Redefining the Role of the Nation-State: A Comparative Analysis of Liberal and Socialist Economic Systems in the Wake of COVID-19

Noor ul Ain*
Lahore College for Women University Lahore
***Correspondence**: noorulain086@gmail.com

Citation | Ain. N.U, "Redefining the Role of the Nation-State: A Comparative Analysis of Liberal and Socialist Economic Systems in the Wake of COVID-19", MCCSS, Vol. 2, Issue. 2, pp. 89-96, Nov 2024
Received | Sep 24, 2024**; Revised |** Oct 27, 2024**; Accepted |** Nov 11, 2024; **Published |** Nov 29, 2024.

The COVID-19 pandemic has prompted a reevaluation of the roles played by nation-states, particularly within contrasting economic systems. This study conducts a comparative analysis between liberal and socialist economic frameworks in the aftermath of the pandemic. In instances when liberalism has been implemented, it has been observed that a system of free market economy and privatization has been formed, resulting in a reduction in the involvement of the state. The liberal economy has been observed to extract resources from the State without providing commensurate compensation. This article examines the significance of the state in world history, as it is the sole entity entrusted with the responsibility of ensuring the provision of fundamental rights to individuals and safeguarding them against both internal and external threats. Currently, the global community is confronted with the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. The analysis delineates their historical foundations, levels of state involvement, approaches to social welfare, and responses to the pandemic-induced economic challenges. The global impact of the crisis, including a sharp decline in GDP, estimated trillion-dollar losses, and the importance of swift containment and policy decisions, underscores the divergent approaches taken by these systems. As the world grapples with recovery strategies, understanding the nuanced roles of these economic paradigms offers crucial insights into navigating the aftermath of this unprecedented global crisis.

Keywords: COVID-19, Liberal Economy, Global Community, Internal and External Threats.

Introduction:

In the aftermath of World War II, the global landscape witnessed a paradigm shift in economic ideologies, with liberalism gaining prominence over socialism. The dissolution of the Soviet Union further solidified the ascent of a liberal economic order on a global scale [1]. This ascendancy ushered in an era where free market principles and privatization dominated, leading to reduced state intervention. However, the implementation of liberalism has raised pertinent questions about the role of the state in safeguarding fundamental rights and protecting individuals against internal and external threats.

The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic has disrupted this established liberal world order, underscoring the pivotal role of the nation-state [2]. The current state of upheaval has accentuated the necessity for effective state intervention, challenging the notion of minimal government involvement advocated by liberal economic systems. The private sector, often seen as insufficient in navigating such crises, has highlighted the role of governments in managing unprecedented challenges, albeit incurring significant costs [3]. The global spotlight on the coronavirus crisis has persisted over recent months and is poised to remain a dominant concern for the foreseeable future. Across various facets such as public and mental health, the essence of work, scientific endeavors, resource allocation, democratic norms, civil liberties, humanity's relationship with the environment, and the essence of education, this crisis appears to have deeply impacted the fundamental dynamics of how societal structures sustain themselves through capital [4]. As the ongoing developments unfold at a relentless pace akin to daily news cycles, the ramifications reveal patterns of inequality underlying the escalating human hardship. These consequences challenge the explanatory power of free market ideologies in justifying the growing suffering experienced by many. It seems that these events mark the onset of a historical shift, eroding established certainties overnight, encompassing the essentials of life from meals on tables to the availability of face masks and hospital resources [5].

It's perceived as inconceivable for individuals to exist outside the framework of a political community, a notion referring to humans as "zoon politic on," inherently political beings. The state, seen as an evolved form of a political community, establishes a close interrelation with its citizens through a rational agreement. The idea of a citizen's existence beyond the boundaries of the state appears implausible [6]. A well-structured administrative State holds a moral purpose in the life of an ordinary individual. Analogous to a human body, the state's constituent parts complement each other, functioning harmoniously to provide a conducive environment for citizen sustenance and well-being. Consequently, individuals bear the responsibility of aligning their actions with the state's affairs, as articulated by the author. The state is expected to prioritize the welfare of the majority and, therefore, should conduct itself in a manner that promotes the overall good [7]. Its authority extends to overseeing both domestic and international matters intricately linked to the people's welfare. Ineffectively managing internal affairs compromises a nation's success on the international stage, posing risks to both the state and the populace [8].

The state constitution is designed as a protective measure against internal and foreign challenges that could jeopardize political, social, and economic interests. Modern states exhibit heightened vigilance and adaptability in addressing issues related to indigenous populations, a notable departure from historical denials of citizen rights [9]. Exploring neoliberalism, socialism, and the market economy occurs within the context of a divided global landscape post-World War II. Capitalism and communism emerged as distinct ideological blocs, with the U.S. adopting capitalism and the Soviet Union establishing communism. Capitalism's analysis spans two key periods: the post-war "Thirty Golden Years" and the subsequent neoliberal epoch. Capitalists prioritize productivity, private property rights, competitive markets, short-term profits, and labor exploitation [10]. Neoliberals, responding to declining profit ratios, strategized to restore profitability by leveraging market competition within state frameworks. The privatization of State-Owned Enterprises (SOEs) aimed to ensure competition favoring private firms. Unrestricted capital movement, low inflation, and resource reallocation from lower to higher socioeconomic classes characterize this system [11]. Neoliberalism champions a market economy with minimal state intervention, rooted in market-oriented policies. It advocates reduced government spending on welfare and privatization of potentially profitable public services, challenging community values in favor of individualism, self-interest, and competition. The entrepreneurial emphasis of neoliberalism fosters intense and ruthless competition, undermining community cohesion, compassion, solidarity, and unity [12].

Understanding China's Paradigm of State Capitalism:

China is an amalgamation of free-market capitalism and state intervention, constituting what's termed a "socialist market economy." This system combines capitalist principles of entrepreneurship and privatization with a strong state presence in the political and financial realms. However, this approach promotes SOEs over private enterprise and free competition, indicating a controlled economic landscape [13]. China grapples with maintaining capitalist economic rationality while preserving its socialist political identity. State support enables SOEs to surpass private enterprises in domestic and global competitiveness, with private firms often requiring governmental approval for activities. The 1993 Chinese economic reforms shifted towards a market-oriented strategy resembling capitalist economies while retaining socialist ideals. Referred to as a "socialist market economy," this system sees substantial state involvement in economic policies, with SOEs receiving a considerable share of firms' profits, exemplifying characteristics akin to "State capitalism." China's mixed economy strives for social equity, aiming for shared prosperity between the state and citizens [14][15].

Remarkably, China has lifted over 750 million people out of poverty in four decades, attributed to its mixed economic model blending socialist and capitalist elements, which significantly boosted the GDP. The focal point of inquiry revolves around the prominence of SOEs in the People's Republic of China, a significant element within the global economic landscape [16]. Notably, the aggregate revenue amassed by SOEs listed in the Fortune Global 500 (FG500) firms reached $6.1 trillion in 2017, accounting for a substantial 22% share among all FG500 corporations. Furthermore, the Fortune 500 catalog featured a total of 61 Chinese enterprises, with 59 being state-owned. Remarkably, Chinese firms have surpassed their American counterparts in income generation within the FG500, with 129 Chinese entities including 10 Taiwanese companies listed compared to 121 American companies. Notably, 82 out of the 129 firms listed in the FG500 are SOEs from China, solidifying China's prominent position as a global business leader, overshadowing the historical dominance of the United States since World War II, as per the Fortune Global 500 rankings [17].

The escalating economic conflict between China and the United States, acknowledged by Henry Paulson, the Secretary of the United States Treasury, revolves around establishing which economy will drive technological advancements in the future and set corresponding benchmarks [18]. China experienced a notable surge in its gross domestic product (GDP) growth rate, nearly reaching 10% from 1979 to 2014, coupled with a substantial increase in per capita GDP, multiplying almost 49 times. The [17] reported the elevation of around 800 million individuals out of poverty in 2014, with a total expenditure of $7590. Moreover, China's GDP at market price saw a remarkable upsurge from $1.21 trillion in 2000 to $11.06 trillion in 2015, corresponding to an increase in China's share of the global GDP, soaring from 3.6% in 2000 to 17.52% in 2015. SOEs played a pivotal role in propelling China's status as a premier exporter, manufacturer, and the largest economy based on Purchasing Power Parity [19]. On the contrary, the United States follows a capitalist economic system, occupying a significant position in the global market economy. Established on the foundational principles of liberalism and conservatism, the United States has historically relied on these ideologies for economic prosperity, having embraced bourgeois values that prioritize individualism, laissez-faire principles, and popular sovereignty [20]. These values are instrumental in diminishing the federal government's role in market activities. While permitting private ownership and market freedoms, the American approach to social welfare predominantly hinges on market mechanisms rather than state intervention. This liberal social welfare framework accentuates the market's advantage and private enterprise, consequently reducing the state's involvement. The notion that markets are effective while governments are not remains influential in contemporary American socio-economic dynamics. Table 1 showcases the comparison of different economies [21].

Shifting Economic Ideologies: From Classical Liberalism to Neoliberalism and the Pandemic Challenge:

Before the onset of the Great Depression, the economic approach followed in the United States and the United Kingdom was primarily based on classical liberal principles. During this period, state regulation played a vital role in maintaining a sustainable capitalist system. However, from the 1930s to the 1970s, there was a shift towards interventionism, supplanting traditional liberalism [22]. This change marked the rise of neoliberalism, especially evident in the 1973 Chilean experiment, where a fundamentally free-market economy was introduced under the influence of the United States, following the overthrow of democratically elected socialist Salvador Allende by a military coup backed by the US. This led to the establishment of a repressive dictatorship under Military General Augusto Pinochet, serving the interests of the capitalist class. Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan furthered the implementation of neoliberal policies in the United Kingdom and the United States, respectively [23].

Table 1. Comparison of Economic Systems: China vs. the United States

Aspect	China	United States
Economic System	Socialist market economy	Capitalist economy
State Presence	Strong state intervention in political and financial realms	Diminished federal government role in market activities
Emphasis on Ownership	State-Owned Enterprises (SOEs) prominence	Emphasis on private ownership and market freedoms
Approach to Social Welfare	Strives for social equity and shared prosperity	Relies on market mechanisms for social welfare
Ideological Foundations	Blending socialist and capitalist elements	Historical reliance on liberalism and conservatism
Economic Development	Notable GDP growth from $1.21 trillion to $11.06 trillion	Significant position in a global market economy
Poverty Alleviation	Lifted over 750 million people out of poverty	Emphasis on individualism and laissez-faire principles
Global Business Influence	Prominence in Fortune Global 500, surpassing US dominance	Major position historically but facing challenges from China
GDP Growth and Share in Global GDP (2000-2015)	GDP surged, reaching 17.52% share of global GDP	Steady economic expansion, global influence historically

Their measures, such as financial deregulation and the removal of capital controls, contributed to the global acceptance of neoliberalism. Financial institutions like the US Department of the Treasury, the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund endorsed a 10-point economic plan emphasizing privatization, tax reductions for the affluent, financial deregulation, and trade liberalization [24]. Neoliberals advocate for an unfettered capitalist system as the key to economic performance, asserting that it ensures both economic development and fairness while promoting efficiency and technological advancement. They limit the state's role in managing the money supply, enforcing contracts, and protecting property rights, cautioning against state intervention in addressing market failures. However, the COVID-19 pandemic challenged the legitimacy of neoliberal ideology by exposing its limitations [25].

Government Intervention Amidst Pandemic: Comparing State and Market Responses:

The situation in China, where the virus originated, highlighted the difficulties faced by the state in timely information disclosure and effective crisis management. Lockdowns affecting millions raised questions about the state's responsibility to safeguard citizens' welfare during such crises. China's response involved direct financial assistance to those affected, particularly the impoverished segments. State-owned enterprises and government policies aimed to stabilize employment by providing unemployment benefits and facilitating negotiations between employers and employees facing pandemic-related challenges. The Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security recommended that enterprises engage in democratic processes to ensure workforce stability through measures like salary adjustments, altered job assignments, leaves, and reduced working hours. For businesses facing financial constraints hindering wage payments, seeking guidance from trade unions or employee representatives was encouraged to explore options for payment deferral, aiming to alleviate the financial strain on affected organizations [3].

The government stepped in to aid businesses by assisting with salary management, devising adaptable work policies, minimizing employer insolvency risks, preventing employee contract terminations, and providing legal support to workers. China's rapid construction of two hospitals within a fortnight, each equipped with 1000 and 1600 beds, coupled with deploying 42,000 additional medical personnel to Hubei province, highlighted the foremost duty of a government: utilizing all available resources during crises. The market, driven by self-interested individuals prone to drastic measures to protect corporate growth, often neglects the welfare of those instrumental in its success. Amid the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, the debate on sustenance responsibility focuses on the market versus the state. As per the social contract, the state assumes the responsibility of caring for all during distressing times.

The pandemic forced partial or complete workplace closures globally, affecting about 81% of the global workforce, and posing imminent job loss threats to 1.6 billion informal workers without savings or credit access. Reports from Pakistan's Ministry of Planning projected around 18.5 million job losses due to the epidemic, prompting a substantial relief package of RS 1200 billion. India witnessed a decline in economic well-being for 400 million informal sector workers, causing a surge in unemployment, surpassing 120 million. India responded with a $260 billion relief package amounting to 10% of its GDP, addressing various sectors and providing free food distribution. The US witnessed over 39 million unemployment insurance applications by mid-May, initiating a $2 trillion rescue package, with an additional $3 trillion stimulus approved later. Globally, the G-20 consortium allocated substantial financial assistance, with notable amounts disbursed to Germany, Canada, China, Australia, and the Eurozone. The COVID-19 pandemic posed significant challenges for global capitalists, revealing the market's reluctance to cooperate with the state in addressing the crisis. However, the market heavily relies on state protections and facilitations. While the state shoulders the burden of aiding both the market and citizens, it incurs direct economic costs due to commercial activity restrictions within and between states. The state's role has surged over the markets during this epidemic, challenging the capitalist paradigm and advocating for a more prominent state role, contrary to laissez-faire economics. The amplified obstacles to market stability in this scenario add substantial strain to the state's capacities. Table 2 represents China’s response to a global pandemic.

Table 2. COVID-19 Pandemic Response: China and Global Impact

China's Response	Global Impact
Provided direct financial assistance to affected segments	Forecasted a 3.0% decline in global GDP growth
Stabilized employment with state-owned enterprises	Estimated $9 trillion loss worldwide in GDP
Recommended workforce stability measures for enterprises	IMF's projections outline economic implications
Government-aided businesses in various ways	World Bank's $160 billion initiative for 100+ nations
Rapid construction of hospitals and medical deployment	Closure of schools impacting 85% of students globally

The global impact of the pandemic is forecasted to surpass that of the 2009 financial crisis. The sweeping lockdown measures have led to a sharp 3.0% decline in global GDP growth, significantly steeper than the 0.1% dip witnessed during the financial crisis. This economic downturn is estimated to result in a staggering $9 trillion loss worldwide, surpassing the combined economies of Germany and Japan. Recent research by the International Monetary

Fund (IMF) has outlined projections for real Gross Domestic Product (GDP) from 2019 to 2021, highlighting substantial economic implications. The World Bank has launched a comprehensive $160 billion initiative named Emergency Operations to Combat COVID-19, aiming to aid developing nations in tackling pandemic-related challenges. This initiative is expected to benefit over 100 countries, encompassing nearly 70% of the global population, with the potential to bolster economic recovery, support the private sector, enhance public health, and alleviate poverty within these nations. The closure of schools due to the virus has affected about 85% of students globally, prompting recommendations from The World Bank to swiftly address the long-term impacts of the pandemic on the education sector. The absence of effective policy coordination could result in a substantial reduction in the global trade deficit, potentially plummeting by 32% or more. The strength of our recovery hinges on swift containment of the pandemic and prudent policy decisions by governments. States must devise robust and socially inclusive strategies encompassing recovery, trade, fiscal, and monetary policies. Sustaining open markets by individual states will facilitate a rapid economic rebound.

Table 3: Economic Impact and Financial Assistance

Economic Impact	Financial Assistance
Projected GDP decline surpassing 2009 financial crisis	Various relief packages: RS 1200 billion, $260 billion, etc.
Global trade deficit could plummet by 32% or more	G-20 consortium allocated substantial financial assistance
IMF and World Bank projections and initiatives	[3] highlights governments' role in recovery
Need for swift containment and robust policy decisions	Importance of devising inclusive strategies for recovery

Conclusion:

In summary, the evolution of the state's role indicates a shift from safeguarding individual rights within borders to a broader responsibility for global citizen interests. The state's support is essential for a sustainable market economy. Throughout history, notable instances like the US interventions during economic crises i.e., the Great Depression, the New Deal Program, the 2008 Financial Crisis, and now, COVID-19 underscore the state's crucial role in supporting its population. However, the market's priorities often diverge from state welfare, emphasizing commercial interests. Interestingly, in China's case during the pandemic, the market aided the state in managing affairs. This global crisis highlights the pivotal role of the State, transcending ideological differences. It's incumbent upon the state to directly manage pandemic-induced crises, irrespective of ideological contexts. The market, typically benefitting from public resources, tends to evade responsibility during crises, exacerbating state challenges. Governments intervene decisively to address fiscal crises, safeguarding citizens and the market economy from epidemic impacts.

Abbreviations:

- State-Owned Enterprises (SOEs)
- Gross Domestic Product (GDP)

References:

[1] J. Delacroix, "The distributive state in the world system," Stud. Comp. Int. Dev., vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 3–21, Sep. 1980, doi: 10.1007/BF02686463.

[2] L. L. Heger and D. F. Jung, "Negotiating with Rebels: The Effect of Rebel Service Provision on Conflict Negotiations," J. Conflict Resolut., vol. 61, no. 6, pp. 1203–1229, Jul. 2017, doi: 10.1177/0022002715603451.

[3] M. Cammett and N. Salti, "Popular grievances in the Arab region: evaluating explanations for discontent in the lead-up to the uprisings," Middle East Dev. J., vol. 10,

no. 1, pp. 64–96, Jan. 2018, doi: 10.1080/17938120.2018.1443606.
[4] M. Turner, "Peacebuilding as counterinsurgency in the occupied Palestinian territory," Rev. Int. Stud., vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 73–98, Jan. 2015, doi: 10.1017/S0260210514000072.
[5] C. Mcloughlin, "When Does Service Delivery Improve the Legitimacy of a Fragile or Conflict-Affected State?," Governance, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 341–356, Jul. 2015, doi: 10.1111/GOVE.12091.
[6] D. W. Brinkerhoff, A. Wetterberg, and S. Dunn, "Service Delivery and Legitimacy in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States: Evidence from water services in Iraq," Public Manag. Rev., vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 273–293, Feb. 2012, doi: 10.1080/14719037.2012.657958.
[7] C. Mcloughlin, "When the Virtuous Circle Unravels: Unfair Service Provision and State De-legitimation in Divided Societies," J. Interv. Statebuilding, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 527–544, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.1080/17502977.2018.1482126.
[8] T. Kivimäki, "The fragility-grievances-conflict triangle in the middle east and North Africa (MENA): An exploration of the correlative associations," Soc. Sci., vol. 10, no. 4, Apr. 2021, doi: 10.3390/SOCSCI10040120.
[9] M. A. Daw, "The Impact of Armed Conflict on the Epidemiological Situation of COVID-19 in Libya, Syria and Yemen," Front. Public Heal., vol. 9, Jun. 2021, doi: 10.3389/FPUBH.2021.667364/FULL.
[10] O. Nay, "Fragile and failed states: Critical perspectives on conceptual hybrids," Int. Polit. Sci. Rev., vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 326–341, Jun. 2013, doi: 10.1177/0192512113480054.
[11] R. Jawad, O. Walton, and W. Merouani, "Service Delivery, State Legitimacy and Conflict in Arab Countries: Exploring the Key Linkages Using a Social Policy Perspective," Soc. Sci. 2021, Vol. 10, Page 481, vol. 10, no. 12, p. 481, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.3390/SOCSCI10120481.
[12] E. Bellin, "Reconsidering the robustness of authoritarianism in the middle east: Lessons from the Arab spring," Comp. Polit., vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 127–149, Jan. 2012, doi: 10.5129/001041512798838021.
[13] A. De Waal, "Mission without end? Peacekeeping in the African political marketplace," Int. Aff., vol. 85, no. 1, Jan. 2009, doi: 10.1111/J.1468-2346.2009.00783.X.
[14] O. Schlumberger, "Opening old bottles in search of new wine: On nondemocratic legitimacy in the Middle East," Middle East Crit., vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 233–250, Sep. 2010, doi: 10.1080/19436149.2010.514473.
[15] Q. S. Rana, "Friendship and Finance: Understanding the Social Dimensions of Individual Investor Choices," Magna Cart. Contemp. Soc. Sci., vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 148–155, Sep. 2022, Accessed: Dec. 20, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://journal.50sea.com/index.php/MC/article/view/626
[16] N. Stel and R. Ndayiragije, "The eye of the beholder: Service provision and state legitimacy in Burundi," Africa Spectr., vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 3–28, Dec. 2014, doi: 10.1177/000203971404900301.
[17] R. Jawad, "Social protection and the pandemic in the MENA region," Curr. Hist., vol. 119, no. 821, pp. 356–361, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.1525/CURH.2020.119.821.356.
[18] H. Sobhy, "The Lived Social Contract in Schools: From protection to the production of hegemony," World Dev., vol. 137, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1016/J.WORLDDEV.2020.104986.
[19] A. Pitcher, M. H. Moran, and M. Johnston, "Rethinking Patrimonialism and Neopatrimonialism in Africa," Afr. Stud. Rev., vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 125–156, Apr. 2009, doi: 10.1353/ARW.0.0163.
[20] B. Balkhi, D. Alshayban, and N. M. Alotaibi, "Impact of Healthcare Expenditures on Healthcare Outcomes in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) Region: A Cross-

Country Comparison, 1995–2015," Front. Public Heal., vol. 8, Feb. 2021, doi: 10.3389/FPUBH.2020.624962.

[21] W. Merouani, C. El Moudden, and N. E. Hammouda, "Social Security Enrollment as an Indicator of State Fragility and Legitimacy: A Field Experiment in Maghreb Countries," Soc. Sci., vol. 10, no. 7, Jul. 2021, doi: 10.3390/SOCSCI10070266.

[22] R. Schwarz, "The political economy of state-formation in the Arab Middle East: Rentier states, economic reform, and democratization," Rev. Int. Polit. Econ., vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 599–621, Oct. 2008, doi: 10.1080/09692290802260662.

[23] S. Van De Walle and Z. Scott, "The political role of service delivery in state-building: Exploring the relevance of European history for developing countries," Dev. Policy Rev., vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 5–21, Jan. 2011, doi: 10.1111/J.1467-7679.2011.00511.X.

[24] M. Loewe, T. Zintl, and A. Houdret, "The social contract as a tool of analysis: Introduction to the special issue on 'Framing the evolution of new social contracts in Middle Eastern and North African countries,'" World Dev., vol. 145, Sep. 2021, doi: 10.1016/J.WORLDDEV.2020.104982.

[25] K. E. Wiegand, "Reformation of a terrorist group: Hezbollah as a lebanese political party," Stud. Confl. Terror., vol. 32, no. 8, pp. 669–680, 2009, doi: 10.1080/10576100903039320.