

Historical Lessons and Practical Rationale of National Coordinated Governance in China

Taijun Jin¹ Zhenbo Zhang²

Abstract: China's national coordinated governance is an inevitable choice for achieving coordinated, orderly, and effective governance in such a diverse country. This research demonstrates how this governance model addresses the challenges of unbalanced development by integrating governance across regions, sectors, and levels, thereby ensuring national unity, social stability, and sustainable development. This governance model is rooted in the conceptual evolution from governance to national governance and draws valuable historical lessons from China's feudal ruling traditions. The framework for constructing national coordinated governance is embodied in the triple real-world processes involving society, government, and the state: (1) the social rationale, which emphasizes societal integration and dynamic interactions between governance and daily life; (2) the government rationale, which focuses on optimizing government functions for adaptability and efficient public administration; and (3) the national rationale, which ensures structural stability and legitimacy by balancing governance actors, scope, methods, and values. These dimensions collectively establish a robust foundation for modernizing governance in China and shaping its authority and legitimacy.

Keywords: National Governance, National Coordinated Governance, Historical Lessons, Practical Rationale

1. School of Law, Anhui Normal University, China

2. School of Public Administration, Nanjing Normal University, China

Correspondence Zhenbo Zhang (zzb900816@163.com)

Introduction

National coordinated governance refers to a governance concept, behavior, and model in which, during the process of national governance, the governance bodies take differentiated governance strategies based on the conditions and endowments, as well as the differences among different regions, various entities, and multiple objects. These strategies are tailored to local conditions, follow specific approaches, and have different emphases. They involve comprehensive consideration and differentiated treatment of specific issues, goals, matters, and interest relationships in the governance process. National coordinated governance is an inevitable choice for a complex country like China to achieve coordinated, orderly, and effective governance. It is an effective path to solve the problem of uneven national development, maintain national unity, achieve social stability and order, and promote national sustainable development (Yin 2024). Deng Xiaoping, the Chinese leader who initiated the Reform and Opening-Up strategy, was keenly aware of the vast disparities across regions, urban and rural areas, and individuals in China. He emphasized that “modernization is a multi-faceted program that requires a comprehensive and balanced approach; a one-track mind is bound to fail” (Deng 1994, 250) and that “we must regulate the interplay of various interests through centrally guided coordination” (Deng 1994, 175). In a 2014 interview with a Russian television network, President Xi Jinping reaffirmed that “To be a leader in China, one must have a clear understanding of the situation and take a holistic approach to make overall plans and strike a proper balance.” (Xi 2016, 193).

The semantic distinction between “governance” and “national governance” is conceptually significant, with the latter reflecting the intrinsic essence and practical demands of national coordinated governance in China. Although governance is longed for and anticipated by people because of the beautiful vision it portrays, even among Western scholars, governance is merely conceptualized as a rationalized imagination of specific practices or as a thematic concept in theoretical research. However, a comprehensive and extensible theoretical system of governance has not yet been fully developed (Wang 2015). The reason it has long lingered in the chaos of proto-theoretical significance is that governance concepts, as a substitute for the state, often fall into a

quagmire of inefficiency or even ineffectiveness once they are detached from the state's supply of institutions, organizations, resources, and ideologies. This is true even in the Western contexts, where the state, society, and market are supposedly tripartite and separate (Hysing 2009). According to Olson's (1965) "logic of collective action" theory, some challenges inherent in self-organization in human society can be difficult to overcome without external intervention. In contrast, considering the irrational rejection of state-centered governance in social governance, Chinese scholars have cautiously adopted the discourse of governance as a flexibly applicable paradigm rather than a mandatorily embedded theoretical system when introducing the governance discourse system. This approach acknowledges the distinction between state and society, emphasizes China's autonomy in shaping its democratic development path, and highlights the interactive relation between state and society (Yang 2021). The state-orientation, party committee leadership, and government domination emphasized in national governance serve as the premise and guarantee for orderly coordination and efficient cooperation among multiple subjects. Thus, the essential requirement for advancing the modernization of national governance resides in integrating the governance process into state-building, conceiving it as a function and capability of the government to formulate rules and provide services. Furthermore, it involves leveraging the state's guiding force, leadership, integration capacity, and coordination ability to manage the diversity, openness, fluidity, and inclusiveness inherent in governance.

Historical Lessons for National Coordinated Governance

Over thousands of years of continuous evolution, Chinese feudal rulers gradually developed a proven system for social management and rule. This system, to some extent, overcame the fragmentation of the small-scale peasant economy, integrating the scattered social structures of ancient China. This traditional model of social management and rule was effective to some extent, as evidenced by its contributions to the extended periods of peace, stability, unity, and cohesion frequently observed in ancient Chinese society (Xiao 2014). Notably, the relation

between the state and society in this traditional model often relied on oppressive mechanisms. Nonetheless, this model also laid a foundation of values and social structures that continue to inform the construction of state–society relations in new historical stages. More importantly, it offers valuable lessons for national coordinated governance in the present day. Despite significant differences in form and substance between feudal and modern national governance, the insights and practices of the former in power operations, social order maintenance, and resource allocation provide invaluable historical references for the latter. Reflecting on and analyzing traditional feudal governance allows a better understanding of the complexity, diversity, and adaptability of national coordinated governance across different historical periods and cultural contexts.

The governance system of China's feudal society was underpinned and characterized by the political and social value of "collective justice." Fundamentally, the collectivist values of China's feudal society aligned with its natural economy and, in turn, objectively reinforced and solidified that economic base. The self-sufficient small-peasant economy constituted the foundational socio-economic structure, with households serving as the basic units of production and life, exhibiting an isolated organizational form. Against this socio-economic backdrop, isolated clan units became the basic cells of society, carrying the responsibility for the reproduction and development of families. Within these clan units, the Confucian scholar class played a crucial role. They were "officials in the court and gentlemen in the countryside," holding dual identities as both officials of the feudal dynasty and gentry of rural society. As "the spokesmen for feudal orthodox values," Confucian scholars spontaneously interpreted and practiced the value of collective justice in family management practices. The core content of the collective justice they advocated lay in ensuring the basic survival needs of family members, guaranteeing that family members receive necessary support and care both materially and spiritually. At the same time, they were committed to maintaining order and harmony within the clan by regulating the behavior of family members and coordinating conflicts within the family, thereby ensuring the stability and continuity of the clan. This value orientation of collective justice was highly consistent with the value of "justice" advocated in feudal China, reflecting the profound embodiment and concrete practice of feudal societal values at the family level and becoming an important

bond for maintaining the family structure and social order in feudal society.

The idea of justice, often expressed through the principle of “people-centered governance,” permeated governance practices built on the pillars of “protecting,” “caring for,” and “nurturing the people.” This concept reached its extreme expression in the interconnection between “popular resistance” and “Heaven’s virtue,” asserting that the dignity and inviolability of the people were inherent, bestowed by nature. From a historical perspective, the people-centered ideology has a long history. The saying “The people are the foundation of the state; when the foundation is solid, the state is tranquil” emphasizes that the people are the cornerstone of the country, and only by safeguarding their basic survival needs can the country enjoy long-term peace and stability. However, as a political value, people-centered governance under feudal absolutism could not transform into a clear institutional concept of “civil rights” in the modern sense (Xia 2004). Even so, if scholars refrain from judging feudal systems through the lens of contemporary civil rights, as embodied in the concept of “civil governance,” and instead examine the policy content, they can discern institutional efforts to reflect the values of collective justice and embody the ideals of people-centered governance. Indeed, even during the Ming and Qing dynasties, when centralization reached unprecedented levels, the state maintained strong policies to secure the basic survival rights of the people, giving it characteristics akin to a modern welfare state (Wei 2003). For instance, during the Ming and Qing dynasties, policies encompassing land distribution, taxation and labor service systems, as well as disaster relief measures, were implemented to guarantee that farmers could fulfill their basic survival needs. To a certain extent, this policy orientation mirrors the concern for the lower strata of society, akin to the notion of modern welfare states safeguarding citizens’ fundamental rights through redistribution mechanisms. The coexistence of strengthened centralization and protection of people’s welfare in the feudal state reflected the interaction and integration of “collective” and “justice” values. It also showcased the institutionalized coordination between feudal monarchy and people-centered governance. This coordination mechanism is not coincidental; rather, it is grounded in the interplay between the “people-centered and “monarch-centered” principles within traditional Chinese

political thought. In this context, the people-oriented principle does not exist in isolation but rather complements the monarch-centered principle, collectively forming the theoretical foundation for feudal state governance.

Under the influence of the value of collective justice, ancient Chinese society witnessed the emergence, development, and flourishing of the concept of the “family-state.” This concept, rooted in Confucian ideals of harmony and inclusivity, wrapped repressive and extractive governance philosophies in a more palatable framework, forming a sense of national identity centered on kinship-based communities. Such national identity contributed to the “super-stability” of ancient Chinese society (Jin and Liu 2011). To some extent, the kinship-based community’s national identity became a means of monopolizing social interests. Although ancient Chinese society could not avoid latent social conflicts and periodic dynastic upheavals, it retained a relatively stable structure over time. The formation of this ultra-stable structure is closely related to the deep-rooted concept of “the family as the foundation of the state” in feudal society. By viewing the country as one big family, it strengthened the people’s sense of identity and belonging towards the ruling class. At the same time, this concept of national identity also promoted integration and identification among various ethnic groups to a certain extent, enabling different ethnic groups to form a unified national identity within a common political and cultural framework. “In traditional states, individuals or groups lived within relatively stable social circles and spaces for life and production. Within this context, ascribed roles and internalized identities shaped personal or group affiliations without the need for deliberate construction or selection” (Jin and Yao 2014).

Social Rationale of National Coordinated Governance

The process of individual participation in social governance is inherently pluralistic and complex, combining dynamic and static elements. In a diverse society, individuals often adjust their behavioral strategies within their limited conceptual frameworks to navigate heterogeneous organizational environments. This adjustment process is not only constrained by individual cognition and resources but also

influenced by social structures and cultural traditions. In ancient Chinese society, the collectivist values advocated by Confucian ethics provided an important cultural framework for individual behavioral adjustment, enabling individuals to pursue their own interests while also coordinating their behavior with collective interests. Furthermore, this dynamic adjustment process also reflects the interactive relationship between individuals and organizations within the context of social governance. By constantly adjusting their behavioral strategies, individuals not only satisfy their own needs but also promote adaptive changes in the organizational environment to a certain extent. Consequently, “it is unrealistic to assume that the behaviors of different individuals can be aggregated solely through rational calculations” (Migdal 2013, 195–196). Only integrative, representative, and unifying forces and organizations in the public sphere, which embody collective agreements, can serve as the key to building the social governance capacities of a pluralistic society. These forces and organizations forge a public value that transcends individual interests by consolidating consensus among diverse entities, thereby achieving the effectiveness of social governance through the combination of dynamic and static elements.

Regarding the distinctive characteristics of social governance, researchers are clarifying the unique needs of social governance compared with other governance entities and highlighting its indispensable role in the state-building process. The recognition and fulfillment of these unique needs are not only crucial for maximizing governance effectiveness but also serve as an important guarantee for ensuring the coordinated advancement of the modernization of the social governance system and national governance capacity. Examination of the intrinsic relation between social governance and state-building reveals that contemporary Chinese society has yet to mature to the point of possessing a robust civil society capable of independently assuming social governance responsibilities while demonstrating both political awareness and efficient governance capabilities. Currently, China’s civil society is still in a developmental stage, characterized by distinct dualities of state-civil society and transitional features. Most non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are established and predominantly guided by the government, with autonomy and voluntarism, typical characteristics of civil society, not yet prominent. Furthermore, citizen participation lacks depth and

breadth, and social organizations operate at a relatively low level and lack alliances. This current situation indicates that, although China's society is gradually introducing diverse entities into social governance, the maturity and independence of civil society are still insufficient to fully shoulder the responsibilities of social governance. Thus, it necessitates gradual improvement of its functions and capabilities under the guidance and support of the state.

Meanwhile, the rapid transformations and heightened complexity of modern society have led to profound diversification of interests within social systems, challenges in political integration, and conflicts in cultural assimilation. With the in-depth development of the socialist market economy, profound changes have taken place in China's social stratum structure, leading to increasingly diversified interest entities and complex interest demands. This differentiation has not only resulted in uneven distribution of interests but has also intensified social contradictions, thereby increasing the difficulty of social governance. At the cultural level, cultural exchanges and collisions in the context of globalization have made differences and misunderstandings between different cultures a significant source of cultural conflicts. These conflicts are not only manifested in the disparities of values and behavioral patterns but may also pose threats to culturally vulnerable groups, further exacerbating the challenges posed by cultural diversity.

Against this complex backdrop, neither the upward centralization of state power nor the downward decentralization advocated by social governance can independently and effectively address the challenges of complex societal affairs. This transformation prompts the state and society to continuously adjust their respective roles and boundaries in their interactions, gradually forming a governance landscape characterized by mutual promotion and coordinated development. In this landscape, the state provides support and guarantees for social governance through institutionalized means, while society contributes rich resources and practical foundations for national development through the participation of diverse stakeholders. Together, they propel the joint progress and development of both the state and society. Amid the gradual dissolution of the traditional divide between state-building and social governance, both domains are beginning to reevaluate and recognize each other's functions and values. In turn, this process is fostering the gradual

formation of the concept of social governance.

Social governance differs from social control and management—it represents a mode of connecting governance actors and managing public affairs. Its core structural characteristics are the diversity of governance actors and decentralization of governance processes. Within this governance framework, not only state authority and governments at all levels but also the market and social systems—comprising individuals and organizations—have the potential to become governance actors. The market system, with its efficiency in resource allocation and its ability to regulate economic activities, can provide powerful economic support and incentive mechanisms for social governance. Meanwhile, individuals and organizations within the social system, leveraging their advantages of flexibility, diversity, and proximity to grassroots communities, can effectively compensate for the deficiencies of national governance and precisely respond to social needs. This participation by diverse stakeholders not only enriches governance resources but also expands governance tools, enabling the governance process to more accurately address social issues and achieve a positive interaction and coordinated governance among the state, market, and society.

Furthermore, the governance of public affairs and satisfaction of interest demands are no longer confined to the political agenda but permeate various aspects and regions of social life. This transformation in governance models suggests that public affairs are no longer managed exclusively through unilateral government decision-making and execution. Instead, it necessitates consultation and cooperation among diverse stakeholders across multiple fields. Whether it pertains to environmental governance in urban communities, resource allocation in rural areas, the optimization of public education, or the enhancement of healthcare services, each level may involve the participation and interaction of stakeholders with varying interests. This broad scope not only necessitates that governance entities possess cross-sectoral coordination capabilities but also emphasizes the significance of inclusiveness and transparency within the governance process, thereby ensuring that the interests and demands of diverse regions and groups are adequately represented and effectively addressed. In summary, this governance model employs a decentralized approach, cultivating a novel landscape that is characterized by diverse governance entities,

decentralized hubs, varied forms, and flexible temporal and spatial arrangements. These structural features of social governance necessitate leveraging the integrative instincts, value-cohesion capacities, and political communication functions of coordinated governance to connect national governance with the daily lives of citizens. This integration bridges the ideological boundaries of the public domain with the traditional values of everyday life, breaking down the barriers between macro-level institutional systems and micro-level customs, moral systems, and informal institutions. It fosters the true integration and mutual shaping of national governance and daily life in a dynamic process, thereby establishing the social foundation essential for the sustainability of national governance.

To achieve this, governance entities capable of coordination and integration at the social governance level—such as party committees and governments at all levels—must transcend the abstract dichotomy between liberalism and statism. These entities should fully leverage their advantages in political communication, policy implementation, social integration, and public education. On the one hand, they should work to enhance the civic awareness of social groups and strengthen the public nature of society, thereby improving the self-organizational capacity and governance efficiency of social systems. In this process, the government must clarify the boundary between administrative regulation and social autonomy, fully leveraging citizens' role as the cornerstone in governance. Moreover, by nurturing and reinforcing endogenous and specialized social organizations within communities, and fostering residents' self-organizing capabilities alongside a spirit of voluntary self-help, it becomes feasible to effectively tackle the dilemma of collective action within communities and further elevate the level of refinement and precision in social governance. On the other hand, they should oversee state authority and provide orderly channels for expressing demands for power decentralization, thereby fostering a flexible and dynamic collaborative relation between state-building and social governance. On this foundation, the interplay between the state and society ought to transition from traditional unilateral management to bidirectional collaborative governance, establishing a cooperative governance framework characterized by “empowerment, incorporation, and embedding,” thereby fostering a positive interplay and synergistic

evolution between national governance and social governance. This collaboration may even enable their mutual transformation when necessary. The establishment of such collaborative relations supports the transformation of state power, directing it toward building “fundamental capacities.” These capacities refer to the state’s ability to penetrate society, organize social relations, and implement policies through processes of social consultation and cooperation.

Government Rationale of National Coordinated Governance

In contrast to governance in Western countries, which often emphasizes “weakening political power, even removing political authority, in hopes of achieving multi-stakeholder co-governance and pluralistic self-governance within society” (Wang 2014a), China’s approach to governance under socialism with Chinese characteristics is not a simple matter of devolving power or depoliticizing authority. Instead, it seeks to achieve governance with multiple centers, diverse actors, and broad social participation, all the while maintaining the authority of the ruling party. This governance model emphasizes giving full play to the advantages of different governance entities under the centralized and unified leadership of the Party to form a collaborative and co-governance structure, thereby achieving efficiency, stability, and sustainability in national governance and further promoting comprehensive social progress and harmonious development. Notably, national governance in China operates within the framework of socialism with Chinese characteristics, aimed at achieving the overarching goal of deepening reforms. This governance model is characterized by “the Communist Party of China serving as the leadership core, overseeing the overall situation and coordinating across all sectors; its actual functioning involves a leadership core, multi-stakeholder participation, and clearly defined responsibilities” (Wang 2014b).

To achieve efficient governance of public affairs, the government must flexibly and timely adjust and optimize its functional configuration—an important benchmark for measuring adaptability and vitality. Properly defining and optimizing government functions holds strategic significance

in accelerating the modernization of the national governance system and capacity. In China's specific conditions, the transformation of government functions is not simply about transferring power from the government to the market or society. Under the strong leadership of the ruling party, it involves actively exploring and implementing a collaborative governance model among the government, market, and society. In recent years, China has continuously promoted the optimization and transformation of government functions through multiple rounds of institutional reforms, aiming to establish a comprehensive, scientifically standardized, and efficient national institutional function system. This process entails appropriately adjusting the scope of government authority as well as comprehensively and deeply coordinating and optimizing its organizational structure, operational mechanisms, and functional execution. The core of transforming government functions lies in reexamining and redefining the roles and relations among the government, society, and market. This requires abandoning traditional, rigid cognitive frameworks and adopting new perspectives and ways of thinking to reshape mechanisms for positive interaction and collaborative development among the three entities. Within the macro framework of the national governance system, the modernization of national governance is seen as a grand goal, with the transformation of government functions as a crucial step and core means to achieve it. The realization of national governance modernization depends on the steady and sustained progress of government function transformation. This transformation must closely align with the goals of national governance modernization, undergoing continuous self-adjustment and optimization. It must be guided by the requirements of governance modernization, with its achievements serving as validation that drives the deepening and further evolution of government function transformation.

The transformation of government functions is a complex and incremental long-term process. Its success cannot be achieved overnight or through arbitrary measures but must be deeply rooted in meticulous top-level design and a clear value-oriented framework. The value orientation of this transformation fundamentally shapes the ultimate form of government functions and directly determines whether such form can align closely with the intrinsic needs of economic and social development, thereby effectively advancing comprehensive social

progress and prosperity.

Regarding value choices, the transformation of government functions must transition from “efficiency first” to a balanced approach that emphasizes both fairness and efficiency. Therefore, government governance must not only pursue operational efficiency and enhance administrative effectiveness but also prioritize fairness. By strengthening accountability, emphasizing service orientation, and deeply focusing on social equity, government governance can better address the actual needs of the people, truly serving their welfare and enhancing their well-being. This transformation is not only a response to the needs of social development in the new era but also an inevitable requirement for advancing the modernization of the national governance system and governance capacity.

Regarding goal orientation, the transformation of government functions should firmly center on public interest, striving to maximize it. As a crucial component of the national governance system, the government must ensure that its public authority always serves the well-being of all citizens, advancing the process of national governance modernization to achieve social harmony, stability, and sustainable development. In this process, the government needs to further clarify its relationship with the market and society, define the boundaries of its own responsibilities, and establish a government governance system with clear responsibilities and administration in accordance with the law, to ensure that public interests are fully represented in policy formulation and implementation.

As for the guiding principles, the transformation of government functions should adhere to a flexible strategy of “appropriate engagement and withdrawal” (Zhao and Fan 2015). During the transformation process, the government should flexibly adjust its roles and responsibilities based on actual conditions. It must avoid excessive interference in the market and society, instead allowing greater autonomy, while also stepping in when necessary to ensure that government functions are appropriately defined and effectively performed in areas where the role of the government is indispensable. This strategy requires the government to reduce direct intervention in microeconomic activities within the economic sphere and give full play to the decisive role of the market in resource allocation. At the same time, in critical areas such as

public goods supply, market regulation, and social equity guarantees, the government should actively fulfill its responsibilities, address market failures, and achieve positive interactions between the government, the market, and society. This will thereby advance the modernization of the national governance system and governance capacity.

Finally, regarding adaptation to evolving relations, the current transformation of government functions in China must be informed by and responsive to the profound changes in the relations between the government and the market, society, and citizens. This effort aims to establish a collaborative governance mechanism among the government, market, and society. This implies that the government must further refine its interaction mode with the market and society, based on a clear delineation of its own responsibility boundaries. By enhancing laws and regulations, innovating governance instruments, and bolstering governance capabilities, the government can foster cooperation and coordination among diverse entities.

National Rationale of National Coordinated Governance

The conceptual essence of national governance clarifies that “governance” does not stand in opposition to the “state.” National governance transcends the one-sided emphasis on “de-statization” often associated with governance models. As such, it aligns more closely with the political and social realities of China and the path of socialism with Chinese characteristics. Therefore, the current understanding of governance should move beyond the Western dichotomy of the state and society, where they are seen as either separate or even adversarial. Instead, we must construct a normative system for national governance based on China’s unique state–society relations and political organization. Only by doing so can governance practices, which formally emphasize “plurality of actors” and “decentralization of governance,” avoid inherently negating or rejecting the role of the state. Such an approach ensures that the extraordinary constructive value of governance can be fully realized in the building of a modern state, rather than becoming overly entangled in the deconstructionist narratives and theoretical

visions idealized by Western scholars (Jin 2015).

As a new mode of state-building, national governance aims to maintain public order and political legitimacy. However, it also requires innovation and flexibility in practice, incorporating markets, society, and relevant stakeholders to confirm and safeguard collaborative governance within the system. This approach promotes the diffusion of public values, enhancement of public interests, and creation of a resilient and dynamic public order based on governance-driven political legitimacy. In this regard, political legitimacy serves not only as the cornerstone of national governance but also as one of the core standards for measuring governance effectiveness. It requires the government, in its governance practices, to fully respect and safeguard citizens' fundamental rights. By establishing transparent and fair decision-making mechanisms and providing effective public services, the government can enhance citizens' trust and identification with the government, thereby providing a solid popular foundation and social support for national governance.

The practical dimension of national governance centers on the realization of its governance functions and their effectiveness, addressing the operational realities of governance. National governance must not remain confined to theoretical frameworks or top-level designs; it must demonstrate deep concern for real-world problems and a strong orientation toward effective solutions. In its pursuit of "leapfrog development," China often faces challenges where issues that would traditionally be addressed in stages emerge simultaneously in complex, interwoven forms. This phenomenon accelerates the fragmentation of social structures, often outpacing the integrative capacity of institutional norms, thus making contradictions and disconnections among structural elements particularly prominent during China's social transformation. Regarding these structural governance challenges, scholars have conducted systematic analyses at various levels. At the macro-level, they have explored the integration of administrative bureaucratic reforms and technological governance models. At the meso-level, they have examined the interaction between authoritative systems and effective governance. At the micro-level, they have delved into the interplay between institutional frameworks and everyday life. In this context, Yan (2014) offered a profound observation: "The core of national governance capacity lies in the state's ability to supply institutions." Scholars have also emphasized

the intrinsic connection between national governance and value systems, arguing that abstract governance values are embedded within specific governance practices and shape the nature and characteristics of governance itself.

Given that structural imbalances often trigger issues of identity (Zhou and Liu 2013), advancing the modernization of national governance and enhancing the practical effectiveness of coordinated governance will require comprehensive consideration. On the one hand, attention must be paid to structural issues, such as governance actors, scope, methods, and performance, to ensure the stability and efficiency of the governance system. On the other hand, stakeholders must conduct a deep exploration of the essential nature, value pursuits, and fundamental principles of national governance to shape its legitimacy and authority. This dual focus not only aids in constructing a scientific, rational, coordinated, and orderly governance structure but also achieves an organic unity between governance tools and governance objectives in practice, enabling national governance to maintain adaptability and flexibility amidst dynamic adjustments. On this basis, further strengthening public participation and democratic oversight in the governance process can effectively enhance governance transparency and bolster societal recognition of governance outcomes, thereby providing a solid institutional guarantee and broad social support for the modernization of national governance.

Conclusion

As an inevitable choice for complex countries to achieve coordinated, orderly, and effective governance, national coordinated governance is not only a crucial path to solving the problem of uneven national development and maintaining national unity and social stability but also an important concept and practical model for advancing the modernization of national governance. By reviewing historical experiences and analyzing current logical frameworks, this paper reveals the construction logic of national coordinated governance at the societal, governmental, and national levels, providing a comprehensive perspective for understanding its significance in China's governance practices.

From a historical perspective, although the governance model of

ancient Chinese feudal society differs significantly from modern national governance, its experiences and lessons in power operation, social order maintenance, and resource allocation offer valuable historical insights for modern national coordinated governance. The values of “collective justice” and the national identity of “the family as the state” in feudal times, although not transformed into “civil rights” in the modern sense under the authoritarian system, still provided important guarantees for people’s basic survival rights and the pursuit of social stability, offering significant enlightenment for contemporary national governance.

At the societal level, national coordinated governance emphasizes the integration of societal forces, value cohesion, and political communication functions of the state to achieve mutual integration and shaping between national governance and citizens’ daily lives. This process not only requires enhancing the civic awareness and public spirit of social groups but also promoting the improvement of social self-organization capabilities through consultation and cooperation between the state and society, thereby constructing the social foundation of national governance.

The governmental rationale demands that governments at all levels, under the centralized and unified leadership of the party, flexibly adjust and optimize their functional configurations, achieving a transition from “efficiency first” to “equal emphasis on fairness and efficiency.” With public interests as the core, a collaborative governance mechanism among the government, market, and society should be established. This governance model avoids the excessive weakening of state authority in Western governance theories while fully leveraging the advantages of multiple governance subjects, promoting the efficiency and sustainability of national governance.

The national rationale further emphasizes that national governance is not opposed to the “state” but transcends the one-sided understanding of “denationalization.” Through innovative and flexible governance practices, it incorporates multiple subjects, recognizes and guarantees multi-agent co-governance, and promotes the diffusion of publicness and the enhancement of public interests. The modernization of national governance requires not only attention to structural issues but also an in-depth exploration of its value connotations to shape the legitimacy and authority of national governance.

In summary, national coordinated governance is an inevitable choice for China to achieve effective governance under complex national conditions. The realization of its practical effectiveness necessitates coordinated progress in multiple dimensions, including societal integration, optimization of governmental functions, and shaping the values of national governance. By combining historical and current perspectives, we can better understand the complexity and adaptability of national coordinated governance, providing useful theoretical support and practical pathways for advancing the modernization of national governance.

References

- Deng, X. (1994). *Selected Works of Deng Xiaoping, Vol. 2*. People's Publishing House. (In Chinese)
- Hysing, E. (2009). Governing without government? The private governance of forest certification in Sweden. *Public Administration*, 87(2), 312-326.
- Jin, G., & Liu, Q. (2011). *The Origins of Modern Chinese Thought: The Super-Stable Structure and the Evolution of Chinese Political Culture*. Beijing: Law Press. (In Chinese)
- Jin, T. J. (2015). Development of social organizations from the perspective of national governance: An analytical framework. *Xuehai*, (1), 16-21.
- Jin, T., & Yao, H. (2014). National identity: A structural analysis from the perspective of globalization. *Social Sciences in China*, 6, 4-23. (In Chinese)
- Migdal, J. S. (2013). *State in Society: Studying How States and Societies Transform and Constitute One Another* (Chinese version). Jiangsu People's Publishing House.
- Olson, M. (1965). *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. Harvard University Press.
- Wang, J. (2015). The effectiveness and responsiveness of national governance: An organizational realism perspective. *Management World*, 2, 72-81. (In Chinese)
- Wang, P. (2014a). The basic meanings and interrelations of national governance, government governance, and social governance. *Sociological Review of China*, 6, 12-20. (In Chinese)
- Wang, P. (2014b). Two tendencies to avoid when understanding national governance. *Governance*, 10, 19-21. (In Chinese)
- Wei, P. (2003). *The Bureaucratic System and Famine Relief in 18th-Century China*. Jiangsu People's Publishing House. (In Chinese)
- Xi, J. (2016). *Excerpts from Xi Jinping's Discourses on Building a Moderately Prosperous Society in All Respects*. Central Literature Publishing House. (In Chinese)
- Xia, Y. (2004). People-centeredness and civil rights: The historical basis of rights

- discourse in China. *Social Sciences in China*, 5, 4-23. (In Chinese)
- Xiao, H. (2014). The traditional social governance model in China and its implications for contemporary rural governance. *Guihai Tribune*, 6, 84-88. (In Chinese)
- Yan, J. (2014). Modern national governance and institutional building. *Chinese Public Administrative Management*, 5, 58-63. (In Chinese)
- Yang, H. (2021). Holistic governance: An explanatory framework. In *Urban Governance in Transition*. Springer, Singapore.
- Yin, D. (2024). The Chinese logic of centrally-guided national governance: A political analysis based on the perspective of balanced national development. *Teaching and Research*, 12, 69-81. (In Chinese)
- Zhao, J., & Fan, R. (2015). The value orientation of government function transformation: An analysis based on the perspective of national governance. *Journal of Public Management*, 6, 35-39. (In Chinese)
- Zhou, G., & Liu, X. (2013). The crisis of national identity and governance in developing countries in the era of globalization. *Social Sciences in China*, 9, 40-54. (In Chinese)

国家统筹治理的历史镜鉴与实践逻辑

摘要: 中国的国家统筹治理是复杂国家实现协调有序与有效治理的必然选择,是破解国家非均衡发展难题,协调和整合各区域、各领域、各层级治理力量和组织,从而维护国家统一、实现社会稳定有序的有效路径。国家统筹治理的意蕴内涵,不仅体现于从治理到国家治理的概念语义变迁之中,又可在封建管治传统的历史镜鉴中寻得深刻启示。国家统筹治理的建构逻辑体现于社会、政府与国家三重现实过程中:社会逻辑强调发挥国家统筹力量的社会整合本能、价值凝聚能力和政治传播功能,实现国家治理与公民日常的互融和动态过程中的相互型塑,构建国家治理赖以存续的社会根基;政府逻辑要求各级政府必须灵活且适时地调整和优化其职能配置,提升政府适应性与活力、实现对公共事务的高效治理;国家逻辑则不仅需求关注治理主体、治理范围、治理方式和治理绩效等结构性问题,以确保国家治理体系的稳固与高效,更要深入挖掘国家治理的本质内涵、价值追求和基本原则等价值性问题,以塑造国家治理的正当性和权威性。

关键词: 国家治理; 统筹治理; 历史镜鉴; 实践逻辑

중국의 국가 거버넌스 조율에 대한 역사적 교훈과 실질적 근거

초록: 중국의 국가 차원 통합적 거버넌스는 복잡한 대국이 조화로운 질서와 효과적 통치를 실현하기 위한 필연적 선택으로, 국가적 불균형 발전 문제를 해결하고 지역·분야·계층 간 거버넌스 역량과 조직을 통합함으로써 국가 통일을 유지하며 사회적 안정과 질서를 달성하는 효과적 경로이다. 국가 통합적 거버넌스의 함의는 ‘통치’에서 ‘국가 거버넌스’로의 개념적 변천 속에 내재되어 있을 뿐만 아니라, 역사적 통치 전통의 반추를 통해 깊은 시사점을 얻을 수 있다. 이러한 거버넌스의 구축 논리는 사회·정부·국가라는 세 차원의 현실적 과정에 구현된다. 사회적 논리는 국가 통합력의 사회적 융합 본능, 가치 응집 능력, 정치적 전파 기능을 발휘해 국가 거버넌스와 시민 일상의 상호 침투를 실현하며, 동적 과정 속 상호 형성을 통해 국가 거버넌스의 사회적 토대를 구축하는 데 중점을 둔다. 정부적 논리는 각급 정부가 유연하게 기능 구성을 조정 및 최적화하여 적응력과 활력을 제고하고, 공공사무에 대한 효율적 관리를 달성해야 함을 요구한다. 국가적 논리는 거버넌스 주체·범위·방식·성과 등 구조적 문제를 확립해 국가 거버넌스 체계의 견고성과 효율성을 보장하는 동시에, 국가 거버넌스의 본질적 가치 추구하고 기본 원칙 등 규범적 문제를 심층적으로 탐구함으로써 그 정당성과 권위를 형성해야 함을 강조한다. 이러한 다층적 접근은 중국 특색의 국가 통합적 거버넌스 체계가 이론과 실천, 역사와 현실을 관통하는 종합적 프레임워크로 진화했음을 보여준다.

핵심어: 국가 거버넌스, 국가 거버넌스 조율, 역사적 교훈, 실질적 합리성

中国における国家協調ガバナンスの歴史的教訓と 実践的な根拠

要旨: 中国のような多様な国にとって、国家協調ガバナンス (national coordinated governance) は、協調的で秩序ある効果的なガバナンスを実現する上で必然的な選択である。本研究では、地域、セクター、レベルを横断してガバナンスを統合し、それにより国家の統一、社会の安定、および持続可能な開発を保証するために、このようなガバナンス・モデルがどのようにして不均衡な発展に対処しているかを実証する。このガバナンス・モデルはガバナンスから国家ガバナンスへの概念的な進化に根差しており、中国における封建的支配の伝統から歴史的な教訓を得ている。国家協調ガバナンスを構築するための枠組みは、(1) 社会の統合と、政府と日常生活の間におけるダイナミックな相互作用を重視する社会的根拠、(2) 適応能力を備えた効率のよい行政のために政府機能を最適化することに重点を置く政府の根拠、そして (3) ガバナンスの主体、スコープ、方法、および価値観のバランスを取ることで構造的な安定性と正当性を確保する国家的根拠、という社会、政府、国家が関与する三重の実世界の過程により体現されている。これらの次元は、中国のガバナンスを現代化し、その権威と正当性を形成するための強固な基盤を確立させている。

キーワード: 国家ガバナンス、国家協調ガバナンス、歴史の教訓、実践的根拠

Author biographies

Taijun Jin is a professor at Anhui Normal University and a distinguished Changjiang Scholar Professor of the Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China. His accolades include the inaugural New Century Excellent Talents Award, recipient of the State Council Special Government Allowance, and chief scientist in the first tier of Jiangsu Province's "333 High-Level Talent Cultivation Project" for young and middle-aged researchers. He obtained his PhD from Nanjing University. His research interests lie in government governance, social governance, and emergency management. He has completed four major and key projects funded by the National Social Science Fund and the Ministry of Education. He has authored numerous books, including *Administrative Reform and Administrative Development (in Chinese)*, and his work has appeared in journals such as *Social Sciences in China*, and *CASS Journal of Political Science*.

Zhenbo Zhang is an associate professor at Nanjing Normal University. His research interests include public policy and environmental governance. He has presided over multiple projects funded by the National Natural Science Foundation of China and the National Social Science Foundation of China, among others. He has authored monographs such as *Intergovernmental Game Effects in Regional Environmental Governance*, and *Research on Innovative Social Governance Systems and Long-term Mechanisms for Social Harmony and Stability*. His work has appeared in *Ecological Economics*, *Energy Policy*, and *Science of the Total Environment*.