



CEIBS

中欧国际工商学院

王建翎 史璞蘭主编

# 国有企业改革

STATE-OWNED ENTERPRISE REFORM

中国的实践和西班牙的经验

# 国有企业改革

 上海遠東出版社

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

国有企业改革/王建柳,史璞兰主编. —上海: 上海  
远东出版社, 2003

ISBN 7-80661-794-9

I. 国... II. ①王... ②史... III. 国有企业—经济体制改革—中国—文集 IV. F279.241-53

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2003) 第 030458 号

国有企业改革 中国的实践与西班牙的经验

---

主 编/ 王建柳 史璞兰

特约编辑/ 徐 勤

责任编辑/ 匡志宏

装帧设计/ 张晶灵

版式设计/ 李如琬

责任制作/ 晏恒全

责任校对/ 周国信

出 版/ 上海远东出版社

(200336) 中国上海市仙霞路 357 号

<http://www.ydbook.com>

发 行/ 新华书店 上海发行所

上海远东出版社

制 版/ 海峰照排经营部

印 刷/ 上海市印刷七厂

装 订/ 上海虎林装订厂

版 次/ 2003 年 5 月第 1 版

印 次/ 2003 年 5 月第 1 次印刷

开 本/ 850 × 1168 1/32

字 数/ 114 千字

印 张/ 7.25

插 页/ 4

---

ISBN 7-80661-794-9/F·169

定价: (RMB) 18.00 元

# 序

国有企业改革是中国社会主义改革的一块硬骨头。虽然已经确立了社会主义市场经济体制,但是只要国有企业没有改革成功,社会主义市场经济体制就是不完善的,就是没有最后建成。鉴于国有企业改革仍是当今中国重大而急迫的命题,2002年5月中欧国际工商学院主办了中国—西班牙国企改革研讨会。西班牙也曾有许多国有企业,后来进行了改革。以前西班牙曾是欧洲经济落后国家之一,现在西班牙已是欧洲经济发达、增长率居于前列的国家,西班牙的企业走向全世界,具有巨大的国际竞争力。这次研讨会开得很成功,双方的发言者都是高层次的专家或直接参与国企改革的高层领导人。他们站得高,看得远,研究有成,许多观点都掷地有声。他山之石,可以攻玉。现将他们的论文和演讲稿

汇编成集出版,我认为这是十分有意义的事,相信会受到致力于中国国有企业改革的学者、官员和企业家们的欢迎。

当然,两国国情不同,西班牙的经验也不能照搬。甚至对某些术语,两国的理解也是不一致的。例如,在欧美广泛使用的“私有化”一词,我就是经过多次到欧美考查、与各方专家讨论争辩之后才搞明白的。原来,在欧美讲的“私有”是一个广义的概念,凡不属于政府所有的都是私有,非此即彼。因此,个人家族所有制、公众股份制、社团所有制、职工集体所有制、社会基金所有制等都是私有制。所谓私有化就是非政府化或非国有化,或者说,只要非国有自然就是私有化了。而在我国,按照马克思主义的观点,“私有”是一个狭义的概念,凡属个人家族所有为私有制,几个家族合伙实行雇佣劳动的也是私有制;凡是国家所有即全民所有的谓之国有制,由各级政府管理。在这两极之间存在着大量公有制实现形式,如各种集体所有制,包括公众股份、社团、职工合伙等所有制。因此,中国改革开放以来,虽然大力发展了私有经济,已是三分天下有其一,今后仍是“坚持发展私有经济”的方针,但反对“私有化”,因为“私有化”意味着全部个人家族所有化。中国仍然要坚持搞活国有企业,更提倡公有制多种实现形式,两者加起来就是“坚持公有制为主体”。这就是党的十六大提出的两个“必须毫不动摇”的方针。

严重的问题是中国国有企业究竟能不能通过改革搞活?我的看法是:国有企业有它存在的巨大价值,国有企业也是可以搞

好的,这已为国内外许多国有企业的成功事例所证实。关键在于真正的改革一定要首先“政企分开”。1997年,我曾写过长篇论文《政企分开、政企分开、政企分开》,发表在《经济日报》上,产生过广泛的社会影响。一连三个“政企分开”,就是说我认为是国有企业改革的首要关键因素是“政企分开”。“政企分开”是搞活国有企业不可缺少的决定性的前提。虽然不能说“政企分开”解决了国有企业一切问题,但我可以断言,不首先“政企分开”,其它云云都只能落入空谈。国有企业面临的困境证明了我的“偏激的言论”是正确的。现在如果我要再写一篇国有企业改革的文章的话,题目一定是《第四,还是政企分开》。如果不真正实行有效的“政企分开”,那么国有企业,不管承认不承认,是在慢性死亡的过程之中。谁搞死国有企业的?不是私有经济,而是那些死抱计划经济思维、不肯“政企分开”、怕丧失自己的各种权益的既得利益者;还有那些生吞活剥马克思主义的教条主义者,他们内心是始终反对这场伟大的社会主义改革的,他们所谓的“坚持国有经济的主体作用”,实际上是想回到计划经济的过去。正是他们死死束缚着国有企业的改革。

历史会作出公正的结论。

刘光

中欧国际工商学院执行院长

## 编者序

2002年5月10日,两百多位分别来自中国和西班牙的国有企业改革领域的学者和实际工作者在上海的中欧国际工商学院欢聚一堂,交流国有企业改革的理论研究成果和实际操作经验。这次“中国—西班牙国企改革研讨会”由中欧国际工商学院主办,西班牙国际合作署赞助。

国有企业改革是世界上许多国家已经完成或者正在经历的、具有重大现实和历史意义的进程。目前关于改革的必要性,至少就竞争性行业而言,已经形成了充分的共识。但是在已经基本完成这一进程的国家,虽然对改革都寄望颇高,改革的结果却大相径庭。这不仅表现为在改革中所付出的经济和社会成本不同,而且表现为在改革后所形成的新体制的效率不同。这表明改革进程的具体设

计和操作在很大程度上决定了国有企业改革的短期效果和长期效果,因而值得进行深入的理论探讨和实践摸索。

在欧洲联盟成员国中,西班牙的国情在某些方面和中国比较相似,1985年开始的西班牙国有企业改革也取得了成效。正是出于这种考虑,中欧国际工商学院让西班牙国企改革历程的过来人和中国国企改革未来的探索者走到一起来了。一方面,西班牙的经验对中国国企改革进程的具体设计和操作有可资借鉴之处。另一方面,西班牙同行也借此机会了解了中国的一些情况。为了使中国国企改革获得成功,与会者一起对双方情况的异同进行了分析,为设计符合中国国情的改革方案发表了意见。

作为由中国政府和欧洲联盟合作创办的惟一所国际化商学院,中欧国际工商学院的宗旨是促进中国的发展和中国与欧盟国家之间的相互了解。这也正是我们主办“中国—西班牙国企改革研讨会”以及编印这本文集的目的。当然,国有企业改革只是经济体制改革的一个方面,因而国有企业改革的理论和实践探索不能脱离经济体制改革的大背景。西班牙的国情和中国还有许多不同,甚至是根本性的差异,因而在借鉴西班牙的经验时不能脱离中国的实际。

在这次研讨会上,中欧国际工商学院执行院长刘吉教授和院长 Albert Bennett 博士分别致了开幕词和闭幕词,副教务长张维炯教授和助理教授 Juan Antonio Fernandez 博士主持了会议,



来自中国和西班牙的九位发言者作了精彩的发言。

本文集收入了这次研讨会的全部九篇发言。编者只对发言的文字作了少许润色。作为学术交流,其中一些观点会有偏颇之处,而有些只是西方学者的看法,我们本着学术研究的原则予以保留,供研究者参考,这一点敬请读者阅读时注意审察鉴别。发言者对国企改革有丰富的经验,从理论和实践的不同角度对国企改革献计献策。集思广益,他们的发言为国企改革问题的深入研究和为国企改革实践的继续成功提供了思路。

中欧国际工商学院

王建翎博士、经济学教授

史璞兰博士、生产管理学教授

2003年2月

# Foreword

Liu Ji

Executive President of CEIBS

SOE reform is one the hardest parts of China's socialist reform. Although the socialist market economic system has been established, it will not be a fully established one unless SOE reform succeeds. Since SOE reform remains an important and urgent issue of China's reform, CEIBS sponsored this International Seminar on Public Enterprises in May 2002. Spain used to have many SOEs and Spain used to be a backward country in Europe. After the reform, Spain has become a developed country with the highest growth rate in Europe. Many Spanish enterprises have become global players of international caliber. As the old Chinese saying goes: "There are other hills whose stones may serve to polish the jade. ( Examples by others may help one overcome one's shortcomings. )" The Spanish experience warranted attention of the Chinese. This seminar was a very successful one because speakers from both countries were top-notch experts and practitioners of SOE reform. Standing high and seeing far ahead, they base their views on solid research. I believe

that to compile their speeches into these proceedings is something of significant value, which will be welcomed by scholars, officials, executives and entrepreneurs dedicated to SOE reform.

Of course, the national conditions of the two countries are so different that the Spanish experience cannot be indiscriminately copied. Even the understanding of the same term in the two countries may differ considerably. For example, only after many visits to Europe and America and many discussions with various experts have I fully understood the meaning of the word "privatization" that is so widely used in Western countries. In the Western context, "private ownership" is a term in its broad sense and refers to non-state ownership, which may include individual/family ownership, public corporation ownership, community ownership, employee joint-stock ownership, fund ownership, etc. Therefore, privatization is the transition from government ownership, or state ownership, to private ownership. In China and according to Marxism viewpoint, however, "private ownership" is a term in its narrow sense and refers to sole proprietor (individual/family ownership) and partnership (ownership by a group of individuals/families) that employs wage labor while state ownership, or all people ownership, refers to ownership by governments at different levels. Between the two extremes exist different forms of public ownership such as collective ownership which encompasses public corporation ownership, community

ownership, employee joint-stock ownership, etc. Hence, although the private sector has grown to a size of occupying one third of the economy since the beginning of reform and opening-up, the official policy will continue to be “developing the private sector” but opposing “privatization” because of its narrow denotation that everything is owned by individuals/families. China will continue to uphold and revitalize SOEs and to promote different forms of public ownership, and the two combined is the policy of “maintaining public ownership as the main component of the economy.” This is exactly the guiding principle of two “never wavering” set forth at the 16<sup>th</sup> National Congress of the Communist Party of China.

Now the crucial problem is whether China's SOEs can be revitalized through reform. My personal view is that the existence of SOEs has its huge value and SOEs can operate efficiently, which has been proven by examples of many successful SOEs in China and abroad. The crux of the matter is that real reform has to start with separation of enterprises from governments. In 1997, I wrote a long article titled “The First Is Separation of Enterprises from Governments, the Second Is Separation of Enterprises from Governments, and the Third Is Separation of Enterprises from Governments” on *Economic Daily* and that article had a widespread impact on the society. The use of the phrase “separation of enterprises from governments” three times in the title highlighted my belief that the key issue in SOE reform was “separation of

enterprises from governments.” “Separation of enterprises from governments” is a necessary precondition to revitalize SOEs. I was then quite sure that although “separation of enterprises from governments” alone would not solve all problems of SOEs, no problem would be solved without “separation of enterprises from governments.” The fact that more and more SOEs are facing more and more and more severe difficulties has proven that my “radical opinion” was unfortunately right. If I write another article about SOE reform, the title must be “The Fourth Is Still Separation of Enterprises from Governments.” If SOEs are not effectively separated from governments, then, admitted or not, they are doomed to gradual demise. Who should be responsible for those failed SOEs? Not the private sector, but those who obstinately cling to the mentality of the planned economy and are unwilling to separate enterprises from governments for fear of losing power and benefit, and those who have been against this great socialist reform since the very beginning and whose idea of “maintaining state ownership as the main component of the economy” is to return to the old days of the planned economy. It is those people who have been holding back the reform of SOEs and it seems that they will not give up until all SOEs are failed.

History will deliver a fair judgment.

## Foreword by the Editors

On 10 May 2002, more than 200 scholars and practitioners with expertise and experience in the reform of state-owned enterprises (SOEs) gathered together at the China Europe International Business School (CEIBS) in Shanghai under the patronage of the Spanish Agency for International Cooperation (AECI). These professionals came from China and from Spain to exchange information and discuss theoretical research and practical experience at the CEIBS-sponsored *International Seminar on Public Enterprises*.

Reform of SOEs is a process of historical and current significance: it has been and is being experienced in many countries. Within China, the necessity of reform—at least for competitive industries—has been commonly agreed. However, it is known that the outcome of reform has varied significantly among countries that have completed their reform although their basic starting points were essentially the same. Discrepancies lie not only in the economic and social costs of the reform process, but also in the resulting efficiencies of new systems. This suggests that the design and implementation of the reform *process* may greatly affect the short- and long-term achievements of SOE reform. Therefore, in-depth theoretical exploration and experimentation with the design and implementation of

the reform process would likely be of considerable value.

Among members of the European Union, Spain has a surprising similarity to China in a number of aspects. Spain also has experienced a successful outcome in the reform of its SOEs, beginning in 1985. With this thought in mind, CEIBS brought together veterans from Spain's SOE reform process and current thinkers about the path ahead for SOE reform in China. On the one hand, the Spanish experience could provide guidelines and advice on the design and implementation of the reform process in China — in essence, the opportunity to learn from the successes and failures of this earlier endeavor. On the other hand, Spanish colleagues could take the opportunity to learn more about an aspect of China with which they have experience. The entire group could reflect on both similarities and differences between the two situations in order to help inform the development of unique strategies that could contribute to successful SOE reform in China.

CEIBS is a unique joint venture between the Chinese Government and the European Union, with a mission to contribute to the continuing development of China while providing a window on China for our European partner. This *International Seminar on Public Enterprises* exactly contributes to the School's mission, as does this record of the *Seminar*. Within China, reform of the SOEs is but a part of a larger economic system reform which continues. Learning from others' experiences while continuing profound theoretical develop-

ment can only enhance the quality of the resulting process and its outcome.

This *International Seminar* was opened with Professor Liu Ji, Executive President of CEIBS, welcoming all speakers, participants and guests to this unique gathering. Dr. Albert Bennett, President of CEIBS, provided closing remarks. Professor Zhang Weijiong, Associate Dean of CEIBS, and Dr. Juan Antonio Fernandez, Assistant Professor, chaired the sessions.

These *Proceedings* contain all nine speeches delivered at the *Seminar*. These remarks have been modestly edited, keeping each speaker's point of view intact—including what might not be beyond dispute—in the spirit of “letting a hundred schools of thought contend” in academic exchanges. The speakers bring a wide experience to the subject, and offer a broad range of approaches—from the theoretical to the deeply practical. As a whole, their remarks provide a glimpse into the nature and extent of the issues, as well as clues to help lead towards another successful reform.

Dr. Linda G. Sprague, FDSI, FIOM  
CEIBS Professor of Manufacturing and  
Operations Management

Dr. Wang Jianmao  
CEIBS Professor of Economics and Director of the CEIBS  
Case Development Center



# 目 录

序 .....	刘 吉	1
编者序 .....	王建翎 史璞蘭	1
国有企业与经济发展 .....	Alfredo Pastor	1
国有企业改革与经济发展 .....	吴敬琏	7
改善政策环境 深化企业改革 .....	陈清泰	18
经济政策和国有企业改革 .....	Claudio Aranzadi	32
银行改革与国有企业改革 .....	谢平	41
私有化与制度的作用 .....	Josep Oliu	50
管理转型中的国有企业 .....	Jordi Mercader Miro	61
西班牙的私有化:20 年经验谈(1983 ~ 2002)		
.....	Francisco Minoves Besolí	70
国有企业改革中的政治问题 .....	Miquel Nadal	81
中国经济改革 .....	Juan Antonio Fernandez	85