

The Internal Logic of Chinese-Style Modernization: A State Governance Perspective

Bao Liu¹

¹ Automotive and Transportation Engineering, Shenzhen Polytechnic University, China

Correspondence: Bao Liu, Automotive and Transportation Engineering, Shenzhen Polytechnic University, 518033, Shenzhen, Guangdong, China. E-mail: liubao@szpu.edu.cn

Received: November 11, 2025; Accepted: November 23, 2025; Published: November 24, 2025

Abstract

Chinese-style modernization has emerged as one of the most consequential governance innovations of the twenty-first century, challenging conventional assumptions within modernization theory and broadening the analytical horizons of political development research. Rather than following the trajectory of Western industrialization—rooted historically in capital accumulation, social polarization, and external expansion—China’s modernization unfolds through a governance-centered pathway grounded in state capacity, institutional continuity, and a people-centered normative orientation. This article argues that Chinese-style modernization possesses a distinctive internal logic composed of four mutually reinforcing dimensions: historical logic, institutional logic, governance logic, and civilizational logic. Together, these logics articulate a political development model that synthesizes long-term state-building traditions with contemporary governance innovation.

The analysis proceeds in three steps. First, the paper situates Chinese-style modernization within broader debates on state theory and political modernization, emphasizing the conceptual relevance of institutional resilience, adaptive governance, and long-range state planning. Second, it examines how China’s modernization path is historically conditioned—shaped by the state’s century-long search for national rejuvenation and the construction of a developmental political order capable of mobilizing large-scale resources. Third, it demonstrates how the Chinese governance model operationalizes modernization through coordinated institutional mechanisms, such as whole-of-government capacity building, people-centered policy design, and the pursuit of social equity as a political objective rather than a market outcome.

The article concludes that Chinese-style modernization should not be interpreted as a derivative or alternative version of Western modernization. Instead, it constitutes an analytically independent modernization paradigm embedded in China’s historical experience and political rationality. Its significance extends beyond China, offering a theoretically coherent and empirically grounded example of how a large civilizational state can pursue modernization without replicating Western developmental logics.

Keywords: Chinese-style modernization, state governance, institutional logic

1. Introduction

Modernization has long occupied a central position in political science, not only as a descriptive account of industrial and institutional transformation but also as a normative framework that has shaped global expectations regarding political development. For much of the twentieth century, modernization theory—largely articulated by Western scholars—proposed a linear progression from traditional society to industrial modernity, treating economic liberalization, institutional differentiation, and political pluralism as the universal indicators of modern development. Although this framework offered insights into the structural features of Western modernity, its implicit teleology and Eurocentric assumptions left it ill-equipped to interpret the diverse pathways emerging in the Global South. In recent decades, the rise of large non-Western states with distinctive political orders has exposed these limitations, prompting increasing calls for theoretical reevaluation.

Within this context, Chinese-style modernization has come to represent one of the most analytically significant cases for rethinking modernization theory. China’s developmental trajectory does not conform to the standard Western sequence in either institutional form or political logic. Instead of treating modernization as a process of liberalization or state retreat, China approaches modernization as a comprehensive project of national rejuvenation—one in which the state plays an active, coordinative, and long-term role in shaping economic transformation, social governance, and normative life. While this model is subject to ongoing debate, it undeniably

challenges conventional dichotomies between state-led and market-led development, illustrating a mode of political modernization in which state capacity and governance coherence constitute fundamental drivers of transformation.

The core proposition of this paper is that Chinese-style modernization possesses an internal logic that is both coherent and analytically identifiable. This internal logic is not a set of abstract principles but a structured set of political rationalities that have accumulated through historical processes, institutional evolution, and governance practices. Specifically, the paper argues that Chinese-style modernization is underpinned by four interrelated logics: a historical logic shaped by China's long-term search for national revitalization; an institutional logic rooted in the organizational coherence and resilience of the Chinese state; a governance logic prioritizing people-centered development and distributive equity; and a civilizational logic that frames modernization within China's cultural and philosophical traditions. Together, these logics provide a substantive explanation for why China's modernization path has diverged from Western trajectories and why it has generated distinct political outcomes.

To understand this model, it is essential to situate it within the broader field of comparative political development. Modernization in China cannot be reduced to GDP growth, industrial upgrading, or technological diffusion—although all of these components are present. Instead, it must be conceptualized as a political project with clear objectives, institutional mechanisms, and governance tools. China's modernization effort integrates long-range planning, deep administrative penetration, and the capacity to coordinate across sectors and regions—features characteristic of what scholars term a “developmental state,” but with notable differences. Unlike classical developmental states that rely primarily on economic bureaucracy, China's model embeds modernization within a more comprehensive political framework that includes ideological coherence, political mobilization, and institutional adaptability.

Another distinctive feature of the Chinese path is its demographic scale. Modernization involving a population of more than 1.4 billion creates governance challenges and structural constraints unknown to smaller states. At the same time, scale produces advantages in terms of market size, institutional mobilization, and national planning. This duality—complexity and capacity—illustrates why modernization in China cannot be understood through frameworks designed for medium-sized or small liberal democracies. The governance mechanisms required to manage such scale necessarily differ in structure, rhythm, and institutional intensity.

Equally important is the normative dimension embedded within Chinese-style modernization. Contrary to modernization models that prioritize economic efficiency above all else, China places distributive equity—expressed through the concept of “common prosperity”—at the center of its modernization agenda. This introduces a political logic often overlooked in Western analyses: modernization is not treated as a natural consequence of market competition but as a state-driven pursuit of collective well-being. This normative orientation has practical implications for public policy, influencing social welfare provision, poverty alleviation, rural revitalization, and regional coordination strategies.

This paper contributes to the political science literature in three ways. First, it clarifies the conceptual content of Chinese-style modernization by articulating its four foundational logics and explaining their internal coherence. Second, it offers a theoretical framework for interpreting China's modernization not as an anomaly or deviation from Western norms but as a distinct political development paradigm embedded in state governance. Third, it situates Chinese-style modernization within ongoing global debates about alternative development models, showing how it complicates and enriches contemporary political theory.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section II examines the historical logic of Chinese-style modernization, emphasizing how China's path emerged from a century-long search for political independence, institutional stability, and developmental capacity. Section III explores the institutional logic of modernization, focusing on state capacity, governance mechanisms, and institutional resilience. Section IV analyzes the governance logic rooted in people-centered development and distributive justice. Section V discusses the civilizational logic that frames modernization within China's philosophical and cultural traditions. The conclusion reflects on the implications of Chinese-style modernization for comparative political development and future modernization theory.

2. The Historical Logic of Chinese-Style Modernization

Understanding Chinese-style modernization requires a return to the historical processes that shaped the political foundations upon which it rests. Unlike some nation-states whose modern institutions emerged gradually through long-term evolutionary differentiation, China's modernization path has been decisively marked by rupture, crisis, and purposeful political reconstruction. These experiences have endowed the Chinese state with strong historical consciousness: modernization is not merely economic upgrading but a response to historical contingencies,

perceived vulnerabilities, and the necessity of national survival. This section argues that the historical logic of Chinese-style modernization is characterized by three critical dynamics: the quest for national revival in the face of systemic crisis; the reconstitution of political authority capable of directing long-term modernization; and the consolidation of a developmental rationality that frames modernization as a collective national project rather than a market-led transformation.

2.1 Modernization as a Response to Historical Crisis

The origins of Chinese-style modernization cannot be separated from the immense political and social disruptions that accompanied China's encounter with Western imperial expansion beginning in the nineteenth century. While Western modernization emerged endogenously through the gradual consolidation of capitalism and state institutions, China's modern transformation unfolded under conditions of external pressure and internal fragmentation. The collapse of traditional governance structures, the decline of imperial legitimacy, and the erosion of territorial sovereignty generated a prolonged period of national crisis commonly referred to as the "century of humiliation." This formative experience imprinted on Chinese political thought a deep awareness that modernization was not optional—it was essential for national survival.

During this period, early attempts at modernization, such as the Self-Strengthening Movement and the late Qing reform initiatives, demonstrated the difficulty of adopting isolated components of Western modernity without institutional coherence. Reformers advocated selective borrowing of Western technology and administrative methods, but these reforms lacked the political depth needed to reshape the state. As many historians note, the tension between "learning from the West" and maintaining regime continuity constrained the transformative potential of these efforts. Consequently, early modernization attempts failed to reverse China's structural decline.

The failure of incremental reforms created a lasting political lesson: modernization requires institutional transformation, not partial adaptation. This insight would later become a foundational component of Chinese-style modernization—modernization must be comprehensive, coordinated, and grounded in political restructuring rather than superficial institutional grafting.

2.2 The Reconstruction of Political Authority

A second crucial component of the historical logic is the reconstruction of political authority capable of directing modernization. The founding of the Communist Party of China (CPC) in 1921 and the subsequent revolutionary struggle fundamentally reshaped the locus of political power. The CPC's rise marked more than a change in political leadership; it signified the emergence of a new political actor that viewed modernization as integral to national liberation and state-building.

Three historical developments are central here.

(1) The New Democratic Revolution and political unification

The victory of the New Democratic Revolution ended decades of warlord fragmentation and reestablished unified political authority. For modernization to succeed, political unity was indispensable. State fragmentation had been one of the major barriers to earlier modernization attempts; unification provided the preconditions for nationwide developmental planning.

(2) The founding of the PRC and the institutionalization of state capacity

With the establishment of the People's Republic of China in 1949, the CPC initiated a systematic project of state-building aimed at consolidating political authority, restoring order, and constructing institutional capacity. Land reform, administrative restructuring, and the creation of a centralized governance framework built the foundational institutions that would later support modernization.

Crucially, the early decades of the PRC established a governance culture centered on policy mobilization and organizational coherence. Scholars of political development often argue that early state-building determines the long-term developmental trajectory of a country. For China, the consolidation of institutional capacity created a durable administrative infrastructure capable of coordinating complex modernization tasks.

(3) Reform and Opening Up as a recalibration of modernization strategy

The reform period beginning in 1978 marked a strategic shift from ideological mobilization toward institutional pragmatism. The leadership recognized that modernization required adaptive governance, technological advancement, and integration into global markets. Yet, even as market mechanisms were introduced, modernization remained politically directed rather than market-driven. This distinguishes China's modernization historically: reforms expanded economic dynamism without weakening central political authority.

2.3 Modernization as a Long-Term Political Project

A third component of the historical logic is China's understanding of modernization as a long-term political project guided by strategic planning and sustained governance effort. The historical experience of fragmentation, external threat, and institutional weakness produced an enduring belief that modernization cannot be left to spontaneous forces. It must instead be planned, coordinated, and safeguarded by political institutions.

This principle manifests in three distinctive historical patterns:

(1) Strong planning rationality

China has consistently adopted long-term planning as a means of structuring modernization. Beginning with the First Five-Year Plan in 1953 and continuing through contemporary national strategies, planning has allowed the state to coordinate industrialization, infrastructure development, and technological transformation across regions and sectors.

Unlike centralized planning models that rigidly restrict market forces, China's approach has evolved into what political scientists call "strategic planning within a mixed economy." This hybrid system enables directional state leadership while harnessing market dynamism.

(2) Continuity across historical eras

Despite major shifts in policy orientation—such as the transition from class struggle to economic development—China's modernization has maintained continuity in its core political logic: strengthening national capacity, improving people's livelihoods, and safeguarding sovereignty.

This continuity distinguishes China's pathway from countries whose developmental trajectories have been disrupted by political instability or regime volatility. China's long-term institutional continuity has allowed modernization to proceed incrementally rather than cyclically.

(3) Integration of modernization with national identity

Modernization in China is framed not merely as economic growth but as part of a larger historical mission of national rejuvenation. The narrative of "rejuvenation" functions as a political and cultural anchor that binds modernization to collective purpose, generating both normative legitimacy and societal mobilization.

This has strengthened the political coherence of modernization efforts by embedding them within a broader historical narrative shared across generations.

2.4 The Historical Logic as a Foundation for Contemporary Governance

The historical logic discussed above continues to deeply shape China's governance model today. Several implications stand out.

First, the state is expected to play a central role in modernization.

This expectation is historically conditioned: because earlier attempts at decentralized or partial reform had failed, the state became the primary agent of modernization. As a result, public institutions retain legitimacy as modernizing actors.

Second, modernization is conceived as multidimensional.

Economic reform, political stability, social development, cultural renewal, and ecological sustainability are treated as interdependent rather than isolated sectors. This multidimensionality flows from historical lessons regarding the risks of partial modernization.

Third, modernization is framed as a collective undertaking.

The emphasis on national revival reflects the belief that modernization is not a private or individualistic endeavor but a societal project requiring shared goals and coordinated effort.

Fourth, modernization is pursued through political continuity and institutional resilience.

The Chinese state's capacity to maintain long-term planning, organizational unity, and policy coordination is historically rooted and continues to shape modernization outcomes.

2.5 Summary

The historical logic of Chinese-style modernization shows that China's modernization is not an imitation of Western industrialization but a product of its own historical trajectory. Shaped by crisis, revolution, and reconstruction, China's modernization path developed as a response to historical necessity, national vulnerability,

and institutional rebuilding. This historical logic provides the political foundations upon which the institutional, governance, and civilizational logics of modernization are constructed.

3. Institutional Logic of Chinese-Style Modernization

If the historical logic of Chinese-style modernization explains why modernization became a national imperative, the institutional logic illuminates how China has been able to sustain modernization through coherent political structures, adaptive governance mechanisms, and a resilient institutional system. Institutional logic refers to the embedded patterns of organization, authority, and coordination that enable a political system to translate long-term developmental goals into realizable outcomes. In the Chinese context, institutional logic is expressed through the organizational capacity of the state, the institutionalized norms governing policymaking, and the mechanisms of vertical and horizontal coordination that bind the political system together. This section argues that Chinese-style modernization is grounded in an institutional configuration characterized by organizational coherence, adaptive flexibility, and strategic capacity—the combination of which distinguishes China’s governance model from both classical developmental states and contemporary liberal democracies.

3.1 Organizational Coherence and Centralized Coordination

A core characteristic of China’s institutional logic is organizational coherence—the ability of the political system to act in a coordinated manner across different administrative levels and policy domains. Political scientists often describe this as “state capacity,” but in China it is not merely administrative efficiency; it is the product of institutional design that balances political centralization with local initiative.

(1) Central leadership as the strategic command center

The central leadership plays a key role in defining the overall direction of modernization. Through mechanisms such as Five-Year Plans, national strategies, and major policy agendas, the central authorities articulate long-term priorities and ensure that modernization efforts remain consistent across political cycles. Unlike electoral democracies, where shifting coalitions often lead to policy discontinuity, China’s institutional system embeds modernization within a durable political project, reducing policy volatility.

(2) Vertical management and multi-level coordination

China’s governance model relies on a structured form of vertical management in which administrative levels—from central ministries to county governments—are bound together by institutionalized channels of communication, supervision, and accountability. This vertical integration enhances policy execution by enabling directives from the center to be translated into local action.

Unlike classical command economies, however, local governments in China retain space for experimentation and innovation. Scholars often refer to this arrangement as “directed improvisation”—a system where local initiative is encouraged within centrally defined parameters. This institutional feature has been widely recognized as a source of China’s developmental dynamism.

(3) Horizontal coordination across policy sectors

Modernization requires coordination across diverse policy arenas: industrial policy, social welfare, environmental governance, and digital infrastructure. China’s institutional system supports horizontal coordination through interagency mechanisms such as leading groups, joint committees, and task forces. These bodies mitigate bureaucratic fragmentation and promote integrated policy solutions—an institutional advantage not commonly seen in many large-scale political systems.

3.2 Institutionalized Policy Planning and Strategic Capacity

Strategic capacity—the ability to formulate, revise, and sustain long-term developmental strategies—is another defining component of Chinese institutional logic. This capacity emerges from institutionalized planning mechanisms that link national strategy with administrative implementation.

(1) Five-Year Plans as institutionalized strategic instruments

Since the 1950s, Five-Year Plans have played a central role in structuring national development. Over time, their function has shifted from rigid production targets toward flexible strategic guidance. Contemporary Five-Year Plans incorporate industrial upgrading, technological innovation, ecological sustainability, and social governance, reflecting a broadened understanding of modernization.

These planning instruments create a shared cognitive framework across the political system. They signal national priorities, allocate administrative attention, and generate policy coherence across ministries and regions.

(2) Scenario-based governance and anticipatory policymaking

A distinctive feature of China's strategic capacity is the use of anticipatory governance—an institutional approach that emphasizes scenario analysis, early warning mechanisms, and long-term risk assessment. This anticipatory logic has been visible in areas such as technological self-reliance, public health, energy security, and demographic management.

By embedding future-oriented thinking into policymaking, China's institutional system enhances its ability to steer modernization under conditions of global uncertainty. This contrasts with governance systems where short-term electoral incentives constrain strategic thinking.

(3) Policy experimentation and iterative adaptation

Contrary to perceptions of rigidity, China's institutional system is characterized by widespread policy experimentation. Pilot programs, trial zones, and experimental governance models allow localities to test new approaches before nationwide adoption. This iterative process reduces implementation risk while enabling institutional learning.

Political scientists describe this as “adaptive authoritarianism,” though the terminology remains contested. What is undeniable is that this mechanism has produced substantial institutional flexibility, contributing to the resilience and longevity of China's modernization project.

3.3 Performance-Based Governance and Institutional Incentives

Institutional logic also includes the incentive structures that shape official behavior. China's governance system employs a performance-based cadre evaluation mechanism that aligns local officials' incentives with national modernization goals.

(1) Cadre evaluation as an institutional mechanism

The cadre evaluation system links officials' career advancement to performance metrics in areas such as economic growth, poverty alleviation, environmental protection, and social stability. This institutional mechanism creates a strong alignment between individual incentives and national objectives, reinforcing the capacity of the state to implement modernization policies.

(2) Accountability mechanisms and political discipline

Performance incentives are complemented by accountability measures. Anti-corruption campaigns, intra-party supervision, and administrative audits maintain institutional discipline and reduce the risk of local deviation. This blend of incentives and discipline helps maintain organizational coherence across a vast administrative structure.

(3) Meritocratic elements in elite selection

Although China's political system does not follow electoral competition, its elite selection process incorporates meritocratic components. Officials typically progress through administrative levels based on performance, experience, and demonstrated governance competence. This meritocratic dimension strengthens state capacity and supports the institutional foundations of modernization.

3.4 Institutional Resilience and Crisis Management Capacity

Institutional resilience—the ability to effectively respond to shocks, crises, and disruptions—is critical to sustained modernization. China's historical experience with crises has produced a governance system capable of rapid mobilization and adaptive problem-solving.

(1) High-speed mobilization capacity

China's institutional system maintains mechanisms for rapid mobilization in response to emergencies. Whether dealing with public health crises, natural disasters, or economic shocks, the state can mobilize resources quickly across administrative levels. This capacity enhances national resilience and protects modernization gains from destabilizing events.

(2) Institutional learning from crises

Crisis often serve as catalysts for institutional development. China's governance system exhibits the ability to extract lessons from crises and integrate them into institutional reform. For example, public health governance reforms after major outbreaks, improvements in disaster response, and energy security strategies all reflect a pattern of institutional learning.

(3) Balancing stability and adaptation

A defining feature of China's institutional logic is the balance between institutional stability and adaptive governance. Stability is maintained through centralized authority and organizational continuity; adaptation is

achieved through experimentation, policy revision, and institutional recalibration. This balance has allowed China's modernization to remain both predictable and flexible—an unusual combination in comparative political development.

3.5 Institutional Logic as the Engine of Modernization

The institutional logic described above constitutes the operational engine of Chinese-style modernization. It translates political objectives into implementable strategies and ensures that modernization remains coherent, adaptive, and resilient. The key features of this logic include: ①Organizational coherence, which enables coordinated policy execution. ②Strategic capacity, which provides long-term direction. ③Adaptive flexibility, which allows institutional learning. ④Performance incentives, which reinforce modernization priorities. ⑤Resilience mechanisms, which protect modernization against disruptions.

Collectively, these institutional characteristics produce a governance system capable of managing the complexity of large-scale modernization.

3.6 Summary

While Western modernization paths often emphasize institutional differentiation and political liberalization, China's modernization is anchored in a governance-centered institutional configuration that blends political centralization, local experimentation, strategic planning, and performance-driven incentives. This institutional logic explains how China has been able to undertake modernization at an unprecedented demographic scale, maintain long-term policy coherence, and adapt to shifting developmental challenges.

In short, the institutional logic of Chinese-style modernization constitutes a distinctive model of political development—one that deviates from Western liberal trajectories yet demonstrates internal consistency, governance effectiveness, and institutional resilience.

4. Governance Logic of Chinese-Style Modernization: People-Centered Development and Political Rationality

If historical logic explains why modernization became a national necessity, and institutional logic clarifies how the state organizes and executes modernization, then governance logic reveals the normative foundations that guide modernization practice. In the Chinese context, governance logic is inseparable from the principle of “putting people at the center,” a normative orientation that shapes policy priorities, administrative behavior, and the strategic goals of modernization. This section argues that the governance logic of Chinese-style modernization is structured around three interrelated principles: people-centered development as a normative foundation, distributive equity as a political objective, and coordinated governance as a practical mechanism. Taken together, these principles form a coherent governance logic that expands the meaning of modernization beyond economic efficiency and embeds it within a broader vision of collective well-being and political legitimacy.

4.1 People-Centered Development as a Normative Foundation

One of the distinguishing features of Chinese-style modernization is its explicit normative orientation toward improving the material and social well-being of the population. While many modernization models implicitly assume that economic growth will eventually translate into improved living standards, the Chinese governance approach treats the welfare of the people not as an expected outcome of economic development, but as a core political objective that guides policymaking.

(1) People-centeredness as political legitimacy

In China's political system, the legitimacy of the state is grounded in its ability to improve people's lives. This logic is not merely rhetorical; it is institutionalized in policy priorities, long-term planning, and administrative accountability. People-centered governance forms a political contract between the state and society: the state provides development, stability, and improved welfare; in return, society grants political legitimacy and supports the modernization agenda.

(2) A developmental understanding of human well-being

People-centered modernization does not equate well-being narrowly with income or consumption. Instead, it encompasses education, healthcare, social security, ecological quality, and opportunities for personal development. This multidimensional understanding is reflected in national strategies such as poverty alleviation, rural revitalization, and regional coordination.

(3) Governance capacity as a moral responsibility

The people-centered approach imposes a moral obligation on political institutions: governance capacity must be exercised for the purpose of serving the public. This principle informs administrative culture, cadre evaluation standards, and the political discourse surrounding modernization. As a result, modernization becomes a moral as well as political project.

4.2 Distributive Equity as a Political Objective

Another pillar of the governance logic is the pursuit of distributive equity. In contrast to Western modernization, which often deepens inequality during early industrialization and relies on redistributive welfare states for correction, Chinese modernization incorporates equity into the modernization process itself.

(1) Equity as part of the modernization agenda

Rather than treating inequality as an inevitable side effect of growth, China frames fairness and shared prosperity as integral to modernization. The concept of “common prosperity” reflects this idea: modernization is not meaningful if large segments of society are left behind.

(2) Poverty alleviation as a governance achievement

China’s nationwide poverty alleviation campaign stands as a landmark example of distributive governance. Through coordinated political and administrative efforts, China lifted hundreds of millions out of extreme poverty—an achievement that demonstrates the state’s capacity to mobilize resources for distributive goals. Importantly, the campaign was not merely economic; it incorporated education, healthcare, housing, and local development planning, reflecting a holistic approach to distributive equity.

(3) Inequality management as governance capacity

Modernization brings structural risks of inequality through urbanization, labor division, and technological change. China’s governance logic addresses these risks through proactive policy measures such as regional coordination, basic public welfare provision, rural revitalization, and social insurance expansion. These policies demonstrate the political importance of managing inequality as a governance function rather than a secondary economic concern.

4.3 Coordinated Governance and Policy Integration

The governance logic of Chinese-style modernization is characterized by a holistic approach that integrates economic, social, cultural, and ecological dimensions. This coordination is not incidental—it is rooted in a view of governance that sees society as an interdependent system requiring balanced development.

(1) Governance as system coordination

Modernization in China is guided by the principle that economic progress must be coordinated with social stability, environmental protection, and cultural development. The governance system therefore emphasizes integrated policymaking across sectors. For instance, ecological protection is embedded in economic planning; cultural development is linked to social governance; rural revitalization integrates industrial upgrading with social welfare.

(2) Social governance as a modernization tool

China’s modernization incorporates social governance innovations such as community-level services, digital governance tools, and grid-based management systems. These innovations enhance the state’s ability to deliver services efficiently, respond to social needs, and maintain stability. The integration of technology with social governance illustrates how modernization is pursued not only through economic means but through improvements in everyday public administration.

(3) The role of participation and consultation

While China’s governance system is not based on electoral competition, it incorporates consultative mechanisms and participatory elements. Public hearings, community-level consultations, and targeted feedback mechanisms help incorporate social input into policy design. These practices support policy responsiveness and enhance the legitimacy of governance outcomes.

4.4 Governance Logic and the Modernization of the State–Society Relationship

A central component of the governance logic is the evolving relationship between the state and society. Chinese modernization does not seek to weaken the state; instead, it seeks to modernize the relationship between state authority and social development.

(1) A developmental partnership between state and society

Rather than a contentious relationship characterized by zero-sum power struggles, China’s state–society relationship is framed as a partnership aimed at achieving national modernization. The state creates opportunities,

maintains stability, and delivers public goods; society contributes through economic participation, innovation, and cultural vitality.

(2) Social mobility and public confidence

Modernization is most sustainable when society maintains confidence in political institutions. Policies aimed at expanding educational access, supporting entrepreneurship, and improving mobility conditions reinforce societal optimism and stability—two essential ingredients for modernization.

(3) The state as a provider of long-term certainty

One of the unique aspects of Chinese governance logic is the state's ability to provide long-term certainty. This certainty benefits both businesses and citizens: investors can plan ahead, and families can make decisions about education, housing, and careers with greater confidence. Certainty, in turn, strengthens the social foundations of modernization.

4.5 Governance Logic as a Normative and Practical Engine of Modernization

When taken together, people-centered development, distributive equity, and coordinated governance form a governance logic fundamentally different from modernization models centered on market forces or political liberalization. In the Chinese model: Governance is not a constraint on modernization; it is a driver. The people are not passive recipients of development; they are the purpose of modernization. Equity is not a long-term aspiration; it is an operational priority. Social stability is not merely political control; it is a condition for sustainable modernization.

This reconceptualization challenges modernization theories that assume governance plays a secondary role. In Chinese-style modernization, governance is primary, and economic growth is only one of its multiple dimensions.

4.6 Summary

The governance logic of Chinese-style modernization embeds modernization within a normative framework centered on human well-being, social fairness, and coordinated development. It views governance not simply as administration but as an engine of national transformation. This approach explains how China has been able to balance rapid economic change with social stability, manage large-scale structural transitions, and pursue modernization in a manner distinct from Western developmental trajectories.

5. Civilizational Logic of Chinese-Style Modernization and Its Global Implications

Beyond historical imperatives, institutional mechanisms, and governance practices, Chinese-style modernization is sustained—and in many ways distinguished—by its civilizational logic. Modernization in China does not emerge from a cultural vacuum, nor can it be explained solely by economic structures or political organization. Instead, it is deeply embedded in China's long civilizational heritage, which shapes conceptions of political order, social harmony, collective responsibility, and the moral role of the state. This civilizational foundation not only informs China's internal modernization project but also influences how China positions itself in the global order. This section argues that the civilizational logic of Chinese-style modernization consists of three interlocking dimensions: philosophical orientations rooted in Chinese political thought, cultural norms that inform social and political behavior, and an international outlook that shapes China's approach to global development and global governance.

5.1 Philosophical Orientations Underpinning Modernization

China's modernization is supported by a set of philosophical ideas that differ significantly from the intellectual foundations of Western modernity. Whereas Western modernization is often grounded in liberal individualism, social contract theory, and rationalist universalism, Chinese political thought emphasizes relational ethics, moral governance, and holistic conceptions of order. These philosophical orientations subtly but powerfully influence the logic of modernization.

(1) Holism and the concept of integrated development

A defining feature of Chinese civilization is its holistic worldview. This worldview perceives society, nature, and governance as interconnected elements of a single system. In modernization, this translates into the idea that economic development must be coordinated with social well-being, cultural continuity, and ecological balance. Holism supports the governance emphasis on multi-dimensional coordination and long-term planning.

(2) Moral governance as a political principle

Classical Chinese political thought places strong emphasis on the moral responsibilities of rulers. Although contemporary China operates under a modern political system, the normative expectation that political authority

should serve the people has deep cultural roots. This civilizational heritage reinforces the governance logic discussed earlier: modernization is evaluated not merely by economic metrics but by its contribution to public welfare and collective harmony.

(3) Harmony as a normative ideal

The ideal of harmony—between individuals, social groups, and between humans and nature—has enduring influence. Unlike Western traditions that often frame progress as a result of conflict or competition, Chinese civilization views harmony as both a social condition and normative goal. This orientation informs policy preferences for stability, consensus-building, and gradual reform rather than disruptive transformation.

5.2 *Cultural Norms and Social Behavior in Modernization*

Civilizational logic is not confined to abstract philosophy; it manifests in cultural practices and social expectations that shape how modernization unfolds. These norms influence governance processes, public participation, and the state–society relationship.

(1) Collective orientation and social responsibility

Chinese culture places emphasis on collective well-being and shared responsibility. This cultural orientation underlies public readiness to participate in nationwide campaigns—from poverty alleviation to public health initiatives—and supports the governance system’s capacity to mobilize society for common goals.

(2) High societal tolerance for long-term planning

A population shaped by a long civilizational history tends to accept long-term political planning and phased modernization strategies. This contrasts with societies where political impatience or short electoral cycles fragment long-term agenda-setting. Cultural tolerance for gradualism strengthens the viability of strategic modernization plans.

(3) Social trust in institutions

China’s modernization also benefits from relatively high levels of trust in political institutions, especially regarding developmental policy. This trust is reinforced by historical patterns of political authority and by contemporary governance performance. Social trust enhances policy compliance and facilitates collective action, making large-scale modernization projects more achievable.

5.3 *The Civilizational Logic and China’s Global Role*

Civilizational logic does not operate solely domestically. It also informs China’s approach to global engagement, development cooperation, and international governance. As China modernizes, it increasingly articulates its development philosophy to the world—not as a prescriptive model but as an alternative pathway.

(1) Modernization without Westernization

China’s civilizational logic challenges the long-standing assumption that modernization inevitably requires Westernization. By demonstrating that modernity can emerge within different political traditions and cultural frameworks, China contributes to a broader intellectual shift in modernization theory. This challenges the universality of Western liberal frameworks and broadens the conceptual space for alternative developmental trajectories.

(2) A non-hegemonic international outlook

Rooted in civilizational traditions emphasizing harmony and non-interference, China’s foreign policy approach frames development as cooperative rather than competitive. This perspective stands in contrast to modernization experiences that historically relied on colonialism or geopolitical dominance. China’s global development initiatives emphasize mutual benefit, respect for sovereignty, and non-imposition—principles reflective of its historical worldview.

(3) South–South cooperation and the Global South perspective

China’s modernization experience resonates strongly with countries in the Global South. Many developing states seek modernization while grappling with postcolonial legacies, demographic pressures, and social inequalities—conditions very different from those of early-industrializing Western states. China’s civilizational logic, institutional experiments, and governance strategies offer insights applicable to other countries seeking to modernize without adopting Western institutional templates.

5.4 *The Civilizational Logic and Global Governance Debates*

As Chinese-style modernization gains visibility, it initiates new debates in global governance and political theory.

(1) Rethinking universalism in modernization theory

Modernization theory traditionally claimed universality based on Western experiences. The Chinese case disrupts this narrative by demonstrating that modernization can follow diverse institutional, cultural, and philosophical pathways. This pluralization of modernization enriches political theory and challenges outdated assumptions about political development.

(2) State capacity as a civilizational asset

China's civilizational tradition of valuing strong, capable governance complicates debates about the relationship between state capacity and modernization. While Western scholarship often views state strength with suspicion—equating it with authoritarianism—China demonstrates how state capacity can support equity, stability, and public welfare. This repositions state capacity as a potential asset rather than a liability.

(3) Normative diversity in global governance

China's civilizational logic contributes to a more diverse normative landscape in global governance. Rather than promoting a singular model of political development, it supports a multipolar normative order where different political traditions, civilizational histories, and developmental priorities can coexist.

5.5 Summary

The civilizational logic of Chinese-style modernization is not a cultural relic; it is a living framework that shapes modernization as both a domestic governance project and a global contributor. It reflects philosophical orientations, cultural norms, and international perspectives that collectively expand the meaning of modernization. In doing so, civilizational logic provides not only a distinctive foundation for China's own modernization but also a valuable reference for global debates on development and governance.

6. Conclusion

Chinese-style modernization represents one of the most significant phenomena in contemporary political development, not only because of the scale of its transformation but also because of its coherent internal logic. As this paper has argued, Chinese-style modernization cannot be understood within traditional modernization theories rooted in Western liberal political traditions. Instead, it must be viewed as a political development paradigm grounded in China's unique historical experiences, institutional structures, governance practices, and civilizational foundations.

The historical logic of modernization in China reflects a century-long effort to overcome national fragmentation, restore political authority, and pursue national rejuvenation. Modernization emerged as both a response to existential crisis and a conscious political project pursued through state reconstruction, institutional building, and social mobilization. This historical logic continues to shape the motivations, priorities, and strategic orientation of modernization today, giving it a depth and continuity not always present in countries that followed market-driven, externally directed paths.

Institutional logic further clarifies how modernization becomes practically possible. China's institutional system—characterized by strong organizational coherence, multi-level coordination, adaptive flexibility, and meritocratic elements—provides the administrative foundation for sustained modernization. Strategic planning mechanisms, policy experimentation, and performance-based governance constitute an institutional architecture capable of handling the complexity of transformation at a demographic scale unprecedented in human history. In this context, modernization is less a spontaneous process and more the result of deliberate, coordinated institutional design.

The governance logic of Chinese-style modernization adds a normative dimension. Rather than equating modernization solely with economic efficiency or technological advancement, China situates modernization within a people-centered framework. Public welfare, distributive equity, rural revitalization, and ecological sustainability form part of the modernization agenda—not afterthoughts or redistributive corrections. This governance logic positions modernization as a process through which state capacity and public well-being reinforce each other, contributing to a conception of development that integrates economic, social, and moral objectives.

Finally, the civilizational logic underlying Chinese modernization highlights the cultural and philosophical foundations that shape China's development path. Concepts such as harmony, collective responsibility, moral governance, and holistic balance inform policy preferences and political behavior. These civilizational elements challenge Western assumptions that modernization requires cultural convergence or institutional replication. Instead, Chinese-style modernization demonstrates that modern political development can be culturally rooted, historically shaped, and civilizationally distinct.

Taken together, these four logics—historical, institutional, governance, and civilizational—form a coherent analytical framework for understanding the internal dynamics of Chinese-style modernization. They illustrate that China's modernization is not a departure from global modernity, but a rearticulation of modernity through a different political rationality. This has significant implications for political science.

First, Chinese-style modernization compels scholars to reconsider the universality of Western modernization theory. The Chinese case underscores the need for more pluralistic approaches to political development—approaches that recognize multiple pathways shaped by different historical conditions, institutional arrangements, and civilizational contexts.

Second, it highlights the importance of state capacity as an independent variable in modernization. Whereas classical modernization theory often assumes that economic development precedes institutional capacity, China's trajectory suggests the reverse: institutional capacity and political coherence can shape economic outcomes and public welfare improvements. This challenges established causal assumptions within political science.

Third, the Chinese case expands the conceptual boundaries of governance. Modernization in China is not judged solely by economic metrics but by its ability to enhance social well-being, manage inequality, protect ecological integrity, and maintain long-term stability. This multidimensional conception of governance offers new insights for global debates on how states can navigate complex developmental challenges.

Fourth, the Chinese experience carries implications for the Global South. Many developing countries face structural constraints—colonial legacies, resource dependency, institutional fragility—that cannot be addressed by importing Western liberal institutions. China's modernization shows how developmental strategies rooted in local histories and political capacities may offer more viable trajectories.

In conclusion, Chinese-style modernization is a political development paradigm that integrates long-term historical consciousness, institutional resilience, people-centered governance, and civilizational continuity. While not universally replicable, it nevertheless enriches contemporary political theory by providing an analytically coherent and empirically grounded alternative to Western-centric models of modernization. As global political and economic landscapes continue to shift, the significance of Chinese-style modernization will extend beyond national boundaries, shaping debates about governance, development, and the future of modernity itself.

References

- Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2012). *Why nations fail: The origins of power, prosperity, and poverty*. Crown. <https://doi.org/10.1355/ae29-2j>
- Amsden, A. (1989). *Asia's next giant: South Korea and late industrialization*. Oxford University Press.
- Ang, Y. Y. (2016). *How China escaped the poverty trap*. Cornell University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7591/9781501705854>
- Breslin, S. (2013). *China and the global political economy*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-67537-1>
- Bu, M. (2011). *China in 2020: A new type of superpower*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Dos Santos, T. (1971). The structure of dependence. In K. T. Fann & D. C. Hodges (Eds.), *Readings in U.S. imperialism* (p. 226). Porter Sargent.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. (2002). Multiple modernities. *Daedalus*, 129(1), 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047401735_004
- Evans, P. (1995). *Embedded autonomy: States and industrial transformation*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400821723>
- Fukuyama, F. (2011). *The origins of political order*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Fukuyama, F. (2014). *Political order and political decay*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Stanford University Press.
- Hall, P. A., & Soskice, D. (Eds.). (2001). *Varieties of capitalism*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/0199247757.001.0001>
- Huntington, S. P. (1968). *Political order in changing societies*. Yale University Press.
- Inglehart, R., & Welzel, C. (2005). *Modernization, cultural change, and democracy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, C. (1982). *MITI and the Japanese miracle: The growth of industrial policy*. Stanford University Press.

- <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780804765602>
- Kennedy, S. (2017). The myth of the Beijing consensus. *Journal of Contemporary China*, 19(65), 461–477. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10670561003666087>
- Kohli, A. (2004). *State-directed development*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511754371>
- Leftwich, A. (2000). *States of development: On the primacy of politics in development*. Polity Press.
- Migdal, J. S. (1988). *Strong societies and weak states: State-society relations and state capabilities in the Third World*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691212852>
- Mkandawire, T. (2001). Thinking about developmental states in Africa. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 25(3), 289–314. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cje/25.3.289>
- Naughton, B. (2007). *The Chinese economy: Transitions and growth*. MIT Press.
- North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change, and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511808678>
- Pei, M. (2006). *China's trapped transition*. Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674041981>
- Rostow, W. W. (1960). *The stages of economic growth: A non-communist manifesto*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.
- Shambaugh, D. (2016). *China's future*. Polity Press.
- Skocpol, T. (1979). *States and social revolutions*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815805>
- Wang, W. G. (2025). Deeply understanding the Marxist worldview and methodology for further deepening reform and advancing Chinese-style modernization. *Marxist Philosophy*, (4), 6–13, 198.
- Weiss, L. (1998). *The myth of the powerless state*. Cornell University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7591/9781501711732>
- Xu, X.-J., & Luo, Y.-F. (2024). The open political economy logic of Chinese-style modernization. *World Economics and Politics (Shijie Jingji yu Zhengzhi)*, (10), 3–32, 159–160.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).