自由中国运动 · Free China Movement

T047 | Is Internal Democracy Enough to Substitute for the Political Rights of All Citizens?

Myths T047 · v1.0 | 2026-11-22

© 2026 Free China Movement

https://freechina.live/china-news-updates/democracy-civil-society/myths-t047-intra-party-democracy-vs-citizens-rights/

contact@freechina.live

Core answer

No. Intra-party democracy is democracy inside one organization; the political rights of all citizens are rights held by everyone, including most citizens, who are not Party members. The first can improve how the ruling party governs itself; it cannot stand in for the second — the two have different subjects, questions, and remedies. A party that elects its own leaders has answered "who rules the party?" — not "who rules the country, and by what right can citizens remove them?" The white paper itself draws the line: intra-party democracy exists "to better serve the development of people's democracy" — a means to an end defined by the people's status as masters of the country.

1. The opposing argument, stated fairly

The strongest version runs like this: the Party governs 1.4 billion people and leads in every area of national life. If it is democratic inside — leaders chosen internally, decisions made collectively, officials supervised — then the system is democratic from the inside out. The white paper makes this case directly: "The CPC upholds democracy within the Party

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

and practices democratic elections, decision-making, management and oversight, to better serve the development of people's democracy." It adds that the Party "has improved its mechanism for selecting and appointing officials, enabling outstanding individuals in all sectors to enter the Party leadership teams and the government."

The scale argument supports it: "CPC leadership is the fundamental guarantee for whole-process people's democracy. It is no easy job for a country as big as China to fully represent and address the concerns of its 1.4 billion people. It must have a robust and centralized leadership." A single deliberating party, the claim goes, can represent a vast population more coherently than competing parties, and the mass line feeds its deliberation with the people's views. On this view, intra-party democracy is how citizens' rights are realized.

A party that deliberates, supervises its officials, and recruits broadly is better than one that does not. But improving the inside of the ruling party is not the same as giving political rights to those outside it.

2. Two different things: subject, question, remedy

The distinction is threefold. First, whose democracy is it? Intra-party democracy belongs to Party members: they vote in party elections and supervise party officials. Citizens' rights belong to all citizens: to vote and stand for election, to express views, to supervise state organs. Most citizens are not Party members, and no party procedure gives them a vote they do not already hold. Second, what question does it answer? Intra-party democracy answers who leads the party and how it decides. Citizens' rights answer who holds state power, how it is authorized, and how it can be checked and removed. Third, what is the remedy when things go wrong? Inside the party: discipline, internal criticism, removal by a higher body. For citizens: the vote, open criticism of state organs, supervision as a right, not a favor.

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

A company whose managers are elected by employees practices real internal democracy — and no one would say this gives its customers the right to choose its board. Democracy inside an organization belongs to that organization; political rights belong to citizenship. The two can reinforce each other, but one cannot be swapped for the other. The white paper's own definition points the same way: "The people's status as masters of the country is the essence of people's democracy." The essence lies in the people — all of them — not in party procedure.

3. The white paper's own test is about all the people

The substitution claim fails on the white paper's own terms: its tests are addressed to the whole population, not to Party members. Its central test is explicit: "Whether a country is democratic depends on whether its people are truly the masters of the country; whether the people have the right to vote, and more importantly, the right to participate extensively" — and, decisively, "whether the exercise of power is genuinely subject to public scrutiny and checks." Its benchmarks are framed for everyone: "whether all the people can manage state and social affairs and economic and cultural undertakings in conformity with legal provisions, whether the public can express their requirements without hindrance."

If intra-party democracy were a substitute, these tests would be redundant; the paper need only ask whether Party members can vote for their leaders. Instead it asks whether all the people can manage state affairs — a test only passable by rights held by citizens as citizens, not by procedures inside one organization. The paper's account of citizens' rights confirms this: "In China, the people have the right to vote and stand for election. They enjoy the rights to be informed about, to be involved in, to express views on, and to supervise the state and social affairs." These are rights of "the people," granted by the Constitution, exercised toward state organs. None is conferred by Party membership,

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

none is exercised inside the party, and none would be satisfied by a party election.

4. What intra-party democracy can do — and where it stops

None of this denies that intra-party democracy does real work: internal elections and supervision can improve the quality of rulers and reduce arbitrary decisions. But substitution requires equivalence on the decisive questions, and on each one intra-party democracy stops at the party's boundary.

Take authorization. Citizens' rights include choosing between competing teams to govern; intra-party democracy chooses among candidates within one team. The white paper is candid: "In China, there are no opposition parties. But China's political party system is not a system of one-party rule." The first sentence is decisive: the authorization of the country's rulers is settled inside the party, not by citizens choosing among alternatives. Take removal. A party can discipline its own officials — a remedy for disloyalty to the party. Citizens have no equivalent vote of removal over the top leadership, no election in which to dismiss a government they judge to have failed. Internal discipline protects the party's standards; it does not let citizens withdraw a mandate. Third, dissent from outside. A non-member who disagrees with a policy has no internal channel; their only recourse is the citizens' rights the paper lists — to express views, to criticize any state organ. Those rights are the fallback for people outside the party, and for moments when the party is wrong.

On the party–state distinction, see CCE-029, "Are the State, the Government, and the Ruling Party the Same Thing?". On legitimacy depending on the mechanisms that authorize and check power, see CCE-044, "Demographic Structure and Aging: How Will Demographic Transition Affect Economic Development and Political Legitimacy?". Cited, not duplicated.

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

5. The conduit argument: transmission is not authorization

The last defense is the conduit: the Party listens to the people and carries their views into policy. The white paper describes it directly: "The CPC follows the mass line – it is committed to doing everything for the people and relying on them, and follows the principle of 'from the people, to the people'." If the party faithfully transmits the people's will, citizens need no separate channel.

But transmission is not authorization. A conduit carries a signal; it does not let the sender choose the receiver. Even a faithful transmission belt leaves the people as petitioners, not principals. The difference shows up the moment party and people disagree. If the people are masters, their disagreement must be able to prevail — through a vote, a choice of leaders, a binding check. If the party is only a conduit, disagreement ends in an appeal to the party's own judgment. Listening is a virtue of rulers; choosing rulers is a right of citizens. "Are we heard?" is not "do we decide?"

Conclusion

Intra-party democracy is a genuine good: a party that elects its leaders, deliberates collectively, and supervises its officials governs better than one that does not. But it is democracy inside one organization, held by its members, answering who leads the party. The political rights of all citizens are held by everyone, answering who holds state power and how citizens authorize, check, and remove them. The white paper keeps the two apart: intra-party democracy exists "to better serve the development of people's democracy," and its tests concern all the people — whether they can manage state affairs and subject power to public scrutiny. Those tests cannot be passed from inside the party: most citizens stand outside it, and authorization, removal, and dissent from outside are exactly what citizens' rights are for. A party that governs itself democratically has improved its own house; it has not given the keys to everyone else.

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

Related CCE123 articles (link-back — cited, not duplicated)

- CCE-029, "Are the State, the Government, and the Ruling Party the Same Thing?" — the party–state distinction: https://freechina.live/china-news-updates/democracy-civil-society/en-cce-029-should-citizen-loyalty-be-to-the-state-the-government-or-the-constitution/
- CCE-044, "Demographic Structure and Aging: How Will Demographic Transition Affect Economic Development and Political Legitimacy?" — legitimacy depending on the mechanisms that authorize and check power: https://freechina.live/china-news-updates/democracy-civil-society/en-cce-044-demographic-structure-aging/

Sources

1. State Council Information Office of the People's Republic of China, China: Democracy That Works (《中国的民主》), released 2021-12-04. English full text verified against the official publication carried by the National People's Congress (Xinhua release): http://en.npc.gov.cn.cdurl.cn/2021-12/04/c_687613.htm (Section I) and http://en.npc.gov.cn.cdurl.cn/2021-12/04/c_687613_3.htm (Section IV) (all quotations in this essay checked verbatim against this text).
2. CCE-029, "Are the State, the Government, and the Ruling Party the Same Thing?", FreeChina.live (EN edition): https://freechina.live/china-news-updates/democracy-civil-society/en-cce-032-are-the-state-the-government-and-the-ruling-party-the-same-thing/ — The live URL carries the CCE-032 slug while the article content carries CCE-029; cited by canonical live URL, content not duplicated.
3. 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-

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

aging/ — cited for its complementary mechanism-based account of legitimacy, content not duplicated.

4. Civic Education 123 hub index consulted for overlap resolution: https://freechina.live/civic-education-100-questions/.

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