status, forming a tradition of contract-based autonomy. This society-centric power structure enabled universities, even amidst the rise of nation-states and intensified state control, to maintain extensive academic autonomy. Germany's academic autonomy under state protection, France's state-led coordinated autonomy and Britain's market-oriented academic autonomy, while differing in degree and mode of state intervention, share a common core premise: the university is an independent legal person, and academic affairs should be autonomously decided by the academic community [4].

China's governance tradition of strategic embedded governance is rooted in the grand unification political tradition, the isomorphic social structure of family and state and a state-centric power structure. Since the Qin dynasty's establishment of centralized imperial rule, China formed a unitary centralized governance system. The state has consistently been the core actor in social governance; no institutional autonomous space independent of state power has existed. Education, as a core instrument of state governance, has always been under state dominance.

The European (including the Belarusian educational system) and Chinese higher education systems represent institutional crystallizations of distinct civilizational traditions. However, they can successfully interact and complement each other. While safeguarding university autonomy, Europe could strengthen strategic planning at supranational and national levels, enhance project-based guidance for cross-institutional collaboration and appropriately incorporate strategic orientation indicators within quality assurance systems. For China, institutional experience from European university autonomy should be assimilated. While upholding state strategic guidance, China could further expand university autonomy in disciplinary establishment, enrolment and personnel matters, clarify boundaries between administrative and academic power and gradually reduce the direct linkage between evaluation results and resource allocation.

The European and Chinese systems are not competing models on a single developmental continuum but parallel instantiations of distinct civilizational logics. Their dialogue and mutual learning concern not only the high-quality development of their respective higher education systems but also the knowledge innovation and governance wisdom humanity requires when confronting shared challenges.

References

1. Mok K. H., Han X. Higher education governance and policy in China. Policy and Society, 2017, no. 36 (1), p. 34–48.
2. Wang S. State-led or university-led? Higher Education Policy, 2021, no. 34 (2), p. 323–344.
3. Stensaker B. Quality assurance and the battle for legitimacy. Higher Education Quarterly, 2019, no. 72 (1), p. 3–17.
4. Wang Y. Liu Q., Chen R. Comparative study on the internal governance models of Chinese and European universities. Asia Europe Journal, 2022, no. 20, p. 115–135.

UDC 001.89.321

SCIENTIFIC POLICY OF MODERN STATES: GENERAL AND SPECIFIC

Xue Peng

Sukhoi State Technical University of Gomel, the Republic of Belarus

Scientific supervisor V. N. Yakhno

In the era of knowledge economy and technological revolution, science and technology have become the core driving force for the development of human society, and scientific policy, as a key

means for modern states to regulate, guide and promote scientific and technological progress, has increasingly become a strategic focus of national governance. Scientific policy is a practical arrangement for national resource allocation and institutional design, and a concentrated embodiment of the country's values. It runs through the entire process of scientific research, technological innovation, and directly determines the level of a country's scientific and technological strength, competitiveness and long-term development potential.

Keywords: science, politics, state, national governance, scientific and technological development.

НАУЧНАЯ ПОЛИТИКА СОВРЕМЕННЫХ ГОСУДАРСТВ: ОБЩЕЕ И ОСОБЕННОЕ

Сюэ Пэн

Учреждение образования «Гомельский государственный технический университет имени П. О. Сухого», Республика Беларусь

Научный руководитель В. Н. Яхно

В эпоху экономики знаний и технологической революции наука и технологии стали основной движущей силой развития человеческого общества, а научная политика, как ключевой инструмент для современных государств в регулировании, руководстве и продвижении научного и технологического прогресса, все больше становится стратегическим центром национального управления. Научная политика – это практическая система распределения национальных ресурсов и институционального проектирования, а также концентрированное воплощение ценностей страны. Она охватывает весь процесс научных исследований, технологических инноваций и напрямую определяет уровень научно-технической мощи, конкурентоспособности и долгосрочного потенциала развития страны.

Ключевые слова: наука, политика, государство, национальное управление, научно-техническое развитие.

The formation of modern science policy is closely related to the transformation of the role of science in society. And history confirms this. Before the 20th century, science was mainly a spontaneous activity of scientists, and the state's intervention in science was very limited, mainly focusing on funding basic research in a small range. After the Second World War, with the wide application of scientific and technological achievements in the fields of national defense, economy and society, science and technology became an important factor affecting national security and economic development, and modern scientific policy began to take shape. For example, the "Manhattan Project" in the United States and the "Five-Year Plan for Scientific and Technological Development" in the Soviet Union marked the formal intervention of the state in scientific research on a large scale, and scientific policy gradually became an important part of national strategy [1, 2].

As an important part of national governance, the scientific policy of modern states is affected by factors such as national conditions, historical culture, scientific and technological level and economic strength, resulting in obvious differences in policy practice. However, as a common product of the development of science and technology and national governance, modern scientific policies of various countries also have close internal connections and common development laws.

The practical differences of modern scientific policies in various countries are mainly reflected in three aspects: policy orientation, policy model and policy focus. These differences are the result of the comprehensive influence of various factors such as national conditions, historical culture and scientific and technological level of various countries. First,

differences in policy orientation. According to the different orientation of scientific policy, modern states' scientific policies can be divided into three types: technology-led orientation, market-led orientation and balanced orientation. Technology-led orientation emphasizes the leading role of the state in scientific and technological development, increases investment in scientific research, and guides scientific and technological development through national strategic planning. Countries with this orientation are mainly developing countries and countries with strong national intervention awareness, such as China and Russia. For example, China's scientific policy takes innovation-driven development as the core, emphasizes the leading role of the state in scientific and technological innovation, and increases investment in key core technologies to achieve technological independence. Market-led orientation emphasizes the leading role of the market in resource allocation, and the state mainly creates a good market environment and provides policy support, while the specific direction of scientific and technological development is determined by the market. Countries with this orientation are mainly developed countries with a mature market economy, such as the United States and the United Kingdom. Balanced orientation combines the advantages of technology-led and market-led, emphasizes the coordination between the state and the market, and realizes the organic unity of national strategic needs and market needs. Countries with this orientation are mainly European countries such as Germany and France. For example, Germany's scientific policy not only has clear national strategic planning, but also pays attention to the role of the market in the transformation of scientific and technological achievements, realizing the close combination of scientific research and industrial development. Second, differences in policy models. According to the different ways of policy implementation, modern states' scientific policies can be divided into three models: government-led model, market-led model and mixed model. The government-led model is characterized by strong state intervention, the government formulates detailed strategic plans and allocates most of the scientific research resources, and scientific research institutions and enterprises mainly carry out scientific research activities according to the government's arrangements. This model is suitable for countries with a strong centralized system and a low level of market economy, such as China, India and Belarus. The market-led model is characterized by weak state intervention, the government mainly provides a good policy environment and legal protection, and the allocation of scientific research resources and the direction of scientific research are determined by the market. This model is suitable for countries with a mature market economy and a high level of scientific and technological development, such as the United States and Canada. The mixed model is characterized by the coordination of government and market, the government formulates strategic planning and provides policy support, while the market plays a leading role in resource allocation. This model is the most widely used model in modern states, such as Germany, France and Japan. Third, differences in policy focus. Due to the differences in national conditions and development needs, modern states have different focuses on scientific policy. Developed countries with high scientific and technological level, such as the United States, Japan and the European Union, focus on basic research and frontier science and technology, and strive to maintain their leading position in the global scientific and technological competition. Developing countries, such as China, India and Brazil, focus on applied research and technological catch-up, and strive to narrow the gap with developed countries in scientific and technological level. For example, China focuses on the research and development of key core technologies in the fields of chips, aerospace and new energy to achieve technological independence [3, 4].

Although there are obvious differences in the scientific policy practice of modern states, they also have close internal connections and common development laws. These internal connections are mainly reflected in three aspects: common goals, common principles and common challenges. First, common goals. The core goal of modern scientific policy of all countries is to promote scientific and technological progress, enhance national core competitiveness, improve people's well-being and realize sustainable development. No matter what kind of policy orientation or model, modern scientific policy is committed to solving the practical problems in national development and social progress through scientific and technological innovation. For example, all countries, including Belarus, are committed to strengthening the research and development of public health technology to improve the level of public health; all countries, including Belarus, are committed to training scientific and technological talents to ensure the sustainable development of science and technology. This common goal is the basis for the internal connection of scientific policies of various countries. Second, common principles. Modern scientific policy of all countries adheres to some common principles, such as respecting the laws of scientific development, protecting the autonomy of scientific research, emphasizing the combination of science and technology and society, and promoting international scientific and technological cooperation. Third, common challenges. Modern scientific policy of all countries is facing some common challenges, such as the imbalance between basic research and applied research, the difficulty in transforming scientific and technological achievements, the ethical and moral issues brought by scientific and technological progress, and the inequality of scientific and technological development among countries. These challenges are not unique to a certain country, but are common problems faced by all modern states. For example, the difficulty in transforming scientific and technological achievements is a common problem faced by all countries. Although all countries have formulated policies to promote the transformation of scientific and technological achievements, there is still a gap between scientific research and industrial application; the ethical and moral issues brought by artificial intelligence, biotechnology and other new technologies are also common challenges faced by all countries, which require all countries to work together to formulate common ethical norms and supervision policies.

The common goals, common principles and common challenges of modern scientific policies of various countries have promoted the mutual learning and exchange of scientific policies among countries. In the process of practice, various countries learn from each other's advanced experience, optimize their own scientific policy system, and promote the common development of global science and technology.

References

1. Mirowski P. Science-Mart: Privatizing American Science. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2011. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/666449 (accessed 23.04.2026).
2. Mazzucato M. The Entrepreneurial State: Debunking Public vs. Private Sector Myths. London, Anthem Press, 2013. Available at: https://docs.yandex.by/docs/view. Pdf (accessed 23.04.2026).
3. UNESCO. World Science Report. Paris: UNESCO Publishing, 2021. Available at: https://www.unesco.org/reports/science/2021/en/report-series (accessed 23.04.2026).
4. Chinese Academy of Sciences. Annual Report on China's Science and Technology Development. Beijing: Science Press, 2023. Available at: https://bulletinofcas.researchcommons.org/journal/vol39/iss8/14/ (accessed 23.04.2026).