

Bourbeau, Philippe, “Resilience, Security, and World Politics”, to be published in Chandler, David and Jon Coaffee (eds.), *Routledge Handbook of International Resilience: Policies, Theories, and Practices*, London, Routledge

Abstract

In recent years, a great deal has been written in the scholarly literature about the role of resilience in our social world. This scholarship has sparked vivid theoretical debates in psychology, criminology, social work, and political geography about the nature of resilience and how scholars should go about studying it. Resilience is increasingly making its entries into International Relations (IR) literature. This chapter provides a brief introduction to how the concept of resilience has been defined and deployed within social sciences, suggests a particular definition of resilience, and outlines a terrain of debate and research agendas.

Keywords

Resilience; Security; World Politics; Change, Continuity, Critical junctures, Progress

Author

Philippe Bourbeau
Department of Politics and International Studies
University of Cambridge
www.philippebourbeau.net
pb623@cam.ac.uk

Acknowledgment

I wish to thank David Chandler and Jon Coaffee for the invitation to participate in this Handbook. Some of the material presented here has been previously published in Bourbeau, Philippe, “Resiliencism: Premises and promises in securitization research”, *Resilience. International Policies, Practices, and Discourses*, 2013, 1(1): 3-17.

Introduction

Resilience is increasingly making its entries into International Relations (IR) literature. This scholarship has sparked several debates concerning the usefulness of resilience and how scholar should go about studying it. Several factors have contributed to these debates: the infancy of the resilience research program; the mistaken belief that some IR scholars have ‘invented’ a new concept; the relative scarcity of empirical research applied specifically to IR; the perennial question of what resilience is actually about.

The first section of this chapter provides a brief introduction to how the concept of resilience has been defined and deployed within social sciences. While recognizing the importance of these contributions, I argue that they all share elements that are problematic in a study about the relationship between resilience and world politics: they fail to take into account the negative aspect of resilience and the multi-scalar dimension of resilience. In the second section, I seek to bolster research on resilience by suggesting a particular definition. In the third section, I outline a terrain of debate between resilience and current IR issues including the question of change and continuity, interdisciplinary dialogue, critical junctures and the notion of progress.

Resilience in social sciences

Resilience is a concept that cut across several disciplines. Psychology, ecology, criminology, engineering sciences, human resources studies, nursing, organizational studies, computer science, and social work have all either tackled, debunked, measured, employed, studied, tested, hypothesized or criticized resilience (Luthans 2002, Ollier-Malaterre 2010, Anaut 2005, Bruneau, Chang *et al.* 2003).

Psychologists, criminologists and social workers have been studying and theorizing resilience for a longer time than IR scholars (Garmezy 1974, Rutter 1987). One of the main elements in this scholarship is the notion of ‘bouncing back’. After all, the English word ‘resilience’ originated in the 16th and 17th centuries, deriving from the verb ‘resile’, which in turn was drawn from the Latin verb ‘resilire’, meaning to ‘jump back, recoil’. Thus, the ability to recover from or adjust easily to misfortune, adversity, unease, conflict, failure, and/or change is central (Seery, Holman *et al.* 2010). A large strand of this scholarship aimed at uncovering the internal and external resilient qualities that help people to bounce back and to adapt positively in the face of profound adversity – that is, adaptation that is substantially better than would have been expected given the circumstances (Hauser 1999, Donnon and Hammond 2007, Bonanno 2004). A special issue of the *American Psychologist* seeking to identify and describe resilient qualities (such as happiness, optimism, wisdom, creativity, etc) illustrates this line of research nicely (Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi 2000).

Wanting to move away from a conception of resilience as a set of dispositional qualities or protective mechanisms of the individual, several criminologists and social workers have proposed instead to ‘de-individualize’ resilience and to see it as a process (Rumgay 2004, Gilgun 2005, Seccombe 2002, Norris, Stevens *et al.* 2008). As such, the definition of

resilience was slightly modified to ‘a dynamic process encompassing positive adaptation within the context of significant adversity’ (Luthar, Cicchetti *et al.* 2000: 543, see also Masten and Powell 2003). Resilience is therefore seen not as a set of predetermined qualities that an individual possesses (or not), but as a temporally and contextually informed process (Ronel and Elisha 2011, Ungar 2004, Schoon 2006, Ungar 2011).

The fields of political geography and environmental studies have also been dynamic in studying resilience, albeit from a different angle. A large strand of literature employs resilience to analyze how co-evolving societies and natural/ecological systems can cope with, and develop from, disturbances. Stemming from the ecological sciences, this scholarship seeks to address persistence and change in ecosystems (Carpenter, Walker *et al.* 2001, Holling 1996, Gunderson 2000), socio-ecological systems (Berkes, Colding *et al.* 2003, Walker, Anderies *et al.* 2006), and in terms of the impacts of natural hazards (Zhou, Wang *et al.* 2010, Cutter 2008, Klein, Nicholls *et al.* 2003, Renaud, Birkman *et al.* 2010). Environmental change and particularly changes of environmental regime have been understandably a central focus of attention (Young 2010, Duit, Galaza *et al.* 2010).

This literature has provided several perspectives on resilience and, in spite of the fact that there appears to be no consensus on how resilience should be theorized, three main currents have emerged: engineering resilience, ecological resilience, and socio-ecological resilience. Engineering resilience is associated with the concept of equilibrium and is about studying the conditions specifying how far a system can be displaced from a fixed point of equilibrium and still return to that equilibrium once the disturbance has passed. Ecological resilience somewhat moves away from the idea of equilibrium and is defined as the capacity of a system to experience disturbance and still maintain its ongoing functions and controls. In the words of one of the most important advocates, ecological resilience determines the persistence of relationships within a system and is a measure of the ability of these systems to absorb changes and still persist (Holling 1973: 17). Unsatisfied with these perspectives, scholars have come up with ‘social-ecological resilience’ to emphasize that the delineation between social and ecological systems is, in fact, artificial and arbitrary. These scholars have transformed research on resilience by arguing that the focus of resilience is not only on being robust to disturbance but also on the opportunities that emerge, in terms of self-reorganization, recombination, and the emergence of new trajectories (Walker and Meyers 2004, Folke 2006, Berkes and Folke 1998).

These definitions share two elements that are problematic for the transference of resilience thinking to the study of world politics. First, they start with the premise that the disturbance (or the shock) is inherently negative and that resilience is about positive adjustment. There is indeed a large acceptance in this literature that resilience is good and thus must be promoted. This might simply be a disciplinary bias as resilience is often employed to describe the capacity to react to sexual abuse, terrorist attacks, or disturbances of global ecological systems. Being resilient in the face of such trauma is unequivocally a positive adaptation. Notwithstanding, resilience defined as positive adaptation eschews that resilience has a dark side, especially in societal terms. Resilience is not always a desirable feature of social, political or economic life. Being resilient might in fact mean being an

obstacle to positive change in some cases. I am not arguing that one should find a way to interpret terrorist attacks in large cities as positive policy. But I do argue that there might be good reasons for wanting to transform a social structure, a given situation, a regime, a norm, an economic system of exploitation, etc., and that being resilient to these changes could be considered as negative. Displaying an *a priori* normative bias seems rather limiting here as adjustment may be both positive and negative. Approaches to resilience should be able to theorize situations in which endogenous or exogenous shocks could be seen as positive and in which a resilient strategy could be understood as negative.

The second element that these models have in common is their tendency to understand resilience in a binary way. Resilience is usually seen as an all or nothing concept: either there is resilience or there is not. One direct consequence of this is that the notion of a scalar understanding of resilience is either under-theorized or entirely lacking in some cases. Just as there is a scale of securitization (Bourbeau 2011), there is a scale of resilience. Another consequence of treating resilience in a binary way is that it eschews the question of types of resilience. This is problematic because it creates a disconnection – in theoretical and empirical terms – between the complexity of contemporary world politics and the analytical framework proposed to make sense of the different patterns of response that world politics brings.

Definition and Typology

With the limits of these definitions in mind, I suggest an alternative conceptualisation of resilience as the process of patterned adjustments adopted by a society or an individual in the face of endogenous or exogenous shocks (Bourbeau 2013b, forthcoming).

This position has multiple advantages. Firstly, it obviously moves away from a conception of social equilibrium; it rids resilience of the assumption of a return to equilibrium. Indeed, the underlying model of change in engineering resilience (and resilience as positive adaptation) is of a system in equilibrium disturbed by exogenous forces. In contrast, the approach adopted here underscores that the sources of change may be endogenous or exogenous and that the outcome of change is not necessarily a return to a previous equilibrium. Instead of returning to some prior equilibrium, societies often make adjustments that are best understood as moves to maintain their compatibility with the social construction of their particular collective identity and changing circumstances. Resilience is thereby grasped as an inherently dynamic and complex process.

Secondly, while resilience involves disturbances and adaptation, this position permits an understanding of disturbances and adjustments as differing from context to context, from culture to culture, and from individual to individual. Resilience can refer to how well a society is navigating through some past adversity such as 9/11 (retrospective), how successfully a society is navigating through some current adversity (concurrent), or the likelihood that a society will successfully navigate through disturbance in the future (prospective). In addition it should be noted that a society may be able to respond with resilience to a particular type of adversity (terrorist attacks) but not to another (rise in

urban criminality), or at one time in its history (during the cold war) but not in another (in a post-cold war era).

A third, and crucial, advantage of this position is that it accepts that disturbances or shocks are interpretative moments. Disturbances do not objectively exist out there waiting to exercise influence. Endogenous or exogenous shocks rarely speak for themselves in the social world. Agents have to interpret shock as being a security threat or a disturbance for that shock to become a security threat. The meaning of an event as a disturbance is often a social construction involving multiple directionality and constant interactions between agential powers and the social structure. Contrary to Leach *et al.* (2010) who argue that scholars focusing on resilience have so far failed to recognize that how resilience is evaluated depends on context and perspective, I argue that if resilience is about anything it is about context and perspective. For some scholars, this is what makes resilience a useless approach. Fully accepting the importance of contextuality does in fact render difficult – if not impossible – the development of a comprehensive theory of resilience, applicable across cases and time. Yet, for those inclined to fully accept the complexity of the social world and the inherent limits that this complexity imposes on our knowledge, this is what makes resilience an especially stimulating approach. A context-informed resilience stimulates a richer dialogue between ideas and evidence.

Inspired by Stephen Dovers and John Handmer's typology (1992, 1996), I further propose to identify three types of resilience. I indeed distinguish between resilience as Maintenance, resilience as Marginality, and resilience as Renewal – in short the 'MMR' typology.

The first type – resilience as Maintenance – is characterized by adaptation in which resources and energy will be expended in maintaining the status quo. The importance and saliency (and 'threateness') of the problem will often be exaggerated in order to better justify the necessity to implement measures to uphold the status quo against changes provoked by the events. Re-affirmation of the value, benefit, and importance of the status quo will be made on several occasions. A society relying strongly on this type of resilience will deal with endogenous and exogenous shocks with rigidity and will underscore the potentially negative transformative consequences brought about by these events. Disturbances or shocks are not by definition problematic or negative; they will be socially constructed as being threatening and dangerous by dominant discourses. Although the possibility that a disconnection between security discourses and security practices exists, resilience as maintenance will often see an alignment of discourse and practices. Rhetoric and discursive powers will be deployed to portray the event as a significant threat and security practices will also be either implemented or strengthened as a response.

The second type – resilience as Marginality – is characterized by responses that bring changes at the margins but that do not challenge the basis of a policy (or a society). Resilience as marginality implies responding within the boundaries of the current policy, norm, and/or social structure. The nature and importance of the 'problem' will often be presented as being less salient than with the first type of resilience, but an effort to

acknowledge the issue and to recognize that marginal adjustment is needed will be made. There is a danger that the minor changes implemented may delay the major changes that some may argue are required. There is also the possibility that the marginal adjustments made at one point in time (and thought of as being marginal at that time) become extremely important and influential at another point in time (and thus not seen as marginal anymore). This type of resilience will often see a disconnection between security discourses and security practices. In some cases, discursive powers will be almost absent and marginal changes in security practices will take place. In other cases, security practices will mostly remain the same but a shift in discourse and how the event is discursively represented will constitute the source of marginal yet important adjustments. As such, studies emphasizing the role of security practices might reveal different patterns of responses than a focus on speech and discourses – and vice versa.

The third type – resilience as Renewal – is characterised by responses that transform basic policy assumptions and, thus, potentially remodel social structures. Resilience as renewal implies introducing novel vectors of response that will (in an implicit or explicit way) fundamentally change existing policies and set new directions for governance in this field. Redefinitions, however, do not take place in a vacuum but draw on past experiences, collective memory and social history, as well as the windows of opportunity upon which agential powers decide to act (or not) (Bourbeau 2011, 2014a). As with resilience as maintenance, the importance of the disturbance (or the shock) may often be exaggerated, but unlike the objectives of the first type of resilience, that seek to maintain the status quo, the goal here is to present the option of renewal as inescapable. The disturbance has such profound ramifications that substantial re-organization of the policy is strongly desired. Redefinition often involves important shifts in interpretation and meaning, in agents' power relations, as well as in institutional and organizational configurations. The particular social mechanisms by which redefinition and renewal are carry through are multiple and could include analytic deliberation, nesting strategies, institutional variety, etc (Dietz, Ostrom *et al.* 2003). This is not to argue that everything would be created anew after a disturbance, as if events and agency were unfolding in a social vacuum. Yet, resilience as renewal means that disturbances would play a triggering role in a sustained and systematic effort to change profoundly a given policy or how a society understands and interprets a particular set of issues.

These types are not mutually exclusive and they can be found in the same society diachronically and synchronically. Furthermore, a society can adopt one type of resilience in one domain and another type of resilience in another domain. By definition, resilience as maintenance is no more normatively negative or positive than resilience as renewal; as such, there is no normative continuum that starts with maintenance and ends with renewal.

The added value of resilience

Elsewhere, I have argued that the premises of resilience are threefold: (1) that resilience has a dark and a bright side, (2) that knowledge about resilience is contingent, and (3) that

resilience is a socio-historically informed, dynamic, and varied process (Bourbeau forthcoming). Understanding resilience as a process of patterned adjustments adopted by a society, a group, or an individual in the face of endogenous or exogenous shocks and postulating the three premises aforementioned offer many kinds of added value and shed a new light on contemporary international politics. In what follows, I take few steps in suggesting ways of broadening and deepening research agendas around issues of change and continuity in IR, interdisciplinary dialogue, critical junctures and progress.

Issues of change and continuity in IR

A focus on resilience can enlighten us about vectors of change and continuity in world politics, particularly as a complement to the recent focus on “practices” in IR and on the new institutionalism in political science (Pouliot 2008, Hopf 2010, 2013, Neumann 2002, Adler and Pouliot 2011a, Mahoney and Thelen 2010b, Thelen 2003, Pierson and Skocpol 2002, Hall and Taylor 1996). While there is a large consensus among “practices” scholars and others about the usefulness of a practices approach to explain continuity in world politics, important disagreements exist about the effectiveness of this approach in tackling the notion of change. For some, a practices approach is particularly well placed to tackle the issue of change, since “change, not stability, is the ordinary condition of social life. [...] Stability, in other words, is an illusion created by the recursive nature of practice” (Adler and Pouliot 2011b: 18). For others, a practices approach makes a strong case for the enduring characteristics of the social world, but a considerably weaker case for the prevalence of change and critical junctures (Hopf 2010). Friendly critics further contend that the analysis of practices, as it is currently organized and applied, not only falls short of offering satisfying ways of theorizing change in international politics but also – and perhaps more importantly – “generates an exaggerated sense of stability and can obscure both the social processes that generate change and the inherent instability of practices themselves” (Duvall and Chowdhury 2011: 337). Notwithstanding these “in-house” disagreements, the fact remains that a practices approach has so far offered few guiding principles to distinguish practices relating to change from those related to continuity, or to make sense of key moments of change in world politics, where actors step out of boundaries and transcend the field of action in which they are normally engaged.

This is where an emphasis on resilience is particularly useful. Resilience offers anchoring devices through which practices inducing change can be discerned and distinguished from practices inducing continuity. In fact, research on resilience has already started to make inroads into these questions. Jon Coaffee and David Murakami Wood (2006) have shown that a focus on resilience allows for a revised understanding of changes in the regulation of urban order. Resilience offers one way of reconstituting change over time, space, and place in order to better understand the social and practices patterns that (re)constitute everyday life and brings ‘security home’. In the field of international intervention, David Chandler has recently argued that it is because the discursive power of human security stems from its articulation with the resilience paradigm, (which stresses in this field of research a programme of empowerment and capacity-building) that we are better able to grasp the

recent change in dominant security discourses and practices, i.e., away from the liberal internationalist framework and towards a growing emphasis on preventive intervention (Chandler 2012, 2014).

A focus on resilience can also nicely complement a practice perspective in attempting to explain continuity in world politics. For instance, I have shown that the resilient pattern of adjustment chosen by dominant narratives in France to the so-called worldwide refugee crisis of the early 1990s led to both the diversion of detention centres from their original purposes and the re-employment of the security practice of detaining migrants in order to fight the perceived existential threat of international migration (Bourbeau 2013b, 2014b). Resilient strategies and security practices were thus employed to fight the security threat that international migration represented to France's collective identity, and were used to uphold the status quo against changes provoked by international migration. Seen in this light, detention centres for migrants are part of the state's security practice and resilient strategy, and have undergone an evolving relationship with the social forces currently at play in France.

A focus on resilience can also be very useful in explaining the endurance of institutions and regimes. It can show that, on some occasions, what seems to be an idiosyncratic institutional reproduction is in fact a culturally embedded pattern of adjustment to endogenous or exogenous shocks. While rationalist explanations for continuity mainly emphasize the maximisation of benefit and the obtained Pareto-optimal equilibrium, a focus on resilience as a tool of explanation provides an informative alternative approach. A resilience-based analysis taps into sociological institutionalist explanations focusing on the institutional practices, cultural frameworks, and 'social resources' available to individuals and/or societies at a given point in time (Hall 2010). Jane Jenson and Ron Levi (2013) demonstrate that the international human rights regime and the social rights regime were able to endure in the face of massive pressure from neoliberalism mainly because advocates of these regimes exploited neoliberalism's ideas for their own purposes. Jenson and Levi argue that one vector explaining the continuity of these two regimes is the fact that actors within these regimes adjusted "their practices and discourse to the changing political context in contingent fashion" (Jenson and Levi 2013: 71). Some variation occurred across both regimes, although adjustments in the human rights regime were less significant than in the social rights regime. Nevertheless, both these regimes maintained essential elements while actively building new approaches to social resilience along dimensions that mapped onto the prevailing political and cultural narratives of the neoliberal era.

Interdisciplinary dialogue

Resilience is an interdisciplinary bridge builder. Research into the interconnections between IR and other disciplines such as psychology, political geography, criminology, and urban studies should be further encouraged, both in theoretical and empirical terms. An excellent example here is Peter A. Hall and Michèle Lamont's edited volume *Social Resilience in the Neoliberal Era* (2013), which bring together an epidemiologist, political

scientists, sociologists, public health specialists, and psychologists. A quick look at the editorial board of the new journal *Resilience: International policies, practices and discourses*, which include IR scholars, economists, sociologists, political geographers, and urban scholars, is also indicative of the interdisciplinary nature of resilience.

The relationship between resilience and the political psychology ‘turn’ in IR is obvious. A number of scholars have recently emphasized the role of psychology in world politics (Mercer 2013, Rathbun 2011, Hymans 2006, Ned Lebow 2008, Fattah and Fierke 2009, McDermott, Wernimont *et al.* 2011, Krebs and Rapport 2012). A focus on resilience contributes to this growing area of research in several ways. A first option is to treat resilience as a psychological quality of an individual or a society. As discussed above, much of the early application of resilience in contemporary world politics followed this line of thought. Another option – the one preferred here – is to highlight the psychological underpinnings of political acts and decisions while underscoring the social, historical, and psychological embeddedness of individual and society. Notably, resilience speaks to the strand of foreign policy literature that focuses on cognition and prospect theory, by further explaining the social mechanisms by which individuals and societies seek to maintain the consistency of their ‘belief systems’ against novel and sometimes discrepant information as well as their tendency to organize issues around a reference point and consider options from that vantage (Levy 1997, McDermott 2004, Mercer 2005, Hudson 2005, Mintz 2004). In this way, a focus on resilience not only enhances our understanding of our multifaceted and emotionally driven social world, but also provides further ammunition to those seeking to underscore the limits of the rational choice model in the field of decision policy making.

The field of international political geography, and particularly the literature on environmental resources and climate change, is also a logical place to develop our interdisciplinary understanding of resilience. In these circles, discussions have mainly focused on the robustness of the resilience paradigm in so-called the social-ecological systems theory (Folke 2006, Berkes, Colding *et al.* 2003). Some have sought to connect this theory with the literature on IR regimes. Oran Young (2010), for example, argues that the social-ecological systems theory yields important insights that advance our understanding of state changes in environmental and resource regimes, whether in terms of incremental changes that actually reinforce status-quo resilient mechanisms of these regimes as well as in terms of non-linear and abrupt changes. However, critical voices have gained considerable traction of late. Mark Pelling and David Manuel-Navarrete seek to uncover the potential bias in the theory of status-quo preservation; together, they move the literature several steps forward by analyzing the transformation that induces resilience and by including a wider understanding of social and political life (Pelling and Manuel-Navarrete 2011, Pelling 2010). Nevertheless, to date, the literature on social-ecological systems has remained relatively untouched by current theorization of resilience in IR. Undoubtedly, further investigating the interconnections and applications of these standpoints on resilience will significantly enhance our understanding of the sources and implications of resilience.

Critical junctures

Most studies of resilience start with the identification of what is sometimes called a “critical juncture.” Commonly defined as “choice points that put countries (or other units) onto paths of development that track certain outcomes – as opposed to others – and that cannot be easily broken or reversed” (Mahoney 2001: 7), critical junctures are slowly making their way from comparative politics (Collier and Collier 1991, Capoccia and Keleman 2007, Katznelson 2003, Mahoney and Thelen 2010a) to IR scholarship (Fioretos 2011, Bourbeau 2011, 2013a). Recent scholarship has pushed the theorization of critical junctures a few steps further. For instance, Hillel Soifer (2012) proposes to distinguish between two types of causal conditions at work during a critical juncture: permissive conditions, which refer to the easing of the constraints of structure to make change possible, and productive conditions, which, in the presence of a permissive condition, produce the outcome and ensure its reproduction. If Soifer (2012: 1582) is right that (a) “the absence of the permissive condition is itself sufficient to determine the absence of change,” and (b) “even when the permissive condition is present, the absence of the productive condition is also sufficient to determine the absence of change,” resilience studies will have to spell out in a more detailed and theorized fashion the conditions enabling and constraining resilient strategies. Further developing the theorization of resilience in connection with Soifer’s arguments should be seen as a stimulating challenge, and advocates of a resilience approach should squarely engage with it.

Another fruitful way to strengthen the critical juncture component of resilience research would be to juxtapose it with the postcolonial perspective, and in particular with this perspective’s focus on “encounter.” In her study of norm-compliance in international relations, Zarakol (2011) interprets the encounter between the ‘East’ and the ‘West’ as a constitutive moment that shaped power relations in a decisive and enduring way. The focus on encounter is crucial, explains Zarakol following Goffman (1963), because it creates and establishes a stigma that individuals and groups have to cope with. Comparatively analyzing how Turkey, Japan, and Russia dealt with the trauma of loss of empire, she points out that dominant narratives in these countries saw their relationship with the ‘West’ sometimes as a weakness that needed to be overcome and sometimes as a blessing that needed to be exploited. The encounter is here understood as the key moment creating a condition that, in turn, leads to a process of formation of collective identity that is rather difficult to transform or reverse. The field of resilience studies has thus a unique opportunity to strengthen one of its components by bolstering and facilitating a dialogue with a diverse array of scholarly approaches, including comparative politics and the postcolonial perspective.

Progress

The focus on resilience speaks to the idea of progress. Some scholars who borrow from the psychological definition of resilience as ‘positive adaptation’ tend to argue, directly or indirectly, that resilience is a successful and progressive strategy. In his account of how two French labour organisations adjusted to the neoliberalization of the labour regime,

Anselovici (2013) argues that two pathways were available to these organizations: a successful one leading to resilience, and a less-successful one leading to stagnation. Along the same lines, one of the forms of resilience that Bouchard (2013: 267) identifies in his analysis of Québec society's response to neoliberalism is 'progressive resilience', by which he means that the society managed to "reinvent [it]self through major innovations and progressive changes" – in other words, the psychologists' axiom of "doing better than expected". Other scholars have presented a radically sceptical view of the progressive nature of resilience (Evans and Reid 2013, Joseph 2013), while I have proposed a middle-ground position, arguing that resilience possesses both a dark and a bright side (2013b). In the end, this is exactly the sort of friendly disagreement that will enliven further research on resilience.

Conclusion

This chapter has sought to deepen our understanding of the various meanings and practices that can be attached to resilience in different socio-cultural contexts. In doing so, I have (a) briefly traced the evolution of the definition of resilience; (b) put forward an alternative definition; and (c) outline a terrain of debate.

Leaving aside both the exhilaration and the lambasting that has arisen concerning resilience, the fact remains that the emergence of resilience in the field of world politics constitutes an invitation for scholars to critically examine our social world. Resilience holds a great deal of potential for renewing and broadening the global governance research agenda. Moving beyond an understanding of resilience as a set of qualities that an individual possesses or as a process of positive adaptation in the face of threats, the threefold type of resilience presented here helps in analyzing the constant and complex interplay between persistence and change, reproduction and transformation. It also provides one among several arenas for generating integrative and interdisciplinary collaboration on issues of critical junctures, progress and interdisciplinary dialogue in the study of world politics.

- Adler, E. and V. Pouliot, Eds. (2011a). *International Practices*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Adler, E. and V. Pouliot (2011b). 'International practices.' *International Theory* 3(1): 1-36.
- Anaut, M. (2005). 'Le concept de résilience et ses applications cliniques.' *Recherche en soins infirmiers* 82(4-10).
- Ancelovici, M. (2013). The Origins and Dynamics of Organizational Resilience. A comparative study of tow French labor organizations. *Social Resilience in the Neoliberal Era*. P. A. Hall and M. Lamont. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 346-375.
- Berkes, F., J. Colding and C. Folke, Eds. (2003). *Navigating social-ecological systems: building resilience for complexity and change*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Berkes, F. and C. Folke, Eds. (1998). *Linking social and ecological systems: management and practices and social mechanisms*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Bonanno, G. 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.
- Bouchard, G. (2013). Neoliberalism in Québec. The response of a small nation under pressure. *Social Resilience in the Neoliberal Era*. P. A. Hall and M. Lamont. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 267-292.
- Bourbeau, P. (2011). *The Securitization of Migration. A study of movement and order*. London, Routledge.
- Bourbeau, P. (2013a). 'Politisation et sécuritisation des migrations internationales: Une relation à définir.' *Critique internationale* 61(4): 125-146.
- Bourbeau, P. (2013b). 'Resiliencism: Premises and promises in securitization research.' *Resilience: International Policies, Practices and Discourses* 1(1): 3-17.
- Bourbeau, P. (2014a). 'Moving Forward Together: Logics of the securitization process.' *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 43(1): 187-206.
- Bourbeau, P. (2014b). Resiliencism and Security Studies: Initiating a dialogue. *Contesting Security: Strategies and logics*. T. Balzacq. London, Routledge: 173-188.
- Bourbeau, P. (forthcoming). 'Resilience and International Politics: Premises, debates and agenda.' *International Studies Review*.
- Bruneau, M., S. E. Chang, R. T. Eguchi, G. C. Lee, T. D. O'Rourke, A. M. Reinhorn, M. Shinozuka, K. T. Tierney, W. A. Wallace and D. von Winterfeldt (2003). 'A Framework to Quantitatively Assess and Enhance the Seismic Resilience of Communities.' *Earthquake Spectra* 19(4): 733-752.
- Capoccia, G. and D. Keleman (2007). 'The study of critical junctures: Theory, narrative and counterfactuals in historical institutionalism.' *World Politics* 59(3): 341-369.
- Carpenter, S. R., B. Walker, J. M. Anderies and N. Abel (2001). 'From metaphor to measurement: resilience of what to what?' *Ecosystems* 4: 765-781.
- Chandler, D. (2012). 'Resilience and human security: The post-interventionist paradigm.' *Security Dialogue* 43(3): 213-229.
- Chandler, D. (2014). 'Resilience and the 'everyday': beyond the paradox of 'liberal peace'.' *Review of International Studies* FirstView On-line.
- Coaffee, J. and D. Murakami Wood (2006). 'Security is Coming Home: Rethinking Scale and Constructing Resilience in the Global Urban Response to Terrorist Risk.' *International Relations* 20(4): 503-517.
- Collier, R. B. and D. Collier (1991). *Shaping the Political Arena: Critical Junctures, the Labor Movement, and Regime Dynamics in Latin America*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Cutter, S. L. (2008). 'A Place-Based Model for Understanding Community Resilience to Natural Disasters.' *Global Environmental Change* 18: 598-606.
- Dietz, T., E. Ostrom and P. C. Stern (2003). 'The Struggle to Govern the Commons.' *Science* 302(5652): 1907-1912.
- Donnon, T. and W. Hammond (2007). 'Understanding the relationships between resiliency and bullying in adolescence.' *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America* 16: 449-472.
- Dovers, S. R. and J. W. Handmer (1992). 'Uncertainty, sustainability and change.' *Global Environmental Change* 2(4): 262-276.

- Duit, A., V. Galaza, K. Eckerberga and J. Ebbesson (2010). 'Governance, Complexity, and Resilience.' *Global Environmental Change* 20: 363-368.
- Duvall, R. D. and A. Chowdhury (2011). Practices of theory. *International Practices*. E. Adler and V. Pouliot. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 335-354.
- Evans, B. and J. Reid (2013). 'Dangerously exposed: the life and death of the resilient subject.' *Resilience: International Policies, Practices and Discourses* 1(2): 1-16.
- Fattah, K. and K. M. Fierke (2009). 'A Clash of Emotions: The Politics of Humiliation and Political Violence in the Middle East.' *European Journal of International Relations* 15(1): 67-93.
- Fioretos, O. (2011). 'Historical Institutionalism in International Relations.' *International Organization* 65(2): 367-399.
- Folke, C. (2006). 'Resilience: the emergence of a perspective for social-ecological systems analyses.' *Global Environmental Change* 16: 253-267.
- Garnezy, N. (1974). The study of competence in children at risk for severe psychopathology. *The child in his family: Children at psychiatric risk: III*. E. J. Anthony and C. Koupernik. New York, Wiley.
- Gilgun, J. F. (2005). 'Evidence-based practice, descriptive research and the resilience-schema-gender-brain functioning assessment.' *British Journal of Social Work* 35(6): 843-862.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. New York, Simon & Schuster.
- Gunderson, L. H. (2000). 'Ecological Resilience - in theory and application.' *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 31: 425-439.
- Hall, P. A. (2010). Historical Institutionalism in Rationalist and Sociological Perspective. *Explaining Institutional Change. Ambiguity, Agency and Power*. J. Mahoney and K. Thelen. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 204-224.
- Hall, P. A. and M. Lamont (2013). *Social Resilience in the Neoliberal Era*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, P. A. and R. C. R. Taylor (1996). 'Political Science and the Three 'New Institutionalisms.' *Political Studies* 44(5): 936-957.
- Handmer, J. W. and S. R. Dovers (1996). 'A Typology of Resilience: Rethinking Institutions for Sustainable Development.' *Industrial & Environmental Crisis Quarterly* 9(4): 482-511.
- Hauser, S. (1999). 'Understanding resilient outcomes: Adolescent lives across time and generations.' *Journal of Research on Adolescence* 9(1): 1-24.
- Holling, C. S. (1973). 'Resilience and stability of ecological systems.' *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 4: 1-23.
- Holling, C. S. (1996). Engineering resilience versus ecological resilience. *Engineering within ecological constraints*. P. Schulze. Washington DC, National Academy Press: 31-44.
- Hopf, T. (2010). 'The Logic of Habit in International Relations.' *European Journal of International Relations* 16(4): 539-561.
- Hopf, T. (2013). 'Common-sense Constructivism and Hegemony in World Politics.' *International Organization* 67(2): 317-354.
- Hudson, V. M. (2005). 'Foreign Policy Analysis: Actor-Specific Theory and the Ground of International Relations.' *Foreign Policy Analysis* 1(1): 1-30.
- Hymans, J. E. (2006). *The Psychology of Nuclear Proliferation: Identity, Emotions, and Foreign Policy*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Jenson, J. and R. Levi (2013). Narratives and Regimes of Social and Human Rights: The Jackpines of the Neoliberal Era. *Social Resilience in the Neoliberal Era*. P. A. Hall and M. Lamont. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Joseph, J. (2013). 'Resilience as embedded neoliberalism: A governmentality approach.' *Resilience: International Policies, Practices and Discourses* 1(1): 38-52.
- Katznelson, I. (2003). Periodization and Preferences. *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. J. Mahoney and D. Rueschemeyer. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 270-303.
- Klein, R., J.T., R. J. Nicholls and F. Thomalla (2003). 'Resilience to natural hazards: How useful is this concept?' *Environmental Hazards* 5: 35-45.

- Krebs, R. R. and A. Rapport (2012). 'International Relations and the Psychology of Time Horizons.' *International Studies Quarterly* 56(3): 530-543.
- Leach, M., I. Scoones and A. Stirling (2010). 'Governing epidemics in an age of complexity: Narratives, politics and pathways to sustainability.' *Global Environmental Change* 20: 369-377.
- Levy, J. S. (1997). 'Prospect Theory, Rational Choice, and International Relations.' *International Studies Quarterly* 41(1): 87-112.
- Luthans, F. (2002). 'The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior.' *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 23(6): 695-706.
- Luthar, S. S., D. Cicchetti and B. Becker (2000). 'The Construct of Resilience: A critical evaluation and guidelines for future work.' *Child Development* 71(3): 573-562.
- Mahoney, J. (2001). *The Legacies of Liberalism: Path Dependence and Political Regimes in Central America*. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Mahoney, J. and K. Thelen, Eds. (2010a). *Explaining Institutional Change: Ambiguity, Agency, and Power*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Mahoney, J. and K. Thelen (2010b). A Theory of Gradual Institutional Change. *Explaining Institutional Change: Ambiguity, Agency, and Power*. J. Mahoney and K. Thelen. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Masten, A. S. and J. L. Powell (2003). A resilience framework for research, policy and practice. *Resilience and Vulnerability: Adaptation in the context of childhood adversities*. S. S. Luthar. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 1-27.
- McDermott, R. (2004). 'Prospect Theory in Political Science: Gains and Losses from the First Decade.' *Political Psychology* 25(2): 289-312.
- McDermott, R., N. Wernimont and C. Koopman (2011). 'Applying Psychology to International Studies: Challenges and Opportunities in Examining Traumatic Stress.' *International Studies Perspectives* 12(2): 119-135.
- Mercer, J. (2005). 'Prospect Theory and Political Science.' *Annual Review of Political Science* 8(1): 1-21.
- Mercer, J. (2013). 'Emotion and Strategy in the Korean War.' *International Organization* 67(2): 221-252.
- Mintz, A. (2004). 'How Do Leaders Make Decisions? A poliheuristic perspective.' *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48(1): 3-13.
- Ned Lebow, R. (2008). *A Cultural Theory of International Relations*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Neumann, I. B. (2002). 'Returning Practices to the Linguistic Turn: The case of diplomacy.' *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 31(3): 627-651.
- Norris, F. H., S. P. Stevens, B. Pfefferbaum, K. F. Wyche and R. L. Pfefferbaum (2008). 'Community Resilience as a Metaphor, Theory, Set of Capacities, and Strategy for Disaster Readiness.' *American Journal of Community Psychology* 41: 127-150.
- Ollier-Malaterre, A. (2010). 'Contributions of Work-Life and Resilience Initiatives to the Individual/Organization Relationship.' *Human Relations* 63(1): 41-62.
- Pelling, M. (2010). *Adaptation to Climate Change: From Resilience to Transformation*. London, Routledge.
- Pelling, M. and D. Manuel-Navarrete (2011). 'From Resilience to Transformation: the Adaptive Cycle in Two Mexican Urban Centers.' *Ecology and Society* 16(2).
- Pierson, P. and T. Skocpol (2002). Historical Institutionalism in Contemporary Political Science. *Political Science: The state of the discipline*. I. Katznelson and H. V. Miller. New York, Norton.
- Pouliot, V. (2008). 'The Logic of Practicality: A Theory of Practice of Security Communities.' *International Organization* 62(2): 257-288.
- Rathbun, B. C. (2011). 'Before Hegemony: Generalized Trust and the Creation and Design of International Security Organizations.' *International Organization* 65(2): 243-273.
- Renaud, F. G., J. Birkman, M. Damm and G. C. Gallopin (2010). 'Understanding multiple thresholds of coupled social-ecological systems exposed to natural hazards as external shocks.' *Natural Hazards* 55(3): 749-763.

- Ronel, N. and E. Elisha (2011). 'A Different Perspective: Introducing Positive Criminology.' *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 55(2): 305-325.
- Rumgay, J. (2004). 'Scripts for safer survival: Pathways out of female crime.' *Howard Journal* 43: 405-419.
- Rutter, M. (1987). 'Psychosocial resilience and protective mechanisms.' *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 57(3):316-331).
- Schoon, I. (2006). *Risk and Resilience: Adaptations in changing times*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Secombe, K. (2002). 'Beating the odds" versus "Changing the odds": Poverty, resilience, and family policy.' *Journal of Marriage and Family* 64(2): 384-394.
- Seery, M. D., A. E. Holman and R. C. Silver (2010). 'Whatever Does Not Kill Us: Cumulative Lifetime Adversity, Vulnerability, and Resilience.' *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 99(6): 1025-1041.
- Seligman, M. and M. Csikszentmihalyi (2000). 'Positive Psychology: An Introduction.' *American Psychologist* 55(1): 5-14.
- Soifer, H. D. (2012). 'The Causal Logic of Critical Junctures.' *Comparative Political Studies* 45(12): 1572-1597.
- Thelen, K. A. (2003). How institutions evolve. *Comparative Historical Analysis in social science*. J. Mahoney and D. Rueschemeyer. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Ungar, M. (2004). 'A Constructionist Discourse on Resilience.' *Youth & Society* 35(3): 341-365.
- Ungar, M. (2011). 'The Social Ecology of Resilience: Addressing Contextual and Cultural Ambiguity of a Nascent Construct.' *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 81(1): 1-17.
- Walker, B. H., J. M. Anderies, A. P. Kinzig and P. Ryan (2006). 'Exploring resilience in social-ecological systems through comparative studies and theory development: introduction to the special issue.' *Ecology and Society* 11(1).
- Walker, B. H. and J. A. Meyers (2004). 'Thresholds in ecological and socio-ecological systems: a developing database.' *Ecology and Society* 9(2).
- Young, O. R. (2010). 'Institutional dynamics: Resilience, vulnerability and adaptation in environmental and resource regimes.' *Global Environmental Change* 20 (2010) 378–385 20: 378-385.
- Zarakol, A. (2011). *After Defeat: How the East Learned to Live with the West*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Zhou, H., J. Wang, J. Wan and H. Jia (2010). 'Resilience to natural hazards: a geographic perspective.' *Natural Hazards* 53(1): 21-41.