Latin American Business and Sustainability Review
Academic Journal

Editorial

Resilience by Design: What Holds, Who Decides, and What Breaks in an Age of Systemic Risk

This issue of *LABSREVIEW* makes a claim without dressing it up: resilience is not something systems "develop" over time. It is something they either earn through design or lose through design shortcuts that look harmless until conditions change. In an era when shocks travel fast and compound quickly, resilience is less a future ambition than a present test of legitimacy.

At first glance, Volume 2, Issue 2 looks wide-ranging: numerical analysis, sustainable finance, social entrepreneurship, and digital public governance. The variety is real. So is coherence. Each contribution interrogates the same modern vulnerability: we now depend on instruments, models, metrics, frameworks, and technologies that promise stability, credibility, or efficiency while narrowing the conditions under which those promises remain true. When capacity is uneven, incentives misalign, and oversight lags, fragility does not announce itself. It performs. It produces plausible outputs right up to the moment it fails.

What makes this type of failure difficult to govern is its procedural character. Breakdown arrives through a rating rubric that quietly rewards the wrong behavior, a sustainability signal that becomes strategy rather than substance, a partnership that exists only at the level of language, or a digital system that restricts participation by design. Accountability blurs because decisions migrate into technical vocabularies and delegated infrastructures. Outcomes remain visible; the machinery producing them becomes harder to see, question, or contest. Under those conditions, resilience becomes inseparable from transparency, contestability, and institutional responsibility.

Díaz's paper anchors the issue in the most concrete sense of stability. In numerical analysis, convergence is not rhetoric; it is the difference between methods that can be trusted and methods that only behave under friendly assumptions. Díaz advances a sixth-order iterative family and tests more than speed or elegance. The work maps where the method holds and where it collapses. That stance matters beyond mathematics. It models a discipline that, in sustainability work, often needs designs to be evaluated under variation, not validated under ideal conditions. If a method cannot tolerate imperfect starting points, it will not tolerate reality.

Finance brings the same question into institutional form. Momo-Dino's study places ESG inside the credibility machinery that structures modern markets. The importance of ESG here is not symbolic. It is operational. It shapes rating judgments, reputational capital, and access to financing, the channels that define what firms can do and what they can justify. The study also refuses a convenient simplification. ESG aligns with stronger credit ratings while coinciding with pressure on short-run operating performance. That tension is the point. Sustainability, in practice, often requires investment before it yields conventional returns. The credibility benefit may arrive sooner than the earnings benefit. Any serious resilience agenda has to deal with that sequencing rather than deny it.

The deeper issue is that credibility systems do not simply describe firms; they train them. Once metrics gain authority, behavior reorganizes around them. Organizations optimize what gets scored. They learn which signals to travel and which do not. That can push systems toward durable value when evaluation captures real risk and real impact. It can also produce a thin, performative compliance when evaluation rewards what is legible rather than what is consequential. The question of resilience, then, is not whether sustainability can be measured. It is whether measurement regimes can withstand strategic behavior, unequal capacity, and shifting incentives without becoming theater.

Medine et al. turn from financial credibility to institutional coordination, and they name a familiar failure mode with unusual clarity: fragmentation produces fragility. Their Transformational Theory of Change does not function as another planning template. It functions as an insistence that resilience depends on coordination across sectors and levels, with government, business, and social-sector organizations acting with shared commitments rather than parallel intentions. In this frame, co-creation is not a motivational slogan. It is an institutional requirement.

That requirement has teeth. Collaboration tends to be celebrated as consensus, but it operates as negotiation: over authority, resources, timelines, standards of proof, and responsibility when outcomes disappoint. Durable co-creation requires structures that outlive personalities and funding cycles, rules that bind, data that can be shared

without capture, and accountability that does not dissolve the moment a partnership becomes inconvenient. Resilience does not come from launching initiatives. It comes from keeping agreements enforceable when conditions stop cooperating.

Morales-Acevedo et al. bring the issue to its sharpest edge by confronting digital governance as power governance. Their argument rejects the comforting assumption that digitization equals modernization. Emerging technologies reshape who can participate, who gets classified, who receives services, and who remains exposed. They can widen access, yet can also harden exclusion. They can enhance efficiency yet also normalize surveillance, deepen dependency, and reproduce bias through automated decisions that appear neutral because they are technical. The difference lies in capacity, regulation, and strategy, especially where territorial inequality and institutional weakness already structure outcomes.

The connective thread to the other papers is not abstract. A state can deploy advanced systems while losing legitimacy if oversight remains weak and decisions cannot be meaningfully contested. A market can reward ESG signals while leaving underlying harms intact. A development agenda can celebrate entrepreneurship while failing to build the governance arrangements that make collaboration durable. The instruments vary, but the pattern repeats: power moves into infrastructure, then disappears behind procedure.

Taken together, the issue advances in a single direction: resilience belongs to design, not slogans. It requires convergence under strain, credibility that does not collapse into signaling, co-creation that survives beyond programs, and digital governance that treats technology as a political force rather than a neutral tool. This is not a call for pessimism. It is a call for adult standards: stability must be demonstrated, trust must be earned through accountable systems, collaboration must be institutionalized, and digital transformation must be governed with safeguards rather than after-the-fact corrections.

This is also a statement about *LABSREVIEW*. The journal's purpose is not to publish sustainability as a theme alone, but to publish on the infrastructures that decide whether sustainability remains feasible: the methods that hold under disturbance, the metrics that discipline behavior, the institutional arrangements that coordinate action, and the digital systems that redistribute authority. These infrastructures determine what becomes fundable, governable, and just, often long before outcomes are measured.

In an age of systemic risk, resilience is no longer a comforting label. It is a standard. This issue invites readers to apply that standard where it matters most: to the architecture we build, the incentives we embed, and the forms of control we normalize. The final question is not whether resilience is desirable. It is whether the designs we adopt can carry the weight we now place on them, and whether those designs remain answerable to the people who live with their consequences.

Dr. Luis José Camacho
Editor-in-Chief
SUNY Empire State University
USA