International Journal of Disaster Risk Science (2025) 16:888–890
https://doi.org/10.1007/s13753-025-00667-w

www.ijdrs.com
www.springer.com/13753

PERSPECTIVE

Antifragility and Natural Hazard Risk: Rethinking Disaster through a Transformative Resilience Lens

Christian Geiß[1,2] · Victor Hertel[1,2]

Accepted: 20 September 2025 / Published online: 7 October 2025

Abstract
This study introduces antifragility as a transformative lens for disaster risk governance, shifting emphasis from restoration to disruption-induced improvement of systems. We distill six principles for operationalizing antifragility in disaster risk reduction contexts and delineate ethical, systemic, and learning-based implications for future resilience. Together, these elements reframe disaster risk governance as dynamic, adaptive, and self-reinforcing amid compounding climate risks.

Keywords Antifragility · Climate adaptation · Complex adaptive systems · Disaster risk reduction · Risk governance · Systemic vulnerability · Transformative resilience

1 Antifragility: Systems that Benefit from Disruption

In contemporary risk studies, the term "natural disaster" is frequently employed as a descriptor for catastrophic events triggered by environmental phenomena such as earthquakes, floods, hurricanes, or droughts. However, critical perspectives in disaster research have increasingly challenged the adequacy and neutrality of this term. A growing body of scholarship emphasizes that disasters do not occur solely due to extreme natural events. Rather, they result from the **confluence of hazardous events and pre-existing societal vulnerabilities**, such as exposure, poverty, weak governance, spatial inequality, and inadequate infrastructure. Hence, disasters are not "natural" in essence; they are socially constructed phenomena whose severity and consequences are shaped by human systems and decisions (Blaikie et al. 2014).

In this context, the concept of **antifragility**, coined by Nassim Nicholas Taleb, offers a compelling theoretical lens for rethinking how societies engage with risk and uncertainty (Taleb 2012). While traditional frameworks such as robustness aim to resist shocks, and resilience focuses on recovering from them, antifragility goes a step further: it describes systems that **benefit from volatility, uncertainty, stress, and disorder**. In other words, antifragile systems do not merely survive disruptions—they evolve and improve because of them. Antifragility further diverges from resilience in its **normative aspiration to thrive on disruption** rather than merely bounce back.

Antifragility is observable in biological systems—for instance, the human immune system strengthens through exposure to pathogens, and muscles grow in response to micro-tears from exercise. Taleb extends this logic to complex social, economic, and ecological systems. He argues that in an inherently unpredictable and nonlinear world, striving for control and optimization often increases fragility. Instead, systems should be designed to **adapt, learn, and emerge stronger in the face of disruption** (Taleb 2007).

Despite its heuristic potential, the concept of antifragility also presents challenges. Who bears the cost of failure? In practice, it is frequently the most vulnerable who are exposed to risk, while benefits can accrue elsewhere. **Furthermore, antifragile strategies have limits**. Systems whose collapse would generate catastrophic, irreversible outcomes—nuclear plants, large dams, core health systems—need to be robust or resilient, **not reactive to failure**. Thus, metrics and indicators for antifragile systems are crucial to enable tangibility and proper application.

✉ Christian Geiß
christian.geiss@dlr.de

[1] Earth Observation Center (EOC), German Aerospace Center (DLR), 82234 Oberpfaffenhofen, Germany

[2] Department of Geography, University of Bonn, 53115 Bonn, Germany

2 Operationalizing Antifragility in the Context of Natural Hazard Risk

Translating this concept into the domain of disaster risk reduction (DRR) and climate change adaptation calls for a **fundamental paradigm shift** in how we perceive and manage risk. Rather than minimizing disturbances at all costs, an antifragile approach encourages systems to engage with uncertainty, to experiment, and to institutionalize learning from failures. The following principles illustrate how antifragility can be operationalized in risk governance:

(1) Decentralization and Adaptive Governance

Antifragile systems thrive on **distributed decision making**, experimentation, and local responsiveness. Decentralized governance allows for multiple, context-specific solutions to emerge simultaneously—some of which may fail, while others succeed and can be scaled. This "evolutionary" model resembles natural selection: diversity becomes a strength, and feedback loops enable real-time learning (Folke et al. 2005). In disaster governance, this implies empowering communities, municipalities, and regional institutions to develop their own adaptive strategies rather than relying solely on top-down directives. As an example, Bangladesh's community-led cyclone shelters demonstrate how devolved, adaptive strategies can embed antifragile logic into DRR practice while improving inclusivity and effectiveness (Uddin et al. 2020).

(2) Strategic Redundancy over Optimization

Highly efficient systems are often fragile because they eliminate buffers and redundancies in pursuit of short-term gains. By contrast, antifragile systems embrace **strategic redundancy**—the deliberate creation of surplus capacities or backups that can absorb shocks. In infrastructure, this might mean constructing redundant power supplies, alternate transport routes, or flood retention basins that are only used in emergencies. While redundancy may appear inefficient under normal conditions, it dramatically enhances survivability and adaptability under stress. This is especially critical in today's society, where hazards rarely unfold as isolated shocks; they cascade through tightly coupled networks—energy, food, finance, cyber—creating polycrisis dynamics. Antifragile design embeds redundancy, modularity, and adaptability at critical network nodes so that cascading failures trigger adaptive responses rather than amplifying damage.

(3) Small-Scale Failures as Learning Opportunities

Antifragility presupposes the value of **controlled, low-stakes failures**. These "safe-to-fail" experiments help systems test boundaries and uncover weaknesses without incurring catastrophic losses. In disaster risk management, this could involve using retention areas to allow partial flooding in exchange for reducing downstream risks, or piloting early warning systems in test communities before national rollout. Through these experiments, risk managers gather vital data and refine interventions over time (Klein et al. 2003).

(4) Post-Disaster Transformation Instead of Restoration

Where resilience often emphasizes a return to the status quo ante, antifragility advocates for **transformative recovery**. Post-disaster reconstruction should be viewed as an opportunity for systemic improvement, rather than mere rebuilding. Examples include redesigning land-use plans to prevent rebuilding in hazard-prone areas, strengthening social protection systems, or reconfiguring emergency response institutions based on observed failures during past crises (Pelling 2011). Furthermore, nature-based and regenerative solutions—restored coastal wetlands, floodable parks, green roofs—absorb storm surges and runoff while sequestering carbon, cooling urban heat, and boosting biodiversity. Since these buffers regenerate after disturbance, each hazard pulse leaves both ecosystem and community incrementally stronger, turning post-disaster reconstruction into a pathway toward **self-reinforcing, antifragile landscapes**. In this way, recovery becomes a driver of innovation and structural change as for instance internalized in the "build back better" strategy included in the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030 (UNDRR 2015).

(5) Embracing Uncertainty through Scenario Diversity

Most planning systems are grounded in predictability and risk control. Yet in complex systems, **uncertainty is irreducible**—and frequently not quantifiable. Antifragile planning encourages **diverse scenario development**, including low-probability, high-impact "Black Swan" events (Taleb 2007). By preparing for surprise rather than assuming stability, planners can enhance the agility and robustness of systems. This may involve stress-testing infrastructure, simulating cascading system failures, or institutionalizing rapid-decision-making protocols under uncertainty.

(6) Metrics: From Resilience Indices to Antifragility Curves

While resilience is often tracked with static scorecards, antifragility demands dynamic metrics that capture convex responses to variability. Recent work formalizes antifragility as a nonlinear, positive second derivative of system payoff with respect to stress—enabling the use of "antifragility curves" for infrastructure portfolios, supply chains, or social programs (Axenie et al. 2024). Integrating such metrics into monitoring frameworks can turn routine hazard variability into continuous stress-testing data.

3 Antifragility as a Guiding Principle in an Era of Climate Uncertainty

As the climate crisis intensifies and the frequency and magnitude of extreme events rise, traditional linear models of risk management are increasingly insufficient. Antifragility offers a **forward-looking, dynamic, and learning-centered approach** that aligns well with the complexity of socio-environmental systems. Instead of seeking to eliminate all shocks, societies must cultivate the **capacity to respond productively to them**—to absorb, adapt, and innovate.

Moreover, antifragility reframes disaster not solely as a failure, but as a **source of critical knowledge and adaptive momentum**. In doing so, it calls for embedding failure-responsiveness into institutional cultures, infrastructure design, policy evaluation, and participatory governance mechanisms. Societies that succeed in doing so may not only reduce their disaster risk—but become more equitable, sustainable, and adaptive in the process.

References

Axenie, C., O. López-Corona, M.A. Makridis, M. Akbarzadeh, M. Saveriano, A. Stancu, and J. West. 2024. Antifragility in complex dynamical systems. *Npj Complexity* 1(1): Article 12.

Blaikie, P., T. Cannon, I. Davis, and B. Wisner. 2014. *At risk: Natural hazards, people's vulnerability and disasters*, 2nd edn. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Folke, C., T. Hahn, P. Olsson, and J. Norberg. 2005. Adaptive governance of social-ecological systems. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 30: 441–473.

Klein, R.J.T., R.J. Nicholls, and F. Thomalla. 2003. Resilience to natural hazards: How useful is this concept?. *Global Environmental Change* 5: 35–45.

Pelling, M. 2011. *Adaptation to climate change: From resilience to transformation*. New York: Routledge.

Taleb, N.N. 2007. *The Black Swan: The impact of the highly improbable*. New York: Random House.

Taleb, N.N. 2012. *Antifragile: Things that gain from disorder*. New York: Random House.

Uddin, S.M., C.E. Haque, D. Walker, and M. Choudhury. 2020. Community resilience to cyclone and storm surge disasters: Evidence from coastal communities of Bangladesh. *Journal of Environmental Management* 264: Article 110457.

UNDRR (United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction). 2015. Sendai framework for disaster risk reduction 2015–2030. https://www.undrr.org/publication/sendai-framework-disaster-risk-reduction-2015-2030. Accessed 24 Sept 2025.