

The Communist Party's Steering of China's Science, Technology, and Innovation System: Aspirations and Reality

ANNA L. AHLERS

Summary

The Chinese Communist Party seeks to permeate every aspect of China's social and economic life—including the realm of science, technology, and innovation. Chinese leadership has heightened calls for technological self-reliance and boosting indigenous innovation, but still recognizes the importance of foreign expertise and international collaboration for China's domestic scientific efforts. Contradictions in the party's approach to domestic science abound, and despite a visible politicization of scientific institutions, no discernable impact on China's scientific production can be seen—yet. The Communist Party's attempts to grow its influence in domestic science institutions nevertheless pose long-term risks to the quality of the country's scientific output.



This brief is part of a special series organized jointly by the University of California Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation (IGCC) and the Mercator Institute for China Studies (MERICS). This analysis was originally presented at the Conference on the Chinese National Innovation and Techno-Industrial Ecosystems in Berlin, September 5–6, 2023.

Key Findings

- The Chinese Communist Party is reclaiming a powerful role in the country's science, technology, and innovation ecosystem. This is leading to a clash between an outward-looking scientific technocracy and an inward-looking party regime seeking to influence this critical sector of China's economy and society.
- The party's growing role in science risks negatively impacting China's research output. So far, however, the consequences appear to be relatively minor. The party's role in steering research coexists with large domains of scientific decision making done by professionals based on non-political considerations.
- Chinese leadership sends contradictory signals about how it intends to steer the country's scientific system. Official calls for technological self-reliance coincide with a recognition of the global nature of scientific endeavors. There has been no noticeable decrease in China's international scientific cooperation. It appears that, rather than isolating China's scientific ecosystem, the party wants stronger control of what happens within it.
- The party is restructuring China's research institutions to wield greater influence in domestic science, which the party sees as critical for the country's development, economy, and global power status. It is centralizing domestic science to pool leadership and resources, while also elevating party secretaries within scientific organizations. It remains unclear how much this politicization will influence the direction of research in China.
- So far, these changes are probably not enough to indicate a complete overhaul of how science is done in China. However, new regulations and the personal influence of party secretaries have a significant impact on organizational management.

Introduction

After decades of Reform and Opening Up, the science, technology, and innovation (STI) system in the People's Republic of China (PRC) is at a watershed moment. On top of policy changes that alter its goals, strategy, and resources, the helm of power on both a macro and day-to-day operational level has shifted. As in many other domains of public life, the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) under Xi Jinping's "top-level design" (顶层设计) credo is reclaiming a powerful role. This is leading to a clash between a well-oiled and adaptive science technocracy oriented toward global competition that has been in place since the 1980s, and an increasingly ossified, inward looking, isolationist, and totalitarian party regime that intends to permeate every last functional domain of China's society and economy.

Why should we care? It will be crucial to see whether increased party control will be a driving force or a roadblock for research and innovation in China. While the state's role is generally regarded as a backbone of economic and technological development in East Asia during the latter half of the 20th century, political and ideological intervention in science is mostly seen as an obstacle to innovation and progress.¹ Historical cases beyond China have demonstrated that such intervention often means that originality, expertise, and experience are replaced by overregulation, incompetence, and opportunism.²

Furthermore, foreign scientific partners are now encountering the party and its nomenclature much more visibly during interactions with and visits to China. Where before they dealt most often with professional peers, they are now confronting obvious ideological content and political actors who wield influence on scientific exchange and its outcomes. A stronger party presence in science organizations, together with Xi's call for pervasive "military-civil fusion" (军民融合)—including in research and education—is already irritating scientific partners around the world and fueling calls for reducing their engagement with China.

As a result, STI-related sectors are increasingly becoming part of the debates on "decoupling" and "de-risking" in the United States, Europe, and Australia.³

This brief analyzes the CCP's ambitions in STI policy and practice and the extent to which they are being realized. The changes appear—so far—smaller in reality than as promised on paper or in speeches. Instead of an exclusive role for the party in steering research and education reminiscent of pre-reform China, a hybrid model is emerging. Despite a stronger-than-ever presence of the party in all kinds of STI organizations since the launch of Reform and Opening Up in the late 1970s, party offices and party logic exist alongside other types of specialized, professional governance and rationalities seen in other sectors of policymaking.⁴

Current reconfigurations in China's science organizations are leading to an all-out merger between party leadership and routine management and decision making within these organizations.⁵ But this politicization coexists with large domains of decision making about scientific content and conduct that are still overseen by groups of professional actors or based on non-political considerations, which, arguably, keeps Chinese STI running on its established course. In other words, the work context for STI professionals has changed palpably because of the CCP's increasingly overarching role in organizational management and strategy. However, there is still a pragmatic acceptance of non-ideological, specialized decisions in science—with the exception of most areas of the social sciences and humanities.

While these distinctions may not be relevant for overall accounts of the CCP's totalitarian turn under Xi Jinping, they can make a difference when assessing their impact on China's STI-related productivity and scientific exchange with partners in the PRC. More data is needed, however, to judge what these changes may mean for China's STI system in the medium to long term, which provide rich opportunities for data gathering, research, and comprehensive analysis in this area in the coming years.



Slogans reading “Learn the [Xi Jinping] thoughts [to] strengthen the Party spirit. Focus on practice [to] achieve new successes” at a campus of Tongji University, Shanghai. Photo: Andrea Braun Stfelcová, 2023

“Indigenous Innovation” and “World-Class Science”: Can You Have It All?

China’s political leadership sends mixed signals concerning the STI system’s proposed trajectory, worldwide position, and the ways in which its diverse goals are to be achieved.

Xi Jinping often calls for technological self-reliance and outlines the necessity to establish science and scholarship with Chinese characteristics while at the same time promising Chinese scientific contributions to tackle humanity’s grand challenges and stressing the need for global governance of science.⁶ China, in his words, is to establish “world first-class” institutions, disciplines, and outputs (世界一流学科建设) under the farsighted but essentially nationalist guidance of the CCP. China is supposed to become a global science superpower and produce “indigenous innovations” (自主创新). Rather than being mutually exclusive, these ambitions are depicted as complementary.

Centralization is Boosting CCP Influence

Besides the rhetoric, the CCP’s desire to take more control of STI developments is evident in institutional restructurings, including the recent establishment of a Central Science and Technology Commission (中央科技委员会), a party organ that now sits hierarchically above the Ministry of Science and Technology.⁷ This shift is similar to other initiatives under the scope of “comprehensively strengthening reform” (全面深化改革) that started as soon as Xi Jinping came to power in 2012-13. The creation of this commission, together with the mentions of STI in top-level speeches and documents, highlights the importance that the party attaches to STI activities for China’s development, economy, and global power status.

Centralization aims to facilitate the pooling of skilled leaders and resources in order to enable the speedy and smooth advancing of core technologies and research fields. This strategy essentially put the previous Medium and Long-Term Plan for the Development of Science and Technology (2006-2020) and China's other national plans for science and technology with their already defined core items—such as quantum computing, aerospace, agriculture, among others—on steroids. Although this represents a significant restructuring, it appears geared toward top-down agenda setting and resource allocation for high-priority capacity building, rather than operationally changing the STI system as a whole.⁸

At the micro level, party cells and secretaries—like in other public and commercial organizations in China—are given elevated status and decision making authority in Chinese universities and research institutions.⁹ Party structures that have always existed in most science organizations—especially in universities—have recently been made more visible and potent again. Staff are required to undergo party ideology training sessions to a degree not seen since the start of Reform and Opening Up. Bringing home the message, Xi Jinping makes references to the old motto of “red and expert” (又红又专) in speeches to university students, researchers, and managers.¹⁰ Scientific organizations are also called upon to become more active in political consultation for party and government bodies and to strengthen in-house think tank-style agencies to directly conduct policy-relevant research work.¹¹ These overhauls show that the party's control of STI is to be established beyond temporary campaigns. It is less clear, however, how much the re-ideologization of China's research organizations will influence the work that they do.

The Contradictions of the CCP Approach to STI

Is there a convincing logic behind these reshuffles that would help disentangle the diffuse messaging? The short answer is no—and this is not surprising. The CCP's rule and its ideology are full of contradictions. Its STI policy reflects contemporary dynamics in other domains. Conventional motives—such as the party's primary objective of political stability and protecting its rule—and the overarching national security imperative under Xi Jinping are coupled with a strong technonationalism reflected in STI policymaking.¹² The logical contradictions are striking. While isolating domestic technological systems and thereby ending the phase of all-out globalization and the strategic import of foreign knowledge is conceivable—and the developments in China's communication technology and the national foreclosure of its digital infrastructure illustrate this point—it is impossible to imagine that China can decouple and maintain its own science system.¹³

Decoupling may not be the ultimate goal, however, as there is no tangible downward trend in China's international scientific cooperation, aside from that with the United States.¹⁴ Besides new legislation that makes it harder to collaborate in fields concerning national security, state secrets, data export, and espionage, there is no explicit call in China to drastically reduce international cooperation in the STI domain. New cooperation agreements are still being signed and international co-publications are still on the rise.¹⁵ Neither is there an apparent intention to abolish basic scientific research or to turn Chinese science organizations into solely policy-relevant advisory and technology production bodies.

It seems that, rather than isolating or curtailing China's STI sector, the CCP wants stronger control of what happens inside these organizations. But how would this supervision work? The following few examples are meant to shed light on this. They support the observation that the CCP's interference in STI goes beyond temporary campaigning and may signal attempts to institutionalize party steering and control. However, they also indicate that the party's approach to guiding STI is not the only game in town.

Reliable Steering Mechanisms? The Party's Grasp on Resources and Incentives

How does the CCP envision putting its ambitions to steer the whole STI lifecycle into practice? Excellent studies explore the macro structures of current top-down STI system reforms in the PRC.¹⁶ Since the most problematic and disruptive effects of party interference in post-reform China are often associated with micro-level attempts at disciplining and individual power plays, however, it is worth looking at them here.

Party of Professionals: Balancing Cadre Competencies and Loyalty

All organizations in China are now expected to engage in extensive “party building” (党的建设) and yield a stronger role to their in-house party secretaries.¹⁷ Scientific institutions in particular seem to answer to these requirements by means of “personal union,” accentuating the existing party function of leadership incumbents and recruiting candidates for new party posts from existing staff, rather than accepting parachuted party cadres into their ranks. In universities, where party mobilization has increased over the past decade and party-related duties and posts were ubiquitous but dormant, party building is relatively easy to implement.¹⁸

Looking at the leading personnel of China's top institutions since 2010 confirms that—as far as can be known—party secretaries are rarely random cadres from outside the organization.¹⁹ In at least three cases, a previous president or rector was made party secretary in the following term (see Figure 1). All these cases occurred in 2021-22, around the time central leadership called for a reinforced party status in universities. These shifts, therefore, often signal the elevation of the party secretary's office rather than a change in personnel—at least in the country's elite science institutions.

In January 2024, it was reported that some universities in China would formally merge party committees with the presidents' offices to form one top leadership body, similar to what is elsewhere in government termed “one institution with two names” (一个机构两块牌子).²⁰ This is an unprecedented step that reflects, in stark terms, the dedifferentiation of party matters, party member management, and ideological control with overall organizational management.

While there are many factors that influence and may distinguish research practices and organization in China from those abroad, the recent changes in personnel and functional denominations are probably not enough to indicate a complete overhaul of how science is done in the country.²¹ In many cases, the dual identity of organizational leaders as professional scientists and party cadres may balance out party influence. This seems to distinguish the STI system from many other domains of increased added party control in China—for the time being.

FIGURE 1

Three Prominent Cases in Which Former University Presidents Became University Party Secretaries in 2021-22

	Peking University		Tsinghua University		Huazhong University	
	President/ Rector	Party Secretary	President/ Rector	Party Secretary	President/ Rector	Party Secretary
2010-2015	Wang Enge (王恩哥, '13-'15)	Ju Shanlu (朱善璐, '11-'16)	Chen Jining (陈吉宁, '12-'15)	Hu Heping (胡和平, '08-'13)	Li Peigen (李培根, '05-'14)	n.a.
2015-2022	Hao Ping (郝平, '18-'22)	Qiu Shuiping (邱水平, '18-'22)	Qiu Yong (邱勇, '15-'22)	Chen Xu (陈旭, '13-'22)	Li Yuanyuan (李元元, '18-'21)	Shao Xinyu (邵新宇, '17-'21)
Current	Gong Qihuang (龚旗煌, 2022-)	Hao Ping (郝平, 2022-)	Wang Xiqin (王希勤, 2022-)	Qiu Yong (邱勇, 2022-)	You Zheng (尤政, 2021-)	Li Yuanyuan (李元元, 2021-)

Guarding State Secrets (and More Mundane Tasks)

Party secretaries are responsible for ensuring that initiatives, such as building theories and disciplines with “Chinese characteristics” (中国特色) or “telling the ‘China story’ well” (讲好中国故事), are enacted by members of their organizations.²² They are tasked with avoiding sensitive topics and undertakings and with making sure their colleagues fulfill ever-increasing mandatory ideological trainings and tests. Anecdotal evidence from exchanges with colleagues based in the PRC implies that these training activities are quite time-consuming, which alone suggests that resources are diverted from research.

Nonetheless, new regulations and legislation in the PRC might develop into harder steering tools than campaigns and initiatives. National security laws, data export controls, and accusations of political disloyalty are a sword of Damocles hanging over actors in the STI system. These tools can be evoked arbitrarily by functionaries charged with discipline and control or who are worried about excessive openness and international exchange in their organization.

Party secretaries also fulfill more routine administrative tasks in their organizations. They are now—more than before—in the position to influence recruitment, financial, and strategic decisions in China's STI institutions. This position and its expanding toolkit also enables incumbents to wield influence over peers within their organizations for purely personal motives, such as controlling professional rivals or the mere desire for power. These aspects should not be overlooked, even if they relate more to internal organizational management and political disciplining than to the core content of scientific work.

Policy Implications: Stalemate Between National Goals and Global Orientation

It is worth asking what kind of control the CCP is trying to exert over actual scientific work, with what ambition, and to what end. Since Reform and Opening Up, China's STI technocracy built a sophisticated system of performance measurement that combined global indicators with national traditions featuring extensive evaluations and rankings.²³ Over the past two decades, successes in the STI sector were almost exclusively measured in internationally recognized publications, patents, and prizes.²⁴ China's STI reputation management was globally oriented, and science organizations enforced it with enormous vigor, putting extreme performance pressure on their staff. Recently, China's political leadership began trying to alter this orientation, claiming that STI with relevance for China is equivalent to publications, prizes and patents realized in China and in Chinese. Moreover, policy-relevant reports and ideological essays should also yield academic credit.²⁵ For grant applications to government funding agencies, projects that pick up party policy slogans and strategically pursue government-promoted core research topics have a better chance of succeeding.²⁶ Yet, this new political pressure is apparently causing ambivalence for China's STI workers, who often pragmatically check off national requirements while striving for international acknowledgement of their achievements, which in turn continues to translate into local rewards.²⁷

Content control by party agencies is nonetheless affecting China's scientific publications, including those in English and in international outlets. This control is implemented with vigor, but varies widely, often hinging on local and personal factors, as confidential conversations with academics in China can confirm. Where exactly this new layer of censorship comes to fruition remains hard to grasp. Content control seems to happen on a broad spectrum, from proactive self-censorship and needing approval by departmental leadership

before research starts or is published, to being held responsible and punished for content post-publication. This control may be applied in any scientific discipline, although it is most blatantly enforced in the social sciences and humanities.

Conclusion

The structural framework for scientific production in the PRC is undergoing profound changes under the growing influence of the Communist Party. However, there are scant discernible indications so far that these reconfigurations will diminish China's general productivity in science, technology, and innovation in the short term.

The CCP and its functionaries are permeating China's STI system more than any time since Reform and Opening Up. The party's attempts at top-level steering and micro-level disciplining are documented by a small but growing body of research. While tangible effects on outputs are still difficult to identify, this politicization will make it harder for collaborating foreign entities to view Chinese counterparts as thoroughly professional partners. The increasingly pervasive nationalist ideologization of STI staff in the PRC—if translated into hard incentives and sanctions—may also increase the risk of academic malpractice, illegitimate knowledge transfer, or political instrumentalization in international cooperation. Nevertheless, strong layers of technocratic STI governance remain. China's political leadership and especially its scientific elites still consider China a part of the global system of science and measure the PRC's scientific and technological power by global standards.

Endnotes

1. See Chalmers Johnson, "Political Institutions and Economic Performance: The Government-Business Relationship in Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan," in *The Political Economy of the New Asian Industrialism*, ed. Frederic C. Deyo, 136-164 (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1987); Thomas Heberer, "The Chinese 'Developmental State 3.0' and the Resilience of Authoritarianism," *Journal of Chinese Governance* 1, no. 4 (November 9, 2016), 611-32, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23812346.2016.1243905>.
2. Paul Josephson, *Totalitarian Science and Technology* (Amherst: Humanity Books, 2005); Andrew Kennedy, "China's Rise as a Science Power: Rapid Progress, Emerging Reforms, and the Challenge of Illiberal Innovation," *Asian Survey* 59, no. 6 (November-December 2019), 1022-1043, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26907115>; Travis A. Whetsell, Ana-Maria Dimand, Koen Jonkers, Jeroen Baas, and Caroline S. Wagner, "Democracy, Complexity, and Science: Exploring Structural Sources of National Scientific Performance," *Science and Public Policy* 48, no. 4 (July 2021), 697-711, <https://academic.oup.com/spp/article-abstract/48/5/697/6325624>; Dean Xu, Kevin Zheng Zhou and Shihua Chen, "The Impact of Communist Ideology on the Patenting Activity of Chinese Firms," *Academy of Management Journal* 66, no. 1 (February 17, 2023), 102-32, <https://journals.aom.org/doi/10.5465/amj.2020.0810>.
3. Margaret M. Pearson, Meg Rithmire, and Kellee S. Tsai, "China's Party-State Capitalism and International Backlash: From Interdependence to Insecurity," *International Security* 47, no. 2 (October 1, 2022), 135-76, <https://direct.mit.edu/isec/article/47/2/135/113544/China-s-Party-State-Capitalism-and-International>. Anna L. Ahlers, *Rural Policy Implementation in Contemporary China: New Socialist Countryside*, (London: Routledge 2014); Anna L. Ahlers and Gunter Schubert, "Nothing New under 'Top-Level Design'? A Review of the Conceptual Literature on Local Policy-Making in China," *Issues & Studies* 58, no. 1 (March 2022) 1-34, <https://www.worldscientific.com/doi/10.1142/S101325112150017X>.
4. Anna L. Ahlers, *Rural Policy Implementation in Contemporary China: New Socialist Countryside*, London: Routledge, 2014; Anna L. Ahlers and Gunter Schubert "Nothing New Under "Top-Level Design"? A Review of the Conceptual Literature on Local Policymaking in China, *Issues & Studies* 58, no. 1, 2022, 1-34.
5. See Gu Ting, "China's Ruling Party Takes Direct Control of Country's Universities," January 18, 2024, *Radio Free Asia*, <https://www.rfa.org/english/news/china/china-universities-01182024160231.html>.
6. "习近平致信祝贺中国社会科学院建院四十周年 (Xi Jinping sends letter to congratulate Chinese Academy of Social Sciences on its 40th anniversary)," *Communist Party of China News Network*, May 18, 2017, <http://jhsjk.people.cn/article/29282853>.
7. Charles Mok, "The Party Rules: China's New Central Science and Technology Commission," *The Diplomat*, August 23, 2023, <https://thediplomat.com/2023/08/the-party-rules-chinas-new-central-science-and-technology-commission/>.
8. Andrea Braun Štřelcová, Jelena Große-Bley, and Fiona Anne Bewley, "Innovation, Infrastructure and Improvements in China's Science System: An Interview with Cao Cong," *Observations: A Short Paper Series*, No. 12 (June 16, 2023), <https://www.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de/observations/innovation-infrastructure-and-improvements-chinas-science-system-interview-cao-cong>; Smriti Mallapaty, "China is Mobilizing Science to Spur Development – and Self-Reliance," *Nature* 14, March 14, 2023, <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-023-00744-4>.
9. "中共中央印发《中国共产党普通高等学校基层组织工作条例》(The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China issued the Regulations on the Work of Grassroots Organizations of the Communist Party of China in Ordinary Colleges and Universities)" China Government Website, April 22, 2021, https://www.gov.cn/zhengce/2021-04/22/content_5601428.htm; Ting, "China's Ruling Party Takes Direct Control of Country's Universities."
10. "习近平在清华大学考察时强调 坚持中国特色世界一流大学建设目标方向 为服务国家富强民族复兴人民幸福贡献力量 (During visit to Tsinghua University, Xi Jinping emphasized that he would adhere to the goal and direction of building world-class universities with Chinese characteristics, contributing to serving the country's wealth, national rejuvenation and people's happiness)," *Xinhuanet*, April 19, 2021, http://www.xinhuanet.com/politics/leaders/2021-04/19/c_1127348921.htm.
11. Anna L. Ahlers, "Technocracy on the Ground: Cadre Competence, Expert Involvement, and Scientific Advice in China's Local Governance," in *Handbook on Local Governance in China: Structures, Variations, and Innovation*, eds. Ceren Ergenc and David S. G. Goodman, (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2023), 152-176.
12. Tai Ming Cheung, *Innovate to Dominate: The Rise of the Chinese Techno-Security State*, (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2022).

13. Erik Baark, "Global Implications of China's Policies on Indigenous Innovation," in *Innovation and China's Global Emergence*, eds. Erik Baark, Bert Hofman, and Jiwei Qian, (Singapore: National University of Singapore Press, 2021), 65-89; Braun Střelcová, Große-Bley, and Bewley, "Innovation, Infrastructure and Improvements in China's Science System: An Interview with Cao Cong;" Cong Cao, "China Must Draw on Internal Research Strength," *Nature* 623, no. 8 (November 8, 2023), <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-023-03445-0>; Simon Marginson, "All Things are in Flux': China in Global Science," *Higher Education* 83 (May 29, 2021), 881–910, <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10734-021-00712-9>.
14. Amy Hawkins, "Warnings of Scientific 'Suicide' as US-China Research Collaboration Hangs in Balance," *The Guardian*, August 23 2023, <https://www.theguardian.com/science/2023/aug/23/us-china-research-collaboration-science-hangs-in-balance>; Jeremy Mervis, "White House Requests Extension of Agreement with China on Joint Research," *Science*, August 24, 2023, <https://www.science.org/content/article/white-house-requests-extension-agreement-china-joint-research>.
15. Natasha Gilbert and Gemma Conroy, "US Extends Science Pact With China: What it Means for Research," *Nature*, August 25, 2023, <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-023-02701-7>; Caroline S. Wagner and Dennis F. Simon, "China's Use of Formal Science and Technology Agreements as a Tool of Diplomacy," *Science and Public Policy* 50, no. 4 (August 2023), <https://doi.org/10.1093/scipol/scad022>; Chris Woolston, "What China's Leading Position on Natural Sciences Means for Global Research," *Nature*, August 9, 2023 <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-023-02159-7>.
16. Cheung, *Innovate to Dominate*; Alexandre De Podestá Gomes and Tobias ten Brink, *A Chinese Bureaucracy for Innovation-Driven Development?* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023); Jeroen Groenewegen-Lau and Michael Laha, *Controlling the Innovation Chain: China's Strategy to Become a Science & Technology Superpower*, MERICS report, February 2, 2023, <https://merics.org/en/report/controlling-innovation-chain>.
17. Daniel Koss, "Discipline Inspections and the Transformation of Party Authority in China's Banks," *China: An International Journal* 21, no. 2 (May 2023), 92-113, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/371398180_Discipline_Inspections_and_the_Transformation_of_Party_Authority_in_China's_Banks; Daniel Koss, "Party Building as Institutional Bricolage: Asserting Authority at the Business Frontier," *The China Quarterly* 248, no. 1 (August 19, 2021), 222-243, <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/china-quarterly/article/party-building-as-institutional-bricolage-asserting-authority-at-the-business-frontier/93AF6FD2B5BFAD95D5DA225BE85FC8C4>; Jean Christopher Mittelstaedt, "Party-Building Through Ideological Campaigns Under Xi Jinping," *Asian Survey* 63, no. 5 (June 28, 2023), 716-742, <https://online.ucpress.edu/as/article-abstract/63/5/716/196730/Party-Building-through-Ideological-Campaigns-under>.
18. Shuangmiao Han and Xin Xu, "How Far Has the State 'Stepped Back': An Exploratory Study of the Changing Governance of Higher Education in China (1978–2018)," *Higher Education* 78, no. 5 (March 22, 2019), 931–946, <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10734-019-00378-4>; Tim Pringle and Sophia Woodman, "Between a Rock and a Hard Place: Academic Freedom in Globalising Chinese Universities," *The International Journal of Human Rights* 26, no. 10 (May 13, 2022), 1782-1802, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13642987.2022.2074979>; Hua Jiang and Xiaobin Li, "Party Secretaries in Chinese Higher Education Institutions: What Roles Do They Play?" *Journal of International Education and Leadership* 6, no. 2, 2016, 13, <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1135210>; Elizabeth J. Perry, "Educated Acquiescence: How Academia Sustains Authoritarianism in China," *Theory and Society* 49, no. 1 (December 28, 2019), 1–22, <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11186-019-09373-1>.
19. This mini study included China's elite universities and prominent research organizations, including the Chinese Academy of Sciences, Dalian University of Technology, Fudan University, Harbin Institute of Technology, Huazhong University, Nankai University, Nanjing University, Peking University, Renmin University, Shanghai Jiaotong University, Tongji University, Tsinghua University, University of Science and Technology of China, Xi'an Jiaotong University, Zhejiang University. I am grateful to Ching-Yang Lee for her help in gathering the data.

20. Ting, "China's Ruling Party Takes Direct Control of Country's Universities."
21. Susan Greenhalgh and Li Zhang (eds.), *Can Science and Technology Save China?* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2020); Wei Hong, "Domination in a Scientific Field: Capital Struggle in a Chinese Isotope Lab," *Social Studies of Science* 38 (August 1, 2008), 543-570.
22. "Xi Jinping sends letter to congratulate Chinese Academy of Social Sciences on its 40th anniversary;" "讲好中国故事 传播中国声音 (Telling China's story. Spreading China's voice)," *Jiefang Daily* (解放日报), March 26, 2020, <https://www.jfdaily.com/staticsg/res/html/journal/detail.html?date=2020-03-26&id=290323&page=08>.
23. Anna L. Ahlers and Stephanie Christmann-Budian, "The Politics of University Rankings in China," *Higher Education* 86 (April 4, 2023), 751-770, <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10734-023-01014-y>.
24. Cao, "China Must Draw on Internal Research Strength."
25. Sonia Qingyang Li, "The End of Publish or Perish? China's New Policy on Research Evaluation," *Observations: A Short Paper Series*, no. 1 (November 19, 2020), <https://www.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de/observations/1/end-publish-or-perish-chinas-new-policy-research-evaluation>; Yojana Sharma, "China Shifts from Reliance on International Publications," *University World News*, February 25, 2020, <https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20200225181649179>.
26. Jianping Cheng, Li Chen, Yonghe Zheng, and Jian Zhang, "Strategic Positioning of National Natural Science Foundation of China within National Innovation System in New Era," *Bulletin of Chinese Academy of Sciences* 36, no. 12 (December 20, 2021), <https://doi.org/10.16418/j.issn.1000-3045.20211118002>.
27. Jing Wang, Willem Halffman, and Hub Zwart, "The Chinese Scientific Publication System: Specific Features, Specific Challenges," *Learned Publishing* 34, no. 2 (September 2020), 105-115, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/345337496_The_Chinese_scientific_publication_system_Specific_features_specific_challenges.

Author

Anna L. Ahlers is the founder and head of the Lise Meitner Research Group at the Max Planck Institute for the History of Science (MPIWG), which explores the many facets of China's rapid and extensive ascent in the global system of science. After studying sinology and political science at the University of Tübingen, Peking University, and Renmin University, Ahlers completed her doctorate in China Studies at the University of Tübingen. Before joining the MPIWG in January 2020, she was a tenured associate professor in modern Chinese society and politics at the University of Oslo, Norway. She has also worked at the University of Bonn's Forum Internationale Wissenschaft (FIW), the Mercator Institute for China Studies, Academia Sinica, and the University of Chicago, where she was a Wigeland visiting professor in the academic year 2018-19. Between 2017 and 2022 she was a member of the Junge Akademie and in 2020-21 a fellow at the Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin. She is still closely connected to the FIW as an associate fellow. In November 2023, Ahlers was appointed professor II in the Department of Culture Studies and Oriental Languages at the University of Oslo, as part of a collaboration with the new Norwegian Research Centre on Geopolitics. Ahlers is a member of the editorial board of The Environments of East Asia series (Cornell University Press), a member of the international advisory board of the Routledge Studies on Local China series, an editor of Soziale Systeme/Social Systems, and a member of the executive committee of the European Journal of East Asian Studies.

About IGCC

The UC Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation (IGCC) is a network of researchers from across the University of California and the Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore national labs who produce and use research to help build a more peaceful, prosperous world. We conduct rigorous social science research on international security, the environment, geoeconomics, nuclear security, and the future of democracy; help to educate and train the next generation of peacemakers; and strive to ensure that what we are discovering contributes to a safer world.

For more information: ucigcc.org

About MERICS

The Mercator Institute for China Studies (MERICS) was founded in 2013 by the German Stiftung Mercator to strengthen knowledge and debate about China in Germany and Europe. With international researchers from Europe, the United States and Australia, MERICS is currently the largest European research institute focusing solely on the analysis of contemporary China and its relations with Europe and the wider world. MERICS experts have a wide range of expertise on China, scientific qualifications and methodological skills. With its main premises in Berlin, MERICS also operates an office in Brussels.

For more information: merics.org

