

Review of: "State crisis theory: A systematization of institutional, socio-ecological, demographic-structural, world-systems, and revolutions research"

Antonio Velasco¹

¹ Universidad de Los Andes

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This paper is a very interesting presentation of the issue under study, and the way its author presents the models/theories on this realm is a smart one, and there is an enormous and extremely patient work of reading, understanding, unifying, criticizing and synthesizing the extraordinary diversity of models on the subject, which is also a great merit of the author of this paper.

But, on the other hand, I feel there still is a lack of clarity, but this is something proper of the issue in itself, not a flaw attributable to the author/reviewer. I mean:

1. There is an enormous diversity of models on this realm, but this has the consequence that there is not a clear way to get useful results as for proposing a scientific theory.
2. I think that a way to escape from this labyrinth is looking for indicators of the core idea: the crisis of the State. If we identify adequate indicators for measurement, we'll be able to answer the main questions: (a) What is a crisis, (b) When there is (and there is not) a crisis of a given State, and (c) When (and how) does a crisis of a State begins, and (4) When and how does it end.

I think that without such a unifying approach, we will continue lost in the big tangle of crude facts and casuistic doctrines. For instance, the ancient problem of changes of the political regime has been marked for some time by an **inductivist bias** according to which it has been considered methodologically more convenient to start from the diversity of empirical cases and the discernment of their common denominators, in order to generate empirically based models, instead of starting from abstract premises and proposing hypotheticalal-deductive models.

But... it happens that these phenomena can be measured by various indicators, the most commonly used are those referring to the duration of the regime, electoral results, opinion patterns, and formal ownership of the executive branch.

Although the methodological intention is good, it seems that the method has not been adequate, to the extent that up to now it does not seem to have been possible to discern **principles** of a sufficiently general scope and with predictive power, and this has led to excessively intuitive procedural models, **with a presence of innumerable factors and residual variables** such as virtù and fortune, which come back to us from a long time ago, and which explain little, if

at all.

The different *post hoc* interpretations and explanations are correct only up to a certain point, since they allow us to plausibly interpret the phenomena, that is, they present **narrative plausibility**, but they **do not explain**, since they do not lead to predictive principles of a general nature, so that according to that method, any other kind of explanation that presents **equal discursive plausibility is equally good**

It is therefore worth asking whether it is worth resuming the development of **more deductivist and less casuistic models**: it seems that a deductive model with an institutional base is a more fruitful possibility of analysis.

This way, my proposal for the research on this issue is

1. Firstly look for mechanisms instead of looking for variables and factors
2. Once identified the main mechanisms, then look for the proper indicators of the variables involved in each of the mechanisms.
3. And then design the adequate deductive model.

Of course, this is not easy, and mine is just a simple general idea. I have such kind of a model, but it is not ready yet...

In short, **I recommend the publication of the paper**, and I think it would be good to **also publish these reviews and comments**.