



## **COVID -19 pandemic: A litmus test of the resilience of Chinese and US governance models**

Mao Dun<sup>1</sup>, Lee Pei May<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Politics and International Relations, University of Nottingham

<sup>2</sup>Department of Political Science, International Islamic University of Malaysia

Correspondence: Lee Pei May (email: [peimay@iium.edu.my](mailto:peimay@iium.edu.my))

Received: 11 August 2021; Accepted: 13 May 2022; Published: 31 May 2022

### **Abstract**

The article is an exploratory study to understand the United States and Chinese governments' response, with different governance models, to the COVID-19 pandemic. This article looks at both governments' initial reactions during the crisis, how essential resources were managed, and the interplay between government and civil society during the containment phase. This qualitative study uses a case study method to explore the contemporary phenomenon of COVID-19. It draws on secondary data such as government and international organisation reports, newspaper articles, journal articles, and books. The findings reveal that a top-down government structure has provided greater leeway to respond to the crisis, as exemplified by China. Since this research is a preliminary study, the authors do not draw far-reaching conclusions about which model fared better in the management of the pandemic; nevertheless, the analysis notes the increased capacity of governments to act during public health crises if power and resources are concentrated, including the ability to mobilise civil actors to help with the problem. Assessing the response of the U.S. and Chinese governments significantly contributes to the literature on governance and crisis management, and thus benefits both pundits and policymakers.

**Keywords:** civil society, COVID-19, global health crisis, governance model, pandemic, policymakers.

### **Introduction**

COVID-19 has shocked humankind; there has never been a disease that ravaged the world as this disease has. The disease has spread globally, infecting virtually every inhabited part of the world. When the disease first hit China, nothing was known about it or how to treat it—patients received pneumonia treatments. After local authorities had identified the disease as different from usual pneumonia, the situation was reported to higher governmental authorities. This eventually led to instituting a lockdown in Wuhan, China. When China notified the U.S. Centers for Disease Control (CDC) about the disease in January 2020, the U.S. quickly shut down its borders to foreign

nationals that had visited China in the past weeks (BBC, 2020). As a response to this novel coronavirus, governments worldwide have implemented large-scale public health interventions to curb the spread of the disease. China and the U.S. have adopted different governance models, each of which has been central to the strategies and containment efforts of the country.

The purpose of this paper is to elucidate how different governance models have handled the COVID-19 pandemic, shedding light on the centralised and decentralised governance structure and the relationship between state apparatus and domestic society. This article discusses the literature relating to the Chinese and Western governance models, the latter represented by the US. It then examines the Chinese and U.S. governments' initial responses to COVID-19, their management of essential sources, and the interplay between government and civil society during the containment phases.

## Literature review

As with many terms in Western political science, the history of governance can be traced back to the ancient Greeks. Plato used governance to mean 'steering' or 'piloting' in designing the governing system's rules. In ancient Greek political thought, governance was regarded as synonymous with the notion of government (Kjaer, 2004). In the 1980s and early 1990s, the meaning of governance shifted and had been ascribed new and broader meanings by political scientists compared to the narrower term government.

Rhodes (1997) argued that in the Western governance theory, it is generally regarded that there should be no "leader" in the governance process. Therefore, equal participation in the decision-making process should be included as an essential feature of the governance model. The opinions of both public and private actors must be taken into account. Peters & Pierre (2009, p. 92) believed that the government's leadership in social governance should be removed as "self-organising networks are better able to provide directions to the society". Therefore, institutional reform that follows Western governance theory should promote equality, negotiation, resource exchange, the rule of law, transparency, responsiveness, consensus orientation, accountability, effectiveness, and efficiency. These should be promoted without a single overarching power that governs the system.

Bray (2006) further discussed the concept of social organisation in the West. He argued that the social organisation "has been presented as a resource that can be mobilised to address a broad range of political, social, ethical and economic problems" (Bray, 2006, p. 531). In short, civil society should be empowered in the Western governance model.

This stands in contrast to Chinese governance theory. This theory upholds the leadership of the party and government in all aspects of governance and subordinates the role of civil society. According to Ren (2015), in the Chinese governance model, the Chinese Communist Party's (CCP) possession of dominant power in national governance systems is a fact that must be faced. China's current governance strategy is top-down, emphasising the fundamental role of the Party. The CCP's social governance slogan in the Decision of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on Some Major Issues Concerning Comprehensively Deepening Reform (Decision) policy document is evidence of this, combining the aims of "strengthening leadership by the Party committee," "giving full play to the leading role of the government," and "supporting the participation of all sectors of the society" (CPC, 2013). Using this strategy, the Party's rhetoric in the Decision policy document reveals the Party guidelines—of maintaining its ruling status in

governance—and indicates that social governance activities might need permission from the government before being undertaken.

Chai and Song (2013) contended that the CCP decides which civil actors participate in social governance. The authorities enjoy their leadership - and the perks of being in power - in the process. Due to the asymmetric distribution of political status and resources between the public and private sectors, civil actors might find that they cannot contribute to the social governance process as they had expected.

Despite this traditional model, the CCP has recognised the increasingly important role that civil actors may play in society. As such, the Party has been introducing new mechanisms for a top-down model of governance of civil society after the third plenum of the 18th Central Committee on 18 November 2013. For instance, the government intends to increase government spending on public services and deregulate the registration system for the four main types of social organisations (trade associations and chambers of commerce, scientific and technological associations, charity and philanthropic organisations, and urban and rural community service organisations). It also aims to commission social organisations to provide public services and tackle issues that they could address by themselves such as mobilising their project funding and human resources. The governmental regulations on Chinese civil society and social organisations seem to be gradually loosening, and social organisations may be entrusted with more public service functions in the future.

Based on the critical analysis of the key characteristics of Western and Chinese governance, China offers a form of governance that is distinct from the West. The Chinese government emphasises a top-down approach and selective civil society participation. This differs significantly from the model adopted in economically advanced Western countries, which promotes equal participation of all.

## **Method and study area**

This is a qualitative study that uses a case study method to explore the contemporary phenomenon of COVID-19. According to Yin (2013), a case study is seen as an appropriate method as this research intends to uncover 'how' has the governance model shaped t governments' responses in managing the Covid-19 outbreak. The authors rely on purposive sampling to choose the case studies (Seawright & Gerring, 2008). China and the US are compared because they represent vastly different governance models, with the China model emphasising the leading role of the government and leadership of the party, and the dominant Western governance model, as practiced by the US, has stressed on equal participation of all actors in the decision-making process. To perform a systematic analysis, the other factors such as population size and economic power of the country are made comparable when selecting case studies. Moreover, it makes more sense to compare the US and China as they are two leading superpowers in the world, exhibiting two vastly different models of governance. This study also draws on secondary data such as party, government and international organisation reports, newspaper articles, journal articles, and books. Notably this study looked at the reports by The State Council Information Office of the People's Republic of China, World Health Organisation Report, Report of CPC Central Committee, newspaper articles from South China Morning Post, BBC, Xinhua, Forbes, USA Today, journal articles from Policy and Society, Policy Design and Practice, and books by Rhodes (1997) and Peters and Pierre (2009) on governance.

## Results and discussion

### *Initial responses to the crisis*

On December 8, 2019, an unidentified case of pneumonia was reported in Wuhan, a major city in central China. Nineteen days later, Doctor Zhang Jixian became aware of the severity of the problem after receiving four patients exhibiting the same severe, pneumonia-like symptoms as revealed by chest radiography. She reported the situation to hospital leaders and the Disease Control and Prevention authority at the district level (Global Times, 2020). Three days after Dr. Zhang sounded the alarm, the Health Commission of Wuhan issued a bulletin, the Urgent Notice on the Treatment of Unknown Cause Pneumonia. It required all medical institutions to track and report the treatment and condition of patients suffering from the new illness promptly (Li et al. 2020).

On December 31, 2019, 27 cases of viral pneumonia detected in Wuhan were related to Huanan Seafood Market, and on 3 January 2021, China notified the World Health Organisation (WHO) of unknown pneumonia. However, due to the lack of data, the local government could not confirm if the disease would cause human-to-human transmission; hence appropriate action was not taken to contain the disease (Global Times, 2020). Large-scale social events, such as Lunar New Year banquets, were still held in Wuhan. Moreover, the government's decision-making focus had not shifted to confront the rising problem; instead, the Wuhan municipal government still held its executive meeting to discuss the issue of deploying standardized transformation of the city's vegetable market.

The initial epicentre of the COVID-19 outbreak, Wuhan, was locked down a day after China reported 17 deaths and more than 550 infections on January 22, 2020 (CNN, 2020). Following that, Donald Trump, the President of the United States, enforced an entry ban on all non-U.S. citizens who had visited China in the last 14 days (BBC, 2020). As a response to this new coronavirus, governments worldwide have implemented large-scale public health interventions to curb the disease. China and the U.S. have adopted different governance models that have been central to each country's strategies and containment efforts. The importance of governance has been highlighted in a European Union (EU) policy brief, "Governance Matters to the Quality of Decisions Made, and to Their Implementation" (Greer et al., 2019, p. 7). This leads us to question how the management of COVID-19 has played out in both countries given their differing governance models.

#### a. Moving toward centralised command in China

In principle, China is a unitary state. However, due to the country's vastness and disparities among its regions, policymakers after the 1980s resorted to several waves of fiscal decentralisation. This means that local governments have been given greater autonomy to decide on the socioeconomic affairs of their locality. The decentralised structure has primarily remained since that time. However, as He et al. (2020, p. 245) have explained, ultimately, "tight political control empowers the central authority to steer the behaviour of local governments in a top-down manner during emergencies." As shown in the following discussion, the Chinese model allows the central government to quickly take over the command from local governments—especially in the epicentre of the pandemic.

After the unknown virus that caused pneumonia was detected and reported to the national CDC, the Chinese CDC sent two expert teams to Wuhan on December 31, 2019 and January 8, 2020. Yet, neither of the two groups of experts publicly and explicitly mentioned that the virus showed signs of human-to-human transmission (Global Times, 2020). On January 20, 2020, the third expert team held a press conference in Wuhan which confirmed that the virus is transmissible between people (The Guardian, 2020). Five days later, on January 25, 2020, the Central Leading Group on Responding to the COVID-19 Outbreak (henceforth CLG) was established. The CLG was tasked with making strategic decisions regarding the disease. It was further mandated that the directives coming from CLG be followed by all, including party committees and sub-national level governments.

The members of CLG are senior members of the Politburo and the State Council, and the Premier is the head of CLG (He et al., 2020). Because CLG was directly answerable to the CCP Politburo Standing Committee—which includes Xi Jinping, President of the People’s Republic of China, as part of the seven-people-committee—Xi was able to preside over the CLG and oversee the COVID-19 prevention and control efforts. This chain of command that was established to cater to the COVID-19 crisis was and continues to be exceptionally important as Wuhan municipal government’s operational efficiency has become very high. Moreover, the duality of the Chinese governance structure, which is characterised by the interwoven and intimate relationship between the ruling political party—that is, the CCP—and the government, has allowed China to form an effective command chain. Such a mechanism is essential to ensure clear and direct communication between national and local governments, especially during crises such as trying to contain COVID-19.

In Beijing, the state council also formed the Joint Mechanism for COVID-19 Prevention and Control on January 20, 2021. Its purpose was to compel greater coordination and cooperation from central ministries involved in public health emergencies. This command structure at the central level was then replicated at all local government levels, where one can observe the establishment of local command headquarters to prevent and control COVID-19 (He et al., 2020). Following the decision made by the central leadership, Wuhan municipal government agents quickly implemented a series of strategies to curb the virus. First, the Wuhan municipal government established a headquarters for coronavirus control, headed by Mayor Zhou Xianwang. The headquarters consisted of eight groups: those in charge of emergency response supply, propaganda, marketing, traffic, medical treatment, epidemic control, community management, and comprehensive support (Xinhua, 2020a). In short, all personnel that the Wuhan government could mobilize were redeployed to focus on containing the virus.

Second, the Wuhan municipal government changed its standard duty schedule and announced a ‘war-time’ period schedule. Third, the focus of the Wuhan municipal government website changed suddenly to the topic of coronavirus information (Li & Weng, 2021). This change signifies that the local government’s attention can be shifted dramatically under the instruction of the central leadership. Fourth, the attention and decision-making of the Wuhan municipal government shifted from “stability maintenance” (weiwen, 维稳) to unprecedented compulsory mask-wearing, self-quarantining, and city lockdown.

Another important mechanism unique to China has played a significant role in reorienting the local cadres to pursue the tasks deemed important by the central administrators, especially during crises. The system of reward and penalty practiced by the CCP can be a strong political incentive for the local cadres to demonstrate exceptional performance in managing a crisis (Mei, 2020). Especially during the COVID-19 outbreak period in Wuhan, one can observe how local

cadres have been punished and promoted at remarkable speed. For example, the provincial and municipal party secretaries—the highest-ranking official in Hubei province and Wuhan municipality, respectively—were replaced on February 13, 2020 due to mounting complaints about their inability to tackle the crisis at the outset (Mei, 2020; SCMP, 2020). Another 620 cadres were punished during one month of “war against coronavirus,” while during the same period 20 cadres were promoted for their competency. Ironically, the same reward and penalty system had also incentivised the Wuhan government to mask the real conditions at the onset of the disease, causing it to spiral out of control before knowledge of it reached the central government (He et al., 2020). Despite this initial setback, the central government has successfully taken control of the situation by dismissing the incompetent leaders of Wuhan and replacing them with trusted and reliable leaders.

b. Sharing of power and responsibility among central and state governments in the U.S.

In contrast to China’s position, the U.S. had more time to assess the situation before the virus hit. Subsequently, when the first confirmed case of COVID-19 in the U.S. was reported in January 2020, the U.S. government was able to rapidly set up a White House Coronavirus Task Force (USA Today, 2020). The task force was staffed with top health officials, such as Doctors Anthony Fauci and Deborah Birx as well as state officials. While the task force’s establishment can be seen in a positive light as the federal government proactively trying to form a national response, the task force faced several challenges.

In Western governance theory, there should not be any overarching power in the decision-making process; rather, this theory emphasises equal participation of all. When disagreement on fundamental issues arises, it is difficult for the stakeholders to reach a consensus. This can be problematic during a crisis. In this case, the government officials and health practitioners often had conflicting opinions about the most efficient approaches to manage the pandemic. For example, President Donald Trump loudly applauded the effectiveness of hydroxychloroquine to treat COVID-19. At the same time, Dr Fauci maintained that there was no scientific evidence supporting the use of the drug to treat the disease (USA Today, 2020). The mixed messages relayed to the people caused confusion and subsequently distrust toward the government. In the Chinese context, if there were disagreements among the actors, consensus shall be reached before any announcement was made to the public. The pledge to abide by collective leadership and collective decision making means that any differences should be resolved and the party-state must present itself as a united front to the people.

The White House Coronavirus Task Force was supposed to develop a national strategy for responding to the virus, including expanding the nation’s overall testing capacity, yet they failed to do so. More than 50 interviews conducted with government officials, senior scientists, and company executives showed that these experts agreed: the reason the U.S. was not able to have large-scale testing was due to “technical flaws, regulatory hurdles, business-as-usual bureaucracies and lack of leadership at multiple levels” (New York Times, 2020b). For instance, the U.S. federal government believed that state governments could max out their testing capacity. However, state governments were often reluctant to impose stay-home orders or stricter social distancing measures until a later stage, due to economic considerations. This left a huge leadership vacuum and caused inconsistent enforcement of guidelines.

Even when the state governments called for more significant intervention from the federal government, the latter refused to take the leading role. Rather than providing the necessary

resources for crisis control, federal leadership stressed the role of state governments in procuring medical resources. This led to meaningless competition, as discussed in the next section. As a result, there were differing responses to the coronavirus across the U.S., making it like a “patchwork of public health measures, often coloured by partisan motivations” (Rocco et al., 2020, p. 549). With an infectious disease like COVID-19 ravaging the U.S., slow and uncoordinated responses result in significant damage.

### *Management of important resources in China and the U.S. during containment period*

It is vital to ensure the sufficient and uninterrupted supply of important resources during the epidemic, such as medical equipment. In China, the Chinese Party-state has insisted on maintaining its core position in the governing of the epidemic which included the unprecedented shutdown of the city of Wuhan.

In the U.S., there were insufficient ventilators to cater to everyone’s needs. This catastrophe was largely avoided in China due to the efforts and ability of the Chinese government to gather and redistribute medical supplies to the most affected areas. The Ministry of Industry and Information Technology (MIIT) of China took a further step to ensure the continuous supply of medical protective clothing by deploying material and human resources to 15 companies. With assistance from MIIT, these companies were able to expand their production rapidly, with most companies operating 24 hours daily (Xinhua, 2020b).

As mentioned above, the governance model of China emphasises the leadership of the Party and the leading role of the government; this can be advantageous, especially in responding to crises. At the outset of the epidemic, Wuhan local government had tried to underplay the severity of the conditions, but the power-centric governance of China has enabled the national government to assume control and subsequently allowed for swift decisions to be made, and policy enforcement at the local level to be effective. For example, two new hospitals—Huoshenshan and Leishenshan—were ordered to be built in Wuhan within ten days. These two new hospitals, along with other quickly constructed treatment centres and 340 medical aid teams gathered from all over China, helped to prevent Wuhan’s medical system from being overwhelmed, and slowed the spread of the virus (China Watch Institute et al., 2020).

In addition, China’s top-down governance has minimised the competition among local governments for available resources, as happened in the U.S. (New York Times, 2020a). Manpower and resources from the government, society, and the army have been coordinated, pooled, and allocated to the main battlefield. For example, the central government sent 14,000 protective suits from central medical reserves to Wuhan, and coordinated moving “three million masks, 100,000 protective suits and 2,180 pairs of goggles” from nearby provinces to Wuhan on January 25, 2020 (Xinhua, 2020c). Additionally, 1,400 military medics were sent to work at the new Huoshenshan hospital in Wuhan on the same day (China Daily, 2020), and troops were mobilised by President Xi (who is also the Chairman of the Central Military Commission) to deliver medicines and supplies in Wuhan.

The explanation of Chinese governance in this study, moving from theory to practice, might reveal that the country’s top-down governance model could be more efficient when handling a crisis. However, this does not mean that the Chinese governance model has no shortcomings. It can breed other problems, such as severe corruption stemming from the concentration of power and officials that are more concerned with the will of the “top” than the opinions of the “bottom.” The chronic corruption situation in China has prompted President Xi to wage a war against

corruption, alongside governance reform to address the problems within China (Xinhua, 2017). While both the Chinese and Western governance models have shortcomings, the COVID-19 crisis has particularly highlighted the weaknesses of the Western governance model.

In Western governance, the idea of sharing resources and creating a better environment through cooperation is inspiring; yet, it is “hard to realise in reality due to pervasive and deep network failures” (Ramesh et al., 2015, p. 356). Such a problem is evident during the COVID-19 outbreak in the U.S. According to Governor Andrew Cuomo of New York, all states of the U.S., along with the federal government, were bidding against each other to secure medical supplies; this pushed up prices, including those of lifesaving ventilators (New York Times, 2020a). There was no intention to cooperate and establish a national purchasing agent, or “a voluntary buying consortium” that could allocate medical supplies based on states’ needs (Forbes, 2020).

In March 2020, three months into the pandemic, the U.S. federal government had yet to place any order for ventilators. As Western governance emphasises on the equal sharing of responsibility in decision making, there is no urgency from the central government to purchase medical resources on behalf of the states. Eventually, as medical resources dwindled and pressure mounted on President Trump to take action, Trump invoked the Defense Production Act (DPA), which he had initially resisted doing. Using executive orders, he ordered companies such as 3M and General Motors to produce protective gear needed for the frontline responders. By that point, however, the companies had already been making them. The slow response to the shortage of medical resources hampered the containment efforts and caused prices to skyrocket. The government decentralisation favoured by the Western governance model, which is premised on the assumption that cooperation among actors can be fostered, seems prone to fail in practice, especially in times of crisis.

### *The role of civil society during the pandemic*

Both governance models encourage the participation of various civil actors. However, in the centralised context—as in China’s case—the participation is guided, often aimed to complement the role of the government. As Li and Wu (2012, p. 89) concisely summarized, the participation of civil actors in China is mainly treated as “a temporary vehicle utilised by the state to materialise its political aims.” China’s response to the COVID-19 crisis provides a striking example of this tendency. During the explosive growth of the epidemic, four million community workers served by “monitoring the situation, measuring body temperatures, screening for infection, disseminating government policies, and sanitising neighbourhoods” (SCIO, 2020). Furthermore, more than 13 million CCP members participated in volunteer services to fight the pandemic, nearly 500 of them losing their lives defending others (SCIO, 2020). All this civil action was meant to supplement the services offered by the Chinese government.

In China, both urban residents and villagers were mobilised by local governments to participate in community management. With help from local volunteers, checkpoints were set up and continue to be used in every community. The checkpoints serve to monitor residents’ body temperature and symptoms, as well as to “persuade the migrants to return where they came from” (Fu & Fu, 2020). Grid-based management and access control were also strictly enforced in communities and villages. For instance, community workers and volunteers in each grid area played the role of couriers, delivering supplies to neighbourhood residents during the quarantine and isolation period. Together, these measures formed a non-medical method of stopping COVID-19 from spreading (SCMP, 2020). Through actions such as “tracing, registering, and visiting each



individual, placing them under community management, and transferring them ... to designated medical facilities for quarantine or treatment” (SCIO, 2020), civil engagement in containment actions has built a barrier for the public, one which has effectively blocked the transmission routes of COVID-19.

In the Western governance model, as exemplified by the U.S., interaction and cooperation between the public and private sectors are emphasised. This is accompanied by a shift in power from the government to civil society actors. A standard practice in Western governance is sharing of responsibilities; so, during the COVID-19 outbreak in the U.S., individuals, communities, social organisations and private businesses have all played a role in contributing to the fight against COVID-19. Americans have generously donated more than \$5 billion in grants to at least 1,000 organisations that have pledged to contribute to the relief efforts (The Economist, 2020). Civic actions have helped in battling the pandemic but at times, the civil societies do mobilise themselves to fight against policies that threatened civic space which leaves the US government with less leeway to control the virus. In contrast, civil society in China has never truly enjoyed an open civic space and its role is always to complement the role of the government.

As with many Western countries, in the U.S., people have a fundamental role to play in the decision-making process. When the state governments imposed a series of restrictions on citizens to curb the spread of the virus, including stay-at-home orders, protesters from more than a dozen states went to the streets to oppose the government’s decision (World Politics Review, 2020). They believed that the measures to contain COVID-19 were an overreaction and an infringement on their civil rights. In the US, individual rights remained a contentious issue in battling the pandemic. The Trump administration was constantly under pressure to lift restrictions that have impinged on individual rights.

Stemming from the Western governance model’s commitment to enhancing equal participation in decision making, the inclusion of public opinion in drafting responses made containment efforts less straightforward. For example, state governments faced mounting pressures from business groups, conservative political groups, and some citizens to return to normalcy. These groups have pushed to end restrictions on the mobilisation of people and opening of businesses even though it is clear that the infection cases are on the rise (Rocco, et al., 2020). Especially worrisome is the danger that COVID-19 may further spread around local communities due to large gatherings of protesters. During the protests, few people protected themselves with facial masks or social distance. In drafting the pandemic responses, the US government was clearly constrained in its actions due to societal pressure. Hence, the Chinese government has more policy tools to battle the pandemic.

## **Conclusion**

This is an exploratory study to understand how each of the two countries reacted to the pandemic and how power is distributed among the stakeholders during the decision-making process, which is largely influenced by the governance models. Through the analysis of the Chinese and U.S. governments’ responses to COVID-19, it is clear that the top-down structure of the Chinese governance model has empowered that country’s national government to intervene in local management to a greater extent than in the U.S. The Chinese national government intervened in local government by gathering and mobilising vital resources from all over the country to the epicentre of the outbreak - taking over the administration power of local governments that had

mishandled the crisis. This was possible as in this model the central government holds supreme leadership. The Western governance model, by contrast, emphasises promoting cooperation among various actors. As shown in the case of the U.S., this model has not performed well during the pandemic. The U.S. demonstrates a disordered administration system. There is an apparent lack of leadership at all levels due to the decentralisation that is a central feature of the Western governance model. In the situation of scarcity caused by COVID-19, people were fighting one another to access the limited supply of medical resources instead of mediating conflicting interests via governance. While the civil society in China complements the government's containment efforts, protests opposed to stricter social distancing measures were observed all over the U.S., resulting in more infections. This could arguably mean that the response of the U.S. authorities may have put containment goals secondary due to competing interests within the society. However, the emergence of the omicron variant is a major test for the resilience of China's governance model, especially with its large number of unvaccinated elderly. Chinese government insisted on pursuing a 'zero-Covid policy' which has been questioned over its sustainability. Whether the strict lockdowns and mass testing in China to buy time would produce similar success in the early years of the outbreak or would the transition to the endemic phases, followed by majority of the countries is the best way to deal with coronavirus is unknown for now. Only time will tell.

## References

- BBC (The British Broadcasting Corporation). (2020). Coronavirus: US and Australia close borders to Chinese arrivals. Retrieved from <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-51338899#:~:text=The%20US%2C%20which%20declared%20a,be%20quarantined%20for%2014%20days>.
- Bray, D. (2006). Building 'community': new strategies of governance in urban China. *Economy and Society*, 35(4), 530-549.
- Chai, H., & Song, X. (2013). The adaptive state—understanding political reform in China. *Policy Studies*, 34(1), 73-88.
- China Daily. (2020). PLA medical personnel to run new Wuhan hospital starting Monday. Retrieved from [http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/a/202002/02/WS5e364b81a31012821727427c\\_2.html](http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/a/202002/02/WS5e364b81a31012821727427c_2.html).
- China Watch Institute, China Daily & Institute of Contemporary China Studies, Tsinghua University & School of Health Policy and Management, Peking Union Medical College. (2020). China's Fight Against COVID-19. Retrieved from <http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/pdf/2020/Chinas.Fight.Against.COVID-19-0420-final-2.pdf>.
- CNN (Cable News Network). (2020). Wuhan coronavirus death toll rises, as city imposes transport lockdown. Retrieved from <https://edition.cnn.com/2020/01/22/asia/china-wuhan-coronavirus-deadly-intl-hnk/index.html>.
- CPC (Communist Party of China). (2013). Decision of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on Some Major Issues Concerning Comprehensively Deepening the Reform. Report of CPC Central Committee.
- Forbes. (2020). Cuomo Calls for National 'Buying Consortium,' Says He Hasn't Discussed Quarantine with Trump. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/sergeiklebnikov/>

- 2020/03/28/cuomo-calls-for-national-buying-consortium-says-he-hasnt-discussed-quarantine-with-trump/#787907d5a091.
- Fu, B., & Fu, X.Y. (2020). The model of epidemic (COVID-19) prevention and control in rural of China. *Critical Care*, 24(146).
- Global Times. (2020). GT investigates: Review of 40-day response. How COVID-19 was detected and stemmed in Wuhan. Retrieved from <https://www.globaltimes.cn/content/1210178.shtml>.
- Greer, S. L., Vasev, N., Jarman, H., Wismar, M., Figueras, J. (2019). It's the governance, stupid! TAPIC: a governance framework to strengthen decision making and implementation. (Policy Brief 33). World Health Organisation.
- He, A.J., & Shi, Y. & Liu, H. (2020). Crisis governance, Chinese style: distinctive features of China's response to the Covid-19 pandemic. *Policy Design and Practice*, 3(3), 242-258.
- Kjaer, A. M. (2004). *Governance*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Li, K. Q. (2020). Report for Third Session of the 13th National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China on 22 May 2020. Report on the Work of the Government. Retrieved from <https://language.chinadaily.com.cn/a/202006/01/WS5ed46379a310a8b241159ce5.html>.
- Li, Y., & Weng, S. H. (2021). How to make decision during war on COVID-19: the transformation of governance mode and the application logic of knowledge when local government making decision. *The Forum of Leadership Science*, (01), 20-36 (In Chinese).
- Li, Y., & Wu, F. (2012). The transformation of regional governance in China: The rescaling of statehood. *Progress in Planning*, 78(2), 55-99.
- Li, X., Cui, W., & Zhang, F. (2020). Who was the first doctor who report the COVID-19 outbreak in Wuhan, China? *Journal of Nuclear Medicine*, 61(6), 782-783.
- Mei, C. (2020). Policy style, consistency and the effectiveness of the policy mix in China's fight against COVID-19. *Policy and Society*, 39(3), 309-325.
- New York Times. (2020a). Governors fight back against Coronavirus chaos: 'It's like being on eBay with 50 other states. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/31/us/governors-trump-coronavirus.html>.
- New York Times. (2020b). The Lost Month: How a Failure to Test Blinded the US to Covid-19. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/28/us/testing-coronavirus-pandemic.html>.
- Peters, B. G., & Pierre, J. (2009). Governance Approaches. In Wiener, A. & Diez, T. (Eds.), *European Integration Theory*, (pp. 91-104). Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Ramesh, M., Wu, X., & Howlett, M. (2015). Second best governance? Governments and governance in the imperfect World of health care delivery in China, India and Thailand in comparative perspective. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 17(4), 342-358.
- Ren, J. T. (2015). Construction of a modernized state- governance system: a review based on the recent top design. *Journal of Renmin University of China*, 2(2), 2-12 (In Chinese).
- Rhodes, R. A. W. (1997). *Understanding governance: policy networks, governance, reflexivity and accountability*. Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Rocco, P., Béland, D., & Waddan, A. (2020). Stuck in neutral? Federalism, policy instruments, and counter-cyclical responses to COVID-19 in the United States. *Policy and Society*, 39(3), 458-477.

- SCIO (The State Council Information Office of the People's Republic of China). (2020). Fighting COVID-19: China in Action. Retrieved from <http://www.scio.gov.cn/zfbps/ndhf/42312/Document/1682142/1682142.htm>.
- Seawright, J., & Gerring, J. (2008). Case selection techniques in case study research: A menu of qualitative and quantitative options. *Political Research Quarterly*, 61(2), 294-308.
- The Economist. (2020). A helping hand: Covid-19 exposes American philanthropy's strengths and weaknesses. Retrieved from <https://www.economist.com/united-states/2020/04/27/covid-19-exposes-american-philanthropys-strengths-and-weaknesses> [paywall].
- The Guardian. (2020). China confirms human-to-human transmission of coronavirus. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/jan/20/coronavirus-spreads-to-beijing-as-china-confirms-new-cases>.
- USA Today. (2020). Here's a timeline of President Donald Trump's and Dr. Anthony Fauci's relationship. Retrieved from <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2020/10/28/president-donald-trump-anthony-fauci-timeline-relationship-coronavirus-pandemic/3718797001/>
- Xinhua. (2020a). The Latest: Wuhan establishes headquarters for pneumonia control. Retrieved from [http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/2020-01/21/c\\_138723390.htm](http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/2020-01/21/c_138723390.htm).
- Xinhua. (2020b). China endeavours to ensure supply of masks, necessities amid epidemic. Retrieved from [http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/2020-02/03/c\\_138753096.htm](http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/2020-02/03/c_138753096.htm).
- Xinhua. (2020c). China cranks up protective equipment supplies to fight new coronavirus. Retrieved from [http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/2020-01/26/c\\_138733811.htm](http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/2020-01/26/c_138733811.htm).
- Xinhua. (2017). China's top anti-graft body to keep high pressure on corruption. Retrieved from [http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2017-01/08/c\\_135964580.htm](http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2017-01/08/c_135964580.htm)
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case Study Research Design: Design and Methods*. (5th ed.). London, Sage Publications.
- SCMP (South China Morning Post). (2020). Grass-roots officials take lead role on the front line of Wuhan's grid-by-grid battle against coronavirus. Retrieved from <https://www.scmp.com/news/china/society/article/3075453/grass-roots-officials-take-lead-role-front-line-wuhans-grid-grid>.
- World Politics Review. (2020). The global rise of anti-lockdown protests - and what to do about it. Retrieved from <https://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/29137/amid-the-covid-19-pandemic-protest-movements-challenge-lockdowns-worldwide>.