State Material Reserves through the Prism of Economic Theories: Neoclassicism, Keynesianism, and Institutionalism

Madona Kebadze, PhD in History, Associate Professor
Iakob Gogebashvili Telavi State University, Georgia
Email: kebadze_madona@yahoo.com; kebadzemadona8@gmail.com
ORCID: 0009-0002-5223-8259
SSRN Profile: https://hq.ssrn.com/UserHome.cfm

Zaur Gumashvili, Associate Professor, Chief Consultant,
Caucasus Scientific Research Center,
Iakob Gogebashvili Telavi State University, Georgia
Email: zaur.gumashvili@tesau.edu.ge

Abstract

The role of state material reserves (SMR) in the national economy is multidimensional and interpreted differently across economic schools of thought. Neoclassical theory conceptualizes SMR primarily as a buffer stock mechanism designed to stabilize prices and protect consumer welfare in the face of supply and demand shocks, while cautioning against inefficiencies arising from state intervention. Keynesian economics, by contrast, views SMR as an active countercyclical policy instrument that enables governments to manage economic fluctuations, mitigate crises, and restore market confidence. Institutional economics emphasizes the role of SMR as a credibility-enhancing institution that reduces uncertainty, lowers transaction costs, and creates a predictable environment for long-term investment. This article demonstrates that SMR performs functions ranging from microeconomic price stabilization to macroeconomic crisis management and institutional trust-building, thereby constituting a critical component of economic security.

Introduction

State Material Reserves (SMR) constitute a critical component of a sovereign state's economic security framework. By ensuring the availability of strategic raw materials, food, fuel, and other essential goods, SMR enhance national resilience to internal and external shocks. Despite their practical importance, the theoretical justification and evaluation of SMR vary significantly across economic paradigms.

This article examines how three major economic schools—neoclassical economics, Keynesianism, and institutional economics—conceptualize the role, efficiency, and legitimacy of SMR. Through comparative analysis, the study highlights the theoretical foundations underpinning state intervention in reserve accumulation and utilization.

Neoclassical Perspective on State Material Reserves

SMR as a Buffer Stock Mechanism

In neoclassical economics, state material reserves are primarily understood as buffer stocks—inventories maintained to reduce price volatility and mitigate the adverse effects of market shocks. This approach is particularly relevant in markets characterized by inelastic supply and demand, such as agricultural commodities and strategic raw materials.

Price Stabilization and Market Efficiency

Neoclassical models posit that buffer stock operations aim to correct temporary imbalances between supply and demand. When prices rise sharply due to supply disruptions (e.g., poor harvests

or logistical failures), the government releases goods from reserves, increasing supply and moderating prices. Conversely, when prices fall excessively due to oversupply, the government purchases goods for reserve accumulation, reducing market supply and preventing further price declines.

Such interventions are intended to stabilize prices around an equilibrium level, thereby enhancing allocative efficiency and reducing welfare losses associated with excessive volatility.

Shock Absorption and Risk Management

Neoclassical theory often incorporates the concept of rational expectations, whereby economic agents adjust their behavior based on anticipated government actions. The existence of SMR signals state readiness to respond to unexpected shocks such as natural disasters, geopolitical disruptions, or global supply chain delays.

By acting as a temporary cushion, SMR allow the economy time to adjust to new conditions without triggering abrupt price spikes or systemic crises. Moreover, reserve availability reduces risk premiums by stabilizing expectations regarding future prices, thereby facilitating long-term planning and investment.

Consumer Welfare Protection

Within the neoclassical welfare framework, price instability is associated with consumer surplus losses, as volatile prices erode real purchasing power. By stabilizing prices, SMR directly protect consumer welfare and contribute to overall social welfare. Producers also benefit from reduced revenue volatility and improved predictability, although some models note that producers may prefer periods of high prices. Nonetheless, neoclassical analysis generally prioritizes consumer protection in evaluating reserve policies.

Neoclassical Critiques of SMR

Despite acknowledging potential benefits, neoclassical economists express skepticism regarding the efficiency of buffer stocks. Key concerns include:

1. High Management Costs – Storage, insurance, and maintenance of reserves require substantial fiscal resources that may outweigh stabilization benefits.
2. Timing Errors – Incorrect decisions regarding the timing of purchases and sales may exacerbate price volatility rather than reduce it.
3. Political Manipulation – Reserves may be used for political purposes, such as subsidized distribution before elections, undermining economic efficiency.

From this perspective, buffer stocks are often considered a second-best solution, justified primarily in markets where private risk-management instruments (such as futures and forward contracts) are ineffective or unavailable.

Keynesian Interpretation of State Material Reserves

SMR as a Countercyclical Policy Instrument

Keynesian economics diverges sharply from neoclassical thought by emphasizing the role of aggregate demand and the necessity of active government intervention, particularly during economic downturns. Within this framework, SMR are regarded as an important fiscal policy tool that contributes to macroeconomic stabilization.

Demand and Supply Stabilization

During crises, economies may experience insufficient aggregate demand alongside supply disruptions. SMR allow governments to respond to both:

- Supply Shock Mitigation – In events such as wars, pandemics, or supply chain disruptions, releasing reserves compensates for shortages, prevents inflationary pressures, and ensures continuity of production in critical sectors.
- Demand Stimulation – While reserve releases do not directly increase demand, reserve accumulation during downturns entails government purchases, which directly raise aggregate demand and function as an automatic stabilizer.

Countercyclical Fiscal Policy

Keynesians advocate countercyclical fiscal policy—expansionary measures during recessions and contractionary measures during booms. SMR align naturally with this principle:

- During recessions, governments purchase goods for reserves, increasing public spending, supporting prices, and mitigating economic contraction.
- During economic expansions, governments sell goods from reserves, moderating price increases and reducing inflationary risks.

This mechanism provides a proportional and timely response to changing economic conditions.

Expectations, Panic, and Market Confidence

Keynesian theory places strong emphasis on expectations and "animal spirits" in shaping economic behavior. In crisis periods, fear of shortages can trigger panic buying and speculative price increases, as observed during the COVID-19 pandemic.
The existence and credible use of SMR serve as a stabilizing signal, reassuring markets that supplies are guaranteed. This reduces panic-driven behavior, dampens speculation, and helps restore trust in market functioning.

Keynes's International Vision

John Maynard Keynes further extended this logic to the international level by advocating for globally managed buffer stocks. He proposed that an international authority should purchase commodities during periods of excess supply and sell them during shortages, thereby stabilizing prices for both producers and consumers worldwide. This proposal reflects the Keynesian belief in active institutional intervention to correct market imperfections.

Institutional Economics and State Material Reserves

SMR as an Institution

Institutional economics, particularly New Institutional Economics (NIE), expands analysis beyond prices and quantities to include the "rules of the game" that structure economic interactions. From this perspective, SMR are not merely physical stocks but a critical institution embedded in formal and informal governance arrangements.

Uncertainty Reduction and Transaction Cost Minimization

Uncertainty regarding future supply and prices increases transaction costs related to information search, contracting, and risk management. The existence of SMR reduces such uncertainty, especially during shocks. Firms facing potential shortages would otherwise need to invest heavily in insurance, hedging, or private stockpiles, all of which increase costs.
By assuming responsibility for strategic reserves, the state reduces these transaction costs and enhances overall economic efficiency.

State Credibility and Institutional Trust

Institutional economics highlights state credibility as a cornerstone of economic performance. SMR function as a formal institutional commitment that signals the government's capacity and willingness to protect society and businesses from extreme shocks.
Effective use of SMR during crises strengthens governmental legitimacy and public trust—factors that are essential for economic cooperation, compliance, and investment.

Investment Protection and Predictability

Long-term investment requires a predictable environment and protection against extreme disruptions. The presence of SMR reassures investors that critical supply shortages will not abruptly halt production cycles. This expectation reduces perceived risk and encourages capital investment, thereby supporting sustainable economic growth.

Institutional Failures and Governance Risks

Institutional economics also recognizes the possibility of failure. Poor governance, unclear rules, or corruption may transform SMR into sources of rent-seeking and political manipulation. In such cases, reserves may increase uncertainty rather than reduce it, undermining trust in the state.

Conclusion

State material reserves represent a multifunctional instrument in the modern economy, extending far beyond the storage of physical goods. Comparative analysis of economic theories reveals that SMR bridge microeconomic objectives, such as price stabilization, with macroeconomic goals, including crisis management and cyclical stabilization. While neoclassical theory emphasizes potential inefficiencies and advocates caution, Keynesian and institutional perspectives provide strong justification for SMR as mechanisms for shock management, demand stabilization, and confidence building. Public goods theory further legitimizes SMR by demonstrating that the private sector cannot supply an optimal level of collective security. Ultimately, the effectiveness of SMR depends not only on the volume of reserves but also on the quality of their governance. Credible, transparent, and rule-based management transforms SMR into a cornerstone of economic stability and institutional trust in times of uncertainty.

References

1. Glauber, J. W., & Laborde, D. (2020). Buffer stocks and food security. In *The economics of food security* (pp. 217–236).
2. Keynes, J. M. (1936). *The general theory of employment, interest and money*. Macmillan.
3. Keynes, J. M. (1938). *The international regulation of commodity supplies*.
4. Keynes, J. M. (1942). *Proposals for an International Clearing Union*. Bretton Woods Conference documents.
5. Musgrave, R. A. (1959). *The theory of public finance: A study in public economy*. McGraw-Hill.
6. Newbery, D. M., & Stiglitz, J. E. (1981). *The theory of commodity price stabilization*. Clarendon Press.
7. North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.
8. Samuelson, P. A. (1954). The pure theory of public expenditure. *The Review of Economics and Statistics, 36*(4), 387–389.
9. Stiglitz, J. E. (1987). The economics of buffer stocks. *The Economic Journal, 97*(387), 675–685.
10. Tobin, J. (1974). *The new economics one decade older*. Princeton University Press.
11. Williamson, O. E. (1985). *The economic institutions of capitalism*. Free Press.
12. Law of Georgia on Mobilization. (n.d.). Georgia.
13. Law of Georgia on State Material Reserves. (n.d.). Georgia.