

Simple Solutions to Complex Catastrophes: Dialectics of Peace, Climate, Finance, and Health

John Braithwaite

Cham, Palgrave Macmillan, 2024, 438 pages, ISSN: 2523-3092 (electronic)

Çağla Vural

Dr., Postdoctoral Researcher, Department of International Relations, Akdeniz University, Antalya

E-Mail: cagla.vural@hotmail.com

Orcid: 0000-0001-8474-2316

In our era, where striking developments unfold rapidly and crises influence one another with unprecedented speed, challenges such as climate change (see Baysal and Karakaş 2017) and the COVID-19 pandemic (see Eminoğlu, Unutulmaz, and Özerim 2020) may initially appear distinct, but they are deeply interlinked in their causes, consequences, and responses. In *Simple Solutions to Complex Catastrophes: Dialectics of Peace, Climate, Finance, and Health*, John Braithwaite addresses precisely this complexity and offers an optimistic perspective on how cascading crises can be brought under control. The author focuses on four crisis domains—climate change, crime–war chains, pandemics, and financial meltdowns—and especially highlights the role of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) as existential threats intricately linked to security, environmental, and health crises. Braithwaite adopts a dialectical and interdisciplinary methodology, combining conceptual analysis with empirical insight to examine interconnected global crises. He emphasizes the role of simple yet adaptive institutions in crisis prevention, drawing on historical case studies and the Peacebuilding Compared dataset to explore hypotheses related to peace and institutional resilience.

In the Prologue (Chapter 1), Braithwaite’s core claim is that even catastrophes with tangled global effects can be tackled by starting with simple, resilient, and learning institutions. He illustrates the dialectic with a lean pandemic preparedness agency—minimal at first, yet deliberately designed to scale and diversify as the crisis becomes more complex. He argues that this logic only works in the enabling shadow of durable peace: wars amplify every other disaster—financial, climatic, or epidemiological—while peace creates space for integrative solutions that connect climate, health, education, and equality.

Chapter 2 shows how modern crises propagate through rapid, mutually reinforcing chains; therefore, the cure is not quick fixes but “slow-built” institutions that learn and adapt over time. Borrowing from the Slow Food ethos—an explicit counter to today’s fast-consumption culture—the author argues that robust regulatory bodies must be gradually

assembled, insulated from short-term political pressures, and continually nourished by independent knowledge centers. He identifies universities as hubs for designing effective regulation, revitalizing civil society, and supporting strong markets—precisely because they can say “no” to vested interests. The concept of Mutual Assured Digital Destruction (MADD) emphasizes how haste in such tightly coupled systems can turn local glitches into global catastrophes.

In Chapter 3, the importance of market mechanisms, regulatory frameworks, and international cooperation is underscored in crisis management. Emphasis is placed on nuclear deterrence policies and collaborative efforts to limit nuclear proliferation. It is argued that long-term and resilient strategies for peacemaking and peacebuilding can reduce the impact of crises. At the same time, joint action plans for challenges such as pandemics and climate change are key to enhancing systemic resilience.

Chapters 4 and 5 focus on the containment strategies for Russia and China in different ways, respectively. Russia’s nuclear deterrence and influence on various regional conflicts are discussed in depth. At the same time, the Timor-Leste Plus Model,¹ which refers to the peaceful resistance strategies used during Timor-Leste’s struggle for independence, suggests ways Russia can return to cooperation with the global community. This includes temporary international alliances and long-term cooperation and diplomacy with Russia. Turning to China, the author discusses the country’s economic and military rise. In response to this rise, he suggests temporary containment and long-term cooperation. This approach will encourage China to play a more constructive role in the international system.

Chapter 6 underlines the importance of strong, resilient, flexible learning and adaptive institutions in effectively managing crises. Furthermore, Andrew Mack’s optimistic perspective² in the context of peace approaches is highlighted, emphasizing that the structure of institutions should be built on peace. This chapter also includes suggestions such as restructuring global regulatory institutions like the United Nations (UN), increasing local and global cooperation, and focusing on preventing war.

-
- 1 Braithwaite presents “Timor-Leste Plus 21” as a practical example of demilitarization. Timor-Leste and twenty-one other small states (from Costa Rica to several Caribbean micro-states) have constitutionally abolished their armies and collectively achieved over a thousand years free from invasion and war. When internal violence arises, these states invite UN or regional peacekeepers to support local police and mass civil resistance, rather than rebuilding their militaries. For Braithwaite, their record demonstrates that legitimacy, international backup and non-violent mobilization can deter aggression as effectively as standing armies—and offers a radical alternative to realist approaches for containing great-power conflict.
 - 2 Reviving Andrew Mack’s argument from the Human Security Report, Braithwaite stresses that the two decades after the Cold War saw a significant decline in wars and battle deaths. Mack attributed this “peace dividend” to three intertwined shifts: an increase in multidimensional UN peace operations, a wave of comprehensive peace agreements, and the newly established routine of escorting refugees safely out of combat zones under international protection. Later quantitative studies have strengthened the evidence that such peacekeeping and treaty architectures can reduce the risk of conflict relapse by half—even though recent budget cuts have coincided with a new rise in violence. Mack’s core insight, Braithwaite argues, is that institutionalized, cooperative peacebuilding can still alter the long-term trajectory of armed conflict for the better. Even Mack later admitted that many of these gains had been lost after 2011. Braithwaite points this out but still believes Mack’s long-term vision remains valuable.

In Chapter 7, threats with immediate and long-term destructive potential—ranging from artificial intelligence and weapons of mass destruction to deforestation and broader ecological decline—are assessed in terms of their manageability. A suite of simple yet effective measures is proposed: early-warning systems for environmental and technological hazards, tighter international regimes to curb destructive weaponry, widespread risk-literacy initiatives, the cultivation of a technology ethic, and diplomacy rooted in preventive peace.

Chapter 8 introduces the concept of restorative diplomacy, which focuses on making amends for past conflicts and wrongs. Accordingly, it is possible to improve relations between great powers through restorative diplomacy by acknowledging past mistakes and developing relations based on mutual trust and cooperation in resolving international disputes. Additionally, empathy-oriented super-soft diplomacy encourages the transformation of hostility into cooperation with common interests, for example, by working together on climate change, thereby ensuring that great powers cooperate rather than control each other. The active participation of civil society in this process of cooperation and peacebuilding in general is also essential.

Chapter 9 criticizes the shortcomings and risks of regime-change strategies—whether pursued through military, economic, or political coercion—and nuclear-deterrence doctrines. In their place, a “Restorative Critique” is proposed: countries’ reform processes are to be supported rather than subverted, robust and binding nuclear-disarmament accords are to be established, long-term cooperation is to be prioritized, and the stabilizing effect of embedding ethical values in diplomacy is emphasized.

In Chapter 10, the ritualized character of contemporary politics is examined: electoral cycles are portrayed as games that serve party strategy rather than public need, and regulatory procedures are seen to have devolved into formalities that achieve little. Instead of this regulatory ritualism, a model of adaptive, situation-specific regulation is proposed, along with participatory mechanisms that engage citizens between elections and grant meaningful authority to local governments.

Chapter 11 highlights the importance of requisite variety and Simple Institutional Virtues in managing complex crises. In dealing with complexity, it is essential to develop diverse and flexible responses to adapt to different situations. The practical and virtuous functioning of institutions facilitates dealing with complexity. It is critical to establish early detection and response mechanisms for crises. Adaptive institutions that can respond to local and global crises are more effective in addressing complex situations with simple, functional, and virtuous structures. The author also emphasizes the necessity of enhancing the welfare and morale of individuals for the growth of institutions.

John Braithwaite’s book stands out with a holistic, interdisciplinary perspective on crises that scholarship typically addresses in isolation. It grounds its arguments in various historical and contemporary cases by merging conceptual innovation with practice. The book broadens the policy vocabulary by proposing ideas such as restorative diplomacy and the MADD analogy while maintaining an unusually optimistic tone. However, one might question

whether these “simple solutions” can be applied in a world of dense interdependence and deep political polarization, and whether proposals emerging from powerful-state contexts can be meaningfully contextualized and operationalized in structurally constrained environments. Nevertheless, this study provides valuable insights for scholars, International Relations students, and practitioners in peace and conflict studies, climate diplomacy, health policy, and global governance.

References

- Baysal, B., and U. Karakaş. 2017. Climate Change and Security: Different Perceptions, Different Approaches. *Uluslararası İlişkiler* 14, 54: 21-44.
- Eminoğlu, N.K., O. Unutulmaz, and M.G. Özerim. 2020. International Society and Its Institutions in Refugee Protection during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Revisiting the Solidarism/Pluralism Debate in English School. *Uluslararası İlişkiler* 17, 68: 55-72.