O'ZBEKISTON RESPUBLIKASI
PREZIDENTI HUZURIDAGI
DAVLAT SIYOSATI VA BOSHQARUVI
AKADEMIYASI

JAMIYAT VA BOSHQARUV

Общество и управление / Society and Administration

2026/3(113)

1997-yildan nashr etiladi

ISSN: 2181-7340
E-ISSN: 3093-9208

Toshkent – 2026

INDUSTRIALIZATION AND THE CHINESE PATH TO MODERNIZATION



Li YIN,
Researcher at Fudan University

Abstract: this article examines China's rapid industrialization and modernization, transitioning from a low-income agrarian society to a global economic power. It highlights the role of indigenous innovation, state investments in education and infrastructure, and technology transfer. The study compares China's productive capability-building model with Western financialization, offering insights for latecomer economies seeking sustainable technological advancement.

Keywords:*industrialization, modernization, indigenous innovation, state investments, technology transfer, economic growth, Chinese experience.*

Sanoatlashtirish va Xitoyning modernizatsiya yo‘li

Li Yin,
Fudan universiteti tadqiqotchisi.

Annotatsiya: ushbu maqola Xitoyning qishloq xo'jaligiga asoslangan jamiyatdan global iqtisodiy kuchga aylanishidagi tezkor sanoatlashtirish va modernizatsiya jarayonlarini o'rganadi. Mahalliy innovatsiyalar, ta'lim hamda infratuzilmaga davlat investitsiyalari va texnologiyalar uzatilishining o'rni yoritilgan. Xitoyning ishlab chiqarish salohiyatini shakllantirish modeli G'arbning moliyalashtirish yondashuvi bilan solishtirilib, rivojlanayotgan davlatlar barqaror texnologik o'sishi uchun muhim xulosalar taqdim etiladi.

Kalit so'zlar: *sanoatlashtirish, modernizatsiya, innovatsiya, davlat investitsiyalari, texnologiyalar transferi, iqtisodiy o'sish, Xitoy tajribasi.*

Индустриализация и китайский путь модернизации

Ли Инь,
исследователь Фуданьского университета

Аннотация: в статье рассматривается быстрая индустриализация и модернизация Китая, превратившегося из аграрного общества в мировую экономическую державу. Подчеркивается роль внутренних инноваций, государственных инвестиций в образование и инфраструктуру, а также трансфера технологий. Модель наращивания производственного потенциала Китая сравнивается с западной финансиализацией, предлагая развивающимся странам важные выводы для достижения устойчивого технологического прогресса.

Ключевые слова: *индустриализация, модернизация, инновации, государственные инвестиции, трансфер технологий, экономический рост, опыт Китая.*

Over the past four decades, the global economic landscape has been profoundly reshaped by China's transition from a low-income, primarily agrarian society into the world's second-largest economy. This structural transformation has not only lifted hundreds of millions of people out of absolute poverty but has also established the nation as a formidable competitor in highly sophisticated, technology-intensive industries. While mainstream economic narratives frequently attribute this rapid rise to simplistic variables—such as cheap labor, market liberalization, or state interventions, these explanations overlook the complex organizational and technological dynamics that drive latecomer industrialization [1].

In this paper, we provide a comprehensive framework to analyze the deep-seated determinants of China's economic trajectory. We argue that China's development is best understood not as a passive consequence of market forces, but as an active, innovation-driven process [2]. This path is defined by a continuous interaction between state-level investments in public capabilities and firm-level technological learning. At the core of this transformation is the process of indigenous innovation—the systematic effort within a developing nation to absorb, adapt, and improve upon advanced technologies transferred from abroad, eventually allowing domestic firms to achieve global competitiveness. By examining the co-evolution of state policy, diverse corporate organizational structures, and international technology transfer, this essay explores how China systematically upgraded its industrial base to challenge established global leaders.

Theoretical Foundation: The Social Conditions of Innovative Enterprise

To comprehend China's industrialization, it is necessary to first understand the microeconomic foundations of economic growth. Standard economic theories often view the business firm as a passive entity that simply combines capital and labor in response to prevailing market prices. In contrast, the analytical framework presented here posits that sustained economic development is driven by innovative enterprises [1, 2].

Innovation is defined as the collective and cumulative process of transforming productive resources into higher-quality, lower-cost products than were previously available. Because innovation is inherently collectiverequiring the cooperation of many individuals-and cumulative-building step-by-step over time-it cannot occur overnight or through isolated individual efforts. Consequently, the process of innovation is fraught with three types of critical uncertainty: Technological Uncertainty, Market Uncertainty, and Competitive Uncertainty.

To navigate these uncertainties, business enterprises require specific social and organizational arrangements. The theoretical framework identifies three essential "social conditions" that must be met

for a firm to successfully innovate: Strategic Control, Organizational Integration, and Financial Commitment [3]. Strategic Control concerns the alignment, abilities, and incentives of the decision-makers who allocate an enterprise's resources. Organizational integration refers to the system of relationships, skill development, and incentives that motivates employees up and down the corporate hierarchy to cooperate in collective learning. Financial Commitment allows the collective learning process to accumulate continuously, shielding the firm from short-term financial market pressures.

In China's development path, the state has acted as an indispensable partner in establishing these three conditions. By funding massive, upfront investments in human capabilities and physical infrastructure, the government has significantly mitigated the technological and market uncertainties facing domestic business enterprises [4].

Foundational State Investments: Education, Science, and Infrastructure

A vital pillar of China's industrialization is the "investment triad" the cooperative interaction among government agencies, business enterprises, and household units to fund and build productive capabilities. The Chinese state did not merely regulate markets; it acted as a proactive investor, establishing the basic infrastructure of a modern industrial economy through three main channels.

At the founding of the People's Republic of China in 1949, the nation faced a staggering illiteracy rate of approximately 80%. Through systematic state investment, the government legally mandated nine years of free education in 1982, successfully reducing illiteracy to under 10% over the subsequent decades. While mass literacy created a highly disciplined workforce suitable for basic manufacturing, the late 1990s witnessed a dramatic expansion of the higher education system. Crucially, the state launched targeted national programs to transform traditional teaching colleges into world-class research institutions, prioritizing engineering and applied sciences over theoretical disciplines [5].

In the pre-reform era of the 1950s through the 1970s, China operated a centralized, Soviet-style planning system. Scientific research was concentrated in elite, isolated military-industrial ministries and the Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS), largely detached from commercial manufacturing. During the 1980s and 1990s, the government systematically restructured this S&T system. Direct administrative funding to traditional research institutes was cut, forcing them to commercialize their discoveries. Concurrently, the state launched targeted funding initiatives, such as the "863 Program" for high-tech development and the "973 Program" for basic research [3].

To unlock the productivity of its educated labor force, the state financed massive infrastructure networks. Fiscal reforms in the 1990s allowed local and regional governments to retain a portion of their tax revenues, linking the career advancement of local bureaucrats directly to regional economic growth. Through the establishment of the China Development

Bank (CDB) in 1993, the state channeled national savings into giant development projects, utilizing land as collateral. This financed the construction of the world's largest high-speed rail network, an expansive national expressway system, and world-class deep-water container shipping ports [4].

The Ladders of Technological Learning

A developing nation cannot transition immediately to the cutting edge of global technology; it must first close the gap by learning from advanced economies. China's industrialization was greatly accelerated by its integration into the global economy, utilizing three primary channels to absorb foreign technological knowledge.

In the 1980s and 1990s, China pursued a deliberate industrial strategy known as "Trading Market for Technology" (TMFT). In critical sectors such as passenger automobiles and telecommunications, foreign multinational corporations were barred from establishing wholly owned subsidiaries. Instead, to access China's rapidly expanding domestic market, they were required to form joint ventures (JVs) with large Chinese state-owned enterprises (SOEs). Through these partnerships, the Chinese government enforced strict "local content" requirements, compelling foreign firms to transfer manufacturing techniques and train local suppliers [5].

Simultaneously, China integrated itself into global supply networks, particularly in the information and communication technology (ICT) sectors. Local firms initially entered global value chains at the lowest level, performing labor-intensive assembly of imported components for foreign brands—a model known as Original Equipment Manufacturing (OEM). Over decades of repetitive learning and capability building, these firms gradually accumulated the engineering skills required to take over product design (ODM) and eventually established their own global brands (OBM).

Like many developing nations, China initially suffered from a severe "brain drain" as its brightest science and engineering graduates moved abroad. However, by the late 1990s and 2000s, this trend reversed. Returning emigrants brought back advanced technical expertise, managerial skills, and deep connections to international venture capital and global production networks. Central and municipal governments actively accelerated this process by offering returning scientists and entrepreneurs substantial incentives to build high-tech startups in designated technology parks [1].

Case Studies in Indigenous Industrial Success

By combining foundational state investments with international technological learning, Chinese enterprises began to transition into the phase of indigenous innovation. The historical trajectory of this transition is illustrated across four key industries.

Computer Electronics: The Pioneer "Minying" Firms. During the mid-1980s, a new category of "non-governmental" technology enterprises emerged, known as minying firms. Operating outside the direct administrative and budgetary control of the central planning bureaucracy, these firms-

such as Stone, Legend (later renamed Lenovo), and Founder—were often spun off from elite state universities or research institutes. These pioneers succeeded because they possessed unique organizational characteristics: Managerial Autonomy, Market-Led Technology Integration, and Earnings Retention [2].

Automobiles: The Shift to Electric Vehicles. The push for true indigenous innovation in the automotive sector came from independent, non-state-owned enterprises like Geely and BYD, which entered the market in the late 1990s. Initially producing low-cost vehicles, these firms pursued a strategy of rapid, iterative upgrades. This foundation enabled China's rapid rise in the New Energy Vehicle (NEV) sector. Supported by coordinated state policies to build massive public charging networks and phase out gasoline engines, domestic firms developed leading-edge capabilities [4].

Telecommunications: Building Global Leaders. The Chinese government kept the domestic market highly competitive by allowing local startups to enter. In the late 1980s, two non-state-owned firms emerged in Shenzhen: Huawei and ZTE. Huawei, founded as an employee-owned cooperative, utilized an Employee Stock Ownership Program (ESOP) to distribute shares among its workers. Keeping the firm off the stock market allowed Huawei's leadership to retain its profits and maintain a massive, long-term financial commitment to R&D [5].

Semiconductor Fabrication: Geopolitics and Patient Capital. The industry shifted in 2000 when the state removed entry barriers, encouraging returnee entrepreneurs to establish independent "pure-play" foundries. The leading example is Semiconductor Manufacturing International Corporation (SMIC). To bridge the immense capital expenditure gap, the Chinese government established the National Integrated Circuit Industry Investment Fund (the "Big Fund") in 2014, providing the massive, long-term financial commitment SMIC needed to upgrade its facilities [3].

Comparative Dynamics: Innovation vs. Financialization

The structural trajectory of China’s development path stands in stark contrast to the modern evolution of Western economies, particularly the United States. This divergence reveals a fundamental difference in how corporate resources are allocated in the modern global economy.

Historically, the rise of both the United States and Japan to industrial dominance was built on a similar foundation: a highly supportive developmental state that funded public education and infrastructure, combined with innovative enterprises that reinvested their earnings into the long-term productive capabilities of their employees and manufacturing facilities [5].

In recent decades, however, the United States has experienced a structural shift toward "corporate financialization." Under the dominant corporate ideology of "maximizing shareholder value," major US technology companies have increasingly prioritized short-term stock price manipulation over long-term productive investment. Instead of retaining profits to

build cutting-edge manufacturing facilities or retrain their workforces, US giants have distributed trillions of dollars to shareholders through stock buybacks and dividends [1].

In contrast, China's development path has remained structurally focused on productive capability building. By shielding key enterprises from the pressures of short-term stock market speculation, encouraging the retention of corporate earnings, and providing massive, state-backed patient capital, China has created a highly resilient ecosystem for indigenous innovation [4].

The global competitive friction between the United States and China is not simply a political conflict over trade rules, tariffs, or intellectual property. Fundamentally, it represents a deep structural competition between two distinct models of resource allocation: a highly financialized corporate model that prioritizes short-term shareholder extraction, and an innovation-driven developmental model built on collective learning, strategic state support, and sustained long-term investment.

China's industrialization demonstrates that economic development is not an automatic outcome of free-market forces. Rather, it is the result of a coordinated developmental state that builds foundational public capabilities, and innovative enterprises that organize collective learning to turn those capabilities into high-quality, competitive products. As the third decade of the twenty-first century unfolds, China's development path continues to challenge conventional economic paradigms, suggesting that long-term industrial leadership belongs to those societies that prioritize continuous investment in productive capabilities over short-term financial gain [2, 3].

References:

1. Li, Y. (2022). China's drive for the technology frontier: Indigenous innovation in the high-tech industry. Routledge.
2. Li, Y., & Lazonick, W. (2022). China's development path: government, business, and globalization in an innovating economy. Institute for New Economic Thinking Working Paper.
3. Naughton, B. (2021). The Rise of China's Industrial Policy, 1978 to 2020. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
4. Lin, J. Y. (2022). Demystifying the Chinese Economy (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
5. Chen, L., & Naughton, B. (2023). State Capitalism, Institutional Adaptation, and the Chinese Miracle. Cambridge University Press.