

Observation, Indeterminacy, and Discontinuous Explanation: A Quantum-Continuity Model for the Philosophy of Social Science

Sebastian Saviano

Independent Scholar

ORCID: 0009-0005-4481-9063

Email: seb@sebastiansaviano.com

DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.20965947](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20965947)

Abstract

The philosophy of social science faces a persistent explanatory gap in reflexive systems: when modeling alters what is being modeled, predictive frameworks become unstable at the moments they are most needed. Complexity theory and reflexivity each address part of this problem — nonlinearity, feedback, recursive expectation — but each leaves comparatively underspecified the moment at which structured indeterminacy resolves into a realized social outcome.

This article proposes Potentialism and the Quantum-Continuity Model (QCM) as a candidate epistemological framework. Rather than claiming social systems are literally quantum, QCM treats quantum theory as a source for disciplined structural analogy, transferring the bare structure by which multiple live possibilities resolve into a definite outcome — while explicitly bounding what does and does not carry over. From this it generates three concepts: Transition Zones, Quantum Thresholds, and Quantum Measurement Events. The framework positions itself among existing accounts of constitutive observation — self-fulfilling prophecy, performativity, and second-order systems theory — specifying what it adds to them.

The Arab Spring serves as illustration, with briefer extensions to the 2008 financial crisis and #MeToo. QCM offers a vocabulary for discontinuous social resolution, reorienting inquiry from prediction toward the navigation of structured indeterminacy.

Keywords

Philosophy of social science; Uncertainty; Reflexivity; Complexity theory; Discontinuous explanation; Quantum analogy

Author's Note.

This article is the framework paper for the Quantum-Continuity Model. Its applied companion, “Applying the Quantum-Continuity Model: Metastability, Observation, and Discontinuous Change across Social and Political Crises,” develops the cross-domain case applications in full and is available at <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5929837>.

This framework was first proposed by the author as a doctoral dissertation in 2007. The proposal was not carried forward at the time, and the project was set aside. It was conceived before the emergence of the quantum turn in social science — the body of work, largely post-2010, that has since made the application of quantum-theoretic reasoning to social inquiry a recognized line of research. Revisiting the material after that turn, the author found its central argument unchanged and, in light of subsequent scholarship, more readily situated than it could have been at the time of its first writing. The paper offered here is its overdue completion.

AI Use Disclosure. The author used an AI assistant (ChatGPT 5.5) in the preparation of this manuscript. Its role included verifying and correcting bibliographic references, and copyediting, each of which the author reviewed, edited, and approved. The framework, arguments, case analyses, and all substantive and final decisions are the author's own. The author is responsible for the content in its entirety.

1. Introduction: From Predictability to Potentiality

A foundational difficulty in the philosophy of social science concerns how to conceptualize uncertainty, causality, and observation in reflexive systems: systems in which the act of modeling alters the phenomenon being modeled. Across domains, from political upheavals to market crises, social events routinely defy frameworks premised on prediction, linear causality, and stable equilibria. Even within democratic politics, episodes such as Brexit and the 2016 U.S. election revealed the fragility of probabilistic reasoning once publics begin responding reflexively to the act of prediction itself.

These failures are not anomalies of data but symptoms of deeper epistemological limitations. They reveal the limits of frameworks designed for closed, non-reflexive systems when applied to worlds constituted through feedback, narrative, and self-reference. The gap between what social scientists model and what unfolds widens precisely because expectation and interpretation are themselves part of political reality. As Taleb (2007) reminds us, the most consequential events, his “Black Swans,” are not external shocks but endogenous ruptures born within systems themselves.

The task, then, is not to promise certainty but to develop a more adequate epistemological framework for social inquiry under conditions of reflexivity and contingency. This article advances Potentialism, a post-Newtonian epistemology that treats social futures as overlapping possibilities until they resolve through observation itself. It develops the Quantum-Continuity Model (QCM) as one possible instantiation of this stance: a framework that adapts three mechanisms from quantum theory, superposition, collapse, and measurement-driven resolution, into conceptual tools for analyzing metastability, discontinuous change, and constitutive observation in social systems.

1.1 Why Newtonian Models Falter in Social Systems

For more than two centuries, the Newtonian worldview has underwritten much of the social sciences. Rooted in classical mechanics, it assumes that phenomena can be decomposed into discrete parts governed by general laws, that cause yields predictable effect, and that sufficient data ensure reliable forecasting. Rational-choice theory, equilibrium economics, and structural realism all bear this imprint, from law-like systemic accounts of international politics (Waltz 1979) to game-theoretic models that formalize strategic interaction into calculable predictions (Schelling 1960; Fearon 1995).

Yet Newtonian determinism falters in reflexive, self-altering systems. Social and political actors are not planets: they anticipate, interpret, and adapt to models of themselves. Forecasts influence turnout, theories shape behavior, and financial models can trigger the panics they seek to avert. In such reflexive settings, analysis collapses the boundary between observer and system, making prediction unstable precisely when it is most desired, during crisis or transition.

Newtonian methods retain value for explaining equilibrium, institutional persistence, and bounded rationality. Yet their dominance has obscured the need for a complementary epistemology, one capable of grasping systems poised at thresholds, where perception and interpretation become causal forces and small shifts can yield disproportionate effects.

1.2 Complexity, Reflexivity, and the Quantum Analogy in Social Life

In response, scholars turned toward complexity theory, network analysis, and reflexivity. Complexity emphasized nonlinearity, feedback, and emergence; network theory illuminated how structure, centrality, density, and modularity, conditions vulnerability and resilience; and reflexivity, from Giddens's structuration theory to Soros's financial reflexivity, revealed how expectations loop back into outcomes.

These perspectives profoundly enriched social inquiry. Jervis showed how tightly coupled systems produce unintended consequences, and Wendt demonstrated how social facts emerge from intersubjective recognition. Yet each approach remains partial: complexity identifies turbulence but not its resolution; network analysis maps fragility but not decisive breakdown; reflexivity captures feedback but not the moment when perception crystallizes into action.

Against this backdrop, the analogy to quantum theory becomes instructive, not as metaphor, but as an epistemological resource whose precise status is elaborated in Section 4. Just as a quantum system is described by multiple coexisting possibilities that yield a definite outcome upon measurement, social systems can harbor multiple coexisting futures until interpretation crystallizes one trajectory. The analogy is structural and should not be mistaken for the popular misconception that a conscious observer causes quantum outcomes; what the analogy borrows is the emergence of a definite result from a system described by multiple live possibilities through physical interaction, not a claim about perception. In social life, the parallel is not consciousness but public registration: acts such as polling, media coverage, or diplomatic recognition feed back into the field of possibility, reshaping the very expectations they aim to record. Uncertainty, therefore, is not merely incomplete information but a structural feature of the situation itself:

futures remain indeterminate until resolution, and observation helps determine which becomes realized.

This insight moves beyond the partial advances of complexity and reflexivity. Where both illuminate instability, the quantum-inspired stance identifies the mechanism of resolution. Metastability, discontinuous transformation, and constitutive observation emerge as structural features of social life. This orientation grounds the Quantum-Continuity Model (QCM), which develops three social analogues of quantum mechanisms, Transition Zones, Quantum Thresholds, and Quantum Measurement Events (QMEs), to explain how futures coexist, collapse, and reconstitute in social systems.

This epistemological move builds upon, but also departs from, ongoing debates within the philosophy of social science about knowledge and ontology. Scholars such as Jackson (2016), Wight (2006), and Kurki (2020) have sought to reorient social inquiry toward reflexivity, pluralism, and ontological awareness. Potentialism extends this project by reframing uncertainty as constitutive rather than residual, transforming social inquiry from a project of prediction to one of navigating structured indeterminacy. It complements the “turn to ontology” but grounds it in a theory of indeterminacy, where observation and resolution are integral to the production of social reality.

2. The Limits of Newtonian Social Science

As outlined in Section 1, the Newtonian worldview has served as the dominant model of modern social science: a vision of the social world governed by stable laws, predictable trajectories, and linear causality. Its appeal lay in the promise that, with sufficient data and the proper analytic model, social outcomes could be forecast as reliably as physical motion. Yet this paradigm repeatedly faltered when confronted with reflexivity, turbulence, and discontinuous change. This section examines why, and traces the partial moves beyond Newtonian assumptions that set the stage for the framework developed here.

2.1 Partial Moves Beyond Newton

Recognizing these limits, scholars sought to move beyond deterministic models through the conceptual languages of complexity, emergence, and reflexivity. Each marked a step away from the Newtonian ideal of prediction, yet none fully escaped its gravitational pull.

Complexity theory emphasized nonlinearity, feedback, and self-organization. Jervis (1997) showed how tightly coupled systems generate unintended consequences that cannot be reduced to individual decisions. Urry (2003) argued that global society should be conceived as a complex system, with nonlinearity as its defining property. Mitchell (2009) illustrated how adaptive systems produce emergent patterns: structures that arise from micro-level interactions but cannot be reduced to their individual components. Recent scholarship has extended this agenda by applying complexity thinking explicitly to social and transnational dynamics (Bousquet and Curtis 2011; Chandler 2021).

Network theory added analytical precision by showing that resilience and fragility depend less on unit properties than on the structure of relationships among them. Castells (1996) captured how flows of information and capital generate new vulnerabilities as shocks cascade through interdependence. Keohane and Nye (1977) anticipated this insight, demonstrating how dense networks can simultaneously stabilize and destabilize social order.

Reflexivity posed a distinct but related challenge to Newtonian logic. Giddens (1984) emphasized the duality of structure: social life is recursively constituted by agents aware of, and acting upon, the very structures that constrain them. Soros (1987) extended reflexivity into finance, showing how expectations feed back into valuations to generate self-reinforcing booms and crashes. Taleb (2007) underscored that perception-driven shocks are not anomalies but structural features of complex systems, events that predictive models systematically overlook.

Yet even these post-Newtonian advances often retained traces of Newtonian assumption. Complexity frequently translated uncertainty into probabilistic prediction, reducing collapse to the gradual crossing of tipping points. Reflexivity was frequently treated as a disturbance of otherwise stable trajectories rather than as a constitutive mechanism of transformation. The result was a body of theory that illuminated turbulence and emergence but stopped short of explaining discontinuous collapse: those critical junctures when multiple potential futures coexist and then resolve abruptly.

2.2 Toward a New Epistemology

Existing traditions in the philosophy of social science, from practice theory and relational sociology to critical realism and post-positivist IR, have sought to capture fluidity and transformation. Yet even these approaches often remain implicitly Newtonian in their

assumptions about linear process and stable causality. The conceptual shift required is therefore deeper: from determinism to potentialism.

Where Newtonian science rests on determinism, the belief that with sufficient data outcomes follow inevitably from given conditions, the framework proposed here rests on potentiality. In social terms, this stance is captured as Potentialism: the view that futures coexist as overlapping possibilities until they resolve through observation. Potentialism treats uncertainty as a structural feature of social situations rather than merely a product of incomplete information. The indeterminacy of social futures is real, not a residue of ignorance.

The Quantum-Continuity Model (QCM) develops this contrast. It adapts three principles from quantum theory, superposition, collapse, and observation, into structured social analogues. QCM extends the insights of complexity and reflexivity while addressing their shared limitation: where complexity identifies turbulence but not its resolution, and reflexivity identifies feedback but not the moment perception crystallizes into action, QCM proposes a candidate mechanism connecting the two. That mechanism is constitutive observation: the process by which acts of registration, representation, or recognition alter expectations and thereby reshape subsequent collective behavior.

QCM is not a rejection of prior traditions but an integration of their insights within a post-Newtonian epistemology. It shares with positivism the aspiration to explanatory rigor, with scientific realism the concern for underlying generative mechanisms, and with critical theory the recognition of the constitutive power of observation and discourse. Yet it reframes each within a paradigm that treats metastability, discontinuous change, and constitutive observation as structural features of social inquiry rather than exceptional cases.

Conceptually, the framework can be situated among three epistemological stances:

- **Determinism** assumes that futures are fixed, unfolding inevitably once initial conditions and laws are known.
- **Probabilism** treats futures as ranked by likelihood, with uncertainty reducible to imperfect information.
- **Potentialism**, the stance developed here, holds that multiple futures remain analytically live until they resolve through observation, which is itself constitutive of the outcome.

While the term echoes Aristotelian distinctions between potentiality and actuality and resonates with contemporary debates in the philosophy of physics, it has not been systematically applied within the philosophy of social science. It is introduced here as a deliberate counterpoint to both determinism and probabilism, reframing uncertainty not as error or ignorance but as a constitutive feature of social situations.

3. The Epistemological Turn: Complexity, Reflexivity, and the Quantum Analogy

Sections 1 and 2 established why Newtonian determinism fails in reflexive social systems and traced the partial moves beyond it through complexity theory and reflexivity. This section completes that diagnosis by identifying what both frameworks leave unresolved, reviews the existing quantum turn in social theory, and introduces the epistemological logic on which QCM is built.

3.1 The Shared Limitation of Complexity and Reflexivity

As Sections 1 and 2 established, complexity and reflexivity each illuminate instability without specifying how it resolves: the moment at which metastable futures consolidate into a realized outcome remains comparatively underspecified in both. Section 3 takes up the response that has attracted growing attention — the turn to quantum theory — and asks what it can and cannot supply.

This gap is not merely abstract. It became visible during the 2008 financial crisis and the Arab Spring, contexts marked by acute complexity and reflexivity. Scholars could identify systemic fragility, recursive expectations, and feedback loops, yet neither framework anticipated the discontinuous collapses triggered by Lehman Brothers' bankruptcy in 2008 or Mohamed Bouazizi's self-immolation in 2010. In each case, existing frameworks explained why the system was unstable but not how, or precisely when, instability resolved into collapse. It is this resolution moment that the quantum analogy, developed in the sections that follow, is introduced to address.

A framework adequate to these episodes would need to clarify three interrelated dynamics: how social systems harbor multiple potential futures simultaneously; why resolution occurs suddenly rather than gradually; and how acts of observation precipitate that resolution. What is required, in short, is an account that treats indeterminacy as structured rather than chaotic, and

observation as constitutive rather than merely descriptive. This is the orientation the following sections develop.

3.2 The Quantum Turn and Its Limits

In recent years, a growing body of scholarship has sought to address this puzzle through what has been described as a quantum turn in the social sciences. Wendt (2015) argues that quantum theory offers not only metaphors but a literal ontology for understanding consciousness and social reality. Barad's (2007) agential realism invokes quantum entanglement to challenge linear causality and positivist epistemology. This literature has gained new traction in political theory, with recent work revisiting Wendt's proposals and extending them to security studies and social ontology (Der Derian and Wendt 2020). Its virtue lies in highlighting the limitations of Newtonian frameworks and expanding the conceptual space for alternative foundations.

Yet these contributions remain limited in their operational relevance. Wendt and Barad approach quantum theory primarily as ontology, implying that social systems are literally quantum rather than that quantum mechanics provides an analogical logic for understanding uncertainty and resolution. Others, such as Laughlin (2005) and Jasanoff (2004), employ quantum ideas more metaphorically, invoking entanglement or superposition as evocative tropes without translating them into mechanisms that clarify how metastable social futures coexist or resolve. The result has been more conceptual provocation than cumulative theoretical development.

QCM departs from this literature in two key respects. It is neither an ontological claim that social systems are literally quantum nor a loose metaphorical borrowing from physics. It is better understood as a disciplined structural analogy: it treats quantum theory as an epistemological resource, a source of analogical reasoning about indeterminacy, observation, and resolution that can be applied to social systems without committing to claims about their physical substrate. The precise status of this analogy is elaborated in Section 3.4 below.

3.3 The Quantum Analogy as Epistemological Resource

In quantum theory, a system can be described by a superposition of states — not merely a list of alternative possibilities but a formally distinct condition that yields definite outcomes only upon measurement (Albert 1992). QCM does not import this formalism; it abstracts from it a modeling schema for situations in which multiple outcomes remain live until interaction or interpretation

resolves them. Applied analogically to social life, this logic suggests that multiple futures can coexist in latent form until intervention, interpretation, or recognition crystallizes a single outcome. Elections balanced on knife-edge majorities, markets suspended between confidence and panic, and protest movements oscillating between dormancy and eruption exemplify this condition of unresolved potential.

In both domains, registration is not fully external to what it registers. In physics, measurement is a physical interaction that can disturb the system measured — a feature formalized in the theory of measurement rather than a matter of human observation. In social life, the parallel acts — polling, media coverage, diplomatic recognition, statistical modeling — feed back into the field of possibility, reshaping the very expectations they seek to record. Uncertainty is therefore not a residue of ignorance but a structural feature of the situation itself. The range of possible futures remains indeterminate until resolution, and interpretive interventions by actors or analysts can decisively shape which path becomes realized.

The strength of the analogy lies in its epistemological discipline. It treats indeterminacy as structured rather than chaotic, enabling social inquiry to conceptualize how metastable systems move from openness to resolution. Where complexity highlights turbulence and reflexivity captures feedback, the quantum analogy supplies what they leave comparatively underspecified: a schema for how indeterminate potential resolves into realized form through acts of registration. The analogy organizes this hypothesis; it does not, by itself, establish the social mechanism, which must be supported on independent social-scientific grounds. This is the foundation on which QCM builds its three social analogues, Transition Zones, Quantum Thresholds, and Quantum Measurement Events, as tools for understanding discontinuous social transformation.

3.4 The Status of the Quantum Analogy

Because the quantum analogy is central to QCM's architecture, its precise status requires explicit clarification. The framework makes four claims, which should be distinguished carefully.

First, the ontological claim. QCM does not claim that social systems are physically quantum or that the formalism of quantum mechanics governs social dynamics. It makes no commitment to quantum consciousness theories or to the literal applicability of quantum field equations to collective behavior. The physical substrate of social life is not at issue here.

Second, the epistemological stance. QCM proposes that the logical structure of quantum indeterminacy, specifically the coexistence of multiple states prior to observation and the

constitutive role of measurement, provides a productive framework for conceptualizing analogous features of social situations. Social systems exhibit structured indeterminacy: multiple outcomes can remain genuinely live until interpretive or communicative acts stabilize expectations around one path. This is an epistemological claim about how to conceptualize social situations, not a physical claim about their composition.

Third, the explanatory role of the analogy. The quantum analogy functions as what philosophers of science call a theoretical model: a structured representation that highlights certain features of the target domain by mapping them onto a better-understood source domain (Hesse 1966; Morgan and Morrison 1999). The analogy is productive insofar as it generates precise, revisable claims about social indeterminacy, resolution, and observation. It is not productive when extended beyond those three mechanisms into quantum concepts such as entanglement, nonlocality, or quantum tunneling, which have no clear social analogues.

Fourth, the limits of the analogy. QCM borrows the familiar textbook vocabulary of superposition and measurement-driven resolution most commonly associated with Copenhagen-style presentations. It does not depend on the Copenhagen interpretation specifically, nor on resolving the disputes that divide the major interpretations: Many-Worlds denies fundamental collapse and treats measurement as branching, Bohmian mechanics is deterministic, and QBism interprets the quantum state as an agent's personal probability assignment rather than an objective physical state. The analogy requires only the minimal, interpretation-neutral structure these accounts all accommodate in some form — the emergence of definite measurement outcomes from systems described by multiple live possibilities — and is adopted for that structure alone. Wavefunction collapse, accordingly, is used here as a structural figure for the appearance of definite outcomes following measurement interaction rather than as a commitment about physical mechanism; decoherence explains why interference between possibilities becomes practically unobservable but does not by itself settle how, or in what sense, a single outcome is selected, and QCM takes no position on that foundational question. The framework explicitly sets aside quantum concepts that lack productive social analogues. It also acknowledges that the analogy carries risks: the prestige of physics can obscure rather than illuminate social phenomena if the transfer criteria are not made explicit. The criteria adopted here are structural rather than substantive: the analogy applies where social situations exhibit observer-dependent resolution of multiple coexisting outcomes, and does not apply where social

dynamics are well explained by linear causality or probabilistic prediction. This structural reading also has a second dimension, developed in Section 4.6: the analogy tracks not only the discontinuous resolution of indeterminacy but the graded transition from open potentiality toward the apparent stability of settled, classical-like social order — the “continuity” the model is named for.

In sum, QCM uses quantum-theoretic reasoning the way a philosopher of science uses a theoretical model: as a structured resource for generating precise claims about a target domain, subject to revision when the analogy breaks down. The following section introduces the three social analogues that operationalize this reasoning.

A final clarification concerns the kind of explanation QCM offers, since the framework operates in two registers that should be kept distinct. In its constitutive register, a public act of registration reorganizes social meaning and expectation: it changes what actors take to be the case, and thereby what becomes the case. In its mechanistic register, QCM makes claims about temporal sequence and counterfactual dependence — that a given act preceded convergence, became publicly legible at an identifiable moment, and that the resolution would not have followed on the same timeline absent it. These registers are complementary but not identical, and conflating them would let the central concept absorb any salient event after the fact. The outcome-independent criteria specified in Section 4 govern the mechanistic register specifically; the constitutive register is what those criteria are designed to discipline.

This positioning also clarifies how QCM relates to existing accounts of constitutive observation in social life, several of which are direct precursors rather than rivals. The mechanism by which a public definition of a situation helps bring about the state it describes is the core of Merton’s (1948) self-fulfilling prophecy; the performativity literature in economic sociology, especially Callon (1998) and MacKenzie (2006), shows in detail how models, ratings, and public representations do not merely describe markets but help enact them. Systems-theoretic accounts of self-reference and second-order observation, notably Luhmann (1995), likewise treat social systems as constituted through communication and observation rather than observed from outside. QCM does not displace these traditions; it stands on them. What it adds is narrower and specific: where the self-fulfilling prophecy and performativity typically trace how a single expectation or model enacts the outcome it names, QCM focuses on the moment at which a metastable field of multiple live outcomes resolves into one, and specifies outcome-

independent criteria (Section 4) for identifying the public acts that do this resolving work. The contribution is thus a more precise account of observation-driven resolution under reflexive indeterminacy, offered as a refinement of these literatures rather than an alternative to them.

4. The Quantum-Continuity Model: Three Social Analogues

Building on the preceding discussion, the Quantum-Continuity Model (QCM) articulates how uncertainty operates as structure by adapting three principles from quantum theory, superposition, collapse, and measurement-driven resolution, into social analogues that clarify how social futures emerge, persist, and resolve. The model is named for continuity because it posits a single connected dimension — a continuum running from open potentiality, through degrees of metastability, to settled, classical-like order — along which every social situation can be located. This continuum is the framework’s central object: social reality is not partitioned into “open” and “resolved” states but graded between them. Discontinuity enters not as a rival principle but as a feature of movement along this continuum: the crossing of any particular threshold is abrupt, an irreversible jump from one region of the continuum to another (developed in Section 4.6). Each principle finds its counterpart in social life: Transition Zones correspond to superposition (the coexistence of unresolved futures), Quantum Thresholds to collapse (the sudden resolution of potentialities), and Quantum Measurement Events (QMEs) to measurement-driven resolution (acts of recognition, exposure, or interpretation that precipitate transformation).

The three concepts are introduced below, each with a definition, a set of observable indicators, and a note distinguishing the QCM interpretation from rival accounts. A summary operationalization table follows in Section 4.4.

4.1 Transition Zones (Analogue of Superposition)

QCM adapts this logic into Transition Zones: periods or configurations in which multiple potential social outcomes remain live as genuine potentiality — open as a structural feature of the situation rather than merely as a gap in anyone’s knowledge — and have not yet resolved into a single realized path. In practice, a Transition Zone is recognizable where collective expectations have not stabilized around one outcome: authoritative actors send conflicting signals about which future will prevail, and incompatible outcomes remain in credible contention.

The model treats several outcomes as analytically live possibilities when no actor has yet stabilized expectations around a single path. This is not a claim that all futures are equally probable in a statistical sense, nor that social systems are literally in quantum superposition. It is an epistemological claim about how certain social situations are best conceptualized: as fields of multiple live outcomes that have not yet resolved. What distinguishes such a situation is the absence of a stabilized resolution: several outcomes remain in genuine contention, none yet fixed, rather than one having been settled in advance. The claim is not that these outcomes carry equal probability — the framework does not assign probabilities at all — but that their resolution is genuinely open, not given beforehand as a fixed distribution to be estimated.

Elections balanced on undecided majorities, markets oscillating between confidence and panic, and protest movements poised between dormancy and eruption exemplify such configurations. Each harbors several possible outcomes, none predetermined or dominant in advance. Outcomes remain indeterminate until new events or interpretations shift collective expectations and crystallize a shared outcome.

Transition Zones are therefore qualitatively distinct from fragile equilibria in rational-choice models or tipping points in complexity theory. They represent not statistical uncertainty but structured indeterminacy: a condition in which multiple outcomes coexist as live potentiality until interpretive intervention produces resolution. Social life unfolds along a continuum of potentiality, from open possibility through metastability toward resolution as thresholds are crossed.

Observable indicators of a Transition Zone include: the absence of dominant narrative convergence among key actors; conflicting signals from authoritative actors about which outcome will prevail; high volatility in opinion or market indicators without directional trend; and the coexistence of publicly credible but mutually incompatible interpretations of the current situation.

4.2 Quantum Thresholds (Analogue of Collapse)

Transition Zones do not persist indefinitely. Just as superpositions in quantum systems eventually resolve into definite states through observation, social futures likewise consolidate into realized outcomes. QCM captures this moment through Quantum Thresholds: points at

which the structured indeterminacy of a Transition Zone resolves discontinuously into a new configuration.

Thresholds mark discontinuous resolution: moments when a social system shifts suddenly from one field of possibility to another, often irreversibly. The distinction from gradual tipping points in complexity theory requires precision. A tipping point, in the complexity literature, refers to the accumulation of incremental pressure until a system crosses a critical threshold, with change understood as the culmination of a continuous process. A Quantum Threshold, by contrast, refers to the active resolution of indeterminacy: the moment when competing outcomes collapse into one, not because pressure has accumulated to a critical level but because collective expectations have reorganized around a single path. The difference is not merely one of speed but of mechanism: tipping points are driven by accumulation, thresholds by resolution.

An authoritarian regime, for instance, may persist for decades in a metastable Transition Zone where discontent and compliance coexist. When a threshold is crossed, through crisis, elite defection, or rapid shifts in collective perception, legitimacy dissolves and the system reorganizes around a new configuration. Such transformations are best understood not as the culmination of linear pressure but as the resolution of genuinely coexisting futures into one realized outcome.

Observable indicators of a Quantum Threshold include: rapid, nonlinear shifts in elite alignment or public behavior following a discrete event; the sudden delegitimation of previously stable institutional arrangements; the emergence of a dominant interpretive frame where multiple frames previously competed; and the irreversibility of the new configuration in the short term.

These indicators are jointly suggestive rather than individually decisive, however, since each can also appear as an ex post signature of ordinary cascades and punctuated equilibria. A Threshold claim therefore requires evidence that resolution was driven by the reorganization of expectations around a discrete act of observation rather than by the continuous accumulation of pressure to a critical level. In hybrid cases — where pressure accumulates over years and then a single visible event reorganizes expectations — QCM does not claim that accumulation is absent; it claims only that the resolution moment, which accumulation accounts background, is where the constitutive work occurs. The coding question is whether removing the observational event would have left the same outcome on the same timeline.

4.3 Quantum Measurement Events (Analogue of the Observer Effect)

If Transition Zones describe coexistence and Thresholds describe resolution, the next question is what precipitates transformation. In quantum theory, measurement is the physical interaction through which a system described by multiple possibilities yields a definite outcome. QCM reframes this dynamic as Quantum Measurement Events (QMEs): acts of observation, exposure, or interpretation that transform structured indeterminacy into realized outcomes by altering the expectations of actors within the system.

The concept requires disaggregation, and a criterion for membership. A Quantum Measurement Event is an act whose effect on the social field runs through *registration*: it makes a previously latent or private state publicly legible, and reorganizes expectations because actors now perceive and reinterpret what has become visible — not because the act itself applies force, resources, or coercion. The paradigm cases are observational in this sense: conducting and releasing a poll, an investigative report that renders private conduct publicly legible, a credit-rating downgrade that publishes a latent assessment and thereby crystallizes coordinated withdrawal. What qualifies such an act is not its content or its drama but its constitutive route: it resolves competing possibilities by changing what is collectively known and expected, rather than by exerting pressure on the system.

Some acts are mixed, and the framework should treat them as such rather than forcing a classification. A diplomatic recognition, for instance, both registers a judgment about an actor's status and may be intended as a strategic intervention to provoke a response; a widely circulated image both makes a private grievance legible and may be deliberately deployed to mobilize. In such cases the QME is present in the registration component — the work done by making a state legible — while any force the act exerts through resources, coercion, or strategic commitment belongs to a different causal channel and should be analyzed separately. The test, in every case, is counterfactual and observational: would the act have reorganized expectations *through what it made visible*, independently of any pressure it also applied?

QMEs should be distinguished from mere triggering events. A triggering event, in standard social science usage, is a proximate cause that initiates a process already underway. A QME, in the QCM framework, is constitutive rather than merely causal: it does not simply initiate a process but helps determine which of several genuinely open outcomes becomes realized. The

distinction matters for explanation: where a triggering-event account asks what set off a chain of events, a QME account asks how observation reorganized the field of possibility.

In social life, polling results can function as QMEs, reshaping voter expectations and influencing the very outcomes they were meant to measure. In finance, a rating downgrade can crystallize the very panic it registers, making a latent fragility publicly legible and thereby helping to realize it. In social movements, the public circulation of testimony, or of an image that renders a private grievance legible, can crystallize diffuse discontent into collective action. In each case, observation is not passive but productive: it transforms structured indeterminacy into a realized outcome.

Observable indicators of a QME include: a discrete communicative or interpretive act that precedes rapid behavioral convergence among previously divergent actors; evidence that the act reorganized rather than merely reflected existing expectations; evidence that its effect operated through what it made publicly legible rather than through force or resources it applied; the act's public legibility across multiple audiences simultaneously; and a demonstrable shift in the dominant interpretive frame following the act.

To guard against circularity — identifying a QME only by the convergence it is meant to explain — the framework requires that a candidate QME satisfy three conditions that are specifiable independently of the outcome. First, **timing**: the act must be datable to a point that precedes the behavioral convergence, not one that merely coincides with it; an event known only after the fact, or simultaneous with the shift, does not qualify. Second, **legibility**: there must be evidence that information became newly public or newly interpretable at that moment — a property of the act of registration itself, observable whether or not convergence follows — and that the act's influence operated through this legibility rather than through force or resources it independently applied. An act that reorganizes expectations by exerting pressure, rather than by making a state legible, may be consequential but is not a QME. Third, a **counterfactual** check: there must be reason to believe that, absent the act, the same resolution would not have occurred on the same timeline. An event that fails this last condition — where the outcome would have arrived at the same time regardless — is better classified as a marker of accumulation already underway than as a constitutive QME. These conditions do not eliminate interpretive judgment, but they shift identification from the outcome to the act, allowing two analysts to disagree about whether a

given event was a QME on the basis of evidence about its timing, legibility, and counterfactual weight rather than on the basis of the transformation alone.

4.4 Operationalization Table

Table 1. QCM Concepts: Definitions, Observable Indicators, and Rival Interpretations

Concept	Definition	Observable Indicators	Rival Interpretation
Transition Zone	A configuration in which multiple social outcomes remain live as genuine potentiality, none yet resolved	Absent narrative convergence; conflicting signals from authoritative actors about which outcome will prevail; high indicator volatility without directional trend; coexisting credible but incompatible interpretations	Fragile equilibrium (rational choice); pre-tipping instability (complexity theory)
Quantum Threshold	The discontinuous resolution of a Transition Zone into a new configuration, driven by the reorganization of collective expectations rather than the accumulation of pressure	Rapid nonlinear shifts in elite alignment or public behavior; sudden delegitimation of stable arrangements; emergence of dominant interpretive frame; short-term irreversibility (jointly suggestive; see text)	Tipping point (complexity theory); critical juncture (historical institutionalism)
Quantum Measurement Event	A public act whose effect runs through registration — making a latent or private state publicly legible — thereby reorganizing the field of live possibilities and helping determine which outcome becomes realized, rather than through force or resources the act applies	Discrete act preceding convergence; reorganizes rather than reflects expectations; effect runs through public legibility, not applied force; shifts the dominant frame. Outcome-independent conditions: datable priority, newly public legibility, and counterfactual weight (resolution would not have	

		occurred on the same timeline absent the act)	
--	--	--	--

4.5 Scope Conditions, Boundary Conditions, and Objections

Any theoretical framework gains credibility by specifying where it applies and where it does not. Five objections to QCM are predictable from the literature, and four boundary conditions follow from them.

Objection 1: QCM simply rebrands tipping points and reflexivity.

The objection has surface plausibility. Both tipping-point models and QCM identify moments of sudden change; both reflexivity accounts and QCM emphasize the role of observation in social dynamics. The distinction, however, is one of mechanism rather than terminology. Tipping-point models explain sudden change as the culmination of incremental pressure; QCM explains it as the resolution of genuine indeterminacy. Reflexivity identifies feedback loops; QCM identifies the specific act, the QME, that converts ongoing feedback into resolved outcome. The contribution is not a new label but a more precise mechanism: constitutive observation resolving structured indeterminacy.

Objection 2: The claim that multiple futures coexist on equal footing is too strong an ontological commitment.

This objection has force, and QCM does not make that claim. QCM does not hold that all futures are ontologically equivalent or that social systems exist in literal superposition. The claim is epistemological and analytical: certain social situations are best conceptualized as genuinely open, in the sense that no available information or causal analysis can determine in advance which outcome will be realized. ‘Equal footing’ refers to analytical indeterminacy, not metaphysical equivalence.

Objection 3: “Observation” is too broad a mechanism, collapsing categorically different acts.

This objection is also well-founded. The revised concept of QMEs addresses it by disaggregating observation into its constitutive components: public legibility, expectation reorganization, and cross-audience simultaneity. Not all acts of observation are QMEs. A private communication, a classified report, or a narrowly circulated disclosure does not reorganize collective expectations at scale and therefore does not function as a QME. The concept applies specifically to acts of observation whose constitutive force operates by becoming legible to the relevant audiences simultaneously — the stakeholders whose coordinated recognition resolves the situation, which

may be the general public or a bounded community of actors (investors, officials, institutional gatekeepers) depending on the case.

Objection 4: The quantum analogy imports physics prestige without sufficient transfer criteria.

This is the most serious objection and is addressed directly in Section 3.4. The transfer criteria adopted in QCM are structural rather than substantive: the analogy applies where social situations exhibit observer-dependent resolution of multiple coexisting outcomes. It does not apply where social dynamics are well explained by linear causality, probabilistic prediction, or incremental accumulation. The analogy is explicitly limited to three quantum mechanisms, superposition, collapse, and measurement-driven resolution, and does not extend to entanglement, nonlocality, or quantum field dynamics.

Objection 5: QCM cannot distinguish genuine indeterminacy from ordinary uncertainty, unmodeled hidden variables, or the analyst's own lack of access to the true causal structure.

This objection is well-grounded, and the framework should concede its force rather than overstate its claims. QCM does not offer a test that distinguishes genuine ontological indeterminacy — multiple futures that are open in the world itself — from severe epistemic underdetermination, in which the trajectory is fixed but no available information or analysis can identify it in advance. The framework's analytical purchase does not depend on resolving this distinction. Whether a situation is ontologically open or merely epistemically opaque, the same observation applies: acts of public registration reorganize the expectations of actors who cannot themselves determine the outcome in advance, and that reorganization is consequential for which outcome is realized. QCM therefore brackets the metaphysical question and operates at the level on which both readings agree — the level of how observation restructures a field of possibility that no participant can resolve from available information. What QCM does require is that the indeterminacy be genuine in the analytical sense (Objection 2): that it not be an artifact of the analyst's hindsight, attached to surprising outcomes after the fact. The outcome-independent identification conditions in Section 4.3 are intended precisely to prevent that post hoc labeling.

Boundary conditions: QCM applies most productively when:

- The social situation exhibits genuine indeterminacy: multiple outcomes are credible and no dominant path has emerged
- Observation is consequential: acts of public registration or interpretation are likely to reorganize actor expectations

- Resolution is discontinuous: the transition from indeterminacy to realized outcome is abrupt rather than incremental

QCM applies less productively when:

- Outcomes are strongly path-dependent and institutional inertia is high
- The situation is well explained by incremental accumulation of pressure
- Observation is private or narrowly circulated and unlikely to reorganize collective expectations at scale
- The relevant dynamics operate over very long time horizons where gradual processes dominate.

4.6 The Continuity in QCM

The notion of continuity in QCM reflects a spectrum rather than a binary. Social systems do not leap directly from pure indeterminacy to fixed determinacy but move through gradations: from configurations of open potentiality, through metastable Transition Zones, toward resolved outcomes once thresholds are crossed. This spectrum parallels the quantum-to-classical transition discussed in physics, where the interference between possibilities becomes practically unobservable through decoherence and the system comes to behave classically, though the parallel is epistemological rather than physical and QCM takes no position on how, or in what sense, a single outcome is ultimately selected. This continuity is not in tension with the discontinuity emphasized elsewhere in the framework: the two describe different axes. The underlying condition is continuous, in that systems occupy positions along a spectrum from openness to resolution, while the crossing of any particular threshold is discontinuous, an abrupt transition from one region of that spectrum to another. QCM is thus a continuity model in its account of where social systems stand and a discontinuity model in its account of how they move.

The continuum also correlates with scale. Micro-level dynamics, such as public opinion, market sentiment, or protest activity, tend toward higher indeterminacy, displaying strong reflexivity and sensitivity to observation. Macro-level structures, such as entrenched institutions or international regimes, exhibit greater apparent determinism through inertia and path dependence. Yet this determinism is ultimately apparent rather than absolute: even stable macro-orders can conceal metastability, revealed abruptly when thresholds are crossed or when QMEs reorganize collective perception. QCM bridges levels of analysis by linking the micro-

indeterminacy of reflexive agents with the macro-order of systemic structures, showing how social systems move between openness and resolution.

5. Illustrative Application: Metastability, Observation, and Resolution

The three mechanisms introduced in Section 4 are best grasped through concrete application. This section uses the Arab Spring as a heuristic illustration of how Transition Zones, Quantum Thresholds, and Quantum Measurement Events can be identified in a well-documented historical episode. The case is chosen not to demonstrate the superiority of QCM over rival frameworks but to show how the vocabulary applies and what it makes visible that alternative accounts leave underspecified. Comparative extensions to the 2008 financial crisis and the #MeToo movement are offered briefly as further illustrative applications across different social domains.

A note on method is necessary here. The cases that follow are illustrative rather than evidentiary. They are intended to show that the QCM vocabulary can be applied coherently to recognized episodes of discontinuous social change, and that this application generates interpretations consistent with existing scholarship. They do not constitute a systematic comparative test of QCM against rival explanations, nor do they establish that QCM provides a uniquely correct account of the episodes described. That more demanding evidentiary project is reserved for future empirical work.

5.1 Transition Zones: Authoritarian Metastability before 2011

Before 2011, Arab regimes were widely regarded as among the most durable political systems in the world. Scholars of authoritarian resilience emphasized the stability of coercive apparatuses, rentier economies, and entrenched patronage networks. Bellin (2004) argued that robust coercive institutions underwrote regime longevity, while Gause (2000) described Gulf monarchies as buffered by rents and external support. Yet beneath this facade of permanence lay what QCM would identify as a Transition Zone: a configuration in which multiple potential outcomes coexisted without any having stabilized into dominance.

The observable indicators identified in Section 4.1 were present. Elite signaling about regime futures was divergent rather than convergent. Public expressions of discontent and compliance coexisted without resolution. Economic stagnation, corruption, and repression generated deep dissatisfaction, but opposition remained fragmented and organizationally weak. Tunisia and Egypt exemplified this configuration: systems in which continued authoritarianism,

gradual reform, and sudden upheaval were all credible outcomes, with no available information determining which would be realized.

This is consistent with the QCM characterization of a Transition Zone, though it should be noted that alternative frameworks offer compatible descriptions. Historical institutionalists would characterize the same situation as path-dependent stability concealing structural brittleness; complexity theorists would identify it as a system approaching a tipping point. The QCM interpretation adds the specific claim that the situation involved genuine indeterminacy rather than merely unobserved pressure accumulation.

5.2 Quantum Threshold: The Resolution of Legitimacy in Tunisia

In December 2010, Mohamed Bouazizi's self-immolation in Sidi Bouzid preceded a rapid and apparently discontinuous collapse of the Ben Ali regime. Within weeks, a government that had persisted for over two decades dissolved, and the apparent stability of authoritarian permanence gave way to a new configuration. I treat this episode as consistent with the QCM characterization of a Quantum Threshold: a moment at which the structured indeterminacy of the Transition Zone resolved into a new outcome, with the resolution appearing abrupt rather than incremental.

Lynch (2012) observed that the speed of resolution reflected the metastable character of the regime: beneath a surface of coercive control lay profound uncertainty about legitimacy. Anderson (2011) similarly noted that Middle Eastern regimes were brittle rather than resilient because they relied on coercion and patronage rather than adaptable institutions. These scholarly assessments are consistent with the QCM interpretation, though they do not require it: both authors would characterize the same episode in terms of structural brittleness and cascading defection rather than threshold resolution of indeterminacy.

Egypt followed a similar pattern, with mass mobilization in Tahrir Square producing Mubarak's resignation in February 2011. In QCM terms, both cases exhibit the observable indicators of a Quantum Threshold identified in Section 4.2: rapid nonlinear shifts in elite alignment, sudden delegitimation of previously stable institutional arrangements, and the emergence of a dominant interpretive frame where multiple frames had previously competed.

5.3 Quantum Measurement Event: The Constitutive Role of Observation

Bouazizi's act became publicly legible through its observation, recording, and circulation via local and transnational media. The story, amplified by Al Jazeera and distributed across social networks, transformed a private grievance into a shared public event. I treat this process as

consistent with the QCM characterization of a Quantum Measurement Event: a public act of observation whose circulation reorganized collective expectations in ways that altered subsequent behavior.

The constitutive dimension of this process is supported by existing scholarship. Brownlee, Masoud, and Reynolds (2015) emphasize that the diffusion of protest across states was not automatic but mediated by interpretation, framing, and strategic emulation. Citizens interpreted the circulated account as evidence of possibility; regime actors interpreted it as evidence of contagion risk. In QCM terms, the act of observation did not merely reflect an underlying instability but helped reorganize the field of live possibilities by making a previously private situation publicly legible across multiple audiences simultaneously.

This interpretation should be distinguished from a stronger causal claim. QCM does not assert that media circulation caused the uprisings or that the Bouazizi case uniquely determined subsequent events. The claim is more limited: the public circulation of the event is consistent with the QME mechanism, in that it preceded rapid behavioral convergence among previously divergent actors and reorganized rather than merely reflected existing expectations.

5.4 Divergent Outcomes and the Limits of Illustration

The Arab Spring also illustrates how Transition Zones can resolve into divergent trajectories. In Libya and Yemen, thresholds were crossed but resolved into civil war rather than democratic transition. In Syria, metastability persisted as protest movements gave way to violent repression and protracted conflict. Weyland (2012) argues that diffusion was mediated by regime capacity, elite cohesion, and external intervention, producing heterogeneous outcomes despite shared initiating conditions.

These divergent outcomes are consistent with QCM's framework: the model does not predict which outcome a Transition Zone will resolve into, only that resolution, when it occurs, will be discontinuous and conditioned by the interaction of thresholds and QMEs within each specific context. The divergence also underscores the illustrative limits of the case. QCM can characterize the structural features of each situation and identify the mechanisms at work, but it does not provide a predictive account of outcomes. That limitation is not a failure of the framework but a consequence of its core epistemological commitment: in situations of genuine indeterminacy, outcomes are not determined in advance.

5.5 Comparative Illustrations

Two further episodes are noted briefly to suggest that the QCM vocabulary applies across social domains beyond the Arab Spring. These are offered as illustrative extensions.

The 2017 exposure of Harvey Weinstein's conduct can be read as a QME in a cultural and institutional context. Long-standing patterns of gender hierarchy and enforced silence constituted a recognizable Transition Zone — a configuration in which multiple outcomes (continued silence, partial exposure, and systemic rupture) coexisted without resolution. The New York Times investigation (Kantor and Twohey 2017) and its subsequent amplification across social media reorganized collective expectations rapidly and publicly, consistent with the observable indicators of a QME identified in Section 4.3. The resulting shift in institutional norms and public discourse was discontinuous rather than incremental, consistent with a Quantum Threshold crossing.

The 2008 financial crisis exhibits a similar pattern. The system constituted a financial Transition Zone: metastable under mounting leverage and opacity, sustained by confidence that persisted without directional resolution. The bankruptcy of Lehman Brothers preceded rapid, nonlinear shifts in financial behavior consistent with a Quantum Threshold. Rating downgrades and the public disclosure of hidden liabilities functioned as QMEs, making latent fragility legible and reorganizing collective expectations at scale, helping determine which of several possible outcomes — managed contraction, partial recovery, or systemic collapse — became realized.

In both cases, the QCM characterization is consistent with existing scholarly accounts without displacing them. The framework adds a specific vocabulary for the mechanisms of indeterminacy and resolution that those accounts leave implicit.

6. Implications for the Philosophy of Social Science

The preceding sections developed QCM's theoretical architecture and illustrated its application. This section considers what difference the framework makes for the philosophy of social science and for social inquiry more broadly. The contribution is not primarily empirical but epistemological: QCM reframes how uncertainty, observation, and explanation are conceptualized in reflexive social systems. Four implications are developed below.

6.1 From Prediction to Navigation

The first implication concerns the purpose of social-scientific explanation itself. The Newtonian tradition equated explanation with prediction: given sufficient data and the right equations, future outcomes could in principle be forecast. This aspiration persists in complexity frameworks that seek to anticipate when systems will tip into new equilibria, and in rational-choice models that treat strategic outcomes as calculable given known preferences and constraints.

Potentialism, by contrast, holds that uncertainty is not epistemic noise to be reduced but a structural condition of social situations. Some episodes are genuinely indeterminate: no available information or causal analysis can determine in advance which outcome will be realized. For such episodes, the appropriate goal of theory is not prediction but navigation: mapping the landscape of live trajectories, identifying configurations consistent with Transition Zones, locating potential threshold conditions, and understanding how acts of observation reorganize the field of live possibilities.

This reframing does not abandon explanatory rigor; it redefines it. Explanatory power lies in elucidating the mechanisms through which reflexive observation and interpretation reshape collective expectations over time. QCM offers what might be called an epistemology of orientation under conditions of indeterminacy: a framework that clarifies how social systems move between openness and resolution without assuming their trajectories are predetermined. The argument here parallels recent calls within the philosophy of social science for frameworks that treat explanation and prediction as separable rather than necessarily connected (Cartwright 1999; Steel 2008).

6.2 An Illustrative Application: Prediction Failure and the Navigation Stance

Rather than reviewing multiple vignettes, a single application is offered here to show what the navigation framework brings into view that a prediction-oriented stance misses, using a recognized episode of discontinuous change.

The 2021 withdrawal of United States forces from Afghanistan and the subsequent fall of Kabul is instructive precisely because it was a prediction failure. Assessments forecast that the Afghan government would endure for months, even years; instead it collapsed within days. On a prediction-oriented account, this is an error to be explained away by faulty inputs or incomplete information. On a navigation account, it is what one should expect when a situation is treated as forecastable that is in fact a live Transition Zone: for years, the credibility of the Afghan state had persisted in a configuration consistent with such a zone, in which continued international

presence, conditional stability, and rapid collapse were all credible outcomes without any having achieved dominance. The prediction stance read this metastability as a stable baseline to be extrapolated; the navigation stance would have read it as an unresolved field whose resolution was observation-sensitive rather than given in advance.

Seen this way, the fall of Kabul marked a rapid and apparently discontinuous resolution consistent with a Quantum Threshold: elite alignment collapsed, institutional arrangements dissolved, and a new configuration emerged within days rather than weeks. The globally circulated images of evacuation from Kabul airport can be read as a QME in the sense defined in Section 4.3: their public registration reorganized collective expectations across multiple audiences simultaneously. The registration and circulation of those images did not merely record the collapse; they helped constitute the shared meaning of failure, reorganizing international perceptions of credibility and deterrence in ways consistent with altered subsequent behavior. This reading is consistent with existing scholarship on the reputational consequences of military withdrawal (Freedman 2013) without displacing it.

The point of the case is not that QCM could have predicted the timing of the collapse. QCM makes no such claim. It is that the navigation stance reframes what the analyst should have been attending to: not a forecast of survival, but the recognition that a metastable legitimacy order was susceptible to abrupt, observation-driven resolution. Where prediction treats the outcome as the object of inquiry, navigation treats the structure of indeterminacy and the acts that resolve it as the object — and on that reframing, the collapse is legible as a Threshold crossing rather than an anomaly.

6.3 Integration with Existing Theoretical Traditions

With the framework now applied, its relationship to the major traditions of social inquiry can be stated more precisely. QCM does not displace these approaches; it situates them within a broader epistemology of potentialism, and the cases above suggest where each is sharpened by the addition of an explicit resolution mechanism. Each tradition captures a fragment of the dynamics QCM theorizes, yet each leaves comparatively underspecified the moment at which uncertainty resolves into a realized outcome — the moment the preceding applications placed at the center of analysis.

Against complexity theory, the gain is a distinction the framework's cases make concrete: between turbulence, the ongoing instability of interconnected systems that complexity traces

well, and threshold resolution, the discontinuous consolidation of a metastable condition into a realized outcome, which it tends to leave as an emergent residue. Where complexity traces process, QCM specifies a mechanism of resolution: constitutive observation reorganizing collective expectations around a single outcome.

Against constructivism, which holds that social reality is constituted by norms, ideas, and intersubjective recognition (Wendt 1999), QCM supplies temporal mechanics that the standing account leaves implicit. Recognition does not merely obtain; it crystallizes through QMEs — moments when public registration resolves competing possibilities into new intersubjective facts. The Weinstein and Kabul cases illustrate the point: each turns on a discrete act of registration that converts a latent configuration into a settled one. QCM thus complements constructivism with a dynamic account of how social facts emerge, persist, and dissolve, rather than treating intersubjectivity as a stable background condition.

Against rational-choice and game-theoretic models, which explain structured strategic behavior within stable equilibria, QCM extends the analysis to the moments when equilibria disintegrate — the moments those models bracket. Under reflexive uncertainty, where perception and expectation interact recursively, strategic calculation becomes entangled with observation, producing the discontinuous resolutions the financial-crisis case illustrates and that equilibrium models are not designed to capture.

In each case the relationship is the same: QCM neither competes with these traditions nor subsumes them, but supplies the account of resolution that each, working within its own assumptions, has reason to leave underspecified.

6.4 Epistemological Positioning: Positivism, Critical Realism, and Post-Positivism

QCM contributes to enduring epistemological debates in the philosophy of social science by offering what might be called a bridge epistemology: one that integrates explanatory rigor with reflexive awareness of the observer's constitutive role.

Against positivism, QCM rejects the assumption that social reality can be observed from outside the system and that regularities can be modeled for prediction without remainder. Observers are not external to social systems but part of their recursive dynamics. Acts of observation, measurement, and modeling feed back into the systems they study, making the boundary between inquiry and object constitutively unstable. This critique of positivist externalism connects to established arguments in the philosophy of social science (Winch 1958;

Taylor 1971; MacIntyre 1973) and to more recent reflexivist accounts (Hamati-Ataya 2013; Jackson 2016).

With critical realism, QCM shares the aspiration to identify generative mechanisms that produce observable outcomes (Bhaskar 1975; Archer 1995). Reconciling this aspiration with QCM's emphasis on constitutive observation requires distinguishing two levels that the framework treats differently. At the first level are the background generative structures: the metastable configurations that constitute a Transition Zone — coexisting incompatible outcomes, divergent signaling among authoritative actors, the absence of a stabilized dominant path. These are real in Bhaskar's sense; they exist and exert their effects whether or not any observer registers them, and a Transition Zone can persist undetected. At the second level is the resolution mechanism: which of the live outcomes becomes realized, and when. It is at this second level, and only here, that observation is constitutive — a QME does not bring the metastable structure into being, but it does help determine how that structure resolves. This layering allows QCM to be realist about the generative structures and constitutivist about their resolution without contradiction: the susceptibility to resolution is observer-independent, while the particular resolution is observer-dependent. QCM thus departs from standard critical realist accounts not by denying observer-independent structures but by locating the constitutive role of observation specifically at the moment of resolution rather than in the standing existence of the mechanisms themselves.

With post-positivism and critical theory, QCM affirms the constitutive power of discourse, interpretation, and observation in social life (Cox 1981; Kurki 2008; Hamati-Ataya 2013; Kurki 2020). It departs from purely critical accounts, however, in seeking analytical structure rather than limiting itself to reflexive critique. The QCM vocabulary, Transition Zones, Quantum Thresholds, and QMEs, retains the precision necessary for comparative application while remaining sensitive to the constitutive dynamics that critical theory foregrounds.

In this synthesis, QCM attempts to occupy a middle position: sharing positivism's aspiration to explanatory rigor, critical realism's commitment to generative mechanisms, and post-positivism's recognition of constitutive observation, while departing from each in ways that address the specific problem of discontinuous social resolution under reflexive indeterminacy.

7. Conclusion

This article addressed a specific problem in the philosophy of social science: how to conceptualize uncertainty, observation, and resolution in reflexive social systems where the act of modeling alters the phenomenon being modeled. Existing frameworks address this problem only partially: complexity theory and reflexivity each illuminate instability without specifying how it resolves. The result is a gap in the explanatory vocabulary of social inquiry — the moment of resolution, when structured indeterminacy gives way to a realized outcome, remains comparatively underdeveloped in these frameworks.

QCM proposes a candidate framework for addressing this gap. Its contribution is threefold. First, it offers a vocabulary of three social analogues — Transition Zones, Quantum Thresholds, and Quantum Measurement Events — that makes the mechanisms of indeterminacy and resolution explicit and revisable. Second, it clarifies the role of observation as constitutive rather than merely descriptive: public acts of registration, representation, and recognition can reorganize collective expectations and thereby help determine which of several live outcomes becomes realized. Third, it situates these mechanisms within a coherent epistemological stance, Potentialism, that treats uncertainty as a structural feature of social situations rather than a residue of incomplete information.

The framework has limits that should be stated explicitly. QCM applies most productively to episodes exhibiting genuine indeterminacy, consequential public observation, and discontinuous resolution. It applies less well to situations characterized by strong path dependence, incremental accumulation, or private and narrowly circulated acts of observation. It does not provide a predictive account of which outcome a Transition Zone will resolve into, only that resolution, when it occurs, will be discontinuous and conditioned by the interaction of thresholds and QMEs within each specific context. The quantum analogy on which the framework draws is productive within the three mechanisms specified and should not be extended beyond them.

Several directions for future inquiry follow from these limitations. The observable indicators proposed in Section 4 require systematic operationalization and testing against a broader range of cases through process tracing or structured comparison. The relationship between QCM and adjacent frameworks in the philosophy of social science, particularly critical realism's account of generative mechanisms and practice theory's account of recursive action, warrants further development. The question of whether Potentialism can be formalized into a more precise model

of social indeterminacy remains open. A fuller treatment would formalize these constructs and adjudicate the framework against rival accounts through structured comparison and process tracing — directions this article deliberately sets up rather than completes, in order to keep its focus on proposing and clarifying the framework itself. These are tasks for subsequent work. The contribution of this article is to propose the framework, clarify its epistemological status, and illustrate its coherent application to recognized episodes of discontinuous social change.

References

- Albert, David Z. 1992. *Quantum Mechanics and Experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Anderson, Lisa. 2011. "Demystifying the Arab Spring: Parsing the Differences between Tunisia, Egypt, and Libya." *Foreign Affairs* 90 (3): 2–7.
- Archer, Margaret S. 1995. *Realist Social Theory: The Morphogenetic Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barad, Karen. 2007. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Bhaskar, Roy. 1975. *A Realist Theory of Science*. Leeds: Leeds Books.
- Bellin, Eva. 2004. "The Robustness of Authoritarianism in the Middle East: Exceptionalism in Comparative Perspective." *Comparative Politics* 36 (2): 139–157.
- Bousquet, Antoine, and Simon Curtis. 2011. "Beyond Models and Metaphors: Complexity Theory, Systems Thinking and International Relations." *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 24 (1): 43–62.
- Brownlee, Jason, Tarek Masoud, and Andrew Reynolds. 2015. *The Arab Spring: Pathways of Repression and Reform*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Callon, Michel, ed. 1998. *The Laws of the Markets*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers/The Sociological Review.
- Cartwright, Nancy. 1999. *The Dappled World: A Study of the Boundaries of Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Castells, Manuel. 1996. *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Chandler, David. 2021. *Resilience and the Politics of Complexity: Situating Change in a Turbulent World*. London: Routledge.
- Cox, Robert W. 1981. "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory." *Millennium* 10 (2): 126–155.
- Der Derian, James, and Alexander Wendt. 2020. "'Quantizing International Relations': The Case for Quantum Approaches to International Theory and Security Practice." *Security Dialogue* 51 (5): 399–413.

- Fearon, James D. 1995. "Rationalist Explanations for War." *International Organization* 49 (3): 379–414.
- Freedman, Lawrence. 2013. *Strategy: A History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gause, F. Gregory III. 2000. "The Persistence of Monarchy in the Arabian Peninsula: A Comparative Analysis." In *Middle East Monarchies: The Challenge of Modernity*, ed. Joseph Kostiner, 167–186. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hamati-Ataya, Inanna. 2013. "Reflectivity, Reflexivity, Reflexivism: IR's 'Reflexive Turn' and Beyond." *European Journal of International Relations* 19 (4): 669–694.
- Hesse, Mary. 1966. *Models and Analogies in Science*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Hooker, Cliff, ed. 2011. *Philosophy of Complex Systems*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Jackson, Patrick Thaddeus. 2016. *The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations: Philosophy of Science and Its Implications for the Study of World Politics*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Jasanoff, Sheila, ed. 2004. *States of Knowledge: The Co-Production of Science and Social Order*. London: Routledge.
- Jervis, Robert. 1976. *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 1997. *System Effects: Complexity in Political and Social Life*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kantor, Jodi, and Megan Twohey. 2017. "Harvey Weinstein Paid Off Sexual Harassment Accusers for Decades." *New York Times*, October 5. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/05/us/harvey-weinstein-sexual-harassment.html> (accessed November 12, 2025).
- Keohane, Robert O., and Joseph S. Nye. 1977. *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.
- Kurki, Milja. 2008. *Causation in International Relations: Reclaiming Causal Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- . 2020. *International Relations in a Relational Universe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Laughlin, Robert B. 2005. *A Different Universe: Reinventing Physics from the Bottom Down*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lawson, Tony. 1997. *Economics and Reality*. London: Routledge.
- Luhmann, Niklas. 1995. *Social Systems*. Translated by John Bednarz Jr. with Dirk Baecker. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Lynch, Marc. 2012. *The Arab Uprising: The Unfinished Revolutions of the New Middle East*. New York: PublicAffairs.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair. 1973. "The Essential Contestability of Some Social Concepts." *Ethics* 84 (1): 1–9.
- Mitchell, Melanie. 2009. *Complexity: A Guided Tour*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MacKenzie, Donald. 2006. *An Engine, Not a Camera: How Financial Models Shape Markets*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Merton, Robert K. 1948. "The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy." *The Antioch Review* 8 (2): 193–210.
- Morgan, Mary S., and Margaret Morrison, eds. 1999. *Models as Mediators: Perspectives on Natural and Social Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morin, Edgar. 2008. *On Complexity*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Schelling, Thomas C. 1960. *The Strategy of Conflict*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Soros, George. 1987. *The Alchemy of Finance: Reading the Mind of the Market*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Steel, Daniel. 2008. *Across the Boundaries: Extrapolation in Biology and Social Science*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Taleb, Nassim Nicholas. 2007. *The Black Swan: The Impact of the Highly Improbable*. New York: Random House.
- Taylor, Charles. 1971. "Interpretation and the Sciences of Man." *Review of Metaphysics* 25 (1): 3–51.
- Urry, John. 2003. *Global Complexity*. Cambridge: Polity.

- Waltz, Kenneth N. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Wendt, Alexander. 1999. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2015. *Quantum Mind and Social Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weyland, Kurt. 2012. “The Arab Spring: Why the Surprising Similarities with the Revolutionary Wave of 1848?” *Perspectives on Politics* 10 (4): 917–934.
- Wight, Colin. 2006. *Agents, Structures and International Relations: Politics as Ontology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Winch, Peter. 1958. *The Idea of a Social Science and Its Relation to Philosophy*. London: Routledge.