Sociology

Human Development and Crisis Management: The 1:3 Imbalance Paradigm

Saito Haruto*
Kyushu University, Ito Campus, 744 Motooka, Nishi-ku, Fukuoka 819-0395, Japan
*: All correspondence should be sent to: Dr. Saito Haruto
Author's Contact: Dr. Saito Haruto, PhD., E-mail: saito_haruto@ourlook.com
DOI: https://doi.org/10.15354/si.25.vw006
Funding: No funding source declared.
COI: The author declares no competing interest.
AI Declaration: The author affirms that artificial intelligence did not contribute to the process of preparing the work.

Human civilization progresses through innovation, culture, and social organization, yet its trajectory is rarely linear or evenly paced. Across history, the energy and resources required to manage crises—ranging from pandemics, wars, environmental disasters, to plastic and pollution management—have consistently outstripped the effort devoted to steady development. This imbalance can be conceptualized as a "1:3 model": for every unit of progress, three units of effort are consumed in crisis response. This paradigm highlights both structural vulnerabilities and adaptive strengths of humanity, emphasizing the need for proactive strategies that shift the balance toward sustainable development. By analyzing historical examples, systemic causes, modern environmental crises, ethical dimensions, and potential future interventions, I explore how the 1:3 imbalance shapes societies and the implications for governance, technology, and global cooperation.

Keywords: Human Development; Crisis Management; 1:3 Paradigm; Future Interventions; History

Science Insights, August 31, 2025; Vol. 47, No. 2, pp.1919-1927.

HUMAN development is often envisioned as a steady forward march—an accumulation of knowledge, technology, and social structures that propels civilization toward higher standards of living and broader understanding of the natural world. Yet history demonstrates a persistent tension: progress is repeatedly disrupted by crises that demand disproportionate resources, attention, and human effort.

I refer to the "1:3 imbalance paradigm" herein to offer a conceptual lens to understand this phenomenon. For every unit of advancement in human development, approximately three units of effort are expended in managing crises. These crises—whether pandemics, natural disasters, wars, economic collapses, environmental degradation, or plastic pollution—strike with intensity and urgency, consuming far more immediate energy than gradual development does.

Development is cumulative, but crises are disruptive. A technological breakthrough may take decades of research, investment, and social adaptation, whereas a pandemic or environmental disaster can demand a response within weeks or months, consuming resources many times higher than those invested in the original development.

I will discuss the historical, systemic, sociocultural, and environmental dimensions of the 1:3 imbalance, with a particular focus on modern challenges such as plastic and pollution management. It further examines proactive strategies and future pathways to reduce the imbalance and enable more sustainable development.

Historical Patterns of the 1:3 Imbalance

Pandemics and Public Health

Epidemics have long exemplified the 1:3 imbalance. The Black Death of the 14th century killed an estimated one-third of Europe's population (Alfani, 2022). Entire economies were disrupted, agricultural systems collapsed, and social order was temporarily destabilized. The development of medicine, hygiene, and social institutions had been slow; the pandemic forced immediate action that consumed enormous social, economic, and political resources.

The 1918 influenza pandemic caused roughly 50 million deaths globally (Stern et al., 2010). Public health systems were overwhelmed, and governments diverted significant resources to emergency medical care, quarantine enforcement, and military support. Despite early scientific advances, the scale of the crisis required effort far exceeding ordinary developmental processes, illustrating the 1:3 imbalance in mortality, resource allocation, and social disruption.

The COVID-19 pandemic further reinforces this paradigm. Despite unprecedented global knowledge and communication networks, countries faced supply chain collapses, medical equipment shortages, and logistical crises in vaccine distribution (González & Vilas, 2024). Efforts to control the pandemic—lockdowns, testing, contact tracing, and emergency economic relief—required resource allocations that dwarfed routine healthcare system investments.

Notably, pandemics often catalyze development indirectly. Black Death accelerated social reforms and labor rights, influenza encouraged public health innovation, and COVID-19 spurred vaccine research, digital healthcare, and global epidemiological collaboration. Yet the cost of response remains disproportionately high relative to incremental development, exemplifying the 1:3 model.

War and Technological Advancement

Wars have repeatedly illustrated the asymmetric relationship between development and crisis management. The First and Second World Wars accelerated technology in aviation, communications, medicine, and nuclear physics (Perry, 2004). Yet the societal cost—tens of millions of deaths, economic destruction, and psychological trauma—exceeded the progress achieved.

The Cold War era demonstrates a more subtle version of the imbalance. Nuclear arms races, space race initiatives, and defense technologies consumed enormous resources, sometimes stimulating technological breakthroughs like satellite communications and nuclear energy (Sambas et al., 2024). However, these were largely reactive investments aimed at geopolitical crises rather than proactive societal development.

Modern conflicts, including cyber warfare and terrorism, require rapid, multi-domain responses. Governments invest heavily in intelligence, cybersecurity, and emergency response frameworks, often diverting resources from social programs, education, and infrastructure. Even technological gains achieved during crises are frequently counterbalanced by long-term social disruption, reinforcing the persistence of the 1:3 pattern.

Environmental and Climate Crises

Environmental crises are increasingly central to the 1:3 imbalance in the modern era. Industrialization, urbanization, and fossil fuel dependence have accelerated development but also generated crises that demand urgent and large-scale interventions.
Climate change presents a prolonged, systemic challenge. Extreme weather events—floods, hurricanes, droughts—require immediate resource allocation for disaster relief, infrastructure repair, and population resettlement. These efforts often dwarf incremental gains in renewable energy deployment, emissions reduction, or sustainable urban planning.

Plastic pollution is a microcosm of the 1:3 imbalance. Global plastic production exceeds 400 million tons per year, with a significant portion entering oceans, rivers, and landfills (Iroegbu et al., 2021). Cleanup operations, recycling initiatives, and public awareness campaigns consume vast financial, technical, and labor resources—often far exceeding the original investment in plastic production infrastructure. For example, large-scale ocean cleanup initiatives cost hundreds of millions of dollars annually, while the market-driven incentive for single-use plastics remains high (Morrison et al., 2019).

The ecological, economic, and social costs of plastic pollution include biodiversity loss, disruption of fisheries, human health risks, and microplastic contamination in the food chain. Societies respond reactively, deploying cleanup crews, regulatory enforcement, and research funding—illustrating how crisis management multiplies resource demand relative to developmental input.

Systemic Causes of the 1:3 Imbalance

Short-Termism and Human Psychology

Humans are evolutionarily predisposed to respond to immediate threats more effectively than long-term challenges. Political cycles, economic incentives, and media focus reinforce this tendency. For example, single-use plastic production is economically profitable and socially convenient, creating immediate gains, while preventive policies such as bans or alternative material development are deferred, socially contentious, or slow to implement (Hira et al., 2022).

Complexity of Modern Systems

The interconnectedness of modern society amplifies crises. Pandemics, climate disasters, and pollution are not isolated phenomena—they cascade through health systems, supply chains, global trade, and social networks. The plastic economy, for example, intersects with global manufacturing, logistics, consumer behavior, and ecological systems, multiplying the effort required for effective management (Balwada et al., 2021).

Resource Allocation and Governance

Development is incremental and often politically invisible, whereas crisis management is urgent and politically salient. Governments frequently prioritize reactive spending, whether for disaster relief, pandemic response, or pollution cleanup. Municipalities spend millions on plastic waste management, while systemic upstream investments—such as sustainable packaging design, circular economy infrastructure, and behavioral interventions—are slower to implement (Macheca et al., 2024).

Philosophical, Sociological, and Ethical Dimensions

The 1:3 imbalance raises deep questions about human values, societal priorities, and ethical responsibility:

- *Intergenerational Equity*: Crisis management often protects current populations while deferring development that could benefit future generations. For instance, over-reliance on emergency plastic cleanup rather than sustainable production may safeguard short-term convenience but jeopardizes long-term environmental stability.
- *Global Justice*: Environmental crises, pandemics, and wars disproportionately impact vulnerable populations. The 1:3 imbalance highlights ethical obligations to allocate resources not only reactively but also equitably across societies.
- *Resilience vs. Growth*: Ethical reflection also concerns trade-offs between maximizing growth and enhancing resilience. The 1:3 model suggests that societies must invest not just in advancement but in systemic robustness to prevent catastrophic setbacks.

Implications for Society

Economic and Social Costs

The 1:3 imbalance imposes profound costs. Emergency expenditures for crises—whether pandemics, wars, or environmental disasters—often exceed planned developmental budgets. Recurrent crises erode public trust, exacerbate inequality, and destabilize communities. Plastic pollution disproportionately affects coastal and economically disadvantaged populations, illustrating social vulnerability intertwined with environmental mismanagement (Karasik et al., 2023).

Innovation under Pressure

Crises can accelerate innovation but may also introduce risks. For example, rapid development of biodegradable plastics addresses environmental crises but raises new challenges regarding production costs, environmental compatibility, and global adoption (Sommer & Pearson, 2011). Crisis-driven innovation is essential but insufficient if not integrated into proactive, sustainable frameworks.

Policy and Governance Challenges

The 1:3 imbalance challenges policymakers to allocate resources strategically. Reactive measures dominate political attention, while proactive strategies—regulatory frameworks, long-term urban planning, renewable energy infrastructure, and sustainable material research—often lag behind. Plastic pollution exemplifies this tension, requiring both cleanup initiatives and upstream prevention to achieve sustainable outcomes.

Toward a More Balanced Paradigm

Proactive Mechanisms

Shifting from reactive to proactive management reduces the multiplier effect of crises. Early warning systems, international cooperation, and robust infrastructure investment can lower the "3" in the 1:3 ratio toward a more sustainable 1:1 model. In the plastic pollution context, proactive strategies include banning single-use plastics, incentivizing circular economy models, and promoting public awareness campaigns.

Integration of Technology and Governance

Digital surveillance, predictive modeling, and AI-driven analytics enhance anticipation of crises. For plastics, AI-based waste sorting, predictive modeling of accumulation hotspots, and global supply chain monitoring allow more efficient resource allocation, reducing reactive burden while promoting sustainable development.

Cultural and Educational Shifts

Education systems and cultural values play a critical role. Societies emphasizing environmental stewardship, risk literacy, and systems thinking cultivate citizens capable of supporting both development and crisis prevention. Cultural adaptation can reinforce structural measures and reduce the disproportionate reactive effort characteristic of the 1:3 imbalance.

Case Studies in Rebalancing Effort

COVID-19 Pandemic Response

The COVID-19 pandemic of 2020–2022 presented one of the most striking contemporary examples of the 1:3 imbalance in human development and crisis management. Despite unprecedented technological and scientific progress, nations around the world faced sudden and immense pressure to redirect resources, disrupt social and economic systems, and coordinate large-scale emergency responses. For countries with robust public health infrastructure and preexisting pandemic preparedness plans, however, the reactive burden was markedly reduced, effectively narrowing the 1:3 imbalance and illustrating the value of proactive development.

Preexisting Public Health Infrastructure: Countries like South Korea, Taiwan, and Singapore had invested in advanced epidemiological surveillance, stockpiles of personal protective equipment, and established pandemic response protocols following lessons from the SARS outbreak in 2003 (Hanvoravongchai et al., 2010). These systems enabled rapid identification of cases, early testing, and efficient contact tracing. By contrast, nations without such infrastructure experienced overwhelming hospital congestion, supply shortages, and delayed response, illustrating how lack of proactive investment magnifies the resource cost of crisis management.

Emergency Preparedness and Policy Coordination: Effective emergency preparedness involves not just physical resources, but governance mechanisms capable of rapid decision-making. For example, South Korea implemented coordinated testing, tracing, and isolation measures through centralized public health agencies, while leveraging mobile technology for real-time reporting (Kim et al., 2021; Lee & Lee, 2020). In Europe, Germany's well-funded healthcare system and pandemic planning allowed hospitals to scale ICU capacity quickly, reducing the human and economic cost relative to less-prepared nations (Zhelyazkova et al., 2022).

Digital Coordination: Technology played a critical role in reducing reactive strain. Mobile apps, AI-based contact tracing, and predictive analytics allowed authorities to target interventions, allocate resources efficiently, and monitor compliance with social distancing measures. These digital tools represent proactive investments in societal infrastructure that transform crisis management from purely reactive to anticipatory.

Lessons Learned: The pandemic demonstrates that proactive development—investments in healthcare, emergency governance, and digital coordination—can reduce the reactive multiplier in the 1:3 imbalance model. Countries that had "developed ahead" faced significantly lower overall crisis costs, proving that the allocation of resources toward long-term preparedness is both economically and socially beneficial (Ezzahid et al., 2022). This case underscores the principle that investment in development does not merely advance societal goals, but directly mitigates future crisis impact.

Plastic Pollution Management in Japan and Sweden

Plastic pollution presents a chronic environmental crisis with systemic social, ecological, and economic consequences. Japan and Sweden have emerged as exemplary cases demonstrating proactive management strategies that reduce the reactive burden traditionally associated with environmental crises.

High Recycling Rates and Strict Regulatory Frameworks: Both countries have implemented rigorous regulations governing plastic production, disposal, and recycling. Sweden, for instance, achieves a recycling rate of over 99% for plastic packaging, while Japan enforces comprehensive municipal waste separation, incentivizing proper disposal and reuse (Moshkal et al., 2024). These frameworks reduce the magnitude of reactive crisis management, such as mass cleanups of rivers and coastal areas, by minimizing uncontrolled pollution in the first place.

Circular Economy Policies: Circular economy initiatives in these nations further illustrate proactive crisis mitigation. In Sweden, manufacturers are required to take responsibility for product end-of-life management, while in Japan, producer responsibility systems encourage sustainable design (Rufí-Salís et al., 2020; Svenskt Näringsliv, 2024). These policies align economic incentives with environmental stewardship, reducing long-term crisis costs while supporting innovation and industry adaptation.

Upstream Interventions: Beyond regulation, both countries emphasize upstream interventions. Design innovation includes the creation of biodegradable plastics, reusable packaging, and products engineered for easy disassembly and recycling. Material substitution campaigns promote alternatives to single-use plastics, while consumer awareness programs educate citizens about responsible disposal and reduction of plastic use.

Impact on 1:3 Imbalance: By addressing plastic pollution proactively, Japan and Sweden demonstrate that the effort required to respond to crises can be significantly reduced relative to development. Resources that would otherwise be consumed in large-scale reactive cleanup are instead invested in sustainable infrastructure and education, effectively narrowing the 1:3 gap.

Climate Resilience in the Netherlands

The Netherlands offers a historically and contemporarily significant example of integrated planning to mitigate environmental crises (Doorn-Hoekveld et al., 2022). With a large portion of its territory below sea level, the country has faced existential threats from flooding for centuries, compelling innovation in infrastructure and crisis management strategies.

Long-Term Infrastructure Investment: Dutch flood defenses, including dikes, storm surge barriers, and water distribution networks, are the result of centuries of continuous development. Projects such as the Delta Works—a complex system of dams, sluices, locks, levees, and storm surge barriers—reflect proactive investment in infrastructure designed to prevent flooding, rather than solely reacting to disaster events (Itsukushima et al., 2019).

Adaptive Crisis Strategies: The Netherlands combines structural development with adaptive management. Real-time water monitoring, predictive modeling, and controlled floodplains allow for dynamic response to rising water levels. This integrated system ensures that resources expended reactively are minimized because preventive infrastructure reduces emergency interventions.

Socioeconomic Integration: Dutch flood management is supported by policies, governance structures, and citizen participation. Insurance schemes, zoning regulations, and public education programs ensure that population behavior aligns with infrastructure and environmental realities (Mees et al., 2016). This systemic integration demonstrates how proactive societal design can reduce disproportionate crisis costs and maintain developmental momentum.

Impact on 1:3 Imbalance: By combining proactive infrastructure, adaptive management, and social integration, the Netherlands exemplifies how deliberate, anticipatory investment transforms potential crises from overwhelming events into manageable, predictable challenges, effectively reducing the reactive multiplier in the 1:3 model.

Global Financial Regulation Post-2008

The 2008 global financial crisis revealed how systemic risk in one domain can cascade across global economies, generating disproportionate resource allocation requirements for reactive intervention. The crisis also demonstrates how proactive measures can reduce future imbalance.

Regulatory Reforms: In response, institutions worldwide introduced more stringent capital requirements, stress-testing frameworks, and risk management standards. The Dodd-Frank Act in the United States, Basel III accords internationally, and similar reforms strengthened banking resilience, reducing the need for emergency bailouts and ad hoc government interventions in future crises (Curti et al., 2016).

Institutionalized Risk Management: Financial regulators now routinely conduct scenario planning, systemic risk monitoring, and crisis simulations. These proactive mechanisms enable early identification of vulnerabilities and allow preemptive corrective action, reducing the magnitude of reactive measures required when crises emerge.

Cultural and Market Effects: Post-2008 reforms also changed corporate culture, emphasizing risk management and accountability. By embedding systemic precautions into routine operations, the financial sector itself contributes to reducing reactive burdens.

Impact on 1:3 Imbalance: The regulatory and institutional lessons from the 2008 financial crisis illustrate that proactive structural and governance measures can significantly narrow the 1:3 imbalance, preventing future crises from consuming resources disproportionately relative to normal developmental processes.

Ocean Cleanup Innovations

The Ocean Cleanup Project and similar initiatives represent a hybrid approach combining reactive intervention with proactive innovation to address environmental crises.

Mass Cleanup Efforts: The Ocean Cleanup Project deploys specialized systems to remove plastic waste from high-density ocean gyres (Morrison et al., 2019). These efforts are inherently reactive, addressing accumulated pollution resulting from decades of mismanagement. The scale of deployment illustrates the intensity of resources required when preventive measures were insufficient, consistent with the reactive side of the 1:3 model.

Proactive Technological Development: Simultaneously, the project invests in research and development of materials and tracking technologies to prevent future accumulation. Innovations in biodegradable materials, real-time monitoring of plastic flows, and upstream collaboration with manufacturers demonstrate proactive reduction of reactive burden.

Global Coordination and Awareness: The project also catalyzes international attention, fostering global awareness and collaboration on plastic pollution (Khadke et al., 2021). Partnerships with governments, NGOs, and private corporations encourage preventive measures, such as reduced plastic production and improved waste management infrastructure.

Impact on 1:3 Imbalance: By combining large-scale cleanup with preventive technological innovation and global collaboration, ocean cleanup initiatives exemplify a dual strategy: mitigating existing crises while reducing future reactive costs. This integrated approach provides a model for reducing the disproportionate effort traditionally required for environmental crises.

Future Directions

The 1:3 imbalance between development and crisis management illustrates a persistent challenge for human societies: the disproportionate effort required to respond to crises compared to the relatively small incremental gains achieved through routine development. Addressing this imbalance requires forward-looking strategies that integrate technology, sustainability, governance, and cultural adaptation. The following future directions explore how proactive measures can reduce reactive burdens, optimize societal resilience, and foster sustainable progress.

AI and Predictive Governance

Artificial Intelligence (AI) and advanced data analytics represent transformative tools for proactive crisis management. By leveraging massive datasets, machine learning algorithms, and predictive modeling, societies can anticipate, prevent, and respond to crises more efficiently. In the context of pandemics, climate change, and pollution, AI allows decision-makers to allocate resources optimally, reduce reaction times, and minimize societal disruption.

Pandemic Risk Modeling: AI can integrate epidemiological data, mobility patterns, and health system capacity to forecast the spread of infectious diseases. During COVID-19, predictive models using AI enabled some countries to anticipate hotspots, optimize testing and vaccination deployment, and allocate medical supplies to high-risk regions (Olawade et al., 2023). Future AI systems could incorporate genetic sequencing, environmental factors, and real-time behavioral data to provide even more accurate early-warning signals, reducing the reactive strain on healthcare systems and aligning resources more closely with actual risk.

Climate and Environmental Predictions: AI applications in climate science allow the modeling of extreme weather events, flood patterns, and ecosystem vulnerabilities. Machine learning algorithms can analyze historical climate data, satellite imagery, and oceanographic patterns to predict hurricanes, droughts, or sea-level rise with increasing precision. In terms of pollution, AI can track plastic waste flows in real time, identify accumulation hotspots, and optimize collection routes (Chen et al., 2023). These capabilities transform reactive disaster response into proactive intervention, lowering the effort required to manage environmental crises and narrowing the 1:3 imbalance.

Resource Optimization and Policy Simulation: Beyond prediction, AI can simulate the impact of policy interventions before implementation. For example, governments could model the effect of carbon taxes, single-use plastic bans, or vaccination campaigns to identify the most effective measures. This anticipatory approach enables efficient allocation of human, financial, and technological resources, ensuring that proactive measures have maximum impact and reducing the disproportionate effort required during crises.

Challenges and Ethical Considerations: While AI offers immense potential, its implementation must be carefully governed. Algorithmic biases, unequal access to technology, and data privacy concerns could exacerbate social inequality if predictive governance is unevenly applied. Integrating AI into crisis management requires transparency, ethical oversight, and international cooperation to ensure equitable benefits across societies.

Sustainable Materials and Circular Economy

The production and consumption patterns of modern societies, particularly in plastics and other non-biodegradable materials, generate persistent crises that demand extensive reactive management. Transitioning toward sustainable materials and a circular economy represents a critical strategy to reduce the disproportionate effort associated with environmental crises.

Circular Production Systems: A circular economy aims to eliminate waste by designing products for reuse, recycling, and safe biodegradation. In plastics, this involves creating materials that can be repeatedly processed without losing structural integrity, promoting closed-loop manufacturing. Companies that adopt circular practices reduce the volume of waste entering natural ecosystems, thus lowering the scale of reactive cleanup operations. For example, biodegradable packaging materials and modular product designs enable easier recycling, reducing the labor, energy, and financial costs associated with crisis management.

Lifecycle Assessment and Sustainable Design: Proactive measures in materials science extend beyond the final product. Lifecycle assessment (LCA) considers environmental impact from raw material extraction through production, usage, and disposal (Buxel et al., 2014). Designing with LCA principles allows industries to anticipate ecological risks and minimize downstream crises. By investing in sustainable materials and responsible design, societies reduce future reactive expenditures while supporting economic innovation and competitiveness.

Consumer Behavior and Incentives: A circular economy also relies on consumer engagement. Incentivizing recycling, encouraging reuse, and promoting sustainable consumption patterns reduces the accumulation of waste. Policy mechanisms such as deposit-return schemes, extended producer responsibility, and subsidies for eco-friendly products can align market behavior with sustainability goals (Kuo et al., 2021). The result is a proactive reduction of reactive effort, narrowing the 1:3 gap associated with environmental crises.

Global Implications: Widespread adoption of circular economy principles can dramatically reduce environmental crises on a global scale. By addressing root causes of pollution and waste, proactive interventions minimize ecological damage, protect biodiversity, and reduce long-term societal costs. In effect, circular economy strategies reallocate resources from reactive management to developmental growth, enhancing overall societal resilience.

Global Governance and Collaboration

Many crises—pandemics, climate change, and pollution—transcend national borders, demanding coordinated global responses. International governance and collaboration provide frameworks for shared responsibility, enabling proactive crisis management and reducing disproportionate reactive burdens.

International Treaties and Agreements: Global agreements such as the Paris Climate Accord, the Montreal Protocol, and the Convention on Biological Diversity establish common standards and coordinated action plans (Affan, 2017). These frameworks encourage nations to invest proactively in emissions reduction, ecosystem protection, and sustainable development, limiting the scale of reactive crisis interventions. For example, international regulation of ozone-depleting substances under the Montreal Protocol successfully prevented widespread environmental degradation, demonstrating the power of collective preemptive action.

Pandemic Preparedness and Global Health Cooperation: The COVID-19 pandemic underscored the necessity of global health governance. Organizations such as the World Health Organization (WHO) coordinate surveillance, share data, and distribute vaccines and medical supplies. By pooling resources, knowledge, and logistical capabilities, global cooperation reduces the disproportionate burden on individual nations, helping prevent local outbreaks from escalating into global crises.

Transnational Pollution Management: Plastic pollution and climate change similarly require cross-border cooperation. Initiatives like the Global Plastics Treaty and multinational agreements on ocean conservation exemplify collaborative frameworks to prevent environmental crises before they escalat (Ford et al., 2021)e. By standardizing regulations, sharing technological innovations, and financing preventive infrastructure, international governance mitigates reactive expenditure and fosters more balanced development trajectories.

Challenges in Global Coordination: Despite potential benefits, global collaboration faces political, economic, and cultural obstacles. Conflicting national priorities, economic competition, and uneven resource capacity can hinder proactive measures. Effective governance requires equitable distribution of responsibility, transparent monitoring, and enforcement mechanisms to ensure that all stakeholders contribute to crisis prevention.

Education and Cultural Norms

Proactive crisis management and sustainable development are ultimately contingent on societal values, education, and cultural norms. Education can cultivate systemic thinking, environmental ethics, and a sense of global responsibility, equipping citizens to actively participate in both development and crisis mitigation.

Systems Thinking and Risk Literacy: Educational programs emphasizing systems thinking enable individuals to understand complex interdependencies in ecological, social, and technological systems. Students trained to recognize cascading effects of pollution, pandemics, or economic shocks are better prepared to make informed decisions, support evidence-based policies, and engage in preventive behavior. Risk literacy encourages proactive personal and community action, reducing reliance on reactive institutional interventions.

Environmental Ethics and Stewardship: Integrating environmental ethics into curricula fosters awareness of human impact on ecosystems and emphasizes the moral imperative of sustainable behavior. Cultural norms that value resource conservation, recycling, and responsible consumption reinforce structural policies, amplifying the effectiveness of proactive interventions.

Citizen Participation and Social Innovation: Education also empowers citizens to participate in policy discussions, community-based initiatives, and technological innovation. Grassroots movements for sustainability, local environmental monitoring, and public health awareness exemplify how informed communities contribute to crisis prevention, reducing the reactive burden on governments and institutions.

Global Cultural Shifts: Long-term transformation of cultural norms is essential for reducing the 1:3 imbalance. Societies that prioritize sustainability, resilience, and collective responsibility integrate proactive behavior into daily life, aligning individual, corporate, and governmental actions toward preventive strategies. Education is the primary vehicle for embedding these values across generations, ensuring sustained societal capacity to manage future crises efficiently.

Conclusions

The 1:3 imbalance model offers a comprehensive framework to understand human development and crisis management. Historically, crises—from pandemics and wars to environmental degradation and plastic pollution—demand far more effort than incremental progress. Modern challenges underscore the continued relevance of this paradigm. Addressing the imbalance requires a multi-pronged approach: proactive governance, technological foresight, cultural adaptation, ethical reflection, and global cooperation. Recognizing and strategically responding to the 1:3 imbalance is crucial for ensuring stability, resilience, and sustainable development. Plastic pollution management exemplifies both the challenges and opportunities: proactive interventions reduce future crisis burdens, while reactive responses illustrate the high costs of imbalance. By integrating development, foresight, and proactive measures, humanity can gradually shift toward a more sustainable trajectory, preserving progress and enhancing resilience. Understanding and acting on the 1:3 imbalance is not merely academic; it is a moral and practical imperative for the future of civilization.■

Received: May 15, 2025 | Revised: June 28, 2025 | Accepted: August 07, 2025

References

Affan, F. B. (2017). Earth Summit: from Rio 1992 via Kyoto and Copenhagen, back to Rio 2012. Journal of Ecosystem & Ecography, 07(01). DOI: https://doi.org/10.4172/2157-7625.1000229

Alfani, G. (2022). Epidemics, inequality, and poverty in preindustrial and early industrial times. Journal of Economic Literature, 60(1), 3–40. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.20201640

Balwada, J., Samaiya, S., & Mishra, R. P. (2021). Packaging Plastic Waste Management for a Circular Economy and Identifying a better Waste Collection System using Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP). Procedia CIRP, 98, 270–275. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2021.01.102

Buxel, H., Esenduran, G., & Griffin, S. (2014). Strategic sustainability: Creating business value with life cycle analysis. Business Horizons, 58(1), 109–122. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2014.09.004

Chen, L., Chen, Z., Zhang, Y., Liu, Y., Osman, A. I., Farghali, M., Hua, J., Al-Fatesh, A., Ihara, I., Rooney, D. W., & Yap, P. (2023). Artificial intelligence-based solutions for climate change: a review. Environmental Chemistry Letters, 21(5), 2525–2557. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10311-023-01617-y

Curti, F., Ergen, I., Le, M., Migueis, M., & Stewart, R. (2016). Benchmarking operational risk models. Finance and Economics Discussion Series, 2016(070), 1–26. DOI: https://doi.org/10.17016/feds.2016.070

Ezzahid, E., Firano, Z., Ennouhi, J., Laaroussi, A., & Anbari, A. S. (2022). Countries' readiness to deal with large-scale crises: analysis, measure, and World classification. Policy Sciences, 55(3), 555–572. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-022-09464-4

Ford, H. V., Jones, N. H., Davies, A. J., Godley, B. J., Jambeck, J. R., Napper, I. E., Suckling, C. C., Williams, G. J., Woodall, L. C., & Koldewey, H. J. (2021). The fundamental links between climate change and marine plastic pollution. The Science of the Total Environment, 806, 150392. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.150392

González, J. J. L., & Fernández-Vilas, E. (2024). The social evolution of COVID-19: pandemics as total social facts. Frontiers in Sociology, 9. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2024.1397826

Hanvoravongchai, P., Adisasmito, W., Chau, P. N., Conseil, A., De Sa, J., Krumkamp, R., Mounier-Jack, S., Phommasack, B., Putthasri, W., Shih, C., Touch, S., & Coker, R. (2010). Pandemic influenza preparedness and health systems challenges in Asia: results from rapid analyses in 6 Asian countries. BMC Public Health, 10(1). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-10-322

Hira, A., Pacini, H., Attafuah-Wadee, K., Vivas-Eugui, D., Saltzberg, M., & Yeoh, T. N. (2022). Plastic Waste Mitigation Strategies: A Review of Lessons from Developing Countries. Journal of Developing Societies, 38(3), 336–359. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0169796x221104855

Iroegbu, A. O. C., Ray, S. S., Mbarane, V., Bordado, J. C., & Sardinha, J. P. (2021). Plastic Pollution: A perspective on matters arising: Challenges and opportunities. ACS Omega, 6(30), 19343–19355. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1021/acsomega.1c02760

Itsukushima, R., Ohtsuki, K., & Sato, T. (2019). Influence of microtopography and alluvial lowland characteristics on location and development of residential areas in the Kuji River basin of Japan. Sustainability, 12(1), 65. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/su12010065

Karasik, R., Lauer, N. E., Baker, A., Lisi, N. E., Somarelli, J. A., Eward, W. C., Fürst, K., & Dunphy-Daly, M. M. (2023). Inequitable distribution of plastic benefits and burdens on economies and public health. Frontiers in Marine Science, 9. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2022.1017247

Khadke, S., Gupta, P., Rachakunta, S., Mahata, C., Dawn, S., Sharma, M., Verma, D., Pradhan, A., Krishna, A. M. S., Ramakrishna, S., Chakrabortty, S., Saianand, G., Sonar, P., Biring, S., Dash, J. K., & Dalapati, G. K. (2021). Efficient plastic recycling and remolding circular economy using the technology of Trust–Blockchain. Sustainability, 13(16), 9142. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/su13169142

Kim, Y., Poncelet, J., Min, G., Lee, J., & Yang, Y. (2021). COVID-19: Systemic risk and response management in the Republic of Korea. Progress in Disaster Science, 12, 100200. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pdisas.2021.100200

Kuo, T., Hsu, N., Wattimena, R., Hong, I., Chao, C., & Herlianto, J. (2021). Toward a circular economy: A system dynamic model of recycling framework for aseptic paper packaging waste in Indonesia. Journal of Cleaner Production, 301, 126901. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.126901

Lee, S. M., & Lee, D. (2020). Lessons Learned from Battling COVID-19: The Korean Experience. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17(20), 7548. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17207548

Macheca, A. D., Mutuma, B., Adalima, J. L., Midheme, E., Lúcas, L. H. M., Ochanda, V. K., & Mhlanga, S. D. (2024). Perspectives on plastic waste management: challenges and possible solutions to ensure its sustainable use. Recycling, 9(5), 77. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/recycling9050077

Mees, H., Crabbé, A., Alexander, M., Kaufmann, M., Bruzzone, S., Lévy, L., & Lewandowski, J. (2016). Coproducing flood risk management through citizen involvement: insights from cross-country comparison in Europe. Ecology and Society, 21(3). DOI: https://doi.org/10.5751/es-08500-210307

Morrison, E., Shipman, A., Shrestha, S., Squier, E., & Whitney, K. S. (2019). Evaluating the Ocean Cleanup, a marine debris removal project in the North Pacific Gyre, using SWOT analysis. Case Studies in the Environment, 3(1), 1–6. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1525/cse.2018.001875

Moshkal, M., Akhapov, Y., & Ogihara,

A. (2024). Sustainable waste management in Japan: Challenges, achievements, and Future Prospects: a review. Sustainability, 16(17), 7347. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/su16177347

Olawade, D. B., Wada, O. J., David-Olawade, A. C., Kunonga, E., Abaire, O., & Ling, J. (2023). Using artificial intelligence to improve public health: a narrative review. Frontiers in Public Health, 11. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1196397

Perry, W. J. (2004). Military technology: an historical perspective. Technology in Society, 26(2–3), 235–243. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2004.01.035

Rufí-Salís, M., Petit-Boix, A., Villalba, G., Gabarrell, X., & Leipold, S. (2020). Combining LCA and circularity assessments in complex production systems: the case of urban agriculture. Resources Conservation and Recycling, 166, 105359. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.105359

Sambas, M., Saputro, G. E., Hermanto, D., & Rizqiah, K. (2024). The impact of the arms race on the economic growth of the United States and Russia. International Journal of Humanities Education and Social Sciences (IJHESS), 3(6). DOI: https://doi.org/10.55227/ijhess.v3i6.965

Sommer, S. A., & Pearson, C. M. (2010). Infusing creativity into crisis management. Organizational Dynamics, 40(1), 27–33. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2010.10.008

Stern, A. M., Cetron, M. S., & Markel, H. (2010). The 1918–1919 influenza pandemic in the United States: lessons learned and challenges exposed. Public Health Reports, 125(3_suppl), 6–8. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/00333549101250s303

Svenskt Näringsliv. (2024, March 8). How can Sweden become more circular? Policy instruments and measures for increasing resource efficiency. https://www.svensktnaringsliv.se/english/how-can-sweden-become-more-circular-policy-instruments-and-measur_1207842.html

Van Doorn-Hoekveld, W. J., Gilissen, H. K., Groothuijse, F. a. G., & Van Rijswick, H. F. M. W. (2022). Adaptation to climate change in Dutch flood risk management: Innovative approaches and related challenges. Utrecht Law Review, 18(2), 51–69. DOI: https://doi.org/10.36633/ulr.860

Zhelyazkova, A., Fischer, P. M., Thies, N., Schrader-Reichling, J. S., Kohlmann, T., Adorjan, K., Huith, R., Jauch, K., & Prückner, S. M. (2022). COVID-19 management at one of the largest hospitals in Germany: Concept, evaluation and adaptation. Health Services Management Research, 36(1), 63–74. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/09514848221100752