

Review of: "The Consequences of Political and Economic Choices: Exploring Disaster Vulnerability with the Structure, Resource, and Behaviour Change model (SRAB)"

Kozo Nagami¹

¹ Tohoku University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This paper is very interesting, because it examines past structural changes, resource acquisition/distribution, and behavioral changes, and elucidates and interprets what kind of influence they had on the vulnerability and resilience of human society to threats from natural phenomena such as droughts, ground subsidence, and saltwater intrusion.

During the discussion, the author pointed out that the Vietnamese government's authoritarian system has strongly promoted the rice cultivation for national food security, and that non-physical factors such as de-collectivization, market opening, and decentralization, and physical measures, such as large-scale irrigation projects and the development of flood control infrastructure, has led to the shift to pervasive triple cropping of rice and increase the vulnerability of society as a whole.

It is true that "passive reliance on government regulation and investment" and "excessive reliance on the function of authority" cause an increase in vulnerability in the form of a deterioration in the ability of individual people and households to adapt flexibly to environmental changes. And, it is also argued that the installation of irrigation networks and sluice gates artificially impeded the circulation of water within the region.

On the other hand, on the flip side of such negative impacts, there have been clear economic benefits, both physical and non-physical, of increasing rice yields and shifting to triple cropping since the 2000s. And it is also a fact that society as a whole has moved forward with the transition to a triple cropping due to its obvious economic merits. Therefore, it can be said that economic vulnerability has clearly reduced and Vietnam as a nation could gain a significant economic and social development after 2000s.

In this way, it may be more appropriate to argue that the various social changes that have taken place in the past have not simply led to increased vulnerability, but have had positive and negative effects on the vulnerability of society. However, as shown by the problems of salinization due to the drought that occurred in 2015-2016 and the flooding that has occurred frequently in recent years. Given the fluctuating trend or frequency of its occurrence due to the climate change, now it may be necessary to adapt to a return to double cropping or a shift to other crops or livelihoods, either as an individual decision or with government support. Even if it is an authoritarian policy, it may be considered sufficiently effective for reducing vulnerability. I look forward to further discussions like this one step further.

