This reading is from an introductory chapter to the book *Emerging Varieties of Resilience: Experiences from Germany, Poland and Ukraine*. In preparation for panel 2, one should read the excerpt "Multiple genealogies and ontologies of resilience" (pp. 4-9).
We look forward to seeing you in Palermo! Dr Agata Mazurkiewicz

1 Introducing resilience

Maciej Stępka, Agata Mazurkiewicz, and Marco Krüger

This is another book on resilience – a book that comes at a time when seemingly everything has been written about it. Resilience oscillates between being the presumed super hero (Dunn Cavelty et al. 2015) and the supervillain (e.g. Neocleous 2013) of the security empire. In any case, it has grown to prominence in the academic and political fora alike and experienced new momentum during the COVID-19 pandemic. Even before, resilience has made its way to mainstream security, disaster, and crisis management studies, sparking heated debates among academics and practitioners concerning the very nature of the concept as well as its real-life consequences (Bosse and Vieira 2023; Chandler 2019; Dijkstra et al. 2018; Krüger 2018). Like many other concepts in the security field, resilience has quickly become an essentially contested concept, assuming different forms across different levels of governance, political contexts, and policy arenas (Brusset and Teller 2017; Pursiainen 2018; Stępka 2022). Resilience might urge us to have challenging and stimulating discussions on such elements as humans' persistence, vulnerability, self-organisation, or adaptability in the face of multifaceted crises, including wars. Yet, more often than not, resilience seems to be demanded rather than fostered. The well-travelled accusation of devolving responsibility to the local and individual sphere seems to remain valid, particularly in all these instances in which those who call for resilience apparently forgot to grant the responsibilised the means to live up to their claims (Joseph 2013, 2018; Neocleous 2013). There are several studies on genealogies of the concept (Bourbeau 2018; Ungar 2006; Walker and Cooper 2011), its multidisciplinary and analytical value (or lack of it) (Bourbeau 2013; Evans and Reid 2013; Jaspars 2021; Joseph 2013), and policy application (Barany and Rauchhaus 2011; Ceccorulli and Lucarelli 2017; Tocci 2017; Wagner and Anholt 2016).

Given this rich and increasingly nuanced debate, it seems questionable why we need another book on resilience. We need it, though, as we want to trace forms of resilience that have emerged at the periphery of the known map of resilience. When Jonathan Joseph (2018) published his work *Varieties of Resilience* in 2018, he rightly stated that resilience was still in a rather early stage in countries such as Germany at that time. France equally revealed a peculiar understanding of how to grant protection for its citizens and the role resilience might have in it. In contrast, the United Kingdom and United States were, besides several EU policies,

DOI: 10.4324/9781003503255-1

the forerunners in setting up resilience policies and proactively devolving responsibility to their citizens. We argue that it is this understanding of resilience that has shaped good parts of the debate and created a core and periphery to resilience policies. Concurring with Chris Zebrowski (2016:148), we doubt that there is anything natural about resilience. Resilience is always entrenched in political and institutional trajectories. Yet, while it is by no means natural, neither is it arbitrary. Even those who are rather sceptical towards resilience relate it to uncertainty, contingency, and complexity (see, for example, Evans and Reid 2013).

This was the starting point for developing this book. We were interested in what has turned out to be the periphery of the resilience discourse. Good portions of the debate have not looked farther east in Europe than Germany. It was thus our interest to trace another variety of resilience – a variety that received momentum particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic – but at least as much due to the full-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine. We therefore gathered researchers from Central and Eastern Europe to sketch out how resilience has emerged in this part of the periphery. This book contributes to the still ongoing resilience debate in at least three ways.

First, it offers a comparative analysis of countries with a fairly state-centric security architecture that have been mostly under the radar of the resilience debate; namely Poland, Ukraine, and – with substantially more research in this regard (e.g., Joseph 2018; Kaufmann 2016; Krüger 2019) – Germany. Within the "Future Democracy Lab"[1] project conducted at the Jagiellonian University in Kraków, we had an opportunity to construct an international and interdisciplinary research group, bringing together scholars and experts from Germany, Poland, and Ukraine. Our initial assessment, later confirmed in team discussions, was that there are far too few opportunities for scholars from the region to explain resilience to each other and to international audiences, as well as to learn how different and yet connected we are in our approaches. While Germany and Poland have more presence in academic and policy debates, this has for a long time not been the case for Ukraine.

Furthermore, we chose these three European countries in order to allow for a comparison of developments of resilience in different (continental) Western-, Central-, and Eastern-European settings, fleshing out the most important similarities and differences across analysed countries and cases. Germany, Poland, and Ukraine hold different geopolitical, economic, and socio-political characteristics, yet they are tied together within a broader European political and security framework, which also puts great emphasis on the development of resilience. Germany is at the centre of the EU and a long-standing NATO member; Poland has become a frontline state of both the EU and NATO since the Russian attack on Ukraine; and Ukraine, being in a state of war with Russia, aspires to join the EU and NATO. Obviously, the war in Ukraine serves as a crucial factor in this edited volume, as it created fundamentally different forms of affectedness. One of our key motivations was to juxtapose how resilience is understood from the perspective of a country at war, namely Ukraine, with countries such as Poland and Germany, which have been developing and mainstreaming resilience under different – albeit peaceful – circumstances.

Second, the analysis revolves around countries which have taken up resilience policies quite recently. It observes ongoing processes and resilience policies in the making. All of these countries have substantially increased the use of the term

"resilience" in the last roughly three to five years, first due to the COVID-19 pandemic and later as a reaction to the Russia's invasion of Ukraine. The overarching commonality of all three countries is their distinct approach to resilience that does not fit contemporary critiques of a withdrawal of the state with the devolvement of responsibility. Rather, all three countries, to different degrees, are trying to develop and implement resilience policies that result in an expansion of state security practices encompassing the population as an actor for national security. Resilience becomes a means for increasing the actionability of the state through the orchestrated engagement of the population. The very different circumstances under which these policies and approaches are implemented and the different timelines entail differences among the countries analysed. However, we see similarities in this overarching rationality of resilience policies.

Third, and not least importantly, the book navigates the frontiers of the academic and political worlds. Normally, academics tend to analyse past events, draw conclusions, and advise politicians and civil society with regard to the lessons learnt. This temporality was changed during the pandemic, when academics were asked to deliver advice in real time, bearing in mind all the contingencies and the lack of knowledge on the basis of which decisions are necessarily made. This book also speaks of yet another facet of this relationship. It shows how political events shape academia. Two of the chapters have been written under the direct influence of an ongoing war in the country in which the authors live and work. The fact should not be underestimated that among the contributors are Ukrainian scholars who wrote their chapters while living in a war zone and actively working to increase the resilience of their society. This book therefore bears witness to how politics – in this case a war – shapes academia, at least inasmuch as vice versa. These two authors, Olga and Ivan, proved themselves to be extremely resilient. Moreover, their chapters speak to the connection between resilience and resistance on a very practical level.

This book encompasses a variety of perspectives on ways towards, and the need for, resilience. The volume looks, among other things, into wartime resilience, increased refugee flows into the EU, societal resilience, and general application of the concept in national security strategies, aiming to answer the following questions:

- How is the concept of resilience interpreted in Germany, Poland, and Ukraine?
- What kind of resilience-centred practices and frameworks of resilience have manifested in selected countries?
- What are the similarities and differences between perspectives on and practices of resilience in the three countries?
- What lessons can be learnt from analysing this variety of resilience policies, particularly with regard to the current resilience literature?

With these questions, we aim to stimulate the discovery of a multiplicity of approaches and broaden the understanding of dynamically (re-)developing approaches to resilience by analysing it as the leading political paradigm and organising principle in the fields of security and crisis response (Brassett et al. 2013). In this vein, the book includes an overview and discussion on the specificity of different national contexts, taking into account the traditional security-relevant

domains such as national security strategies and civil protection, also encompassing different outlooks such as the economic foundations for national resilience (in the Ukrainian case). Country-specific overviews, serving as a bird's-eye view, are illustrated and elaborated by corresponding case studies, focusing on resilience as a security and crisis-response approach.

The analyses presented in the edited volume are predominantly, but not exclusively, driven by constructivist and interpretative methodologies, building on policy discourses, narratives, and framings of resilience in selected countries. As the contributors come from different disciplines and analyse different cases, individual chapters feed on a variety of data, including interviews, policy documents, and legal texts, to name a few. The analysis utilises qualitative as well as mixed-method approaches.

1.1 Multiple genealogies and ontologies of resilience

What is the meaning of resilience? How does it operate as an academic and policy concept? Fundamentally, resilience is a notion that spans various fields and scientific disciplines, inspiring research in areas such as socio-ecology, psychology, urban studies, engineering, criminology, political science, security studies, and crisis research, to name just a few (Greenhough 2016; Ungar 2006). In this multidisciplinary context, resilience has acquired numerous meanings, ranging from the elasticity of materials such as yarn or steel, to the resourcefulness of individuals and the robustness of social and political systems during crises (Olsson et al. 2015:1–2). Within the premise of this book, we use Marco Krüger's definition of resilience – which draws heavily on Philippe Bourbeau's work (2018) – treating it as "the process of patterned, decentral and mutually constitutive adjustments of societal entities through the mobilization of capacities to cope with shocks of any kind by maintaining, modifying or transforming the referent object" (Krüger 2023:4). The roots or genealogies of resilience are embedded in a multidisciplinary paradigm, inspired not only by various definitions of what resilience is but also by its practical application and means of accomplishment. Even though the core of resilience thinking is comparable in multiple disciplines, there are shapes and shades that make each iteration of this concept special in its own way.

Just within the field of psychology, resilience manifests in a multitude of ways (see Fletcher and Sarkar 2013). Initially, it was viewed through the lens of "protective factors" or a set of resilience-centred qualities, including self-esteem, self-efficacy, and a positive outlook, which help people withstand and recover from adversity (Richardson 2002:309). Building on these assumptions, resilience became defined as an

> ability of adults in otherwise normal circumstances who are exposed to an isolated and potentially highly disruptive event to maintain relatively stable, healthy levels of psychological and physical functioning, as well as the capacity for generative experiences and positive emotions.
>
> (Bonanno 2004:20–21)

In yet other interpretations, psychological resilience has been defined as an outcome of successful adaptation to difficult or challenging circumstances (Masten et al. 1990:426).

Resilience is also a significant concept in engineering, where it is centred on the notion of functionality of a design and its quick return to a stable equilibrium after a shock. The definition "concentrates on stability near an equilibrium steady state, where resistance to disturbance and speed of return to the equilibrium are used to measure the property" of resilience (Holling 1996:33). In this vein, the engineering approach focuses on the development of such notions as robustness, durability, brittleness, or persistence, which are supposed to help in keeping a designed system within desirable operational parameters (Bourbeau 2018:41–42). These elements are often discussed within the framework of two broad factors, that is the reliability of the design and its capability to recover (bounce back) after disruptions (Carmichael 2015; Woods 2015).

Ecology gave rise to yet another understanding of resilience. As part of this strand of literature, C.S. Holling famously noted that resilience "determines the persistence of relationships within a system and is a measure of the ability of these systems to absorb changes of state variables, driving variables, and parameters, and still persist" (Holling 1973:17). With this definition, Holling distanced his interpretation from the "engineering approach," which operates under the assumption that there was one equilibrium with a single operating objective, and the measure of resilience "is how far the system has moved from that equilibrium (in time) and how quickly it returns" (Gunderson 2000:426). Instead, Holling builds on the idea of multiple equilibria a system might seize. This ecological approach to resilience assumes that instabilities can trigger the system to adapt and change into another stable domain, be it a specific regime or behaviour (Gunderson 2000:427). Resilience is then not only a bounce back but also a transformation that changes the system's composition to uphold its essential persistence.

While stemming from different disciplines, these approaches to resilience have been adjusted and applied in various ways to fit into security studies, reflecting its multifaceted and interdisciplinary character. Ari-Elmeri Hyvönen and Tapio Juntunen (2020) discuss how the current Finnish model of comprehensive security reflects the incorporation of theoretical and applied psychology into its national defence policy during the Cold War. The resulting concept of total defence included the ideas of "psychological" and "spiritual" defence, emphasising psychological preparedness and "the ability to withstand heavy societal pressure, caused by an external aggressor, both on an individual and on a societal level" (Hyvönen and Juntunen 2020:164). Alison Howell (2014) critically discusses how positive psychology programmes of the US Army aim at enhancing psychological resilience in military personnel and their families. In doing so, she

> assesses how the psychological science of resilience is being developed with two aims: first, it aims to produce a fit fighting force in order to wage war more effectively; second, it aims to reduce healthcare costs and entitlements by claiming to prevent mental health difficulties.
>
> (Howell 2014:16)

Psychological resilience is here instrumental to the creation of a robust, enduring, and prosperous "entrepreneur of their own life," who succeeds in spite of adversity. This idea of resilience, which primarily aims at increasing functionality as an end and personal well-being only as a means, has been rightly criticised as fostering a neoliberal reasoning (Schwarz 2018). The tenets of positive psychology have also been applied in the contexts of terrorism. In the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, the "focus on individuals' resilience was transformed to a mass-scale through training practices designed to enhance an inner strength and flexibility for individuals such as US soldiers and their families but also for the broader public" (Jore 2020:347).

Similarly, the engineering approach to resilience, with its emphasis on the reliability of systems in the face of disturbances and their swift recovery, has found its natural use in security studies. States' and societies' dependence on physical – and more recently also cyber – infrastructure sparks discussions on vulnerabilities to deliberate attacks, natural disasters, or climate change, as well as on methods of assessing and measuring the level of resilience of critical infrastructure elements (see e.g. Rehak et al. 2019). For example, using the Ukrainian transport network as a case study, Mitoulis and colleagues (2023) discuss how to enhance the post-conflict resilience of critical infrastructure. The engineering take on resilience, focused on robustness and resistance, is also reflected in studies on terrorism, extremism, and radicalisation. Resilience is therein reflected in the establishment of community-level, bottom-up fail-safe mechanisms, which complement official state institutions (e.g. the police) and allow "to detect radicalisation risks, prevent the recruitment of community members into violent extremism, and bounce back after instances of recruitment via learning and adaptability that permits the community to better limit future recruitment" (Dalgaard-Nielsen and Schack 2016:310).

Notwithstanding these different strands of resilience research, security studies and international relations, as a discipline, have been heavily influenced by the ecological strand of resilience. Walker and Cooper observe that since the early 2000s, resilience thinking has proliferated in emergency preparedness, crisis response, and national security as a result of the intermeshing of both the structural robustness of essential infrastructure and functional continuity of public and private organisations during crises (Walker and Cooper 2011:152). They suggest that resilience's alignment with neoliberal principles of complex adaptive systems accounts for its widespread adoption across governance practices (Walker and Cooper 2011:144). In their view, resilience moves beyond the dichotomy of civilian versus military threats and is manifested in a culture of preparedness and adaptation rather than mere anticipation and prevention. This view overlaps with the safety and security take of Wildavsky (1988), who argues that in conditions where the security environment is extremely dynamic and unpredictable, anticipating threats and attempting to manage risk provide an illusory sense of certainty and safety. In this situation, Wildavsky proposes changing the approach to public policymaking in order to increase the resilience of specific public domains. Instead of investing in actions to prevent, for example, one of the most likely crisis scenarios, resources should be dispersed in an attempt to increase the efficiency and resilience of the system (e.g. society) as a whole (Wildavsky 1988:87–88).

While the ecological influence on security studies and crisis response have been widely recognised in academic literature (Evans and Reid 2013; Joseph 2013; Methmann and Oels 2015), it becomes clear that many important contributions come from social work, psychology, or engineering (Bourbeau 2018:31). For Bourbeau, these genealogies in essence lead to the emergence of multiple logics of resilience, which are situated in a particular socio-political context and shaped by a "an interpretative moment" – a particular shock or disturbance. This multiple-logic approach can be observed in the community (societal) approach to resilience, which operates within the domain of security studies and draws directly from engineering-, ecology-, psychology-, and economy-centred definitions. Community resilience can be defined as "the ability of individuals and communities to deal with a state of continuous, long-term stress; the ability to find unknown inner strengths and resources in order to cope effectively; the measure of adaptation and flexibility" (Ganor and Ben-Lavy 2003:106). Other definitions often include such elements as rapid recovery in the face of adversity (Bruneau et al. 2003); the ability to self-organise, learn, and work within common standards in emerging systems (Kaufmann 2013); or the ability to thrive in an environment characterised by change and unpredictability (Magis 2010).

This complexity of genealogies and consequent understandings of resilience reflect "respective ontological, epistemological foundations and associated methodologies" of its underlying disciplines (Aranda et al. 2012:549). In the face of these different bases of the concept, Simon and Randalls (2016) claim that resilience cannot be treated as singular as it takes on different meanings depending on the context in which it is being used.

> Variously, a psychological trait, community asset, urban quality, ecological property, development strategy and so on, these resiliences "that go by a single name" . . . can be many different things, imagine many different futures and inspire different interventions and, yet, are all drawn under the same banner.
>
> (Simon and Randalls 2016:5)

The variety of definitions, actors, referent objects, values, goals, and strategies of action demonstrates how resilience, while not fragmented, is multiple.

Simon's and Randalls' idea of a *resilience multiple* is a result of different ontological sitings of resilience, which are revealed through discursive articulations and framings of responsibility, security, and care. In this sense, and building on Aranda and colleagues (2012), they distinguish between resilience "found" (framed as an inherent attribute), "made" (framed as a constructed process), and "unfinished" (framed as an ever-unfinished process of becoming) (Simon and Randalls 2016). According to them, the ontological framing of the siting of resilience determines the options for interventions and the fostering of resilience. Arianna Tozzi (2021) brings this idea of resilience multiple further my merging natural and social forms of resilience into interdependent and co-created socio-natural assemblages of enacted practices, "focusing on the cultural, economic, political and historical processes that give rise to a particular resilient configuration" (Tozzi 2021:1091).

Discussing the case of resilience to water scarcity, she points out that the materiality of water circulation influences knowledge structures and sense-making, which then directly translates into the types of interventions designed to enhance resilience. While the focus solely on discourse may overshadow less powerful and less mainstream assemblages of resilience, "when we pay attention to multipl[e] assembled realities as enacted through practices, it finally becomes possible to interrogate the ontological politics of alternative resilient configurations" (Tozzi 2021:1096). Resilience, so the argument goes, flourishes in the messiness of a world characterised by ontological complexity that tears down the wall between social and natural systems.

This multitude of ontological sitings, thus likewise of different meanings, has earned the concept considerable criticism. Amin points out that resilience has become part of "a new lexicon of words with ambiguous meanings" which allow the smoothing over of "any inconsistency between narrating the turbulent future as governable and ungovernable, or opportunity and threat" (Amin 2013:141). In their famous critique of resilience, Walker and Cooper called it "a pervasive idiom of global governance" which is "abstract and malleable enough to encompass the worlds of high finance, defence and urban infrastructure within a single analytic" (Walker and Cooper 2011:144). The application of resilience to individuals, households, companies, cities, regions, states, or elements of infrastructure, viewing it as a trait, an ability, a process, or an outcome and reaching to methodologies stemming from a vast array of disciplines, has surely stretched the meaning of the concept, putting it "in danger of becoming a vacuous buzzword from overuse and ambiguity" (Rose 2007:384). White and O'Hare point out that this quality of a "conveniently nebulous concept" permits the use of resilience as a pretext to shift responsibility for and cost of care and security away from governments and onto the private sector and communities (White and O'Hare 2014:947). It becomes a pragmatic tool of governance reinforcing neoliberal politics and "calling on the most vulnerable to adapt to a world of generalized crisis" (Tozzi 2021:1088; see also: White and O'Hare 2014; Walker and Cooper 2011).

Yet, the conceptual multiplicity and messiness are exactly what resilience is about. Ignoring the contextuality of resilience "is politically dangerous, because it hides the conflicts and contestations at stake when one 'reality' of resilience is chosen to matter more than others" (Tozzi 2021:1084). Different framings and practices of resilience, as articulated and undertaken by political actors, shape the understanding of challenges and crises and influence the desired goals and strategies, thus ultimately shaping the world. In this light, it is no wonder that visions and applications of resilience vary across time and space. The investigation of the various iterations comprised by the resilience multiple helps to grasp the complexity and multi-level nature of the world and human activity, including the non-dominant forms of sense-making. In this book, we embrace the messiness of both resilience and the complex world it seeks to deal with. We do so not by adding a new interpretation of how resilience *is* to Amin's lexicon but by carefully watching how resilience is unfolded in spaces that have so far been rather resistant to its adoption. Therefore, we would like to contribute to the study

of the resilience multiple and set these different approaches to resilience under the particular perspective of the emerging and changing security rationalities of Germany, Poland, and Ukraine.

1.2 Structure of the book

With the aim of identifying and discussing the tenets of resilience in the German, Polish, and Ukrainian cases, the book is structured as follows: each national case consists of a more general overview of the resilience approach, rooted in strategic and policy discourses, as well as case studies of resilience within a particular type of crisis.

In the second chapter, "Approaching Resilience: The Rise of Resilience in the German Civil Protection System," Marco Krüger sets out to investigate the underpinnings of resilience in German security policies and disaster response. Based on the analysis of flood management operations in 2013, Krüger shows the direction in which the German approach to resilience evolved and which is reflected in the "German Strategy for Strengthening Resilience to Disasters." The mobilisation of resilience in Germany differs from the oft-criticised models of pushing responsibility for protection and security away from the state and down to individual citizens. Instead, the German approach to resilience involves the simultaneous responsibilisation of individuals and an expansion of the state's sphere of action. Thus, within the German context, the vision of disaster resilience takes the form of an orchestrated effort and preparedness that permeates all levels – from national, through state, down to individual. In this way, the chapter strongly positions itself within those debates on resilience revolving around dealing with a complex world.

The third chapter, "Societal Resilience in Germany: Conceptual and Empirical Reflections for Dealing with Crises and Disasters" by Cordula Dittmer and Martin Voss, continues the study of the German approach to resilience. Situating the discussion within the interplay of engineering, ecological, psychological, and societal resilience debates, the authors propose studying resilience through a multi-level, multi-factor model, incorporating the development and changes into the forms of resilience across time. Using the 2013 river Elbe floods as a case study, Dittmer and Voss also discuss different aspects and levels of resilience in coping with extreme events, ranging from a struggle for survival, through immediate recovery, bouncing back, and normalisation, to long-term sustainability and transformation. While the provisions of the "German Strategy for Strengthening Resilience to Disasters" seem to indicate a reactive disaster culture, the advancement of the role of the state, and resilience based on bouncing back, the analysis shows a key role of the population, trust, social cohesion, and networks in strengthening German resilience.

With the fourth chapter, "Polish Trajectories of Resilience: Exploring Discourses on Security and Crisis Response" by Agata Mazurkiewicz, the volume proceeds to a discussion of resilience in Poland. Building on the analysis of resilience discourse in Polish security strategies and legislation on national security and crisis response, the author reveals the conceptual underpinnings of the Polish approach to resilience. Polish resilience reflects a rather conservative stance, with the emphasis

on the maintenance of state functioning, protection of critical infrastructure, and a reliance on the strategy of bouncing back following crises. While the aspect of community resilience is also visible, embodied in such ideas as education for security and a culture of preparedness, it is to a large extent to be developed and maintained through military service, thus re-emphasising the position of the state and its institutions in the Polish resilience scheme. With the proceedings of new legislation on civil protection and defence, this state-centric and militarised framework of resilience might change, although it will be a slow process.

This state-centric and militarised side of Polish resilience is depicted in Chapter 5, "Resilience in the Polish Strategic Discourse and Practice: The Use of the Polish Territorial Forces during the COVID-19 Pandemic," by Maciej Stępka and Agata Mazurkiewicz. As the pandemic revealed serious shortcomings in the Polish resilience framework, including a warning-response gap and limited human and physical resources, the government mobilised the Armed Forces to fill the capability gaps and strengthen the weakest links of the system. Here, the primary role was given to the Territorial Defence Forces, the newest branch of the Polish military, which not only quickly took over the narrative of resilience but also became its default instrument. This was possible due to the inefficiencies of the Polish crisis-response system; the privileged status of the Armed Forces; and the propensity for short-term, ad hoc mobilisation rather than a focus on preparedness. Though more through necessity than by design, the use of the military in crisis response does reflect a certain degree of flexibility with the Polish resilience scheme.

Chapter 6, "Resilience and Self-organisation of the Polish Migration Governance System: Experiences from the First Months of the 'Ukrainian Refugee Crisis of 2022'" by Maciej Stępka, provides a specific case study of Polish resilience in action. It also shows a different, more spontaneous, side of the Polish resilience framework. While discussing the reactions of the Polish state and society to the influx of large numbers of refugees from Ukraine following Russia's full-scale invasion in 2022, Stępka reveals the mechanism of self-organised resilience in Poland. This type of bottom-up approach could be mobilised due to the state's withdrawal in the first days of the crisis, which created a window of opportunity for more creative, humanitarian-oriented, and non-securitised interpretations of a crisis centred around mass immigration. This space was quickly utilised by the population and non-governmental organisations, providing not only assistance to refugees but also time and an interpretative framework for a governmental response supportive towards Ukrainians.

With the seventh chapter, "The Ukrainian Approach to Ensuring National Resilience: Experience Proven in Peace and Wartime" by Olga Reznikova, the volume turns its focus to Ukrainian resilience. Using a systemic approach, Reznikova discusses Ukraine's experience with the development of national resilience driven by an expanding range of threats, including hybrid war, the COVID-19 pandemic, natural disasters, and finally Russia's full-scale invasion. The resulting approach to resilience is a comprehensive one, encompassing multiple, interdependent levels. Reznikova shows how Ukrainian resilience, both in peace- and wartime, combines such diverse aspects as individual and household resilience to backouts and disinformation, international political and military support for Ukraine, protection

of critical infrastructure, leadership, and finally the adaptability and resistance of the economy. At the same time, while Ukrainian resilience after February 2022 surprised many observers and continues to prove persistent in the prolonged war effort, it is not without its weak points and requires continuous development.

The eighth chapter, "Foreign Trade Resilience during Wartime" by Ivan Us, discusses in depth one of the aspects of Ukrainian economic resilience in times of a full-scale war. Against the backdrop of other cases of armed conflicts and their influence on trade, Us discusses factors both contributing to and hindering Ukrainian foreign trade resilience. While a strong and resilient economy is vital in wartime, Ukraine is experiencing double pressure – on the one hand resulting from the destruction and disruptions to supply chains caused by the war, and on the other from the increased demand linked with the necessary reconstruction. The detailed analysis of changes in Ukraine's foreign trade in the first year of the war shows the importance of international collaboration for state and regional trade resilience, as well as depicting global interdependencies in terms of food-chain supplies.

Finally, the concluding chapter brings together the findings of all contributions, presenting the differences and similarities of German, Polish, and Ukrainian approaches to resilience. While these three states vary in terms of their (geo) political and socio-economic situation, they all reflect the finding that the role of state and state institutions is not necessarily a withdrawing one in resilience policies. Rather than being sideline-sitters, state institutions have tried to expand their influence and actively taken action to shape the proper behaviour of their citizens. Resilience becomes detached from the idea of a self-sufficient emergent structure. While resilience is still supposed to be an answer to adapt to the inevitable, unknown, and at times even unanticipated, it is likewise a vehicle to expand reactive patterns beyond institutional boundaries and to orchestrate joint efforts of patterned adjustment processes in various contexts, as demonstrated in the following chapters.

Note

1 The establishment of the team of contributors and part of the research for this publication was funded by the Future Democracy Lab, a flagship project of the POB Society of the Future, under the programme "Excellence Initiative – Research University" at the Jagiellonian University in Kraków.

References

Amin, Ash. 2013. "Surviving the Turbulent Future." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 31(1):140–156. https://doi.org/10.1068/d23011

Aranda, Kay, Laetitia Zeeman, Julie Scholes, and Arantxa Santa María Morales. 2012. "The Resilient Subject: Exploring Subjectivity, Identity and the Body in Narratives of Resilience?" *Health (United Kingdom)* 16(5):548–563. https://doi.org/10.1177/1363459312438564

Barany, Zoltan, and Robert Rauchhaus. 2011. "Explaining NATO's Resilience: Is International Relations Theory Useful?" *Contemporary Security Policy* 32(2):286–307. https://doi.org/10.1080/13523260.2011.590355.

Bonanno, George A. 2004. "Loss, Trauma, and Human Resilience: Have We Underestimated the Human Capacity to Thrive After Extremely Aversive Events?" *American Psychologist* 59(1):20–28. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.59.1.20.

Bosse, Giselle, and Alena Vieira. 2023. "Resilient States vs. Resilient Societies? The 'Dark Side' of Resilience Narratives in EU Relations with Authoritarian Regimes: A Case Study of Belarus." *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 00(00):1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/14782804.2023.2211938.

Bourbeau, Philippe. 2013. "Resiliencism: Premises and Promises in Securitisation Research." *Resilience* 1(1):3–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/21693293.2013.765738.

Bourbeau, Philippe. 2018. *On Resilience: Genealogy, Logics, and World Politics*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brassett, James, Stuart Croft, and Nick Vaughan-Williams. 2013. "Introduction: An Agenda for Resilience Research in Politics and International Relations." *Politics* 33(4):221–228. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9256.12032.

Bruneau, Michel, Stephanie E. Chang, Ronald T. Eguchi, George C. Lee, Thomas D. O'Rourke, Andrei M. Reinhorn, Masanobu Shinozuka, Kathleen Tierney, William A. Wallace, and Detlof Von Winterfeldt. 2003. "A Framework to Quantitatively Assess and Enhance the Seismic Resilience of Communities." *Earthquake Spectra* 19(4):733–752. https://doi.org/10.1193/1.1623497.

Brusset, Xavier, and Christoph Teller. 2017. "Supply Chain Capabilities, Risks, and Resilience." *International Journal of Production Economics* 184(June 2016):59–68. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2016.09.008.

Carmichael, David G. 2015. "Incorporating Resilience through Adaptability and Flexibility." *Civil Engineering and Environmental Systems* 32(1–2):31–43. https://doi.org/10.1080/10286608.2015.1016921.

Ceccorulli, Michela, and Sonia Lucarelli. 2017. "Migration and the EU Global Strategy: Narratives and Dilemmas." *International Spectator* 52(3):83–102. https://doi.org/10.1080/03932729.2017.1332850.

Chandler, David. 2019. "Resilience and the End(s) of the Politics of Adaptation." *Resilience* 7(3):1–10. https://doi.org/10.1080/21693293.2019.1605660.

Dalgaard-Nielsen, Anja, and Patrick Schack. 2016. "Community Resilience to Militant Islamism: Who and What? An Explorative Study of Resilience in Three Danish Communities." *Democracy and Security* 12(4):309–327. https://doi.org/10.1080/17419166.2016.1236691

Dijkstra, Hylke, Petar Petrov, and Esther Versluis. 2018. "Governing Risks in International Security." *Contemporary Security Policy* 39(4):537–543. https://doi.org/10.1080/13523260.2018.1503776.

Dunn Cavelty, Myriam, Mareile Kaufmann, and Kristian Søby Kristensen. 2015. "Resilience and (in) Security: Practices, Subjects, Temporalities." *Security Dialogue* 46(1):3–14.

Evans, Brad, and Julian Reid. 2013. "Dangerously Exposed: The Life and Death of the Resilient Subject." *Resilience* 1(2):83–98. https://doi.org/10.1080/21693293.2013.770703.

Fletcher, David, and Mustafa Sarkar. 2013. "Psychological Resilience." *European Psychologist* 18(1):12–23. https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000124.

Ganor, Michael, and Yuli Ben-Lavy. 2003. "Community Resilience: Lessons Derived from Gilo under Fire." *Journal of Jewish Communal Service* 79(2/3):105–108.

Greenhough, Beth. 2016. "Conceptual Multiplicity or Ontological Politics?" *Dialogues in Human Geography* 6(1):37–40. https://doi.org/10.1177/2043820615624069.

Gunderson, Lance H. 2000. "Ecological Resilience – In Theory and Application." *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 31(1):425–439. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.31.1.425.

Holling, C. S. 1973. "Resilience and Stability of Ecological Systems." *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 4(1):1–23. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.04.110173.000245.

Holling, C. S. 1996. "Engineering Resilience versus Ecological Resilience." Pp. 31–43 in *Engineering Within Ecological Constraints*, edited by P. Schulze. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Howell, Alison. 2014. "Resilience, War, and Austerity: The Ethics of Military Human Enhancement and the Politics of Data." *Security Dialogue* 46(1):15–31. https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010614551040

Hyvönen, Ari-Elmeri, and Tapio Juntunen. 2020. "From 'Spiritual Defence to Robust Resilience in the Finnish Comprehensive Security Model." Pp. 154–178 in *Nordic Societal Security. Convergence and Divergence*, edited by S. Larsson and M. Rhinard. London and New York: Routledge.

Jaspars, Susanne. 2021. "Protracted Crisis, Food Security and the Fantasy of Resilience in Sudan." *Security Dialogue* 52(3):195–212. https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010620927279.

Jore, Sissel H. 2020. "Is Resilience a Favourable Concept in Terrorism Research? The Multifaceted Discourses of Resilience in the Academic Literature." *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 13(2):337–357. https://doi.org/10.1080/17539153.2020.1733788

Joseph, Jonathan. 2013. "Resilience as Embedded Neoliberalism: A Governmentality Approach." *Resilience* 1(1):38–52. https://doi.org/10.1080/21693293.2013.765741.

Joseph, Jonathan. 2018. *Varieties of Resilience: Studies in Governmentality*. Cambridge University Press.

Kaufmann, Mareile. 2013. "Emergent Self-Organisation in Emergencies: Resilience Rationales in Interconnected Societies." *Resilience* 1(1):53–68. https://doi.org/10.1080/21693293.2013.765742.

Kaufmann, Mareile. 2016. "Exercising Emergencies: Resilience, Affect and Acting out Security." *Security Dialogue* 47(2):99–116.

Krüger, Marco. 2018. "Building Instead of Imposing Resilience: Revisiting the Relationship between Resilience and the State." *International Political Sociology* 13(1):53–67. https://doi.org/10.1093/ips/oly025.

Krüger, Marco. 2019. "Building Instead of Imposing Resilience: Revisiting the Relationship between Resilience and the State." *International Political Sociology* 13(1):53–67. https://doi.org/10.1093/ips/oly025.

Krüger, Marco. 2023. *The Emancipatory Potential of Resilience*. Diss. Universität Tübingen.

Magis, Kristen. 2010. "Community Resilience: An Indicator of Social Sustainability." *Society and Natural Resources* 23(5):401–416. https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920903305674.

Masten, Ann S., Karin M. Best, and Norman Garmezy. 1990. "Resilience and Development: Contributions from the Study of Children Who Overcome Adversity." *Development and Psychopathology* 2:425–444. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400005812

Methmann, Chris, and Angela Oels. 2015. "From 'Fearing' to 'Empowering' Climate Refugees: Governing Climate-Induced Migration in the Name of Resilience." *Security Dialogue* 46(1):51–68. https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010614552548.

Mitoulis, Stergios Aristoteles, Sotirios Argyroudis, Mathaios Panteli, Clemente Fuggini, Sotirios Valkaniotis, William Hynes, and Igor Linkov. 2023. "Conflict-resilience Framework for Critical Infrastructure Peacebuilding." *Sustainable Cities and Society* 91(January):104405. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2023.104405

Neocleous, Mark. 2013. "Resisting Resilience." *Radical Philosophy* 178(6):2–7.

Olsson, Lennart, Anne Jerneck, Henrik Thoren, Johannes Persson, and David O'Byrne. 2015. "Why Resilience Is Unappealing to Social Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations of the Scientific Use of Resilience." *Science Advances* 1(4):1–12. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1400217.

Pursiainen, Christer. 2018. "Critical Infrastructure Resilience: A Nordic Model in the Making?" *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* 27(July 2017):632–641. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2017.08.006.

Rehak, David, et al. 2019. "Complex Approach to Assessing Resilience of Critical Infrastructure Elements." *International Journal of Critical Infrastructure Protection* 25:125–138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcip.2019.03.003.

Richardson, Glenn E. 2002. "The Metatheory of Resilience and Resiliency." *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 58(3):307–321. https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.10020.

Rose, Adam. 2007. "Economic Resilience to Natural and Man-made Disasters: Multidisciplinary Origins and Contextual Dimensions." *Environmental Hazards* 7(4):383–398. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envhaz.2007.10.001

Schwarz, Silke. 2018. "Resilience in Psychology: A Critical Analysis of the Concept." *Theory and Psychology* 28(4):528–541.

Simon, Stephanie, and Samuel Randalls. 2016. "Geography, Ontological Politics and the Resilient Future." *Dialogues in Human Geography* 6(1):3–18. https://doi.org/10.1177/2043820615624047

Stępka, Maciej. 2022. "In Anticipation of New Migration Crises." *Politeja* 19(4(79)):151–165. https://doi.org/10.12797/Politeja.19.2022.79.09.

Tocci, Nathalie. 2017. *Framing the EU Global Strategy: A Stronger Europe in a Fragile World*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tozzi, Arianna. 2021. "An Approach to Pluralizing Socionatural Resilience through Assemblages." *Progress in Human Geography* 45(5):1083–1104. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132520983471

Ungar, Michael. 2006. "Resilience across Cultures." *British Journal of Social Work* 38(2):218–235. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcl343.

Wagner, Wolfgang, and Rosanne Anholt. 2016. "Resilience as the EU Global Strategy's New Leitmotif: Pragmatic, Problematic or Promising?" *Contemporary Security Policy* 37(3):414–430. https://doi.org/10.1080/13523260.2016.1228034.

Walker, Jeremy, and Melinda Cooper. 2011. "Genealogies of Resilience: From Systems Ecology to the Political Economy of Crisis Adaptation." *Security Dialogue* 42(2):143–160. https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010611399616.

White, Iain, and Paul O'Hare. 2014. "From Rhetoric to Reality: Which Resilience, Why Resilience, and Whose Resilience in Spatial Planning?" *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 32(5):934–950. https://doi.org/10.1068/c12117

Wildavsky, Aaron. 1988. *Searching for Safety*. New Brunswick, London: Transaction Publishers.

Woods, David D. 2015. "Four Concepts for Resilience and the Implications for the Future of Resilience Engineering." *Reliability Engineering and System Safety* 141(September):5–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ress.2015.03.018.

Zebrowski, Chris. 2016. *The Value of Resilience. Securing Life in the Twenty-First Century*. London and New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315681924.