

Triple Understanding and Chinese Expression of the Proposition That “Civil Society Determines the State”

YUAN Chenjia^{[a],*}

^[a]Ph.D. Candidate, School of Marxism, China University of Political Science and Law, Beijing, China.

*Corresponding author.

Received 18 September 2017; accepted 12 November 2017
Published online 26 December 2017

Abstract

“Civil society determines the state” is an early proposition of Marx. However, since reform and open, the change in understanding of it in domestic academia illustrates that the proposition still has practical meaning to China’s practice. The development of Chinese civil society and western civil society are in the synchronic historical context, and have many in common, but are the individual expression of their own historical experience. It is necessary to understand the connotation of the proposition that civil society determines the state from the perspective of economy, politics and culture, and investigate it in the particularity of contemporary China’s modernization practice. Chinese civil society is the labor equity in the condition of socialist market economy, and the determination role of civil society is realized by the correct leading of the Chinese Communist Party.

Key words: Civil society; State; Democracy; Cultural leading; Chinese practice

Yuan, C. J. (2017). Triple Understanding and Chinese Expression of the Proposition That “Civil Society Determines the State”. *Canadian Social Science*, 13(12), 45-51. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/css/article/view/10020>
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/10020>

INTRODUCTION

Since reform and open, especially in the 1990s, the establishment of socialist market economy made China’s civil society develop rapidly, and the relationship between

China’s civil society and the state also becomes the topic concerned by academia. In numerous research paths, the proposition of civil society determines the state, as a primary judgment of Marx on the relationship between civil society and the state, is an important entry point. At present, academia has gradually recognized that the proposition of Marx that civil society determines the state has guiding significance to China, but the particularity of the theoretical connotation of the proposition in today’s Chinese practice seems to be missed, which will be discussed in the paper.

1. TWO PERIODS OF RECOGNITION THE THEORY THAT CIVIL SOCIETY DETERMINES THE STATE

The recognition of the proposition that civil society determines the state can be divided into two periods. Before reform and open, it was mainly to investigate its role in the process of forming Marx’ historical materialism and its value was just in the level of thought history. After reform and open, China develops market economy, and civil society has become an undeniable existence of reality in China. The value of the practice of the proposition that civil society determines the state in China began to enter the theoretical horizon.

(a) Before reform and open, the recognition of the proposition that civil society determines the state focuses on the formation of the understanding of historical materialism

At the beginning, Marx’s recognition of the relationship between civil society and state was Hegel’s idealistic national view, that is, civil society was a real existence of internal contradiction. The realization of contradictory unity was possible in a higher national rationality, that is a state which is the existence as the highest concept, and so can determine the development

of civil society. However, there was a contradiction between the concept and the social practice by Marx in the period of *Rheinische Zeitung*, especially, the argument of the Act of Steal Wood in the Rhine council showed the important role of material interests in legislation. Marx began to question Hegel's idealistic national view. After that, affected by the methodology that Feuerbach materialism overturned Hegel's speculative philosophy, Marx completely reversed the relationship between civil society and state proposed by Hegel in *Criticism on Hegel's Legal Philosophy*, and realized the recognition of historical materialism of the relationship between civil society and state: family and civil society were the real foundation of a state, and "they are the existence form of a state...they are impetus" (*Karl Marx and Frederick Engels [Vol.3]*, 2002, p.11). Marx's recognition of the important status of civil society in historical development made Marx begin to trace social foundation downward and look for the source of historical development from civil society. Therefore, both the textbooks of the history of Marxist philosophy and research articles generally thought that "the proposal of the proposition that 'civil society determines the state' explored the road of Marx to historical materialism and was the bud of the establishment of historical materialism." (Huang, Shi, & Song, 1989, p.60; Wu, 1989) Marx also had a retrospective description of thought transformation in 1859. He said,

from 1842 to 1843, as the editor of *Rheinische Zeitung*, I first encountered the difficulty of expressing opinion about so-called material interests...in order to solve the question that troubled me, my first work is to critically analyze Hegel's legal philosophy...my study draws the conclusion: Legal relations as the form of a state cannot be understood from themselves but also cannot be understood by the general development of human's spirit. In contrast, they are from material life relations. Hegel summarized the sum of material life relations as "civil society" according to the precedent of British and French in the 18th century, and the dissection of civil society should be sought in political economics. (*Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels [Vol.2]*, 2012, pp.1-2)

Based on the research of the dissection of civil society by political economics, Marx obtained the theory of the basic contradiction of a society that productivity determines production relations, and economic foundation determines superstructure.

Understanding the meaning of civil society determines the state from the developmental history of Marxist thought is a consensus in academia. After Marxist thought matured, "economic basis determines superstructure" replaced civil society determines the state, which made the proposition that civil society determines the state only has historical meaning rather than theoretical principle status. Before reform and open, Chinese academia basically did not discuss the meaning of the proposition that civil society determines the state in China's real development.

(b) Since reform and open, the recognition of civil society determines the state was from the development of China's market economy

The rise of research on civil society in China is mainly due to two reasons: First, the development of socialist market economy in China improved China's private entity status, rapidly expanded private space, and constantly expanded the middle-class group. Second, in the early 1990s, the collapse of Soviet Union and eastern Europe made some scholars full of imagination of the development prospect of China's private field. Since then, a large number of domestic and foreign scholars began to discuss the connotation feature of civil society in China and the relationship between Chinese civil society and the state from their own theoretical perspective and academic field. The theoretical connotation and real meaning of Marx that civil society determines the state are also one of the focuses.

First, the re-understanding of the theoretical connotation of civil society determines the state is whether the proposition is equal to "economic basis determines superstructure". The present academia thought the two were not equal. Although Marx emphasized the connotation of economic basis of civil society, civil society also includes private field, social organization, and social life that is different from political life (Yu, 1993), so civil society is not the same as the economic basis. Moreover, the function of the two propositions is different. The proposition that economic basis determines superstructure is to reveal the momentum of social development from the perspective of the basic contradiction law of a society, while the proposition that civil society determines the state is to deeply investigate a society by analyzing the basic structure of the society. The two propositions are the interpretation of human social development law from different perspectives and levels (Li, 1996).

The recognition of the special value of the theoretical connotation of the proposition that civil society determines the state guides it to analyze the development of civil society in contemporary China. At present, academia mainly has the following views: First, the emergence of market economy made civil society separate from the state, and the material life relations in contemporary China is market economy, so China must have civil society, and Chinese civil society is not a false proposition; second, the basic role of civil society determines the importance and urgency of China to cultivate civil society; third, the proposition is connected with China's value concept of establishing harmonious society and insisting on "standard of society" in theory. The above views agree that Marx's proposition that Civil Society Determines the State has a practical meaning to China, but they did not pay attention to the particularity of the proposition in today's Chinese practice. Before investigating the particularity of Chinese

practice, it is necessary to first study the theoretical connotation of the proposition.

2. TRIPLE UNDERSTANDING OF THE THEORETICAL CONNOTATION OF THE PROPOSITION THAT “CIVIL SOCIETY DETERMINES THE STATE”

The proposition that civil society determines the state is the early expression of historical materialism, and its theoretical connotation should take various levels of social structure into account and emphasize different aspects in different context: When the historical idealism was criticized, the proposition emphasized that economy was the foundation of social development and state was superstructure; when the political structure of state of bourgeoisie was analyzed, the proposition focused on the revelation of the class nature of a state; later, when western Marxism scholars criticized capitalist culture, the proposition stressed the contend for cultural leadership in the level of ideology.

2.1 The Proposition That Civil Society Determines the State Is the Illustration of Economic Foundation and Political Superstructure

When Marx criticized the Hegel's opinion that state determines civil society, he reached the conclusion that “it is not the state that restrains and determines civil society but it is the civil society that restrains and determines the state.” (*Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels [Vol.4]*, 2012, p.202) The reversal of Hegel's proposition by Marx realized the transformation to historical materialism.

Viewed from form, the relationship between civil society and the state is that “the state determines civil society”, that is, all demands of civil society can be realized by rising to national will and confirming by laws; however, viewed from content and essence, it is that civil society determines the state, that is, “in general, national will is determined by the constantly changing demand of civil society, the advantageous status of a certain class, after all, the development of productivity and exchange relation” (*Ibid.*, p.258), and a state is just “a form used by the ruling class to realize their common interest, and is the pattern of obtaining concentrated expression by the whole civil society in this era” (*Ibid.*, p.212). Bourgeois state is the concentrated expression of material life relation that takes capitalist mode of production as the foundation, and is the tool of the capitalist class to maintain the economic structure for survival.

Marx and Engels also illustrated the relationship between civil society and a state from the perspective of the formation of history. Before the formation of modern civil society, civil society and countries are the same. Civil society directly has the political nature, and the element of civil society directly exists in the form of national

life element. The first bourgeois political revolution really divided civil society and countries, and made state and civil society exist independently, and liberate civil society from politics and the spiritual bondage of itself, which was called by Marx as the simultaneous finishing of national idealism and the materialism of civil society (*Karl Marx and Frederick Engels [Vol.1]*, 2009, p.45). The historical separation makes civil society really obtain its fundamental status and makes various elements of civil society fully develop, and also makes the social productivity of civil society be greatly liberated. Because of this, Marx and Engels said “the productivity created by the bourgeoisie in less than one hundred years of class rule is much larger than all productivity created by all generations in the past” (*Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels [Vol.1]*, 2012, p.45). Meanwhile, the development of civil society requires people to establish a closer and wider social connection, and a state must choose to accept and actively establish the social connection, otherwise, it might be faced with the fate of death. This impels a political state to have corresponding progress. Bourgeois countries established the right suitable to civil society and fair legal system in the process and “admitted their own birthplace and foundation” in this way (*Karl Marx and Frederick Engels [Vol.1]*, 2009, p.313).

In real history, the proposition that civil society determines the state is not represented by the recognition and conformity of civil society by a state all the time, and sometimes it is even embodied as the great contradiction, conflict and confrontation between the two. In the introduction of Criticism on Hegel's Legal Philosophy, Marx had considered the striking contradiction between the requirements for German ideology and the German reality's answer to the requirements, proposed the question that “is there the same inconformity between civil society and a state or civil society themselves” (*Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels [Vol.1]*, 2012, p.11). The author thought the question was answered in a paragraph of *On the Jewish Question* by Marx, and he proposed that:

When political life feels very confident, it tries to suppress its premise, civil society and its elements, to make itself become human's real life without contradictions. However, only when it has contradiction with its own life conditions, and only revolution is announced to be constant, can it be done. Therefore, as war ended in peace, politics must...end in the recovery of all elements of civil society. (*Karl Marx and Frederick Engels [Vol.1]*, 2009, p.33)

It is clear that, in Marx's view, in experiment life, there is not only inconformity between civil society and a state, but also opposition in a fiercest way. However, at last, “the recovery of all elements of civil society” shows the decisive role of civil society in a state. The judgment of proposition that civil society determines the state on the law of historical reality does not mean that it completely conforms to empirical fact. It reveals the essential content in empirical fact, and illustrates the essence of the

contradictory relation between economy and politics in the historical development of human.

2.2 The Proposition That Civil Society Determines the State Reveals the Essence of Bourgeois Democracy

Marx’s proposition that civil society determines the state is also the theoretical guidance of viewing the political practice of bourgeois states. Communist League pointed out that bourgeois state power “was just the committee that managed the common affair of the whole capitalist class” (*Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels [Vol.1]*, 2012, p.402), and revealed the essence of democracy of bourgeois state.

After Marx transferred to historical materialism, he realized that “the anatomy of civil society should be sought in political economics” (*Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels [Vol.2]*, 2012, p.2). He deeply investigated the production mode of capitalism, and his recognition of the relationship between bourgeois states and civil society is more detailed. Individual capitalists have the natural impulse to constantly accumulate capital for expanding reproduction, but social mass production makes individual capital depend mutually to form aggregate social capital, therefore, good operation of aggregate social capital is the premise for individual capitalists to realize capital accumulation as well as for capitalism to expand reproduction. In addition, hired labor is another premise for capital. Therefore, capital is a collective product and can be operated only through the common activity of social members. However, the contradiction between socialized production and private ownership of capital is usually destroyed by the operation of aggregate social capital. States should “maintain the general external condition of capitalist mode of production to be not infringed by workers and individual capitalist”, so Engels called capitalist countries as “ideal total capitalist” (*Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels [Vol.3]*, 2012, p.666). In addition, as the role of “committee of common affairs” and “total capitalist”, the specific realization form of bourgeois states was generated with western representative democracy, including the development from hierarchy to delegacy, generation of the separation of the three powers, and the establishment of human rights. As a result, capitalist state, as the “total capitalist”, is the “committee of common affairs” required by maintaining the capitalist mode of production, and capitalist civil society determines the basic political features of states.

We tried to analyze the features of the relationship between America with civil society in democracy with above views. The primary features of the development of American civil society is that society is earlier than the generation and development of state. The long history that civil society refuses the intervention of the state makes the design of American political system focus on restraining governmental right, and the political representative elected by judges and people, that is, political party, has dominated

the American government until the middle 20th century. After World War II, although the power of the United States government became stronger, courts and legislature still constantly contended for the governmental function. Therefore, Fukuyama pointed out that compared with European countries, “in terms of governmental scale and range, the United States was and is ‘outsider’” (Fukuyama, 2014). Moreover, the great changes of civil society promote political reform which is accompanied with the changes of civil social structure, because although political reform depends on the promotion of political elites, if it does not establish the foundation maintaining itself, it will not be realized finally. During the Great Depression in the 1930s, the changes of civil society stimulated the reform of political strategy and national political system. As a result, there were two political reform programs, that is, Roosevelt’s New Deal and fascism. At last, the reason why Roosevelt’s New Deal was able to lead the United States out of the crisis because it helped workers, small and medium-sized capital, implemented New Deal coalition, and established a civil society of acting uniformly once being agreed. On the surface, during the New Deal period, although the state determined civil society, from the perspective that if the New Deal did not confirm it was the representative of the whole interest of civil society, it would not success, and it New Deal did not obtain the recognition of the whole civil society, it would not be promoted, civil society maintains the social foundation of the New Deal and plays a decisive function to the country.

2.3 The Proposition That Civil Society Determines the State Includes the Contend for the Leadership of Cultural Ideology

The theory of cultural ideology was proposed by Gramsci who is an Italian Marxist. He thought the success of the October Revolution of Russia cannot be repeated in European countries, and the proletariat of western countries must search for and establish the revolutionary strategy suitable for the west. He thought what revolution faced was not only countries but also civil society; western revolution cannot copy the experience of Russian revolution to carry out frontal attack on bourgeoisie state machinery, but should adopt new strategies, and first establish the leadership of the proletariat in the field of cultural and ideology; therefore, he said that civil society did not belong to economic basis but to superstructure. Gramsci’s theory of cultural leadership has a profound effect on the development of western Marxism. The studies on civil society made by Habermas and Cohen had diversion in culture. Gramsci emphasized that civil society was the field where bourgeoisie implemented “culture hegemony”, and was the ideological helper of the rule of the bourgeoisie. Habermas recognized “national socialization” and “social nationalization” caused by monopoly capitalism, and thought civil society, as a cultural communication field, constructed the critical force opposed to the state to some

extent. Based on Habermas, Cohen and Arato emphasized the function of civil society cultural communication in supporting democracy. In general, unlike Marx who mainly understood civil society determines the state from economic basis and political superstructure, western Marxism mainly understood it from the perspective of cultural criticize, and thought civil society determined the state as the legal foundation of national political culture.

Grasping civil society determines the state in the cultural level should be a contribution of western Marxism. The cultural value concept formed in civil society communication is the concentrated reflection of cultural value concept of a state in a historical period, and civil society is the place where modern culture is produced and spread. First, civil society provides foundation of value choice for the construction of national political ideology which has to do with the transmission of civil society. Therefore, the core value concept of national politics will be like the tree without root and fish without water if it is separated from civil society. In addition, if a country lacks the cultural value recognition of civil society, it will also lose its own legal foundation, so Gramsci regarded civil society as “approved” field. Moreover, civil society has been the field full of multicultural values all the time, and generates the progressive idea that maintains its own and national development. However, sometimes, it cannot grasp the idea or make the idea to dominate itself. Sometimes it lacks the force to transform the idea to reality. In this case, the intervention of the country is necessary.

The practice of civil society determines the state in the field of cultural ideology includes the contend for cultural leadership, and its primary object is civil society. If the ruling class treats it lightly and loses the cultural leadership, its political foundation of social ruling would sway, and the order of economic structure would even be impacted. The theory of cultural leadership of western Marxism is commonly emphasized in the modern society. In the past, domestic academia regarded the above recognition as the heresy in the development of the theory of Marxism. In fact, viewed from the integrity of economy, politics and culture of social structure, and from the modernized development of information culture communication in the era of globalization, including the contend for cultural leadership into the theoretical connotation of civil society determines the state is tenable in logic and is realistic in practice.

3. THE FEATURES OF THE PRACTICE OF “CIVIL SOCIETY DETERMINES THE STATE” IN CONTEMPORARY CHINA

A law usually has different forms due to different conditions. Civil society determines the state was originally the revelation of the internal relationship

between capitalist countries and civil society. However, after China developed socialist market economy, it is also suitable for contemporary China, but has different pattern of manifestation due to different social condition in China.

3.1 Particularity of “Civil Society” in the Context of Socialist Market Economy

Viewed from the specific practice of civil society in contemporary China, the establishment of socialist market economy makes private capital and private ownership of labor marketization become important contents of Chinese civil society, which is the commonness of Chinese and western civil society. However, Chinese civil society is in the context of socialist market economy and is different from western civil society, which is mainly represented by the different status and function of private capital in civil society.

First, the difference of leadership force determines the different status of private capital in Chinese and western civil society. Both Chinese and western civil society are composed of bourgeoisie and proletariat and include marketized or semi-marketized peasantry, small handicraftsman and intellectual. However, western civil society is led by bourgeoisie, especially after the capitalist code of production obtained the dominant position, private capital has become the entity ruler of western civil society. Chinese civil society is led by Chinese Communist Party which represents the fundamental interest of proletariat and the Chinese nation. The CCP’s leading of civil society is not only the result of Chinese historical development but also the requirement of China’s modernization construction. First, different from European countries where civil society is earlier than the generation of nation, political party and politics, since modern times, China “first has party competition and then modern country and thus civil society” (Xu, 2003). Therefore, the CCP that achieved victory in the context of revolutionary naturally becomes the leader of new China and the construction of civil society. Second, China’s modernization is carried out in the modernized activities that take capitalist countries at the center. Chinese civil society must conform to the capital logic in the capital-dominant globalized economy, refer to the historical experience of capitalist countries, fully play the active role of capital in promoting social production and communication and thus promoting the development of civil society. However, meanwhile, socialist civil society must strive to overcome the phenomenon of governing and depriving labor by capital in civil society in capitalist code of production, so the CCP with fundamental revolutionary should be the leader. This makes Chinese civil society have two levels: in micro-level, private capital plays the main body role in Chinese civil society; in macro-level, Chinese civil society healthily develops in the leading of the party. In the civil society under the leading of capitalist class, although workers are the members of civil society, they

are in the status of being exploited and suppressed by bourgeoisie, and the recognition of their rights is based on the promotion function to the interest of bourgeoisie. In the civil society under the leading of the CCP, all classes depending on the market economy are the main body with equal status. The CCO not only serves and guides private capital but also restrains private capital.

Second, the difference of economic structure regulates the different function of private capital in Chinese and western civil society. Chinese and western civil society are based on market economy, and the micro decision-making right of capital in market economy is fully guaranteed by laws. However, due to the control force and strategic dominant status of Chinese public capital economy in the special field of whole national economy, although private capital is in the majority in quantity, it cannot randomly control and operate China’s economy, and its profit-making behavior must conform to the framework of the whole Chinese civil society and the fundamental interest of the country to realize sustainable development. Although the capitalist economy of western countries has some natures and functions of public capital, the limitation of political system determines that western public capital is just supplementary and first-aid and still serves private capital essentially. However, the public capital-dominant economic structure constructed by China sublates capital and serves the interests of the masses (Li, 2006). The public capital did not eliminate the contradiction between private and social interests of civil society in the feature of modern productivity, but eliminates the class exploitation of capital to labor in public capital, which provides preparation condition for civil society to eliminate internal contradictions (Rong, 2004).

3.2 Particularity of Civil Society Determines the State in the Practice of Contemporary China

China’s political system, different with western capitalist countries, is system of people’s congress and multi-party democratic consultation system under the leading of the CCP and is formed in history and constantly improved in practice. For example, in view of the long-term and overall mistakes during Great Cultural Revolution, China established the basic state policy of law-based governance and constructing the socialist country built on the rule of law, and included the leadership of the party into the orbit of the construction of the rule of law. China’s political situation constructed the particularity of civil society determines the state in the practice of contemporary China.

First, the relationship between capital and country is not “master and servant”. This is the basic reason of different pattern of manifestation of civil society determines the state in China and western countries. Double identity of private capital in western countries and civil society makes a state become the “management committee” hired by capital, and the state serves for the long-term interest of capital. However, in China, capital

plays an important role in micro economy, but not the ruler of a state. China (government) represents the fundamental interests of all of the people essentially, and is not the rule tool to realize capital-dominant status. Therefore, capital owners play the dominant role of independent decision-making in market economy, but capital owners have equal status with labor in national political life. Capital is the dynamic factor that benefits the interests of the whole society under the norms of law ruling.

Second, the realization path of the positive interactive relationship between civil society and a state is different. Marx’s civil society determines the state is not the dualistic proposition as Locke’s “society is prior to the state”. Marx’s recognition of “abstract dualism” of modern civil society and a state illustrates that the relationship between the two is contradictory in form and uniform essentially.¹ Therefore, pursuing positive interaction between the two is the scientific recognition of the contradictory and unified relationship between them. However, the road is different in different countries. Western civil society was developed in the historical struggle against feudal as well as in the binary opposition and the manipulation of the rule of law of bourgeois government. The early western civil society and countries underwent long-term confrontation and conflict, which made opposability become a feature of the relationship between western civil society and countries. However, after several times of crisis and the reform under the guidance of the theory, such as neo-liberalism, theory of left-wing criticism, and “the third road”, western countries gradually have clearer recognition of the interactive relationship between civil society and a state (Yu, & Zhou, 2002, pp.162-173).

The tortuous road of the relationship between western civil society and countries can be seen from the history of the relationship between labor, capital and government of the United States. In the early period of free capitalism, the conflict between workers and capitalists in America was serious and affected the healthy development of market and country. First, the country regulated capital with the progressivism movement in the late 19th century, and protected the rights of workers through the National Industrial Recovery Act and Wagner Act and assisting labor organizations during the period of Roosevelt’s New Deal to make workers and capitalists relieve the contradiction and conflict in civil society through collective bargaining, so as to promote the positive interaction between countries and civil society. This is the key for the United States to become the world power, but the country and people also paid a great price in the process. The civil society in contemporary China was developed in an orderly reform from top to bottom. Several years of successful experience of reform, development and

¹ Marx said in page 284, Vol. 3 of *Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, “the middle ages is realistic dualism, and modern is abstract dualism”.

stability indicates that the development of Chinese civil society cannot seek reform in conflicts and confrontation as western countries. Chinese civil society needs to grow and expand in the construction of harmonious society, and Chinese civil society and the country need to realize win-win through positive interaction.

Third, the specific realization of civil society determines the state in China is due to the correct leading of the party. Correct leading of the party is because of the grasping of advanced productivity and culture and full respect of civil society's historical status of the main body. The leading status of the CCP in the country and civil society make the country to play the dynamic reaction of civil society to the largest extent. The interest in civil society is multiple and its harmony and coexistence need the country to play its function. Large capital pursues monopoly interests. Small and medium capital pursues speculation naturally. Workers are easily tempted by current welfare. The CCP, as the political party focusing on the fundamental and long-term interest of the country and civil society, controls the contradiction and conflicts inside the civil society and between civil society and the country. This is the key why China can obtain remarkable achievements.

The leading status of the CCP is recognized by people (civil society) in historical practice and takes people's interest as the utmost purpose. It can make mistakes because of certain historical limitation, but it has error correcting capability, because it regards mass line as its life line and sees people as the creator of history. Double penetration of civil society and the country by the CCP make the relationship in civil society and its relationship with the country actively interactive rather than contradictory. Positive operation of the interactive relationship is the social foundation for stable and sustainable development of China's modernization. The facilitation of civil society to the construction of the rule of law also makes the leading of the party operate normatively in the orbit of rule of law. In addition, the "cultural civil society" developed by western Marxists such as Gramsci warns that, on the one hand, the party should be vigilant that the cultural leadership of civil society in the socialist road is graped by capital, on the other hand, correct leading of the party depends on the cultural discussion and supervision function of civil society over the country and party.

CONCLUSION

The proposition of civil society determines the state is a general recognition of the relationship between the state and civil society in the context of market economy, but has different manifestation of connotation in capitalist practice and different theoretical demands. The establishment of socialist market economy system makes civil society which is the "material life relation" is also the foundation of the existence and development of China. However, the

pattern of manifestation of civil society determines the state has its own features, that is, the basic experience of "the unify of the party's leading, people being the masters and law-based governance" as well as the specific manifestation on the development road of civil society. Although the development of Chinese civil society still has many problems and the supervision of civil society over the party and the country needs to be enhanced, the joint efforts of the Chinese people and the CCP are transforming the practice form of civil society determines the state in China from reality to necessity, which as western experience adds colors for human civilization. Therefore, Chinese practice enriched the connotation of the proposition that civil society determines the society. The views that denied Chinese experience with the relationship between western civil society and countries regarded western experience as necessity and are also the one-sided understanding of Marx's proposition.

REFERENCES

- Fukuyama, F. (2014). Decline of American political system. *Foreign Theoretical Trends*, (9).
- Huang, N. S., Shi, D. F., & Song, Y. X. (1989). *History of Marxist philosophy (Vol.1)*. Beijing: Peking University Press.
- Karl Marx and Frederick Engels (Vol.1)*. (2009). People's Publishing House.
- Karl Marx and Frederick Engels (Vol.3)*. (2002). People's Publishing House.
- Li, K. L. (2006). Meaning of "public capital" to construct socialist harmonious society. *Expanding Horizons*, (6), 18.
- Li, S. Z. (1996). Discussion of the theory of civil society and the national thought and its historical and practical significance. *Academic Monthly*, (9).
- Rong, Z. Z. (2004). Capital general and public capital. *Teaching and Research*, (10), 69.
- Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels (Vol.1)*. (2012). People's Publishing House.
- Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels (Vol.2)*. (2012). People's Publishing House.
- Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels (Vol.3)*. (2012). People's Publishing House.
- Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels (Vol.4)*. (2012). People's Publishing House.
- Wu, H. Y. (1989). "Civil society determines the state" explores the road to historical materialism, *Jiangxi Social Sciences*, (2).
- Xu, Y. (2003). Analysis of the non-equilibrium and autonomy in the construction of modern countries. *Journal of Central China Normal University (Humanities and Social Sciences)*, (5), 100.
- Yu, J. X., & Zhou, J. (2002). *Changes of contemporary capitalist countries and social relations* (pp.162-173). Beijing: Social Science in China Press.
- Yu, K. P. (1993). *Theory and historical status of Marx's civil society*. Social Science in China Press.