture + cultural and creative industries + tourism.”^[8]

3.3. Strengthening top-level design and coordinated development by applying the principles of systematic thinking

The principle of hierarchy requires overall planning from three dimensions: macro, meso and micro. At the macro level, it is necessary to base on national strategies and regional characteristics, construct policy support systems for finance, talent, etc, and avoid “one-size-fits-all”. The meso level focuses on industrial upgrading and infrastructure construction. The micro level takes grass-roots governance as the core, and by enhancing villagers’ self-governance capacity, the principal role of farmers can be activated. This principle is also applicable to spatial layout. Regions, counties and villages need to be collaboratively planned, and production, living and ecological spaces should be reasonably zoned to achieve comprehensive revitalization.

The principle of openness emphasizes that rural revitalization needs to break through closure and achieve self-innovation through factor flow with the external environment. On the one hand, rural areas need to strengthen internal capabilities: improve infrastructure such as transportation and communication, optimize the business environment, and enhance farmers’ quality, so as to transform from “passive blood transfusion” to “active hematopoiesis”. On the other hand, multi-dimensional cooperation should be strengthened. It is necessary to not only give play to the dual role of government and market, but also promote urban-rural integration and regional collaboration, so as to facilitate the two-way flow of factors such as talent, technology and capital. For example, in East-West cooperation, the capital and talent advantages of the East can complement the resource endowments of the West, accelerating rural industrial upgrading.^[9]

3.4. Cultivating new rural civilization trends

The concepts of “harmonious coexistence between humanity and nature”, “thrift and frugality”, and “neighborhood mutual assistance” contained in the excellent traditional farming culture are consistent with the value orientation and spiritual essence of the socialist core values. Integrating the socialist core values into rural cultural construction is not only a response to the spirit of the times but also an inheritance and development of traditional farming culture.

In practice, cultural venues such as village history museums and folk museums can be constructed to showcase the historical changes of rural areas and traditional farming culture. Traditional folk activities, such as temple fairs and festival celebrations, can be organized to enhance villagers’ sense of identity and belonging to traditional culture. Meanwhile, platforms like the New Era Civilization Practice Centers can be utilized to carry out publicity activities for core socialist values, organize volunteer services, and advocate new civilized habits, such as promoting simplified weddings and funerals and resisting bad practices like extravagance and feudal superstition. In particular, through the construction of rural civilization, it is necessary to specifically address issues such as “insufficient knowledge and weak environmental awareness” among some villagers, transforming Marxist ecological concepts into a mode of production and living that emphasizes “harmonious coexistence between man and nature,” providing cultural support for rural ecological revitalization. By converging consensus on rural development through cultural identity and guiding social behavior through value orientation, rural cultural soft power can be transformed into spiritual motivation for rural revitalization, achieving coordinated development of rural material and spiritual civilization.^[10]

Disclosure statement

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Xia C, 2024, Implementation Effectiveness and Optimization Path of Promoting Comprehensive Rural Revitalization through Sound Rural Governance, *Agricultural Economy*, (12): 50-51.
- [2] Long W, Meng T, Fan S, 2024, Integrating New Urbanization with Comprehensive Rural Revitalization[J]. *Rural Work Communication*, (21): 35-36.
- [3] Press Conference on Answering Reporters’ Questions about the Main Data Results of the Seventh National Population Census [EB/OL]. 2021.05.11, 2025.01.25.
- [4] Yu X, 2024, From Rural Revitalization to Common Prosperity: Dilemmas, Practical Logic, and Implementation Pathways, *Agricultural Economy*, (12): 75-77.
- [5] Yin Z, Li L, Wu Z, 2024, Research on the Development of “Two Creations” of Excellent Traditional Chinese Culture Boosting Rural Revitalization, *Shanxi Agricultural Economy*, (24): 5-9.
- [6] Yang Z, 2024, Talent Cultivation Paths for Rural Revitalization in Higher Agricultural Institutions, *University*, (32): 1-2+205.
- [7] Shi J, 2024, Talent Development Strategies for Grassroots Party Organizations in the Context of Rural Revitalization, *China Collective Economy*, (35): 110-113.
- [8] Shi J, 2024, Rural Grassroots Party Building Leading Rural Revitalization: Goals, Foundations, and Pathways, *Chongqing Social Sciences*, (11): 60-74.

- [9] Wang X, Zou S, 2024, The Implications of Taiwan's Community Governance Experience for Mainland China's Rural Revitalization in the Context of Cross-Strait Integrated Development, *Taiwan Agricultural Research*, (06): 9-16.
- [10] Huang C, 2024, Reform Pathways to Advance Comprehensive Rural Revitalization from the Perspective of Urban-Rural Integrated Development, *New Horizons*, (06): 34-45.

Publisher's note

Bio-Byword Scientific Publishing remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.