

Editorial

From Surviving Disruption to Thriving Through It: Resilience, Humanity, and the Future of Strategic Management and Entrepreneurship

John C. Camillus ^{1,*}  and John Lipinski ²¹ School of Business, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15217, USA² Eberly College of Business, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, PA 15705, USA; john.lipinski@iup.edu

* Correspondence: camillus@pitt.edu

Societal disruptions have ceased to be exceptional events around which organizations can plan temporary responses. Geopolitical conflict, pandemics, technological discontinuities, environmental stress, institutional change, supply-chain fragmentation, and profound social transformations increasingly overlap and interact. Their consequences cascade across organizational, industry, national, and societal boundaries. The challenge confronting strategic management and entrepreneurship is therefore no longer simply how organizations should respond to an occasional shock; it is how they can remain coherent, adaptive, innovative, and humane when disruption becomes a persistent characteristic of the environment.

The contributions to this collection approach that challenge from remarkably different vantage points. They examine organizational routines after COVID-19; feedforward strategic control and dynamic capabilities; entrepreneurship amid geopolitical change in India; the emergence of the Amul cooperative during economic and institutional disruption; entrepreneurship under political conflict in the Occupied Palestinian Territories; the commercialization of publicly funded research through entrepreneurial technology-transfer mechanisms; and the century-long evolution and strategic dilemma of Siniora Food Industries in Palestine. Taken individually, they illuminate distinct aspects of strategic management and entrepreneurship under disruption; however, taken together, they reveal a larger and more consequential pattern.

The argument developed in “Resilience and Humanity: A Framework for Thriving Through Disruptions” by Camillus et al. (2026) provides a lens through which that pattern can be seen. The framework begins with the proposition that the contemporary environment is not merely volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA); increasingly, it is “wicked.” “Wicked problems” are difficult to define, involve stakeholders with conflicting values, have tangled causes, possess no definitive solutions, and evolve as attempts are made to address them. Under such conditions, conventional assumptions of strategic management—stable organizational boundaries, reasonably predictable environments, definable problems, and strategies that can be optimized through analysis—become increasingly problematic.

The framework consequently defines resilience more ambitiously than the capacity to recover from adversity: resilience is the capacity to thrive through disruption—to recover beyond the shock and to benefit because of it. It proposes that organizational identity, grounded in values, competencies, and aspirations, provides an enduring strategic anchor when structures, missions, strategies, and even organizational boundaries become fluid. Identity then finds expression through three vectors of a Resilient Organizational



Received: 9 September 2026

Accepted: 14 September 2026

Published: 13 October 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors.

Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland.

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license.

Architecture: Inspirational Transformative Ambition, Innovative Value Networks, and Hybrid Intelligence Ecosystems.

Viewed through this lens, the articles and case study in this collection are not simply accounts of organizations responding to different disruptions. Collectively, they illuminate how resilience is created: through purpose and aspiration, human agency, anticipatory intelligence, adaptive routines, entrepreneurial action, relationships and ecosystems, institutional innovation, and the continuing interplay between economic value and human well-being.

1. From Disruption to Wickedness

A first insight emerging from the collection concerns the nature of disruption itself. The papers demonstrate that disruption is rarely a discrete event with a clearly identifiable beginning, end, and organizational consequence. Responses, therefore, have to be embedded in management systems.

Caner and Madhavan's (2026) examination of hybrid work following COVID-19 makes this particularly clear. Firms exposed to the same global pandemic did not respond uniformly: some institutionalized hybrid work; others eventually returned toward established workplace arrangements. Their analysis of Fortune 100 firms shows that responses varied by region, sector, and organizational complexity. Most importantly, their findings indicate that the effect of an external event depends partly on the organization's capacity to interpret and process it.

The same disruption can therefore become a different strategic problem for different organizations.

This finding resonates strongly with the wicked-problem perspective. Objective conditions matter, but they do not uniquely determine strategic responses. Organizations encounter environments through interpretive systems, values, mental models, histories, routines, and institutional contexts. Caner and Madhavan (2026) show that mental model complexity can facilitate rapid responsiveness while also making the stabilization of new routines more difficult. Mental model complexity is thus not an unqualified capability; it can enable adaptation and simultaneously complicate its institutionalization.

Geopolitical developments reinforce the systemic nature of disruption. Soni et al. (2025) describe India's entrepreneurial awakening as emerging from the confluence of geopolitical realignment, domestic policy reforms, digitalization, infrastructure investment, resource development, and entrepreneurial initiative. Global supply-chain diversification, changing geopolitical relationships, and domestic programs such as Make in India, Startup India, and Digital India jointly reshape the opportunity environment.

Disruption here is simultaneously threat and opportunity, global and local, and political and economic.

The Palestinian contributions reveal an even more severe manifestation. Lipinski and Shomali (2024) examine entrepreneurship in a setting in which political conflict is not an episodic environmental disturbance but a continuing condition influencing entrepreneurial motivations, processes, resources, institutions, and outcomes. Their analysis cautions against decontextualizing entrepreneurship; in conflict environments, it can contribute to economic development, resilience, empowerment, and peacebuilding, but its effects depend critically on sociopolitical and institutional conditions.

These studies suggest an important proposition for strategic management: societal disruption cannot be understood solely as an exogenous variable acting upon the organization. Disruption interacts with organizational interpretation, institutional arrangements, stakeholder relationships, political conditions, and entrepreneurial agency. Strategy under societal disruption is therefore inherently contextual, relational, and increasingly wicked.

2. From Recovery to Thriving

A second theme unifies the collection: resilience becomes strategically meaningful when organizations do more than restore the status quo ante.

The conventional metaphor of resilience is a spring returning to its original shape. However, returning to the past may be precisely the wrong objective when disruption has permanently altered the environment. A resilient organization must sometimes preserve what is essential while abandoning what is familiar.

Veliyath's (2025) analysis of feedforward control illustrates this distinction. Feedback systems are indispensable for correcting deviations from established goals, but they are fundamentally retrospective and do not direct attention toward emerging conditions and potential futures. By broadening feedforward control to encompass strategic foresight and aspirations, Veliyath (2025) argues that organizations can develop dynamic capabilities that allow them to not only respond to disruption but also sense, seize, and reconfigure resources in anticipation of change. Zara illustrates how such an orientation can become embedded in organizational attributes and help an enterprise migrate toward new sources of competitive advantage when its established resource base is threatened.

This is precisely the distinction between surviving disruption and thriving through it. Survival asks: *How do we preserve what we have?* Resilience in the stronger sense asks: *What can we become because the environment has changed?*

Amul provides perhaps the most dramatic historical answer in this collection. Ghosh and Chakrabarti (2025) show how economic hostility and institutional inadequacy became the conditions under which dispersed milk producers organized collectively. Amul did not merely enable farmers to withstand an exploitative market structure: collective action created a new organizational form and ultimately transformed the market structure itself.

What began as a fragile experiment based on an emancipatory vision evolved from two village cooperatives and approximately 60 members into an organization serving tens of thousands of producers within little more than a decade. Its subsequent development involved technological innovation, diversification, partnerships, institutional engagement, and foresight about emerging markets. Amul's strategy eventually connected social purpose with competitive capability: its decisions concerning milk powder, cheese, baby food, and condensed milk simultaneously addressed farmer livelihoods, national priorities, technological innovation, and commercial opportunity.

The Amul story therefore captures the deeper meaning of resilience. Disruption released entrepreneurial and collective energy that eventually produced an organization stronger and more consequential than the previous arrangement.

3. Identity, Humanity, and Inspirational Transformative Ambition

If organizations must transform, an apparent paradox arises: *What should endure when almost everything else may need to change?*

The resilience-and-humanity framework proposes organizational identity as the answer. Structure cannot provide the anchor because structures must change, mission alone may be inadequate because domains and businesses evolve, and current strategy cannot provide continuity because strategy itself must adapt. However, identity—what is core, distinctive, and enduring about the organization—can provide continuity amid transformation.

The framework conceptualizes identity through core **values**, distinctive **competencies**, and enduring **aspirations**. Under disruption, these elements serve four strategic functions: sensemaking, decision coherence, stakeholder alignment, and transformation guidance.

Identity is therefore simultaneously an **anchor**, preserving essential values; a **beacon**, expressing enduring aspirations; and a **compass**, guiding the development and deployment of competencies.

Several contributions illuminate this first resilience vector—**Inspirational Transformative Ambition**.

Amul's origin in an emancipatory vision for farmers is one example. Its founding purpose was not simply to create another dairy processor but to transform the economic relationship between producers and the existing system. The historical narrative demonstrates the importance of solidarity, collective progress, community values, and prior experiences of collective action in making that transformation conceivable.

The Siniora case presents identity from another direction: endurance across generations. [Salhout and Buchanan \(2025\)](#) describe a Palestinian food enterprise that evolved over more than a century from a local family business into a publicly traded regional multinational business. Yet its next strategic choice raises the classic resilience dilemma: how can an organization undertake a potentially transformative expansion without losing the strengths, relationships, knowledge, and identity that enabled its endurance? The case clearly demonstrates that ambition under disruption cannot simply mean greater risk-taking; it requires a disciplined relationship between aspiration and identity. Siniora's internationalization experience emphasizes knowledge, trust, commitment, partnerships, and learning rather than expansion through ungrounded experimentation.

Transformative ambition is resilient when it is inspirational enough to transcend the current environment but sufficiently anchored in identity to maintain coherence.

This is equally relevant to entrepreneurship in conflict settings, which may be born of necessity, opportunity, resistance, empowerment, or aspirations for social reconstruction. [Lipinski and Shomali's \(2024\)](#) review emphasizes resilience and adaptability, social innovation, empowerment, institutional context, and peacebuilding.

Entrepreneurship, from this perspective, is not simply venture formation. It can be an assertion of agency and a mechanism through which individuals and communities imagine and realize a future different from the present.

4. Innovative Value Networks: Resilience Beyond the Boundary of the Firm

A third major conclusion from this collection is that resilience increasingly depends on alliances with other organizations.

Traditional strategy often treats the firm as the principal unit of analysis and asks how it can acquire or protect resources that produce competitive advantage. The papers in this Collection repeatedly direct attention beyond the organizational boundary—to communities, suppliers, governments, universities, research laboratories, entrepreneurs, international partners, investors, institutions, and digital platforms.

This is the logic of the second resilience vector: **Innovative Value Networks**. Such networks extend competencies, distribute risk, create access to resources, facilitate knowledge flows, and enable organizations to influence rather than merely accept their environments. In the resilience framework, alliance portfolios, smart power, ecosystem governance, and stakeholder and community integration generate capability extension and risk reduction.

[Soni et al.'s \(2025\)](#) study of India makes this ecosystem logic explicit. Innovation does not occur in isolation but through interactions among entrepreneurs, investors, research institutions, government agencies, multinational corporations, and support organizations. The authors argue that ecosystem navigation, strategic bridging between local and global networks, digital platforms, human capital, partnerships, and innovation capabilities can enable entrepreneurs to exploit opportunities created by geopolitical and institutional change.

Their broader argument is that entrepreneurial success emerges from the interaction of firm resources, global value chains, innovation ecosystems, and public policy.

Minutolo et al. (2025) bring this network perspective into the commercialization of publicly funded innovation. Their analysis of Entrepreneurial Separation to Transfer Technology programs and Entrepreneurial Leave Agreements addresses a difficult boundary-spanning problem: valuable knowledge developed in universities and federal laboratories may remain uncommercialized because it is tacit, sticky, early-stage, and difficult to transfer. The researcher who created the knowledge may therefore be essential to its successful movement from laboratory to market.

Their analysis is particularly important because it reminds us that resilient value networks do not emerge spontaneously: they require institutional architecture. Intellectual-property regimes, human-resource policies, entrepreneurial incentives, risk allocation, technology-transfer mechanisms, government policy, and relationships between laboratories and spin-offs all influence whether knowledge can cross organizational boundaries. The authors consequently characterize successful technology commercialization as highly collaborative and argue for mechanisms that preserve relationships between research institutions and entrepreneurial ventures. Amul again supplies a historical counterpart. Its development depended on networks linking farmers, cooperative societies, political leaders, technologists, government agencies, international organizations, and sources of finance and expertise; for example, its partnership with UNICEF combined a socially responsible purpose with technological and strategic opportunity.

The boundary between social value and economic value becomes difficult to draw—and that is precisely the point.

Siniora's internationalization similarly demonstrates the importance of local relationships, market knowledge, partnerships, supply-chain networks, and trust. Its experience suggests that networks are not merely channels through which resources flow; they are repositories and sources of knowledge, legitimacy, commitment, and resilience.

Across these contributions, a consistent conclusion emerges: in a wicked environment, self-sufficiency can become vulnerability. Organizations rarely possess all the competencies required for domains they have not previously encountered. Resilience therefore requires the ability to assemble, align, govern, and continually reconfigure networks of complementary capabilities.

5. Intelligence, Learning, and the Capacity to Anticipate

The third vector in the resilience framework is **Hybrid Intelligence Ecosystems**—systems combining human judgment, experience, values, tacit knowledge, and moral imagination with the speed, scale, analytical capacity, and pattern-recognition capabilities of artificial intelligence and other technologies.

Not every contribution in this Collection examines artificial intelligence directly, and it would be inappropriate to impose an AI interpretation where the studies do not provide one. Collectively, however, the papers say a great deal about the broader foundation upon which hybrid intelligence must be built: **how organizations perceive, interpret, learn, anticipate, and convert knowledge into action.**

Veliyath's feedforward orientation is central here. Strategic foresight allows organizations to "learn from the future" rather than relying exclusively on learning from past deviations. Indeed, the resilience framework itself identifies feedforward systems and scenario building as ways of taming wickedness.

Caner and Madhavan (2026) complement this anticipatory perspective by examining the cognitive infrastructure through which organizations interpret disruptive events. Their findings are especially instructive: greater mental model complexity can increase responsiveness while simultaneously undermining stability.

More information, more connections, and more cognitive complexity are therefore not necessarily equivalent to greater resilience.

That observation may become even more consequential as AI expands organizational information-processing capacity. The managerial challenge will not simply be to maximize intelligence; it will be to design intelligence ecosystems capable of combining interpretation with execution, complexity with coherence, responsiveness with institutionalization, and technological power with human judgment.

The resilience-and-humanity framework consequently places ethical governance and human development alongside data and AI capability. Hybrid intelligence is resilient precisely because it is hybrid. AI reflects data, incentives, assumptions, and choices originating in human systems. As technological capability increases, human judgment, dignity, fairness, empathy, and moral imagination become more rather than less important.

This creates a substantial agenda for future research arising from the Collection: How can feedforward systems be augmented by AI without confusing prediction with foresight? How do organizational mental models change when machine intelligence becomes an active participant in sensemaking? Under what circumstances does greater information-processing capacity enhance adaptation, and when does it create cognitive or coordination overload? How can tacit knowledge—so important in technology transfer—be combined with computational intelligence? And how should organizations govern human–AI systems when strategic problems contain irreducibly normative and ethical dimensions?

6. The Business of Humanity: Humankind and Humaneness

The most important synthesis across this collection of articles may concern the relationship between resilience and humanity.

The Business of Humanity framework deliberately employs both meanings of *humanity*: **humankind**, which expands the strategic opportunity set by engaging broader populations and underserved communities, and **humaneness**, which evaluates strategies through values such as integrity, safety, quality, diversity, equity, environmental sustainability, dignity, and empathy.

These are not proposed as constraints imposed upon competitive strategy. The argument is more ambitious: economic value and social benefit can be synergistic. Engaging societal needs can generate markets, innovations, capabilities, legitimacy, trust, and stakeholder alignment. The framework synthesizes the insights of Porter, Prahalad, and Christensen to argue that underserved populations and difficult social conditions can simultaneously represent human needs, market opportunities, and environments that stimulate disruptive innovation.

The papers in this Collection provide unusually diverse manifestations of this proposition.

Amul is perhaps the clearest: the cooperative combined empowerment, livelihoods, community concern, producer participation, technological innovation, and economic enterprise. Ghosh and Chakrabarti (2025) explicitly describe cooperatives as combining social and economic objectives rather than treating them as mutually exclusive.

Amul's subsequent growth suggests that its social embeddedness was not simply compatible with scale and competitiveness; it was integral to their creation.

The Palestinian entrepreneurship paper gives humaneness even greater urgency. When entrepreneurship takes place amid political violence, displacement, institutional weakness, and social fragmentation, evaluating success only through venture growth would be profoundly incomplete. Entrepreneurship can contribute to livelihoods, empowerment, resilience, social innovation, peacebuilding, and recovery. The authors ultimately call for stakeholder-engaged policy capable of leveraging entrepreneurship for both economic development and conflict resolution.

The technology-transfer article introduces another societal dimension: publicly funded research represents a societal investment. If promising knowledge remains trapped in laboratories, society does not realize its potential economic and social return. Minutolo et al. (2025) therefore frame commercialization not merely as private value capture but as a mechanism through which national innovation, competitiveness, and social welfare can be advanced. India's entrepreneurial transformation similarly links economic development with broader opportunity. Soni et al. (2025) discuss policy initiatives aimed at infrastructure, digital access, entrepreneurship, skills, investment, and participation by underserved groups.

Here again, societal development and entrepreneurial opportunity need not represent competing objectives.

These examples support a broader conclusion: *humanity can be a source of resilience because it expands both the opportunity space and legitimacy space of strategy*. Humankind reveals needs, markets, talent, partners, and sources of innovation that conventional strategic lenses may overlook. **Humaneness** builds the trust, commitment, legitimacy, and stakeholder relationships needed to act under conditions in which no organization possesses sufficient resources or authority to solve problems alone.

7. Entrepreneurship as an Architecture of Agency

Although this Collection addresses both strategic management and entrepreneurship, the contributions suggest that the boundary between them becomes increasingly porous under societal disruption.

Entrepreneurship is often conceptualized as the recognition and exploitation of opportunity. The studies collected here point toward a broader conception: under disruption, entrepreneurship becomes an architecture of agency—a mechanism through which individuals and communities refuse to accept the existing configuration of resources, institutions, markets, and constraints as immutable. Examples abound: Amul's farmers reorganized an exploitative production system (Ghosh & Chakrabarti, 2025); researchers may temporarily cross institutional boundaries to carry inventions into markets (Minutolo et al., 2025); Indian entrepreneurs bridge emerging global and domestic ecosystems (Soni et al., 2025); Palestinian entrepreneurs continue creating economic and social activity within severe institutional and political constraints (Lipinski & Shomali, 2024); and Siniora confronts the decision of whether a century of endurance can become a platform for a new phase of international growth (Salhout & Buchanan, 2025).

Ghosh and Chakrabarti (2025) make this relationship between structure and agency particularly explicit. Their analysis rejects both the image of the unconstrained heroic entrepreneur and a deterministic view in which institutions dictate outcomes. Amul's emergence instead reflects the mutually constitutive relationship between human agency and structure: people draw upon existing rules, meanings, relationships, and resources while their actions can transform those structures.

This insight may be one of the most important bridges between strategic management and entrepreneurship. In a stable environment, strategic management may emphasize positioning within a given environment while entrepreneurship emphasizes creating something new within it. In a wicked environment, neither assumption is sufficient. Strategic actors must increasingly become entrepreneurial by shaping ecosystems, developing new capabilities, reframing problems, and creating options; entrepreneurs must increasingly become strategic by navigating institutions, building networks, managing legitimacy, and developing resilience.

The distinction between adapting to the environment and changing the environment consequently becomes less useful. Resilient actors do both.

8. An Emerging Research Agenda

Together, the contributions suggest a research agenda that crosses levels of analysis and disciplinary boundaries.

First, we need to understand *identity under disruption*. Which dimensions of identity should remain enduring, and which can evolve? When does identity provide coherence, and when does it produce rigidity? How do entrepreneurial organizations develop identity while simultaneously changing domains, technologies, and business models?

Second, research should examine the *transition from disruption to durable transformation*. [Caner and Madhavan \(2026\)](#) demonstrate that rapid adaptation does not necessarily produce persistent change.

Future research can connect routines, cognition, identity, leadership, and organizational architecture to explain why some adaptations become capabilities while others disappear when the immediate crisis recedes.

Third, *feedforward and foresight* deserve greater attention. Strategic management has historically invested heavily in feedback—performance measurement, variance analysis, benchmarking, and corrective action. Persistent societal disruption raises the value of anticipatory systems, scenarios, robust actions, real options, experimentation, and mechanisms for recognizing weak signals.

Fourth, the appropriate unit of resilience analysis must increasingly extend from the organization to the *value network or ecosystem*. Research should investigate not simply whether alliances exist but how partners become strategically, operationally, culturally, and ethically aligned; how trust and power interact; how capabilities move across boundaries; and how ecosystems remain adaptive without becoming incoherent.

Fifth, *hybrid intelligence* presents an especially urgent frontier. The Collection's insights concerning mental models, tacit knowledge, routines, digital platforms, foresight, and human capital point toward a larger question: how should human and machine intelligence be architected together to improve resilience without diminishing human judgment and responsibility?

Sixth, the collection invites more research into *humaneness* as a strategic variable. Under what conditions do dignity, fairness, empathy, inclusion, environmental stewardship, and stakeholder concern produce measurable resilience? Through which mechanisms—trust, legitimacy, employee commitment, innovation, access to communities, or reduced conflict—do these effects occur? When might humaneness involve short-term economic costs but produce longer-term resilience?

Finally, research should examine whether the three vectors—*Inspirational Transformative Ambition*, *Innovative Value Networks*, and *Hybrid Intelligence Ecosystems*—operate independently, complement one another, or become effective only when appropriately configured together. The resilience framework proposes them as elements of an architecture rather than as isolated capabilities.

The papers in this collection provide promising contexts in which those relationships can be empirically investigated.

9. Closing Reflection: Building a Better Normal

The contributions to this collection began from different questions, employed different theoretical traditions, examined different levels of analysis, and investigated dramatically different contexts. Yet, they converge on an important message.

Societal disruption does not merely threaten existing competitive advantages: it exposes assumptions, reveals dependencies, changes stakeholder needs, challenges routines and institutions, creates new resource configurations, and can make once-powerful competencies obsolete while increasing the value of previously peripheral ones. Crucially,

it can create opportunities for entrepreneurship, innovation, institutional redesign, and societal advancement.

The strategic task, therefore, cannot be simply to restore equilibrium.

Organizations need something enduring enough to provide coherence and yet sufficiently generative to permit radical transformation. Camillus et al. (2026) posits that humanity-based organizational identity offers such an anchor: values provide continuity and legitimacy; aspirations provide direction and ambition; and competencies provide the means through which purpose becomes action. Inspirational Transformative Ambition converts identity into a future worth pursuing; Innovative Value Networks allow capabilities, knowledge, resources, and risks to be shared across increasingly permeable organizational boundaries; and Hybrid Intelligence Ecosystems expand the capacity to sense, interpret, learn, anticipate, and act—while keeping human judgment and humaneness at the center.

The articles in this collection enrich that architecture. Veliyath (2025) demonstrates why resilient organizations must look forward rather than rely only on feedback. Caner and Madhavan (2026) reveal how cognition and routines mediate the translation of disruption into durable organizational change. Ghosh and Chakrabarti (2025) show how human agency, collective purpose, and institutional transformation can turn economic hostility into enduring socioeconomic value. Soni et al. (2025) demonstrate how entrepreneurs can convert geopolitical realignment and public-policy change into opportunity through resources, global value chains, and innovation ecosystems. Minutolo et al. (2025) show why innovation requires institutional bridges capable of carrying human knowledge across organizational boundaries. Lipinski and Shomali (2024) remind us that entrepreneurship under conflict must ultimately be understood in human as well as economic terms. Lastly, Salhout and Buchanan (2025) demonstrates that resilience is not a theoretical abstraction: it is the continuing strategic challenge of preserving identity, managing risk, building relationships, and pursuing aspiration amid profound uncertainty.

Together, these contributions suggest that resilience and humanity should not be positioned as alternatives to competitive advantage. Under conditions of societal disruption, they increasingly become sources of it.

Perhaps, then, the most important change required in our conception of resilience is a change in the question we ask. The traditional question is:

How can an organization survive disruption and return to normal?

The papers in this Collection encourage a more demanding question:

How can organizations, entrepreneurs, institutions, and their networks create a better normal because of disruption?

That question moves resilience beyond recovery, strategy beyond prediction, entrepreneurship beyond opportunity exploitation, and humanity from the periphery of strategic management toward its center.

When the future is VUCA and wicked, strategy cannot provide a permanent solution; it must continually frame, tame, learn, and transform. Identity must provide continuity without imposing rigidity, networks must extend capability without sacrificing coherence, and intelligence must increase our capacity to act without diminishing our humanity.

The challenge facing strategic management and entrepreneurship in an age of societal disruptions is therefore not merely to endure the future; it is to help create the future, one in which it is possible and worthwhile to thrive.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Camillus, J., Abel, K., Bidanda, B., Bronder, K., Gassman, C., Lam, A., Madhavan, R., & Mirchandani, P. (2026). Resilience and humanity: A framework for thriving through disruptions. *Administrative Sciences*, 16(5), 235. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Caner, T., & Madhavan, R. (2026). Routines of resilience: How organizational routines shape enterprise response to societal disruptions. *Administrative Sciences*, 16(3), 115. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Ghosh, A., & Chakrabarti, A. (2025). The emergence of a cooperative amidst economic disruption: A historical narrative of Amul Coop in India. *Administrative Sciences*, 15(6), 214. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Lipinski, J., & Shomali, R. Q. (2024). Navigating adversity: Revisiting entrepreneurial theories in the context of the occupied Palestinian territories. *Administrative Sciences*, 14(12), 313. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Minutolo, M. C., Winn, S., & McFeeters-Krone, D. (2025). The potential threat of march-in rights to entrepreneurial separation to transfer technology programs. *Administrative Sciences*, 15(12), 458. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Salhout, S. M., & Buchanan, F. R. (2025). Enduring legacy: Proud roots in an uncertain land. *Administrative Sciences*, 15(3), 84. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Soni, R., Schimmel, K., Slack, F., & Nicholls, J. (2025). India's entrepreneurial awakening: Navigating geopolitical shifts and domestic policy reforms. *Administrative Sciences*, 15(4), 122. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Veliyath, R. (2025). Does a feedforward orientation provide competitive advantages under disruptive conditions? A review of control literature with an illustrative case. *Administrative Sciences*, 15(1), 13. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.