

DOI 10.51558/2490-3647.2021.6.2.165

UDK 316.4.05:578.843
35.1:17

Priljeno: 10. 06. 2021.

Izvorni naučni rad

Original scientific paper

Olivera Pavićević, Ivana Stepanović, Ljeposava Ilijić

RESILIENCE IN THE TIMES OF COVID-19: RETHINKING THE NEOLIBERAL PARADIGM AND CREATING NEW STRATEGIES FOR BATTLING THE GLOBAL CHANGE

The paper is an attempt to redefine the concept of resilience in the context of changes taking place globally. One of the key changes was caused by the Covid-19 pandemic. It has shown the inadequacy of the neoliberal discourse of resilience that shifts responsibility to individuals who must be prepared to overcome the circumstances of crisis or shock. However, resilience can be seen in terms of solidarity, dignity and responsibility towards others. Resilience also implies strategies that involve large investments in public health, ecology and self-sustainable solutions to battle climate change that is causing infectious diseases. The purpose of this paper is to raise awareness of the need to start creating a set of public policies that would imply an ethical evaluation related to the success or failure of treating others responsibly.

Keywords: resilience; COVID-19; neoliberalism; environment; ethic responsibility

1. INTRODUCTION

Over the past decades, the notion of resilience permeates various fields of science, theoretical concepts, political and organisational doctrines, security projects and many spheres of everyday life. The widely accepted and widespread use of resilience has attracted the critical attention of the scientific community, primarily in the sphere of policy and particularly in the field of social sciences. From that point of view, the pop-

ularisation of resilience is perceived as an integral part of the neoliberal governance, which, through the discourses of risk and capability of both individual and collective actors, creates an ideological set of qualities of resilience which represents a generator of chances, self-improvement and creative recoveries from the inevitable stresses.

In the context of the Covid-19 pandemic, the concept of resilience is seen as a strategy to restore „social justice, and principles that bring people together” and focus on public funding which deeply undermines the logic of neoliberalism that relies „on the narrow market efficiency” (Akar 2020: 516). The concept of resilience seems like an adequate response to a globally widespread state of catastrophe such as Covid-19 pandemic and possible future pandemics. It is evident that SARS-CoV-2 effectively stems from larger global problems such as climate change, technology development, urbanisation and human impact on ecosystems (Brooks 2020; Horton 2020; Mackenzie 2020). However, it also stems from the pure ideology of neoliberalism which tends to subsume all human activities under one single purpose which is production of capital. And it does so regardless of the consequence it has on public health and transformations of natural ecosystems that are brutally exploited.

The Covid-19 pandemic has shown that neoliberalism has left the world unprepared for catastrophes such as climate change and new deadly viruses because they require international cooperation, strong governmental control, substantial investments into public goods and solidarity among individuals (Horton 2020; Mackenzie 2020). Moreover, „confluence of two interconnected global dynamics – neoliberalism and the climate emergency – the destructive nature of which forces the world to rethink the organisation of societies and our relationship with other human being and the planet” (Nunes 2020). The ideals of neoliberal resilience epitomised in the independent individual and free market economy proved to be obsolete and inadequate in the times of natural disasters. Even the concept of physical distance which is a necessary epidemiological measure to prevent the spread of a deadly virus such as Covid-19 is contradicting the basic principles of neoliberalism because it implies close collaboration and empathy between individuals who are *de facto* closer and more interdependent during the crisis such as a global pandemic.

Methodology is based on theoretical analysis which comprises literature review to map the key thinkers and the most important ideas related to the notion of resilience and analytical philosophical research which aimed to examine and (de)construct the concept of resilience as an ideological construct and explore the possibilities to transport it outside of the given neoliberal discourse and relate it to the current Covid-19 crisis as well as climate change that is inherently connected to the pandemic.

2. RESILIENCE BEYOND NEOLIBERALISM

“The concept of resilience arose not as a direct product of neoliberal doctrines but as an element of the critique of neoliberalism which sustainable development itself pertained to be at its origin. This should not surprise us. Neoliberalism is not a homogeneous doctrine, nor are its particular forms of dogmatism homeostatic” (Reid 2013: 108). Adaptive capacity and hybrid nature of neoliberalism are limiting the engagement in everyday practices through constant movement, mutations and adjustments to local settings while connecting heterogeneous elements into inconsistent batches of limited duration is challenging to analyse (Pavićević, Bulatović & Ilijić 2019: 18). The neoliberal regulation of the self as a breakthrough of neoliberal governance is continuously redistributing advantages and drawbacks while shifting discursive structures and promoting certain normative frameworks that are defining ways in which people should live their lives and determining what they are capable of (Hall & Lamont 2013). In this sense, resilient subjects could be subjects that permanently struggle to accommodate themselves to the world (Reid 2012: 75), and hence they cannot change and transform the outside world or can only do so to a limited extent. In order to survive and possibly thrive in the face of uncertainty, perturbations, and shocks, the resilient subject must abandon the liberal modernist hubris „of seeking to shape the external environment through conscious, autonomous and goal-oriented decision-making”, and embrace a resilience-oriented form of agency as constant work „on inner life through learning from exposure to the contingencies of ontological complexity” (Schmidt 2015: 404).

Abandoning the idea that the state and its mechanisms of governance are capable of coping with the unpredictable circumstances has brought about the logic of resilience which shifts responsibility to the socially networked and self-efficient individuals (Pavićević, Bulatović & Ilijić 2019: 14). Understanding sociability as a network changes the quality of social interactions and relations with the surrounding environment. It represents a shift from individual autonomy towards interconnectedness (Chandler 2014a) and towards building human capacities through strategies of resilience. The focus is on creating resilient individuals and communities rather than institutions. Promoting new networks and alliances makes resilience a part of the new set of practices that should fill in the gaps in the rationality of the market by introducing a social element (Joseph 2016). This follows an idea that „the current imaginary of resilience does not operate in continuation of a paramount neoliberal paradigm, but can be understood as a response to its inherent frustrations” (Schmidt

2015: 404). Consequently, the „frustrations” of the liberal and neoliberal paradigms performed by the post-neoliberal discourse of resilience may open up the possibility for new forms of self-reflexive governance in which individuals are not mere targets of top-down or bottom-up frameworks of government, but empowered selves constantly involved in learning processes (Mavelli 2019). However, as a response to the dilemma on whether the postliberal resilience really is an alternative, Mavelli warns that the concept of resilience fails to recognize the manufactured complexity as a product of regimes of power and knowledge¹.

Resilience discourses recognise the complexity of the world as a creative and untameable source of the „power of life” which escapes appropriation by liberal and neoliberal power (Chandler 2014b). According to Mavelli, promotion of resilience encompasses the bare essence of the neoliberal overcoming of its own weaknesses. Moreover, the post-neoliberal resilience rests on an ultimately reductive understanding of the state as the enforcing power of liberal/modernist top-down rationalities of government (Mavelli 2019).

The reduction of equality to meritocracy was especially noteworthy. The progressive-neoliberal program for a just status order did not aim to abolish social hierarchy but to “diversify” it by “empowering” “talented” women, people of colour, and sexual minorities to rise to the top. And that ideal was inherently class-specific, ensuring that “deserving” individuals from “underrepresented groups” could attain positions on equal grounds with the straight white men of their own class. The feminist variant focused on “leaning in” and “cracking the glass ceiling”, while its principal beneficiaries could only be those already in possession of the requisite social, cultural, and economic capital. Everyone else would be stuck in the basement (Fraser 2017).

3. DIGNITY AND RESILIENCE

If the „pervading fatalism” (Joseph 2016: 381) lies in the heart of the concept of resilience as a macro discourse of the (post)liberal governance, the question is whether this concept can be defended from the perspective of the micro or mezzo level or whether individual and local levels are just imaginary „vital resources” (Chandler 2014b: 38) that (un)consciously work in favour of the neoliberal paradigm. The use

¹ In post-Marxist vein for Laclau power is manifest in the sedimentation of social relations through techniques of governance and political management, and through the elaboration of ideologies which function to conceal the contingency of social relations and naturalise relations of domination (Webb 2018).

of the concept of resilience on micro levels also implies hegemonic discourse around resilience as it is either instrumental because it enhances performance, or it is understood as an individual responsibility to ensure wellbeing (Bal 2020). Because the neoliberal concept of resilience implies the potential to generate economic output, it is imposed as a necessary strategy. People who are not resilient have no utility, and therefore organisations are discouraged from investing or even employing individuals who are not resilient (Cabanas & Illouz 2019). However, this concept of resilience disregards the differential possibilities of people and underlines the division between winners and losers (Bal, Kordowitz & Brookes 2020).

In search of a possibility to anchor resilience outside the instrumental and individualistic neoliberal ideological pattern, some authors suggest taking the dignity-perspective (Lucas 2015; Kostera & Pirson 2017) and making it available for wider use in academic research and practice (Bal, Kordowitz & Brookes 2020). The theoretical concept of human development and capabilities approach (Sen 2009; Nussbaum 2000) begins with the concept of dignity as a truly „human functioning” (Nussbaum 2003:40) which retains the idea of resilience and explores how it can be used in alternative ways. The concept of „dignity” (Bal 2017; Kostera & Pirson 2017) offers an alternative framework to conceptualize resilience with a fundamentally different meaning that breaks away from the neoliberal construct and uses collective welfare as an anchoring point (Bal, Kordowitz & Brookes 2020).

Resilience is a highly complex human phenomenon, but it becomes simplified and deprived of its core meaning due to the superficial discourse and its instrumental purpose (Bal, Kordowitz & Brookes 2020). It implies that contemporary humans need to be ‘entrepreneurs of the self’ (Bauman 2000; Žižek 2014) and individualized atoms of self-interest. These principles are incorporated within governing institutions, social relations, academic disciplines or workplaces and they encourage individuals to build themselves through their practices, understanding, and manner of speaking according to the rules and out of necessity (Hamann 2009: 50).

Resilience can also be seen as an important factor for developing „human maturity” (Bauman 1993) and can be defined through notions of dignity, solidarity and autonomy. It does not have to be merely an instrument for organisational performance, but can also have important intrinsic attributes (Stewart 2011). The concept of responsibility corresponds with the idea of moral dignity and the concept of resilience. From this perspective, resilience is the empowerment of the social actors who are capable to act independently from social structures (Abercrombie et al., 1984) with moral responsibility and the „nature of freedom” (Pavićević 2016).

The postmodern conditions are opening up the chance for „true morality” which is not subordinated to the universal principles and ethical codes but is founded on „possibilities for individual responsibility which is translated (in the domain of practice, not even in theory) into lack of respect of the socially adopted ethically legal rules” (Bauman 1993: 29). Modernism has been built on the mistrust towards human spontaneity, incentives, impulses and inclinations which were supposed to be replaced by the universal „staring into a non-emotional calculated reason” (Bauman 1993). However, according to Bauman, true human moral acting is based on ambiguity and responsibility. Bauman believes that moral acting incorporates the possibility for individuals to say „no” (Dawson 2012). This shift from the „modern ethics” towards „postmodern morality” does not represent nihilism or radical, but rather points towards the possibility of humanist maturity (Morgan 2013).

The discourses of complexity and social relativity have disassembled power relations into intricate processes of indirect interpersonal connectedness and equal sharing of responsibility between actors differently positioned in the social hierarchy. This shift towards collective responsibility leads to the ethics of resilience which sees problems as societal and therefore ontological rather than political, economic or moral (Chandler 2013).

The individual is no longer seen as an isolated actor but rather as a socially, environmentally and materially embedded subject (Chandler 2013). Therefore, resilience ethics suggest that the market and its outcomes are a shared responsibility. Even attempts to exclude ourselves from the market make no ethical sense as our power to influence the world through our own ethical reflexivity depends on it. Resilience ethics therefore reverses the power relations and implies that governments may even need to „interfere” in our own private choices of consumption to enable us to recognise our responsibilities.

The dignity of human life as a basic idea is an attempt to justify a list of capabilities as central requirements for a dignified life. To some extent, all supposed capabilities are part of a minimum account of social justice. A society that does not guarantee capabilities at an appropriate threshold level to all of its citizens fails to be a fully just society regardless of its level of opulence. Capabilities are important for each and every person: each person is treated as an end and nobody is a mere adjunct or means to achieve others’ goals (Nussbaum 2003: 40).

4. RESILIENCE, BIOPOWER AND THE PANDEMIC

Re-conceptualising resilience as a potential for empowerment of dignity should include the analysis of new power relations. Foucault's analysis shows that power is ubiquitous and conceived as structuring a field of possible actions. Governability is the mechanism by which human beings are predisposed towards a certain activity and towards a certain praxis that makes it the subject of this activity (Webb 2018). Power functions by investing, defining, and caring for the body which is understood as a bioeconomic entity. The operation of biopower is defining the freedom and truth of the individual in economic and biological terms. The formation of the disciplines marks the moment where it was absorbed within biopolitics. This „critical attitude” that Foucault repeatedly refers to in all of his discussions on Kant from the 1970s and 1980s is inseparable from both his analysis of governmentality and his discussions of ethics and the history of experience of the relationship between the subject and truth. Foucault has been fascinated with „care of the self” he discovered in Greek and Roman ethics which was the „spiritual” relationship that existed between the subject and truth (Hamann 2009: 56). To gain access to the truth, that is, in order to acquire the „right” to the truth, individuals had to take care of themselves by engaging in certain self-transformative practices or ascetic exercises (Ibid.). Here we find critical and resistant forms of subjectivation where individuals engaged in practices of freedom that allowed them to engage in ethical „parrhesia” or speak truth to power rather than objectifying themselves within a given discourse of power/knowledge. In modernity, however, following what Foucault identified as „the Cartesian moment”, the principle of „taking care of yourself” has been replaced by the imperative to „know yourself” (THS, 1–24 according to Hamann 2009: 56). In contemporary life, the individual is granted access to the truth which is knowledge and knowledge alone, including knowledge of one's self. In this context, knowledge of the self is not something produced through the work individuals perform on themselves, but it is rather something given through disciplines such as biology, medicine, and the social sciences. These modern forms of knowledge, of course, become crucial to the emerging biopolitical forms of governmentality. Whereas individuals were once urged to take care of themselves by using self-reflexive ethical techniques to give form to their freedom, modern biopolitics ensures that individuals are already taken care of in terms of biological and economic forms of knowledge and practices (Hamann 2009). Power, in its governmental form, according to Foucault, presupposes the freedom of a subject who acts or has the capacity to act and not to act (Webb 2018). On the other hand,

Foucault's analysis of panopticism describes how the disciplined biopolitical subject is made to internalize particular forms of responsibility for him or herself through practices of subjectivation. One of the tasks required for producing genealogies of neoliberalism and Homo economicus is to identify the specific forms of knowledge that are both individual and institutional as well as informative and produced by neoliberal practices (Hamann 2009: 53). The new values promulgated in this contemporary form of panopticism are exclusively entrepreneurial ones.

Foucault's concepts of panopticism and disciplinary power are relevant today, especially when we are trying to make sense of the key ideological shifts caused by the Covid-19 pandemic. In his book „Discipline and Punish: the Birth of Prison”, he introduces the notion of panopticism by painting the picture of a 17th century plague and practices of surveillance and control at the time. He writes that the „enclosed, segmented space, observed at every point, in which the individuals are inserted in a fixed place in which the slightest movements are supervised, in which all events are recorded, in which an uninterrupted work of writing links the centre and periphery, in which power is exercised without division, according to a continuous hierarchical figure, in which each individual is constantly located, examined and distributed among the living beings, the sick and the dead – all this constitutes a compact model of the disciplinary mechanism” (Foucault 2020: 192).

In the times of Covid-19, the concept of panopticism is extended to include stricter forms of control and surveillance that no longer stay within the borders of visible and instead go „under the skin” (Harari 2020). Measuring bodily temperature, using PCR and IGG tests, practicing contact tracing strategies and issuing digital vaccine certificates shows how governments utilise technology to introduce new, more intrusive systems of monitoring and controlling large populations. Some argue that one of the possible consequences of this pandemic could even be „death of neoliberal capitalism that will lead to higher state intervention” (Singh 2020: 635). One of the paradoxes is the fact that governments who have been advocating for tremendous cuts in public spending including public healthcare can suddenly summon up trillions to mitigate consequences of the pandemic, which violates „all the conventional market rules” (Žižek 2020: 93).

The concept of neoliberalism not only fails to grasp the problem of the Covid-19 pandemic, but also starts to collapse under pressure of the increasingly worsening consequences of climate change, emergence of new infectious diseases and demands for better public health. Moreover, the ideal of empowered individuals who should be able to take care of themselves has been completely overrun due to the pandemic

as we are witnessing calls for close cooperation in terms of physical distancing and other measures that will protect people from each other. Consequently, resilience is often being perceived as a collective rather than individual activity.

5. RESILIENCE IN THE TIMES OF COVID-19: A SHIFT TOWARDS STRATEGIES FOR FIGHTING CLIMATE CHANGE

„Scientists have been warning for at least a generation about the potential impact of EID (emerging infectious diseases) in a world experiencing climate change” (Brooks, Hoberg & Boeger 2019: 4), and yet countries across the globe were „not prepared” for a pandemic such as Covid-19 (Horton 2020: 25). This shows that neoliberal systems are not capable of coping with major health crises and that they are fragile and vulnerable during global emergencies (Sheehan & Fox 2020: 264).

After the outbreak of SARS in 2002, H1N1 in 2009, MERS in 2012, Ebola in 2013 and Zika virus in 2016, „there was ample evidence to signal the urgent need for countries to strengthen their preparedness for new infectious pandemic. But as WHO has described, fewer than half the countries of the world have the public health capacity to prevent or respond to new outbreaks of disease” (Horton 2020: 34). Worryingly, „despite increasing alarm among researchers and global health experts about emerging infectious disease for almost three decades now, the mainstream attitude, especially in rich countries, had been complacency – perhaps because, as always in public health, problems tend to be invisible until it’s too late” (Mackenzie 2020: 41). A lack of resources, hospital capacities, qualified doctors, nurses and other medical staff shows how impactful and damaging neoliberal ideology and its policies were to public health as they failed to recognise the needs and address the problems (Bell & Green 2016: 242). In other words, neoliberalism gets in the way of responding to crucial global transformations and problems that are stemming from the climate change and human impact on nature (Taylor 2020; Devine & Baca 2020).

Major cuts and austerity measures have started with the economic crisis of 2008 (Labonte & Stuckler 2016: 312) when „the health sector was often a particular victim of cuts in social spending” (Horton 2020: 35). With „intensive global trade and travel” it has never been easier to „transport” illnesses across the world instantaneously (Mackenzie 2020: 38), and the Covid-19 pandemic caught the governments unprepared to deal with high pressure on the public health sector. From the attempts to contain the virus, to the strategies used to control the pressure on public health services, minimise the spread of the virus, mitigate the devastating effects on economy,

lower the number of deaths and vaccinate people, Covid-19 has turned out to be a responsibility for governments and their public services rather than a job for the private sector. The pandemic has elevated the governmental control over finances, as well as public and private lives of citizens. Imposing police-enforced curfews, quarantines and all kinds of bans has cut through the private lives of citizens who were no longer able to perceive themselves as self-sustainable individuals, but a part of a collective in which everyone is responsible for everybody else's health.

Despite the warnings coming from WHO and many voices in the scientific community, the UK, USA and many other countries started off with a weak approach, whereas China has imposed a total lockdown of entire cities and provinces and completely turned off the economy (Horton 2020: 54; Mackenzie 2020: 30-31). Countries which opted for less severe measures in the beginning have suffered much worse pressures on their health systems and economies in the long run while China has managed to start recovering after only three months. The libertarian *laissez-faire* approach to the Covid-19 pandemic has created pressure on public health and the economy. Due to the multiple „waves” of the pandemic and the discovery of new mutations, many western countries were forced to keep imposing lockdowns and maintain balance between health and economy, but only countries who imposed draconian measures which involved strong government intervention and breaching of human rights and freedoms tackled the problem successfully. In other words, „deficiencies in decision-making reflect not only the surprising fragility of modern science-based societies but also something far worse – inherent failures in the mechanics of Western democracies that threaten their very existence” (Horton 2020: 40).

Covid-19 has revealed the „astonishing fragility of our societies” and „inability to cooperate” (Horton 2020: 56). On the one hand, it has shown how much our economies are interdependent and that the globalisation has interwoven the processes of production and distribution which are effectively dispersed across the globe. On the other hand, it has proven that a consensus on preventive measures or even common approaches to global problems are a big challenge. This was especially visible in the context of the problem of vaccine distribution when the COVAX plan has failed. Individualism as one of the basic principles of neoliberalism has failed to provide an answer to the question how to approach a global pandemic which requires solidarity and cooperation. The idea of creating a reliable health service is based on the principles of solidarity, collective action and responsibility towards one another (Horton 2020: 63). „One lesson of Covid-19 is that every country must now begin a national conversation about how far it is willing to go – and how much the public is willing

to pay – for a health system that can save lives when a pandemic arrives again” (Horton 2020: 83).

Addressing these global changes require global cooperation and coordinated actions. In addition to the Paris Agreement² which should be the priority and “humanity’s most important public health goal” even though it still is not (Maibach et al. 2021), there are also other neglected initiatives across the world that are calling for immediate action. One of them is Greta Thunberg’s ‘School Strike for Climate’ movement demanding three key changes: 1) no new oil, coal and gas projects, 2) 100% renewable energy generation and exports by 2030 and 3) funding a just transition & job creation for all fossil fuel workers and communities³. The DAMA Protocol is a policy recommendation that provides ‘a foundation for proactive activities to directly address potential and realized infectious diseases’ and calls for ‘documenting’, ‘assessing’, ‘monitoring’ and ‘actions’ that are necessary to battle emerging diseases (Brooks et al 2020). Finally, the ‘Green New Deal’ formulated and backed by DiEM25⁴, Progressive International⁵ and Bernie Sanders⁶ provides a comprehensive solution to entwined economic and ecological problems while calling for the both social change and action for climate that radically opposes all the neoliberal postulates. Nevertheless, there is no firm political will to tackle these issues and start global actions that will battle against climate change, emerging diseases or rising poverty in the world. The current crisis shows the urgent need for new policies and radical changes on the individual, local, national and international level.

6. CONCLUSION

Neoliberalism has failed as the dominant ideology because it has been proven to be insufficient when it comes to the basic needs of the humanity such as health and environment. It has become evident that the neoliberal paradigm which prioritises production of capital under any circumstances and no matter what lead to the ecological and climate catastrophe which caused disruptions in planet’s ecosystem and global pandemics. The Covid-19 pandemic has also made it obvious that neoliberalism as

² United Nations Climate Change <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-paris-agreement> (Accessed: 05. 05. 2021)

³ School Strike for Climate <https://www.schoolstrike4climate.com/about> (Accessed: 05. 05. 2021)

⁴ Diem25 <https://diem25.org/campaign/green-new-deal/> (Accessed: 05. 05. 2021)

⁵ Progressive International <https://progressive.international/movement/campaign/organizing-for-a-green-new-deal-7af9e89d-542f-44b1-816c-d79745459027/en> (Accessed: 05. 05. 2021)

⁶ Bernie Sanders <https://berniesanders.com/issues/green-new-deal/> (Accessed: 05. 05. 2021)

an economic system cannot withstand any major pressures caused by natural disasters. Major lockdowns across the planet have caused economic problems which could be solved only through actions such as bailouts that are fundamentally at odds with neoliberal principles.

The concept of resilience in the times of Covid-19 is focusing on public or collective good as a contrast to the interests of an atomised individual (Akar 2020: 516). This pandemic has shown the need to address the underlying issues that are causing the emergence of new diseases such as climate change which requires a collective action and global cooperation. At the same time, individual contribution to these universal goals can also be seen as a form of resilience and resistance to the dominant neoliberal ideology. Similarly, strategies for battling the spread of the extremely contagious virus are also incompatible with the basic principles of neoliberalism as they call for solidarity and collaboration between states, communities and individuals as well as involvement of public services or stricter governmental controls.

In other words, climate change and emergence of new infectious diseases have a profound effect on our societies and require organised actions that are not in line with the neoliberal ideology. The usual attitudes towards global problems that include „pretending nothing is happening”, „hiding inside the castle” and “running away from home” are not solutions because „the entire planet is a minefield of evolutionary accidents waiting to happen” (Brooks, Hoberg & Boeger 2019: 260-264) even after the Covid-19 pandemic is over. There is the need to address the main processes that are allowing dangerous mixing of pathogens and the crisis of emerging diseases, which include climate change, globalised trade and travel and increasing urbanisation (Brooks et al., 2020: 4).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Abercrombie, Nicholas, Stephen Hill, Bryan S. Turner (1984), *The Penguin Dictionary of Sociology*, Penguin Books, London.
2. Akar, Ismail (2020), “Post-Coronavirus Disease 2019 Health Care and University: From Efficiency to Resilience”, *OMICS A Journal of Integrative Biology*, 25(9), 515-518.
3. Bal, P. Matthijs, Maria Kordowicz, Andy Brookes (2020), ”A Workplace Dignity Perspective on Resilience: Moving Beyond Individualized Instrumentalization to Dignified Resilience”, *Advances in Human Resources* 22(4), 1-14.

4. Bal, P. Matthijs (2017), *Dignity in the Workplace, New Theoretical Perspectives*, Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke, UK
5. Bal, P. Matthijs (2020), "Why we should stop measuring performance and well-being", *German Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 64(3), 196–200.
6. Bauman, Zygmunt (1993), *Postmodern ethics*, Blackwell, Oxford, UK & Cambridge, USA
7. Bauman, Zygmunt (2000), *Liquid modernity*, John Wiley and Sons
8. Bell, Kirsten, Judith Green (2016), "On the Perils of Invoking Neoliberalism in Public Health Critique", *Critical Public Health* 26(3), 239-243.
9. Sanders, Bernie, <https://berniesanders.com/issues/green-new-deal/> (Accessed: 05. 05. 2021)
10. Brooks, Daniel R., Eric P. Hoberg, Walter A. Boeger, Scott L. Gardner, Sabrina Araujo, Katalin Bajer, Sebastian Botero-Canola, Brian Byrd, et al. (2020), "Before the Pandemic Ends: Making Sure this Never Happens Again", *WCSA Journal* 1(1), 1-10.
11. Brooks, Daniel R., Erich P. Hoberg, Walter A. Boeger (2019), *The Stockholm Paradigm: Climate Change and Emerging Disease*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London
12. Cabanas, Edgar, Eva Illouz (2019), *Manufacturing Happy Citizens: How the Science and Industry of Happiness Control Our Lives*, Polity Press, Cambridge
13. Chandler, David (2013), "Resilience Ethics: Responsibility and Globally Embedded Subject", *Ethics and Global Politic* 6(3), 175-194.
14. Chandler, David (2014a), "Beyond neoliberalism: Resilience, the new art of governing complexity", *Resilience: International Policies, Practices and Discourses* 2(1), 47–63.
15. Chandler, David (2014b), *Resilience: The governance of complexity*, Routledge, Abingdon and New York
16. Creteny, Raaven (2014), "Resilience for Whom? Emerging Critical Geographies of Socio-ecological Resilience", *Geography Compass* 8/9, 627–640.
17. Dawson, Matt (2012), "Optimism and agency in the sociology of Zygmunt Bauman", *European Journal of Social Theory* 15(4), 555-570.
18. Devine, Jennifer A., Jenny A. Baca (2020), "The Political Forest in the Era of Green Neoliberalism", *Antipode* 52, 911-927.
19. DiEM25, <https://diem25.org/campaign/green-new-deal/> (Accessed: 05. 05. 2021)

20. Evans, Brad, Julian Reid (2013), "Dangerously exposed: The life and death of the resilient subject", *Resilience: International Policies, Practices and Discourses* 1(2), 83-98.
21. Evans, Brad, Julian Reid (2014), *Resilient Life: The Art of Living Dangerously*, Polity Press
22. Financial Times, "Yuval Noah Harari: The World After Coronavirus", March 20th 2020. Retrieved: <https://www.ft.com/content/19d90308-6858-11ea-a3c9-1fe6fedcca75> (Accessed: 23. 03. 2021)
23. Foucault, Michel (2020), *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of Prison*, Penguin, London
24. Fraser, Nancy (2017), "From Progressive Neoliberalism to Trump – and Beyond", *American Affairs Journal* 1(4), 46-64.
25. Hall, Peter, Michèle Lamont (2013), *Social Resilience in the Neoliberal Era*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
26. Hamann, H. Trent (2009), "Neoliberalism, Governmentality and Ethics", *Foucault Studies* 6, 37-59.
27. Harari, Noah Y. (2020), "The World After Coronavirus", <https://www.ft.com/content/19d90308-6858-11ea-a3c9-1fe6fedcca75> (Accessed: 04. 04. 2021)
28. Higgins, Vangham, Wendy Larner (eds.) (2017), *Assembling Neoliberalism Expertise, Practices, Subjects*, Palgrave Macmillan, US
29. Horton, Richard (2020), *The COVID-19 Catastrophe: What's Gone Wrong and How to Stop it Happening Again*, Polity, Cambridge
30. Joseph, Jonathan (2013), "Resilience as embedded neoliberalism: A governmentality approach", *Resilience: International Policies, Practices and Discourses* 1(1), 38-52.
31. Joseph, Jonathan (2016), "Governing through failure and denial: The new resilience agenda", *Millennium* 44(3), 370-390.
32. King, Danielle D., Alexander Newman, Fred Luthans (2016), "Not if, but when we need resilience in the workplace", *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 37(5), 782-786.
33. Kostera, Monica, Michael Pirson (eds.) (2017), *Dignity and the organization*, Palgrave Macmillan
34. Labonté, Ronald, David Stuckler (2016), "The rise of neoliberalism: how bad economics imperils health and what to do about it", *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 70, 312-318.

35. Lucas, Kristen (2015), "Workplace dignity: Communicating inherent, earned, and remediated dignity", *Journal of Management Studies* 52(5), 621-646.
36. Mackenzie, Debora (2020), *COVID-19: The Pandemic that Never Should Have Happened and How to Stop the Next One*, Hachette Books, New York
37. MacKinnon, Danny, Kate D. Derickson (2012), "From Resilience to Resourcefulness: A Critique of Resilience Policy and Activism", *Progress in Human Geography* 37(2), 253-270.
38. Maibach, Edward Jeni Miller, Fiona Armstrong, Omnia El Omrani, Ying Zhang, Nicky Philpott, Sue Atkinson, Linda Rudoph, Josh Karliner, Jennifer Wang, Claudel Pétrin-Desrosiers, Anne Stauffer, Génon K. Jensen (2021) "Health professionals, the Paris Agreement and the fierce urgency of now", *The Journal of Climate Change and Health* 1, 1-3.
39. Mavelli, Luca (2019), "Resilience beyond neoliberalism? Mystique of complexity, financial crises, and the reproduction of neoliberal life", in: Humbert, Clemence and Johnatan Joseph (eds.), *The Politics of Resilience, International Policies, Practices and Discourses*, 7(3), 224-239.
40. Morgan, Marcus (2013), "The poverty of (moral) philosophy: Towards an empirical and pragmatic ethics", *European Journal of Social Theory* 17(3), 129-146.
41. Nunes, João (2020), "The COVID-19 pandemic: securitization, neoliberal crisis, and global vulnerabilization", *Cadernos de Saúde Pública* 36(5), <https://www.scielosp.org/pdf/csp/2020.v36n5/e00063120/en> (Accessed: 05. 04. 2021)
42. Nussbaum, Martha (2003), "Capabilities as Fundamental Entitlements: Sen and Social Justice", *Feminist Economist* 9(2-3), 33-59.
43. Nussbaum, Martha (2000) *Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
44. Pavićević, Olivera (2016), *Resilience and Moral Agency*, IKSI, Belgrade
45. Pavićević, Olivera, Aleksandra Bulatović, Ljeposava Ilijić (2019), *Resilience – Asymmetry between Macro Discourse and Micro Process*, IKSI, Belgrade
46. Pollard, Tyler J. (2014), "Education, the Politics of Resilience, and Wor on Youth: A Conversation with Brad Ewans", *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* 36, 193-213.
47. Progressive International, <https://progressive.international/movement/campaign/organizing-for-a-green-new-deal-7af9e89d-542f-44b1-816c-d79745459027/en> (Accessed: 05. 05. 2021)

48. Reid, Julian (2012), "The Disastrous and Politically Debased Subject of Resilience", *Development dialogue* 58(1), 67-79.
49. Reid, Julian (2013), "Interrogating the Neoliberal Biopolitics of Sustainable Development – Resilience Nexus", in: Mezzadra Sandro, Julian Reid and Ranabir Samaddar (eds.), *The Biopolitics of Development: Reading Michel Foucault in the Postcolonial Present*, Springer Science & Business Media, 107-123.
50. Schmidt, Jessica (2015), "Intuitively neoliberal? Towards a critical understanding of resilience governance", *European Journal of International Relations* 21(2), 402-426.
51. School Strike for Climate, <https://www.schoolstrike4climate.com/about> (Accessed: 05. 05. 2021)
52. Sen, Amartya (2009), *The Idea of Justice*, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts
53. Sheehan, Mary C., Mary A. Fox (2020), "Early Warnings: The Lessons of COVID-19 for Public Health Climate Preparedness", *International Journal of Health Services* 50(3), 264-270.
54. Singh, Paramjit (2020), "Beyond the COVID-19 Pandemic: Gauging Neoliberal Capitalism and the Unipolar World Order", *International Critical Thought* 10(4), 635-654.
55. Stewart, E. Donna (2011), "Toward understanding resilient outcomes", *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry* 56(5), 256-257.
56. Taylor, Lisa (2020), *Addressing Anthropogenic Climate Change: How Contemporary Latent Neoliberalism is Getting in the Way*, OCAD University, Toronto
57. Thaning, S. Moren, Marius Gudmand-Høyer, Sverre Raffnsøe (2016), "Ungovernable: Reassessing Foucault's Ethics in Light of Agamben's Pauline Conception of Use", *International Journal of Philosophy and Theology* 77(3), 191-218.
58. United Nations Climate Change, <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-paris-agreement> (Accessed: 05. 05. 2021)
59. Webb, Stephen A. (Ed.) (2018), "Resistance, biopolitics and radical passivity", In: *Routledge Handbook of Critical Social Work*, Routledge Handbook Online.
60. Žižek, Slavoj (1989), *The Sublime Object of Ideology*, Verso Books, London
61. Žižek, Slavoj (2014), *Trouble in Paradise: From the End of History to the End of Capitalism*, Melville house, London
62. Žižek, Slavoj (2020), *Pandemic! COVID-19 Shakes the World*, OR Books, New York and London

OTPORNOST U VREMENU COVID-19: PREISPITIVANJE NEOLIBERALNE PARADIGME I STVARANJE NOVIH STRATEGIJA ZA BORBUN SA GLOBALNIM PROMENAMA

Sažetak

Rad predstavlja pokušaj redefinisivanja koncepta otpornosti u kontekstu promena koje se dešavaju na globalnom nivou. Jednu od ključnih promena izazvala je pandemija Covid-19 koja je pokazala neadekvatnost neoliberalnog diskursa o otpornosti, koji odgovornost prebacuje na pojedince koji moraju biti spremni da prevaziđu okolnosti krize ili šoka. Međutim, otpornost se može posmatrati u smislu solidarnosti, dostojanstva i odgovornosti prema drugima. Otpornost takođe podrazumeva strategije koje uključuju velika ulaganja u javno zdravlje, ekologiju i samoodrživa rešenja za borbu protiv klimatskih promena koje uzrokuju zarazne bolesti. Svrha ovog rada je podizanje svesti o potrebi započinjanja i stvaranja niza javnih politika koje bi podrazumevale etičku procenu povezanu sa uspehom ili neuspehom odgovornog postupanja prema drugima.

Ključne reči: otpornost; COVID-19; neoliberalizam; životna sredina; etička odgovornost

Adrese autorica

Authors' address

Olivera Pavićević

Institute of Criminological and Sociological Research Belgrade

oliverapavicevic4@gmail.com

Ivana Stepanović

Institute of Advanced Studies Kőszeg (iASK), Hungary

ivana.stepanovic@iask.hu

Ljeuposava Ilijić

Institute of Criminological and Sociological Research Belgrade

lelalela_bgd@yahoo.com

