Is real resilience attainable?

The concept of resilience — the ability to withstand or recover from adverse conditions — has come of age in the wake of the terrorist attacks on 11 September 2001. Politicians, emergency planners and others talk of the need to “build”, “engender”, “improve” or “enhance” resilience in society. Bill Durodie examines what is being proposed and the extent to which real resilience is achievable in today’s conditions.

According to the UK Cabinet Office Draft Civil Contingencies Bill, resilience is the ability to handle disruptive challenges, characterised as emergencies, that can lead to or result in crisis. In particular: “The aim of building resilience is to reduce susceptibility to challenges by reducing the probability of their occurrence and their likely effects, responding effectively and efficiently when they occur and building institutions and structures in a way as to minimise the possible effects of disruptions upon them.”

The bill suggests that the level of resilience in the UK is already high due to the experience of Irish terrorism, which established a capability within government, and an awareness among businesses and the public. This strong position is also held to be due to a long-standing tradition of effective planning and response at the local level. This is being supplemented, at an organisational level, by Regional Resilience Teams located in government offices throughout the country, and Regional Resilience Forums to bring together the key players.

The draft bill indicates the UK government’s approach to the resilience agenda which, in summary, consists of:

- improved horizon scanning;
- increased investment;
- an enhanced counter-terrorism framework;
- improved business continuity arrangements; and
- new civil contingencies legislation.

Unfortunately, by framing the discussion in the fashionable language of ‘risk’, an element of passivity has been built in from the outset. As sociologist Frank Furedi has indicated elsewhere, the concept of risk nowadays is increasingly connoted in an external and reactive sense, whereby people are designated as being ‘at risk’ from certain hazards or influences. Thus “risk becomes an entity in its own right, only minimally subject to human intervention.”

And, even though the document indicates that, in some circumstances, “it is possible to prevent disruptive challenges occurring by taking action at an early stage”, the language used makes it clear that this is merely a case of anticipating what are considered to be inevitable challenges. Thus: “This cycle — anticipation, prevention, preparation, response, recovery — is at the heart of resilience.”

The notion that it may be possible to shape conditions or set the agenda, with a view to obtaining desirable outcomes independently of external forces, is not considered.

The Cabinet Office is not alone in this mode of thinking. Many leading officials have referred to the fact that, in their minds, it is “not a matter of if, but when” a future terrorist attack will occur. Similarly, the head of the UK security service recently advised an audience in London that it was “only a matter of time”, before a crude chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear weapon was launched on a Western city.

Such rhetoric presumes to be challenging an assumed complacency towards the issue of terrorism. It is perceived of (and presented as) resolute and robust. But it reveals an almost resigned air of fatalism towards future events — a sense that risks are simply coming to us. It also runs counter to the spirit of the speech made by Tony Blair on 11 November 2002 at the
Lord Mayor’s Banquet in London, in which he coun-
tenanced against actions “on the basis of a general
warning”, which could lead the UK to “doing [the
terrorists’] job for them”.4

In February 2003, the US Department of State issued
the Bush administration’s National Strategy for
Combating Terrorism.5 This noted that the best form
of defence is offence. But the very terms used in its
comprehensive four-‘D’ strategy — “defeat”, “deny”,
diminish” and “defend” — reveal a remarkable
defensiveness. At best, what is being put forward is a
series of reactions to the assumed actions of others
in the war on terror.

Beyond passing references to “freedom” and “democ-
racv”, the National Strategy provides no sense of what
the US stands for as a society, or how it hopes to
promote this to the rest of the world. Rather, it is a
reiteration of what the US is opposed to. It is precise-
ly this responsive mode that undermines the real
meaning of resilience, which is not just to anticipate
and respond, but to orientate and build.

The idea that it may be possible to put forward a
positive vision for society is rarely entertained. Yet
surely it is by establishing one’s aims and values, and
then pursuing these, that one stands the most chance
of winning the battle for hearts and minds, both on
the domestic front and further afield. It may accord-
ingly be possible to convince those who are disaffect-
ated not to do the same again.

Technical fixations
Within the discussions that emerged after 11
September 2001, in addition to a reactive mode and
the assumed urgency those events demanded, there
was a proclivity (which still remains) to put forward
technical solutions to the issue of resilience. The
usual list consists of:

- better surveillance and intelligence;
- effective models for predicting behaviour;
- new detection equipment and protective clothing;
- alternative modes to impart appropriate informa-
tion; and
- new structures of government and integrated
response systems.

These solutions still suffer from being responsive in
outlook, focusing on means rather than ends. It
appears as if the whole point of being alive has been
narrowed down to merely staying alive. All we need
do is keep safe and remain alert. Yet surely those
who risk their lives fighting fires, or dealing with
other emergencies, aspire to more for ensuing gener-
ations, including their own children, than simply that
they should be able to do the same again?

The technologies we introduce to handle our fears
are inevitably shaped by our vision of the future. If
this is a narrow, apocalyptic one, rather than an
ambitious, future-oriented one, then we are likely to
constrain ourselves with it. Ironically, this may
impact adversely on our ability to handle crises.
Indeed, our obsession with improbable dangers may
distract us from more mundane yet plausible risks,
and lead us to divert social resources accordingly.

Some academics and social commentators have sug-
gested that we now live more isolated lives in an
increasingly disaggregated society compared to previ-
ous generations. Indeed, the more networked we seem
have become, with all the new gadgets at our dispos-
al in a narrow, technically fixed way, the more we
seem to have fragmented at the human or social level.
As the eminent Cambridge philosopher Onora O’Neill
recently remarked; “There is no shortage of informa-
tion today, but how much of it is two-way?”6

Many proposed technological solutions seem to
make the problem worse rather than better. This is
because encouraging us to be suspicious of others
accentuates the trend towards social atomisation,
effectively pushing us further apart. Real resilience
requires bringing people together by engaging them
with a common purpose, thereby enhancing their
sense of confidence and spirit of camaraderie.

Resilience may be a function of technique and compe-
tence, but ultimately real resilience is about attitude or
will. Engendering such an attitude requires a cultural
focus that has rarely been discussed since the events of
two years ago. It is a qualitative shift that cannot be
quantified in financial terms. Indeed, if we are not
careful, the vast sums being poured into the resilience
agenda may simply feed a new bureaucracy, as well as
making us more isolated and insecure.

Real resilience
Real resilience has four key components: knowing,
judging, engaging and acting. However, these are
not as unproblematic as they might appear within
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the context of contemporary society.

The pursuit of knowledge has, in certain circles, become assumed to be both impossible and a distraction from more immediate, vocational or practical orientations. Social scientists suggest that there is no single ‘truth’ but rather many ‘truths’. At best, one can aspire to know oneself, although this too has been problematised. To know where one is and seeks to be going, let alone aspire to do so for the whole of society, is often seen as positively dangerous.

As a result, we live in remarkably non-judgmental times. Indeed, not to judge the circumstances, actions and motivations of others is held to be a positive virtue. Yet the creeping inability to discern, and be able to say that one thing is better than another, may ultimately disarm us in our search for real resilience. It is also a remarkable form of self-denial and self-deception. We live by judging what we do against the alternatives on offer. Judgment remains the basis for acting as moral, conscious beings. It allows us to push ourselves and others to improve — succeeding in our aims by transcending or overcoming circumstances and limitations.

Engagement in the contemporary world is noticeable by its absence or its very limited scope. Participation rates in all manner of formal social institutions appear to be in terminal decline, while at the informal level one can no longer assume a common bond with others.

Critics of the UK government’s approach to civil protection have been quick to remark the extent to which the public appear to be taken as passive beneficiaries of enlightened and benevolent state protection. Yet, the solution offered — to engage more representatives of differing ‘stakeholder’ groups — falls far short of the active engagement of the population that the Second World War witnessed.

Finally, the will to act is not as strong as one might hope. Indeed, action is increasingly seen in a negative light today. It is held to lead to unforeseen or unintended consequences. Thus even when societies do act, as they did in the recent conflict in Iraq, this is usually based upon a narrow risk calculus that seeks to weigh up the unforeseen consequences of not acting against the unintended consequences of being too decisive.

This mode of thinking has been formalised through the advent of the so-called ‘precautionary principle’ that, despite its origins among the liberal-left in relation to science, has been adopted by those of a more hawkish persuasion in government and the military. These now speak of the need for pre-emptive action to deal with the dangers of ‘unknown unknowns’ with all the alacrity of the environmental movement.

However, without restoring the centrality of knowing, judging, engaging and acting, real resilience will remain a distant dream. This is not an abstract, philosophical imperative — it is the role and responsi-
sibility of all who claim to lead. Clarifying and winning the argument for a common social project and setting about achieving it would necessarily build real resilience, which comes from engaged action and outward orientation rather than reaction and retrenchment.

For all the above reasons, we stand a long way from achieving or establishing real resilience in society. Indeed, such an attitude and outlook cannot be established, only nurtured. It requires a significant degree of freedom and engagement on the part of the wider population, and an identification with and support for the values promoted by their leaders.
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