自由中国运动 · Free China Movement

T024｜Without One Party Concentrating Power, Could Infrastructure Not Be Built?

Myths T024 · v1.0 ｜ 2026-11-22

© 2026 Free China Movement

https://freechina.live/china-news-updates/democracy-civil-society/myths-t024-one-party-concentrated-power-infrastructure/

contact@freechina.live

© 2026 Free China Movement · https://freechina.live · contact@freechina.live

Core answer

No. The infrastructure record is real, and shared goals genuinely help: a society that agrees on where it is going can marshal resources toward that destination. But it confuses two things — agreement on goals and the procedure by which decisions are made. A shared goal states the destination; a decision procedure picks the route, decides who pays, hears objections, corrects mistakes — and the first does not require the second to be closed. One-party concentration is one way of organizing the work, not the only way, and not what makes the work possible.

1. The opposing argument, stated fairly

The strongest version runs like this. China has built high-speed rail, expressways, dams, airports, and urban transit on a scale and at a pace few countries have matched, under a system in which one party sets the direction and concentrates resources. The white paper *China's Political Party System: Cooperation and Consultation* presents this capacity as a strength of the system itself: "With the goals of upholding and developing socialism with Chinese characteristics and realizing the Chinese Dream of national rejuvenation, this system helps to build powerful social synergy and pool all resources to complete major missions for the benefit of the people."

The mechanism is straightforward: a shared goal aligns everyone behind the same mission, and pooled resources remove the friction that elsewhere stalls large projects. The white paper contrasts this with systems where "power rotation and destructive competition among multiple political parties" fragment effort: "It unites all political parties and non-affiliates towards a common goal, effectively mitigating the risks of inadequate oversight in one-party rule, and the problems of power rotation and destructive competition among multiple political parties." The result, it claims, is continuity: "It is able to avoid vetocracy and situations where there is deliberation but no decision, or where decisions

© 2026 Free China Movement · https://freechina.live · contact@freechina.live

are made but not implemented. It can therefore ensure continuity and consistency of policies."

This deserves to be taken seriously: infrastructure needs long horizons, enormous capital, cross-region coordination, and costs today for benefits years away, so a system that sustains a plan across decades has a genuine advantage. The question is whether that advantage belongs to concentration as such, and whether concentration is necessary for it. That is a further step, and it does not follow.

2. Goal consistency is not a decision procedure

"We all agree on the goal" and "one body decides how to reach it, without challenge" are two different claims. The first is about ends; the second is about means. Shared goals belong to no one system: democracies routinely agree on goals spanning decades — clean water, reliable electricity, safe transport. What differs is how the route is chosen — who proposes, who can object, who checks the spending, who can stop a project that turns out to be a mistake. A railway can be a shared goal while its route, budget, and operator remain contested — and the contest is how a society learns whether the goal is worth its price.

The white paper itself recognizes the difference: its decision-making section describes a procedure: "The system promotes sound decision-making and implementation. Through consultation between political parties, participation and deliberation in the administration of state affairs, democratic oversight, and other standardized institutional procedures and arrangements, the system pools ideas and suggestions to ensure informed and democratic decision-making." Consultation, it insists, runs through a project's whole life: "It incorporates political consultation into the decision-making process, and ensures consultation both before decision-making and during policy implementation. In this way decisions are made through rounds of consultation, and acted upon

© 2026 Free China Movement · https://freechina.live · contact@freechina.live

in a rational and prudent manner, so as to ensure sound decision-making and effective implementation."

That is a procedural claim, to be judged as one: does consultation actually happen — can objections change a decision, are alternatives examined, can a bad project be stopped? A system that treats questioning the route as disloyalty to the goal has not consulted; it has used the goal to close the procedure.

Note, too, that the white paper does not describe the system as one-party rule: it presents multiparty cooperation under CPC leadership, claiming this mitigates "the risks of inadequate oversight in one-party rule." The myth's phrase — "one party concentrating power" — is therefore stronger than the paper's own language: if the paper's defense is right, the capacity to complete major missions comes from cooperation and consultation, not concentration.

3. The test that would settle it: necessity

The myth claims necessity: without one-party concentration, infrastructure cannot be built — a claim that fails if there are counterexamples.

There are many. The United States built the Interstate Highway System through a federal system with divided government, competing parties, and courts able to block projects. Japan built the Shinkansen, the first high-speed railway, under multiparty parliamentary democracy. France, Germany, and Spain built extensive high-speed rail networks under changing governments and open competition. None concentrated power in one party, and none was unable to build infrastructure — more slowly, with more argument, but they built it.

What these cases show is that building depends on things not unique to one-party rule: long-horizon planning, financing large projects, cross-jurisdiction coordination, sustaining commitments through changes of

© 2026 Free China Movement · https://freechina.live · contact@freechina.live

government. Democracies achieve these through their own institutions — independent agencies, cross-party agreements, long-term budgets, frameworks that outlive any administration. Concentration is one solution to the coordination problem — not the only one.

The reverse test is equally instructive: if concentration were sufficient for good infrastructure, concentrated systems would not produce misallocated projects — lines built where demand is thin, dams whose costs were never honestly weighed. Yet every system has built projects it regretted. The difference is whether the system can recognize and correct them. The white paper's own language makes the point: the system, it says, "makes it possible to create mechanisms for identifying and rectifying mistakes and reducing errors so that it can effectively prevent blind or arbitrary decision-making." Such a mechanism is a procedure: open information, independent evaluation, the power to change course. Where it is weak, concentration does not prevent blind decisions; it accelerates them, because no one is left with the standing to say stop. Speed of execution is a separate question, belonging to T045; what matters here is that building requires correction as much as momentum.

4. What concentration actually adds — and what it costs

None of this denies concentration's real advantages: one directing authority can resolve conflicts between regions, override local objections, and keep a project moving when a divided system would stall — which helps explain China's pace of building. But advantages are not necessities: a faster way of doing something is not the only way, and building quickly under concentration does not show a dispersed system cannot build at all.

The cost side matters too: concentration lowers the cost of starting a project and raises the cost of stopping one, since the authority that chose it is also the one that would have to admit it was wrong. Infrastructure is not only whether the bridge gets built, but whether the right bridge gets

© 2026 Free China Movement · https://freechina.live · contact@freechina.live

built, at the right price, in the right place, and whether the people who pay for it and live beside it had any say. A system that answers the first well and the others badly has solved the construction problem and left the governance problem standing.

On how legitimacy depends on mechanisms rather than outcomes alone, see CCE-044, "Demographic Structure and Aging: How Will Demographic Transition Affect Economic Development and Political Legitimacy?" (https://freechina.live/china-news-updates/democracy-civil-society/en-cce-044-demographic-structure-aging/). The same test applies here: a record of things built does not by itself answer who decided, who could object, who could correct.

Conclusion

China's infrastructure achievements are real, and shared goals help marshal resources. But a shared goal is not a decision procedure, and concentration is not a precondition for building. What building requires is coordination over time, financing, and the capacity to carry a plan through — and democracies have repeatedly shown these can be organized without concentrating power in one party, through institutions outliving elections and binding successive governments. What the white paper itself holds up as the system's strength is not concentration alone but consultation before and during implementation, and mechanisms for identifying and rectifying mistakes — procedural achievements demandable of any system, including the one that claims them. The question to ask of any infrastructure program is not only "was it built?" but "who chose it, who could object, who could stop it if it was wrong?" A system that can answer all three has earned its bridges; one that can answer only the first has left the main question unasked.

© 2026 Free China Movement · https://freechina.live · contact@freechina.live

Sources

1. State Council Information Office of the People's Republic of China, *China's Political Party System: Cooperation and Consultation* (《中国新型政党制度》), released 2021-06-25. English full text, Section IV ("China's Political Party System Has Distinctive Characteristics and Strengths"), verified against the official SCIO publication: http://english.scio.gov.cn/m/whitepapers/2021-06/25/content_77587473_6.htm — all quotations below were checked word-for-word against this text on 2026-11-21 (all times America/New_York; page fetched 2026-11-20 22:45 ET).
2. CCE-044, "Demographic Structure and Aging: How Will Demographic Transition Affect Economic Development and Political Legitimacy?", FreeChina.live (EN edition): https://freechina.live/china-news-updates/democracy-civil-society/en-cce-044-demographic-structure-aging/ — URL verified live (HTTP 200, page read, title confirmed) on 2026-11-20 22:45 ET; cited for its complementary mechanism-based account of legitimacy, content not duplicated.

© 2026 Free China Movement · https://freechina.live · contact@freechina.live