

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

Katalin Botos<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Szeged

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

It was abnormal big work for the author to read through so many crisis stories which were happening in very different times and analyze the studies which concentrated on that special topic. My interest is first of all in 19-20th centuries' actions. He tried to make some generalizations, and find some common elements in them. Not easy to compare events under very different circumstances. Systematization of occurrences even despite different approaches had some comparable elements.

First of all, he sorts the researchers of the „state crisis” as follows: neo-institutionalists, socio-economic system researchers, demographic-structural theory, and world systems approach following researchers, and lastly revolutionist researchers. I found interesting those references where he quoted that some world-systems approach-following scientists focused on the decline and rise of hegemonic states within a larger economic system. We can't avoid thinking of the contemporary rivalry between US and China. This may cause state crises in some countries which are connected more strongly to one or another of the two rivals.

He systematized theories of state crises to get answers for the following questions: Why do crises occur? And what factors influence societal responses to state crises?

The author shows us the different outcomes of the state crises. It can lead to catastrophe but it can be solved peaceful way as well. It can bring reforms, but bloody revolutions as well.

It was interesting to see first of all the differentiation between the notion of crises in the different ecological-economic conditions of *sufficiency and scarcity*

Why and how sufficiency may create crises? It was interesting to read:

„the loss of virtue and the neglect of the public good associated with moral decay may actually be the result of an increase in personal wealth which produces individuals whose power exceeds the abilities of states to constrain them may lead to „crisis”. Here the author quotes Van Bavel's words like „corruption, coercion, and violence”. It has so much in common with problems in contemporary politics.

The author attracts our attention to the fact that often occurred unrest despite that quality of life for the majority has been

improving. We mainly think that unrest stems because of scarcity, but he showed us that on the contrary, it can happen in conditions of sufficiency as well. Technological changes, too, may lead too, to unrest. He mentions the transition from agrarian to fossil fuel-based energy systems..And really, it was followed in the 19th century very soon by a big wave of revolutions which created state crises in the whole of Europe.

The author shows us the different outcomes of the state crises. It can lead to catastrophe but it can be solved peaceful way as well. It can bring reforms, but bloody revolutions as well.

It was interesting to see first of all the differentiation between the notion of crises in the different ecological–economic conditions of *sufficiency and scarcity*

Why and how sufficiency may create crises? It was interesting to read:

„the loss of virtue and the neglect of the public good associated with moral decay may actually be the result of an increase in personal wealth which produces individuals whose power exceeds the abilities of states to constrain them may lead to „crisis“. Here the author quotes Van Bavel’s words like „corruption, coercion, and violence“. It has so much in common with problems in contemporary politics.

The author attracts our attention to the fact that often occurred unrest despite that quality of life for the majority has been improving. We mainly think that unrest stems because of scarcity, but he showed us that on the contrary, it can happen in conditions of sufficiency as well. Technological changes, too, may lead too, to unrest. He mentions the transition from agrarian to fossil fuel-based energy systems. And really, it was followed in the 19th century very soon by a big wave of revolutions which created state crises in the whole of Europe.

He also states that many theories of worsening scarcity rest on a common mechanism: diminishing returns which is a remarkable statement.

The main merit of the study is the systematization of the factors both in the typical scarcity or abundance crises. What caused and what type of reaction was to be seen in different cases? He writes: an individual scholar can at best “take up a small piece of the problem, or dare a provisional synthesis” and that is what he tries to do.

It is a bit difficult and complex analysis but worth reading. You may find some parallels in contemporary history. Elites and governing bodies can draw some conclusions for themselves seeing some symptoms in current events.