FILOZOFIA
Volume 79, Number 10, 2024

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31577/filozofia.2024.79.10.7

Practicing Uncertainty as Resilience

LOVÍSA EIRÍKSDÓTTIR, Department of Business Studies, Uppsala University, Sweden

JOSEF PALLAS, Department of Business Studies, Uppsala University, Sweden

EIRÍKSDÓTTIR, L. – PALLAS, J.: Practicing Uncertainty as Resilience
FILOZOFIA, 79, 2024, No 10, pp. 1159 – 1173

Drawing on the pandemic experiences of Swedish welfare professionals and the philosophies of Hannah Arendt, Simone Weil, Jonna Bornemark, and Isabelle Stengers, this paper argues for approaching resilience as a transformative process rather than merely a restorative or protective one. We address resilience as connected to the capacity to act under conditions of uncertainty and where embodied and relational knowledge is central. This knowledge emerges from daily interactions in the world we share with others and to whom we hold a deep moral and ethical commitment.

Keywords: Covid-19 – uncertainty – resilience – judgement – welfare professionals – Sweden

Introduction: Taking on Resilience through Uncertainty

Based on insights from four philosophers, spanning three generations, this paper theorizes *with* the concept of "resilience." We do not attempt to define what resilience *is* but rather suggest different aspects of being *resilient, mainly* through the lens of carrying out responsibilities within the domain of one's professional work under conditions of uncertainty. With empirical examples brought from a study of Swedish welfare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic,[1] we discuss the relationship between embodied judgment and the capacity to be with uncertainty as what can be seen as a prerequisite for resilience. We do so through an exploration practice inspired by what St. Pierre (2019) calls *post qualitative inquiry* (PQI), where we use concepts to write and

[1] In the Swedish context, the definition of welfare is broad and as it is based on three pillars: economic, social, and health-related security systems, which also include areas such as social services, the justice system, refugee reception, and culture.

think with rather than using them to create a separation between theory and method, conceptional work or descriptive work. This allows our arguments on uncertainty to emerge together both in our conceptualization of resilience and in how we, as researchers, construct our reasoning. Our approach is meant to inspire openings and new perspectives between the reader and the writer by allowing concepts to shape each other into an emergent understanding of uncertainty and resilience. In this way, we do not wish to close off an experience with our material, which would make our story into a frozen image. Rather, we seek to open up for new questions to join how we can understand the phenomenon under inquiry.

I. Uncertainty and Un-Knowing

Experience as a knowledge base for understanding and approaching uncertainties of the world can be discussed within the modern interpretation of the Aristotelian concept of phronesis (cf. Flyvbjerg et al. 2012). This interpretation of phronesis involves moving away from the strict teleological focus on fixed ends or goals and instead embracing uncertainty as a generative space for curiosity, exploration, and the development of practical wisdom. As Bornemark (2020) suggests, traditional interpretations of phronesis have often prioritized the application of established knowledge and predetermined virtues to achieve specific outcomes. In contrast, her perspective considers phronesis as a dynamic and adaptable process where embodied experiences and situational understanding play central roles. Bornemark underscores that judgment in real-world scenarios frequently involves navigating ambiguity and complexity, where predefined knowledge may be inadequate. By emphasizing embodied judgment, she highlights the importance of experiential learning and relational interactions, advocating for a more flexible and context-sensitive approach to decision-making. In this way, phronesis can be interpreted as an opportunity to cultivate wisdom that is responsive to the fluidity and unpredictability of life and allows us to challenge and go beyond purely analytical, rational, and technical knowledge as a basis for dealing with uncertainty. Flyvbjerg (2004) argues, phronesis, with its emphasis on practical ethics of experience, helps us to balance instrumental and technical rationality with reflections on values, power, and justice (Flyvbjerg 2004, 285).

A similar argument, concerned with the ethics of experience, can also be found in Arendt's philosophy and her writing on human conditions, which she argued are always earthbound by nature (Arendt 2018, 42). In a text she calls *The Crisis in Education,* she grounds this earth-bound condition in what she calls

natality "the fact that human beings are *born* into this world" (Arendt 2006, 171), but where we are not only *in* this world but also *of* this world (Arendt 2018). With better awareness of this basic fact, that is yet fading away as an ontological grounding in our knowledge development, in the shadow of techne and episteme that assumes we can disregard our connection to the world and look at it from the outside, based on "demands of a mass society" (Arendt 2006, 176), we are able to regain certain *common* sense. Natality reminds us of the basic collective condition we have with the world where we make direct judgements (embodied) and not preformed judgements based on old answers that have been decoupled from their original questions. Modern development thus, has the tendency to remove experience and uncertainty away from our senses with a "chronic overload" (Arendt 2006, 176), where we, on the way, lose a sense of our collective condition (that is earth-bound) as well as our capability to be resilient in a vital dance with *the other* - human and non-human.

Related to such a view on uncertainty is Bornemark's notion of "judgment knowledge" (Bornemark 2020, 85), i.e., knowledge that is based on experiences that are ingrained in the body and accumulated over the years through lived exposure to and sharing of others' bodily experiences. She suggests that a crucial part of facing uncertainty is curiosity, or wonder, about what you do not yet know (Bornemark 2020, 18). Her argument does not relate to all types of uncertainty, for instance, in authoritarian contexts or in situations where autonomy cannot be exercised. However, she would argue that in uncertain and unclear situations, bodily experience and embodied knowledge are necessary for actors to decide what actions are right or even necessary (Bornemark 2020, 181). These experiences, which are shaped over time and remain unique to their specific contexts, also carry elements of uncertainty. Bornemark argues that by being sensitive to the uniqueness of these experiences, especially in interactions with others, we can better recognize what is important and which ethical values are justifiable in professional practices—such as those of welfare workers—when they face significant challenges or changes in their work (Bornemark 2020, 105).

As illustrated below, the work of welfare professionals was during the COVID-19 pandemic dependent on the capability to handle situations where their theoretical knowledge and formal expertise were not sufficient. Many of the judgment calls these professionals made required skills and knowledge that emerged and were passed on between members of their professions as well through ongoing interaction with patients, students, parents, and clients. Their work was connected to a process in which individual and collective

experiences were merged into a shared, yet not (too) abstract and generalizable, knowledge base from which the capacity to act under uncertainty could be constantly generated and renewed.

Shared experiences and sensitivity to context-specific needs, as the foundation for judgment capabilities, not at least under uncertainty and extra-ordinary conditions, have previously been associated with professions where tacit and bodily knowledge has proven difficult to replace with the modern interpretation and utilization of rational, objective, emotion-free, and production-oriented forms of knowledge (i.e., episteme and techne). As this knowledge is considered central to societal institutions such as science, healthcare, or the legal system, there is also a general mistrust towards alternative modes of knowing and gaining experience. Many studies (cf. Blomqvist – Winblad, 2024) point to a systematic undermining of the embodied and relational knowledge both in formal training of many welfare professions and in the way public sector organizations such as schools or hospitals are organized.

II. Judgment under Uncertainty

How do we embrace uncertainty and embodied forms of knowing among those we rely on in times of crisis? This is what Stengers (2021) wonders about in "Putting Problematization to the Test of our Present," which she argues happens when we dare to problematize the world as it is without knowing what the result of that problematization will bring. Stengers stresses that even though placing trust in uncertainty "may seem foolish" (Stengers 2021, 138), uncertainty is another way of becoming something worth living and being in relation to others, which is the very condition of resilience. In this way, we cannot decide beforehand what is the best way to go, based on already gained knowledge, but depend much more on the in-between space of, for example, the doctor/patient, teacher/student, social worker/youngster. However, the in-between can never be measured for its forever becoming, but it needs embodied attention. Stengers' argument does not mean that embracing or even encouraging uncertainty as a base for judgment is, in any objective sense, superior to the rational and emotion-free type of knowledge advocated by, for instance, the Weberian notion of bureaucracy. Rather, Stengers would argue that such a distinction is false as all bureaucratic rules and structures when applied, are, in essence, relational and emotional and include elements of the unknown (Stengers 2018, 110). There is certainly a risk that, under uncertainty, many decisions will not lead to imagined future(s). But that is not the point. The core argument is that the rational conceptualizing and implementation of

bureaucracy that seeks to eliminate uncertainty also makes most forms of embodied knowledge highly unattainable.

In the very common space of uncertainty, we frequently make situational decisions about whether to continue the fight or let it go (Stengers 2021), which is what makes the future. Giving things up and making space for the new and unknown is no less important than fighting for or resisting things you have clear ideas about in advance. To give up "the world as we know it" without knowing in advance what it will become might be the highest level of resilience and requires the quality of being able to be in uncertainty. This does not mean that uncertainty always leads to resilience; rather, without uncertainty, new knowledge is difficult to develop. Arendt simply calls this space for the new to emerge, or the world as we do not know it, *natality,* and stresses it to be the essence of education and thus an important factor of becoming educated (i.e., professional) (Arendt 2006, 174).

Arendt argued that the relationship between the world as we know it and the world as we do not yet know happens under the faculty of judgment, where we shape the world into the unknown together. Natality, the very fact that we are born into this world, maintains the hope that we will never lose sight of our earthbound condition, which makes it possible for us to regain or replenish the sense of this condition. Embodied knowledge and its ability to operate under uncertainty can contain clues on how to re-address resilience, our capacity to share and navigate in a common world increasingly characterized by a diversity of hybridized crises, catastrophes, and other sources of uncertainties (Bornemark, 2019).

III. The Unconditional Relationship between Resilience and Embodied Judgment

With our current sustainability crisis, characterized by threats to biodiversity, extreme climate change, inequity, war, and exploitation of everything that is considered 'the other' (everything which you define yourself *from*), the concept of resilience has developed into different meanings where conservation and circularity of the old meets the need to transform into something completely new and different. The same argument also goes for crises that sociologists usually associate, although in different ways, with the internalization of the underlying rationality of contemporary social and organizational structures and their focus on productivity, performance, and constant connectivity. These crises often manifest in terms of self-exploitation and self-aggression (Han

2015, 46 – 47), and they are not just a superficial phenomenon. They are rooted in the very essence of how modern life is organized.

The remedy to such crises lies in creating spaces for individual reflection, meaningful relationships, and a shared sense of the possibility of resistance against the pervasive demands of neoliberal productivity, where decisions are not only made into fixed alternatives but allowed to emerge with the process of embodied judgment with the obvious fact that the human condition is earthbound as Arendt would have put it. It is here where judgment starts to play a pivotal role, and engagement in the inquiry of what needs to stabilize and what needs to transform becomes necessary.

According to Arendt, judgment happens when your ways of experiencing, thinking, and being in the world can be expanded and tested by others through interaction. Resilience is a concept that can well describe these interactions with others. It stresses reactions to the processes of how we are shaped by one another (human and non-human). Awareness of this relationship helps us to fulfil our (human) potential to connect to the world. Arendt questions the commonly held idea that judgment is individual (even though it is certainly personal) and reminds us that making a judgment is always a relational process (Arendt 1971/1978).

Arendt distinguishes between decisions and judgments. Decisions are often based on already existing "know-how" and can be made without reflection on different ways of being *with* the world, while judgments cannot. Judgments are always made in the present, where resistance to uncertainty becomes unbearable. Arendt (2018, 55) argues that decisions without judgment (that is always relational) are "worldless," as she calls it, happening under the assumption that we are solely *in* this world and not *of* it. We argue that the concept of resilience can remind us to assume the opposite.

Judgment is always done with others as a transition from theory to practice, where the self-dialogue of thinking transforms into a more broadly shared public or common interest and constitutes an "enlarged mentality… where [people can] think in the place of everybody else" (Immanuel Kant in Arendt 2006, 217). This opening to the world is rooted in the ancient Greek word doxa, where the assumption is that the world opens up differently to everyone but is cultivated through the faculty of judgment (Arendt 1990, 81).

We are constantly shaping the world together with our judgments, which happens in an in-between space of the unknown, and thus, uncertainty becomes a condition we will have to learn to live with. Just like embodied knowledge, which Bornemark (2020) stresses, what Arendt calls our earth-

bound condition disturbs the absurd assumption that we are in control and independent of the world. While the concept of resilience has questioned this assumption in different ways, there has been little focus on its relationship to judgments and how our judgments form the way we overcome crises together, beyond resistance to the world and recovery of the self, where resilience is often understood in the passive form of having to adapt rather than being the ones that shape the world. The question that remains is: What kind of resilience do we need to prepare "for the task of renewing a common world?" (Arendt 2006, 193).

Values are relative and exchangeable, causing much ontological confusion about impartiality regarding how we should be resilient and who should be involved in that process of survival. According to Arendt, the highest objectivity we know is only possible on the assumption that the standards we set are evident and common to all. In Rider's (2017) interpretation of Arendt, this is usually not the case, where fixed decisions and standards usually represent expressions of different interests, which surrenders the hope of a common world by doing away with any place for the role of judgment:

> All there is left to do is correlate relations between individual cases and the functions they serve in the ongoing (but intrinsically meaningless) process of social goings-on, and manipulate them to conform with equally meaningless social (economic and ideological) goals (Rider 2017, 158).

This is why true resilience can never be discussed without the concept of judgment, and judgment can never be discussed without the practice of being with uncertainty.

IV. Earth-Bound Attention toward Resilience

Being with uncertainty requires attention to the unknown – surprising interactions that need to be nurtured. While judgments are often thought of as an active step towards the future, Arendt defined it as an internal receiving act, where you make the future a part of your present perspective (Arendt 1971/1978). This, Arendt says, happens through *thinking,* a two-in-one dialogue with yourself, where you internalize and receive instead of externalizing with a fixed perspective. This perspective on resilience (if we agree that resilience is a series of judgments of survival towards a viable life) can be connected to what Stengers calls paying "active attention focused on the danger of capture" (2018, 74). The danger of capturing emphasizes the importance of slowing down, and instead of constantly trying to capture alternatives, slowing down is a *sine qua*

non for such answers. Stengers' message of slowing down regains our realization that the answers to the crisis are always the unknown outcomes of the present that we collectively shape. While reactions to the crisis are often thought of as attention towards something that is separated from yourself, Weil (1951/1973), similar to Arendt and Stengers, would argue that this *attention* is something that comes to you through the experiences of others and not through the projection of yourself (Panizza 2022). This conceptualization of attention makes it more bearable to be with uncertainty because it stresses how you receive a crisis rather than how you act on it in relation to your personal needs.

Using Weil's argument offers an understanding of resilience as the capacity and readiness to pay attention to others as opposed to one´s own survival. When the world, and the people in it, is suffering, our hope and obligation towards the world (of which we are an inseparable part) is not primarily to find a solution but to pay attention – that is, to immerse ourselves into the situation of others (Weil 1951/1973, 115). Understanding a fellow human requires, Weil argues, that we go beyond observing and theorizing about others by way of not using ourselves, our experiences, and values as a starting point. Understanding also stretches beyond showing empathy. Compassion reduces others and their suffering to subjects of misfortune and denies them to be recognized and understood as a human being. Recognizing and understanding, however, does not mean that we, by paying attention, get involved in a direct and rationalized search for solutions. Quite the contrary, solutions emerge from being attentive (Weil 1951/1973, 115).

Stengers would call this attention *slowing down,* which she describes as…

> …to become capable of learning again, becoming acquainted with things again, reweaving the bounds of interdependency. It means thinking and imagining, and in that process, creating relationships with others that are not of those of capture (Stengers 2018, 82).

Weil refers to similar resistance to capturing as "another more mysterious dimension" – a moral space where we have a real opportunity to learn about not only our own lives but also about the lives of others with whom we share this world.

V. Practicing Uncertainty

The material for this text originates from a comprehensive research project examining the work of Swedish welfare professionals during the COVID-19

pandemic (Czarniawska – Pallas – Raviola 2025). Between March 2020 and March 2024, the study employed ethnographic methods and interviews to focus on understanding the challenges the welfare personnel encountered in their professional work. The material was gathered in places such as libraries, elderly care homes, healthcare centers, municipal administration, elementary schools, museums and even individuals' home offices and included 75 interviews from 30 different professions.[2]

Most of the welfare work during the COVID-19 pandemic, especially during its initial part, was conducted under the reign of extensive stress and uncertainty. Many welfare professionals experienced previously unimagined changes in the nature of their work conditions, the form and content of their assignments, and the scope of their responsibilities. They also experienced a lack of information, insufficient resources, and weak support while dealing with the practical challenges and continuing to deliver welfare services. Large parts of the Swedish public sector were simply not prepared to meet what was coming.

The intended function of welfare professionals, whether in normal times or crises, is to place significant responsibility on their individual and shared knowledge, expertise, and experiences as a basis for professional work. However, recent reforms in Sweden have negatively impacted the conditions necessary for the emergence and development of such knowledge and expertise. Continuous adaptation to new efficiency-oriented governance forms of welfare organizations such as schools, hospitals or libraries, combined with changes in education and training of professions central to these organizations, have come to emphasize standardized, technical, evidence-based, impersonal, de-contextualized, and measurable knowledge and skills. Neo-bureaucratic pressures underlying these reforms also effectively undermine the experience, context-specific skills, and ability of welfare professionals to make judgment calls in complex and uncertain situations.

Under "normal" conditions, welfare work is characterized by its reliance on formal regulation, coordination, policies and administrative procedures, i.e., aspects that correspond with the rational, evidence-based knowledge as a foundation for the provision of welfare services. During the pandemic, the

[2] In addition to traditional welfare professions such as nurses, doctors, teachers, and social workers, the material also included people working as asylum officers, building inspectors, members of municipal boards, employment officers, environmental and health protection inspectors, family counsellors, librarians, municipal directors, politicians, public health coordinators, researchers, social coordinators, social secretaries, university lecturers, youth workers.

continuity and stability of public service provision seem to have become more dependent on different aspects of welfare professionals' work, such as lived (rather than mediated) expertise, personal commitment, and loyalty to public sector ethos. This also meant a stronger emphasis on viewing and relating to their work as a collective and collaborative matter of concern. Teachers, for instance, had to expand their work to physically comfort worried students, parents, and each other. They needed to reorganize classrooms, canteens, personal rooms, and training rooms in a way that signaled compliance with formal pandemic restrictions and that would, at the same time, ensure an inclusive and caring learning environment. Nurses and other healthcare personnel needed, in a similar manner and without having any prior experience of working under pandemic conditions, to find novel ways to physically and emotionally approach patients with unfamiliar symptoms.

The same challenge also dominated the work of social workers who needed to compensate for not being able to physically show support and empathy in dealing with exposed and vulnerable clients – for instance, in contexts where they were dealing with victims of domestic violence, economic hardship, or social isolation. What does it mean to be a nurse or a caregiver in a nursing home if you are not able to fully satisfy the need of older people for physical affection? Finding themselves in situations where pre-pandemic knowledge, routines, and working practices, at least partly, lost their relevance, the welfare professionals, both individually and collectively, needed to embrace the new unknowns. Could bringing in domestic animals such as dogs, cats, or even horses be an answer to their patients' needs? Could singing soothe the distress created by the nurse's face hidden behind the protective mask? How do you re-learn and redefine what it means to be a social worker, teacher, nurse, family counsellor, or migration officer, and what knowledge and skills are necessary to acquire or develop to be able to carry out your work and responsibilities?

The stories from the material suggest that answers to such questions were to be found in places where we can relate to uncertainty in a way that emphasizes an empathetic understanding of both individual and shared experiences and that would provide a deeper sense of connection and purpose. Under the pandemics the welfare sector offered a particularly fitting place for such endeavour as its *raison d'etre* is based in the responsibility for such connection and purpose. A municipal schoolteacher, reflecting on the future of

her profession, described such an empathic and relational understanding quite illustratively: [3]

> You also realize that sharing responsibility and doing things together is a way of being a teacher. That it [teaching] can be done differently. And if you can involve your colleagues, why not also involve the students, their parents, and everyone else who helped us during the pandemic?

Thus, when the rational, impersonal, technical knowledge of welfare professionals was deemed inadequate or even contradictory, the focus on being uncertain in places such as schools, hospitals, health and family centers, and libraries shifted toward the needs of pupils, patients, asylum seekers, or recipients of social support.

At the same time, the pandemic contributed, in many ways, to a need to redirect attention to the needs of colleagues and co-workers. The pandemic challenged not only the already purulent boundaries between work and private life, making it difficult to find time for rest and recovery. It also made high intensity, uncertainty, unpredictability, stress, discomfort, and even life-threatening working conditions an almost natural part of what it means to be a welfare

The importance of having, relating to, and learning from each other as a part of being with uncertainty was also highlighted by a school nurse who argued that during the pandemic, collaboration and sharing experiences with other professionals at the schools (such as support staff at the student health office and teachers) were more important and effective than relying on formal, impersonal settings and support structures in which she normally conducted her work.

However, it was not only shared experiences that were central to how welfare professionals navigated the uncertainties brought about by the pandemic. Their ability to withstand the challenges the pandemic imposed on their professional and personal lives was also clearly connected to their capacity to align their work with the specific contexts of their communities, cities, or municipalities. As the pandemic swept through the welfare sector, particularly in small municipalities and cities, there was more room (and need) for viewing the challenges related to pandemic as well as to other crisis as specific to the uncertainties experienced by the people inhabiting these cities

[3] The following quotes come from the material collected for the research project examining the work of Swedish welfare professionals during the COVID-19 pandemic.

or municipalities (Palmer Rivera – Pelling, 2024). Individual and collective senses of duty, loyalty, and responsibility for the challenges within a particular municipality or city among welfare workers were thus not only an expression of their professional affiliations. Being a welfare professional also represented a personal embodiment of the potential risks the pandemic threatened to impose on the context of which the professionals were a part.

Environmental and health protection inspector in one of Sweden's smallest municipalities pointed to the importance of connection to the people the inspector served and to the surrounding nature:

> I think it's easier to be loyal to your co-workers and stand up for your rights in a smaller municipality because you feel more personal responsibility. You know that what you do matters.…You know everyone, and it gives you a perspective on everything you do. Cause people talk to you, they share their views, and they care.…Sure, there is formal regulation I have to follow when checking their businesses, livestock farming, or dwells. But you can never disregard the understanding you have for the people and the nature around you. Especially now.

VI. Theorizing with Resilience into the Unknown

Being resilient requires the practice of being with uncertainty, and being with uncertainty requires new ways of knowing. In other words, resilience involves the capacity to stay with uncertainty, often requiring a departure from rationalized, objective forms of knowledge. We argue that embodied judgment, which draws from earth-bound, emotional, and relational experiences, is crucial in navigating crises.

Drawing on the works of Arendt, Bornemark, Stengers, and Weil, the paper highlighted the importance of phronesis—a form of practical wisdom that balances rationality with ethical reflections on values, power, and justice and that includes the attention to the other while forming judgments in crisis. Picking four main concepts that are central to these writers, we got a deeper understanding of what it means to be uncertain and what qualities it brings, not in a way of *handling* the uncertainty but to *be with* it. We argue that traditional, standardized approaches to professional knowledge often fall short in crises, where adaptive, experience-based judgment is necessary and where working under uncertainty should be expected and received as the general practice of professionals. Our examples suggest, by stressing the role of interpersonal relationships and shared experiences in fostering the capacity to act under uncertainty, that welfare professionals had to innovate and rely

on collective, context-specific knowledge to meet unprecedented challenges. That is, understanding and responding to crises require an openness to uncertainty and a willingness to engage with diverse forms of knowing, as well as to "love[ing] the world enough to assume responsibility for it" (Arendt, 2006, 193), where you are not only in the world but of it.

In contemporary discourse on resilience and crisis management, it is essential to shift our focus from major transformations to the everyday practices that sustain resilience. This shift would also mean that resilience is not solely an individual trait, nor is it confined to systemic or structural frameworks. Rather, it is a collective endeavor that is nurtured through everyday interactions and compassion within communities, where the future emerges with attention to the present. Consider the role of many municipal welfare workers who often perceive themselves as part of a larger entity, experiencing a sense of unity and emotional engagement with those they serve. This human connection exemplifies the intricate balance between individual agency and systemic structures. The challenge lies in articulating the nuanced and mysterious space where the individual and the systemic intersect, especially through tangible examples from our lived experiences.

Crises invariably serve as catalysts for learning, not merely as hurdles to overcome. In this context, declaring an event educational means embracing resilience in a manner that involves internalizing and integrating the crisis into one's being rather than a superficial triumph over it. However, most of the (organizational) contexts in which welfare professionals conduct their work exhibit an aversion to uncertainty. This aversion reveals a preference for predictable and controllable processes, neglecting the valuable insights derived from engaging with uncertainty.

We can here differentiate between what can be called low (weak) resilience, which merely overcomes crises, and high (strong) resilience, which entails becoming one with the crisis and embracing the resultant transformation. A strong resilience, Arendt would argue, involves cultivating an enlarged mentality—the ability to think from the standpoint of others (drawing on Kant's concept, as discussed in Arendt 2006, 217). In this framework, resilience is practiced by immersing oneself in the collective process of worldmaking, where judgment is continuously expanded and tested through interaction with others, rather than remaining fixed or singular. Stengers (2021) characterizes this stronger resilience as the capacity to engage with crises, seeing it as an opening to something new, different, and potentially better, rather than striving to impose a vision of how the world should be.

Similarly, Weil describes it as allowing crises to approach us, rather than resisting them outright (Weil 1951/1973).

This does not suggest passively accepting crises, such as climate change, without working to prevent catastrophic consequences. Instead, by integrating the reality of these crises into our understanding and acknowledging them as part of ourselves, we may better grasp how to respond effectively, engaging in the ongoing process of refining our judgments.

To fully appreciate the welfare sector's role in our shared world, there is a critical need to recognize and integrate conditions that would enable the transformative forms of resilience. The welfare sector, inherently intertwined with human compassion and daily interactions, is better acknowledged not as an isolated system but as a fundamental component of our collective capacity to deal with the unknown – in whatever form it manifests itself. This inclusion fosters an environment where uncertainties are embraced, and transformations through crises are valued, ultimately contributing to a more robust and empathetic societal framework.

Bibliography

ARENDT, H. (2018): *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

ARENDT, H. (1971/1978): *The Life of the Mind: The Groundbreaking Investigation on How We Think*. San Diego, California: Harcourt.

ARENDT, H. (1990): Philosophy and Politics. *Social Research*, 57 (1), 73 – 103.

ARENDT, H. (2006): *Between Past and the Future. Eight Exercises in Political Thought*. London: Penguin.

BLOMQVIST, P. – WINBLAD, U. (2024): Have the Welfare Professions Lost Autonomy? A Comparative Study of Doctors and Teachers. *Journal of Social Policy*, 53 (1), 64 – 85. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047279422000228

BORNEMARK, J. (2020): *Horisonten finns alltid kvar: om det bortglömda omdömet*. Stockholm: Volante.

BORNEMARK, J. (2019): Introduction: Subjectivity and Ethical Questions in an Equestrian World in Transformation. In: Bornemark, J. et al. (eds.): *Equine Cultures in Transition*. New York: Routledge, 1 – 14.

CZARNIAWSKA, B. – PALLAS, J. – RAVIOLA, E. (2025): *COVID-19 Stories from the Swedish Welfare State: The Pandemicracy*. Bristol: Bristol University Press.

FLYVBJERG, B. (2004): Phronetic Planning Research: Theoretical and Methodological Reflections. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 5 (3), 283 – 306. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/1464935042000250195

FLYVBJERG, B. – LANDMAN, T. – SCHRAM, S. (2012): *Real Social Science: Applied Phronesis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

HAN, B. C. (2015): *The Burnout Society*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

PALMER R., M. – PELLING, L. (2024): *Livet som pågår här*. Stockholm: Bokförlaget Atlas.

PANIZZA, S. C. (2022): *The Ethics of Attention: Engaging the Real with Iris Murdoch and Simone Weil*. London: Routledge.
RIDER, S. (2017): Coercion by Necessity or Comprehensive Responsibility? Hannah Arendt on Vulnerability, Freedom and Education. In: Fóti, V. M. – Kontos, P. (eds.): *Phenomenology and the Primacy of the Political*. Cham: Springer, 155 – 174.
ROSA, H. (2019): *Resonance: A Sociology of Our Relationship to the World*. Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley.
STENGERS, I. (2018): *Another Science is Possible: A Manifesto for Slow Science*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
STENGERS, I. (2021): Putting Problematization to the Test of Our Present. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 38 (2), 71 – 92. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/02632764198480
ST. PIERRE, E. A. (2019): Post Qualitative Inquiry in an Ontology of Immanence. *Qualitative Inquiry,* 25 (1), 3 – 16. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800418772634
WEIL, S. (1951/1973): *Waiting for God*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Lovísa Eiríksdóttir
Department of Business Studies
Uppsala University
Kyrkogårdsgatan 10C, 752 10
Sweden
e-mail: Lovisa.Eiriksdottir@fek.uu.se
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1424-7373

Josef Pallas
Department of Business Studies
Uppsala University
Kyrkogårdsgatan 10C, 752 10
Sweden
e-mail: Josef.Pallas@fek.uu.se
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5854-7373