Received: 17 JUN 2025 | Accepted: 14 DEC 2025 | Published Online: 29 DEC 2025
Recoletos Multidisciplinary Research Journal Vol. 13 no. 2 (December 2025)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.32871/rmrj2513.02.10

recoletos MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH JOURNAL RMRJ

Perspective

Phase Change and the Limits of Resilience: A Physics-Inspired Lens on Societal Fragility and Collapse

Russell John Walker

[1] Department of Industry, Science and Resources, Australian Government

[2] AccessAsiaPac, Australia

Correspondence:
rwalker@accessasiapac.com.au

Abstract

Contemporary systemic disruptions in finance, supply chains, ecological regimes, governance and critical infrastructure often appear sudden, yet they usually reflect long periods of hidden stress, declining resilience, and structural weakening beneath surface stability. This paper uses the logic of thermodynamic phase change as a disciplined metaphor for interpreting how modern social systems accumulate latent pressures, maintain metastability, and cross thresholds into rapid reconfiguration. Drawing on research in complexity, resilience, and tipping-point dynamics, the framework identifies recurring features of systemic transitions: the slow erosion of buffers, weakening recovery capacity, and abrupt shifts that occur once critical boundaries are exceeded. Case analyses illustrate both the value and the limits of the analogy, particularly regarding agency, distributional effects, and political context. The paper then develops policy implications centered on buffering, modularity, early warning signals, adaptive governance, and the efficiency-resilience trade-off. An ethical analysis examines how metaphors influence responsibility and intervention. While the phase-change lens does not predict specific events, it offers a structured approach for recognising fragility and supporting governance that can absorb stress, anticipate thresholds, and adapt without disproportionate harm.

Keywords

societal collapse, phase change metaphor, systemic resilience, complexity theory, adaptive governance, critical transitions

INTRODUCTION

Societies often experience disruptions that appear sudden, yet these events usually reflect long periods of hidden stress, declining resilience, and structural weakening beneath surface stability. Moments labelled as failure or collapse can obscure the slow accumulation of pressures that erode a system's ability to absorb shocks. As with any metaphor, the analogy carries interpretive risks that require further examination in more detail later. When thresholds are crossed, transitions can unfold quickly and reorganise institutional, ecological, or economic structures in ways that appear disproportionate to the initial trigger.

Contemporary systems amplify this pattern. Globalisation, digital integration, and decades of efficiency-oriented optimisation have produced systems that are tightly coupled, highly interdependent, and increasingly sensitive to disturbance. Small perturbations can travel across sectors, revealing how surface stability masks the accumulation of latent stress (Boulton et al., 2015; Luhmann, 1995). Financial volatility can spill into labour markets and political systems. Supply-chain failures can disrupt critical infrastructure, food, and energy networks, causing significant disruptions. Ecological thresholds can reshape water security, agriculture, and public health. These dynamics are not new, but their speed and scale have accelerated. Classical analyses of societal decline similarly emphasised long periods of internal weakening preceding sudden transformation (Gibbon, 1776-1789; Spengler, 1918–1922; Tainter, 1988; Toynbee, 1934–1961). Although framed historically rather than systemically, this tradition recognised nonlinear patterns in political and institutional collapse.

Research across several fields has demonstrated that these transitions are nonlinear rather than gradual. Foundational work in complexity science and network theory demonstrated early on how tightly coupled systems can propagate disturbance disproportionately. Self-organized criticality explains how systems accumulate stress until small perturbations trigger cascading changes (Bak et al., 1987), while network-fragility research shows how highly connected structures can be robust to random shocks yet vulnerable to targeted failures (Albert et al., 2000; Barabási, 2002). The literature on adaptive cycles and panarchy, as described by Gunderson and Holling (2002), explains how systems move through phases of growth, conservation, release, and reorganization. Studies on tipping elements and early-warning signals (Dakos et al., 2012; Lenton et al., 2008) show how slow variables create conditions for sudden change. Resilience scholarship has examined how buffering capacity, feedbacks, and adaptive governance shape a system's ability to absorb disturbance and reorganise (Berkes & Ross, 2013; Folke et al., 2010; Walker et al., 2004).

Within this established body of work, the purpose of this paper is to explore how the structural logic of thermodynamic phase change can clarify the behaviour of social systems under stress. The metaphor is not literal or deterministic. Social systems involve agency, meaning, and conflict in ways that physical systems do not. However, specific features of phase transitions, including latent heat, metastability, threshold activation, and rapid reconfiguration, provide a structured vocabulary for interpreting how systems can absorb stress quietly before crossing boundaries that trigger rapid transformation (Taleb, 2012).

This paper contributes to the existing literature by developing a systematic mapping of the relationship between thermodynamic phase-transition dynamics and forms of systemic social change. The goal is not to claim novelty in recognising nonlinearity, which is well established, but to demonstrate how the phase-change framework reveals structural similarities across domains that are often treated separately. These include financial markets, supply chains, ecological regimes, governance failures, and critical infrastructure. By focusing on patterns of hidden load, declining recovery capacity, and threshold behaviour, the framework complements existing approaches while remaining attentive to the ethical and political features that distinguish social systems from physical ones.

Phase Change as Systems Metaphor

Understanding abrupt social transitions requires a framework that can explain how systems tolerate rising stress for long periods before shifting rapidly once critical limits are exceeded. Thermodynamic phase change provides a systematic approach to understanding these dynamics. The aim is not to reduce social behaviour to physical law. Social systems involve intention, conflict, institutions, and meaning. This reflects insights from social-systems theory, which emphasises that meaning-making and institutional differentiation shape how societies perceive and respond to stress (Luhmann, 1995). Instead, the metaphor provides a structural vocabulary for understanding how complex systems accumulate hidden pressures, maintain metastability, and undergo rapid reconfiguration.

In physical systems, phase transitions occur when matter changes state as heat or pressure crosses specific thresholds. Water can absorb significant energy while remaining liquid, and ice can warm without losing structure. A system may appear unchanged even as internal bonds weaken. Once a critical point is reached, transformation is swift. This combination of hidden accumulation, apparent stability, and sudden reorganisation has strong structural parallels in social systems (Bak et al., 1987; Barabási, 2002).

Social, economic, and ecological systems often exhibit similar patterns of behavior. Debt loads can rise without immediate consequence. Supply chains can thin buffers while maintaining efficiency. Ecosystems can degrade quietly while sustaining surface productivity. Public institutions can continue functioning even as trust erodes and capacity declines. Stress accumulates beneath visible stability. When thresholds are crossed, transitions can accelerate, producing changes that appear abrupt even though the conditions developed over long periods (Dakos et al., 2012; Lenton et al., 2008).

The value of the phase-change metaphor lies in how it highlights three recurring features of systemic transitions: the long accumulation of hidden pressures, the decline of resilience during periods of apparent stability, and the rapid, nonlinear behaviour that emerges when stress exceeds absorptive capacity. These structural features appear in financial networks, governance systems, ecological regimes, and critical infrastructure. The metaphor is useful not because it predicts specific events but because it clarifies how systems behave under stress and how underlying conditions shape the pace and form of transition. Complexity-oriented strategic analysis similarly argues that system behaviour near thresholds cannot be understood through linear extrapolation but requires attention to feedback, emergence, and path dependency (Boulton et al., 2015).

Structural Mapping: Thermodynamic Concepts and Social Analogues

Understanding why phase-change concepts illuminate social behaviour requires more than surface comparison. Each thermodynamic principle reflects an underlying structural mechanism: how energy is stored, how systems resist disturbance, and how they reorganise once limits are exceeded. Social systems differ fundamentally from physical ones, but they exhibit analogous structural dynamics—hidden loading, weakened recovery capacity, and rapid reconfiguration—that justify the metaphor when used with care.

Latent Heat and Hidden Stress

In thermodynamics, latent heat refers to energy absorbed internally to weaken molecular bonds rather than increase temperature. A system appears unchanged even as its internal structure is being transformed.

Social systems likewise absorb stress without showing immediate surface effects. Institutions compensate for resource shortages through staff overwork and the use of informal workarounds. Supply chains stretch delivery times without reporting failure. Ecological systems mask degradation as long as slow variables such as soil fertility or species diversity remain above minimal levels. Stress is stored in weakening structures rather than expressed as visible disruption (Dakos et al., 2012; Lenton et al., 2008).

The analogy works because both systems exhibit a divergence between their external appearance and internal condition: stability is maintained only because the underlying structures are absorbing an increasing load.

Critical Thresholds and Tipping Points

Physical phase transitions occur when energy input drives the system across a defined boundary. Before the threshold, behaviour is stable; after it, transformation accelerates.

Social thresholds operate similarly, though they are institutionally constructed rather than physically fixed. Financial markets function smoothly until liquidity evaporates. Ecosystems remain productive until biodiversity or nutrient balances cross critical limits. Public institutions endure budget constraints and declining trust until legitimacy collapses.

The structural parallel lies in the nonlinearity: small increments of pressure have little effect until a threshold is reached, after which change is disproportionate (Lenton et al., 2008; Scheffer et al., 2009).

Metastability and Apparent Robustness

A metastable physical state maintains form despite weakened internal bonds. It remains stable only as long as disturbances remain modest; larger shocks trigger a rapid transformation.

Social systems frequently display this pattern. Organisations maintain service delivery despite chronic understaffing. Infrastructure networks function despite maintenance backlogs. Political systems remain outwardly calm despite institutional fatigue (Berkes & Ross, 2013).

In both cases, performance creates an illusion of robustness. The actual condition is a fragile equilibrium in which stabilising forces are eroding.

Critical Slowing and Declining Recovery Capacity

As a physical system approaches a threshold, its ability to recover from perturbations slows. The time taken to return to equilibrium increases, signalling declining resilience.

Social systems exhibit analogous behaviour. Economic recoveries lengthen after successive shocks. Supply chains take longer to restock. Ecological systems regenerate more slowly after disturbance. Governance systems respond more sluggishly as institutional capacity weakens.

The structural link is the diminishing strength of restorative processes: whether molecular, ecological, or institutional (Walker et al., 2004).

Rapid Reconfiguration and New Equilibria

Once a threshold is crossed, physical systems reorganise quickly into a new state with different properties. This is not a return to the previous equilibrium but the emergence of a new configuration.

Social transitions behave similarly. Governance reforms, market collapses, or ecological shifts often occur abruptly when accumulated stresses surpass an entity's absorptive capacity. The resulting configuration—new political orders, supply-chain structures, or ecological regimes—constitutes a new equilibrium rather than a temporary deviation (Gunderson & Holling, 2002).

Limits of the Metaphor

The metaphor clarifies structural dynamics, but it has its boundaries. Physical thresholds are fixed and mechanistic; social thresholds, on the other hand, are dynamic and responsive to policy, collective action, and institutional design. Social systems embed values, intentions, and power asymmetries absent in physical systems. Recognising these limits ensures the metaphor functions as a disciplined heuristic rather than a deterministic model (Taleb, 2012).

These structural dynamics also interact with cultural, social, and interpretive systems, shaping how societies perceive disruption and respond to emerging thresholds (Norris et al., 2008).

From Complexity to Fragility

Modern systems are designed for efficiency. Global integration, digital coordination, and decades of optimization have produced tightly coupled networks that minimize costs, reduce redundancy, and accelerate throughput. These characteristics have increased productivity and convenience, yet they have also reduced buffers, lengthened dependency chains, and heightened vulnerability. Under these conditions, the structural patterns identified earlier—hidden stress, metastability, threshold behaviour, and rapid reconfiguration—become more pronounced (Boulton et al., 2015).

Many contemporary disruptions illustrate these dynamics. What appears to be a crisis often reflects long periods of load accumulation and declining resilience. Examining these cases through the lens of phase-change highlights recurring patterns of hidden stress, threshold activation, and nonlinear transition (Bak et al., 1987; Scheffer et al., 2009).

Financial Systems

Financial systems illustrate how efficiency and interdependence can lead to fragility. Periods of economic growth often encourage increased leverage, erode buffers, and lead to excessive liquidity. These conditions create an appearance of stability while masking rising vulnerability. Prior to the 2008 global financial crisis, mortgage-backed securities and interbank exposures created a tightly coupled network that functioned smoothly under normal conditions. As mortgage defaults increased, what initially seemed a limited disturbance propagated rapidly. Liquidity evaporated, confidence collapsed, and institutions that appeared stable shifted abruptly into failure (Gorton, 2008).

This pattern mirrors the behaviour of metastable physical systems: outward stability masking internal deterioration and rapid transition once thresholds are crossed (Albert et al., 2000; Barabási, 2002).

Supply Chains and Logistics

Global supply chains prioritise cost reduction and speed. Just-in-time logistics, centralised production nodes, and long-distance transport create efficiency but reduce redundancy. These systems operate reliably when conditions are stable; however, they are susceptible to perturbations (Rinaldi et al., 2001).

The COVID-19 pandemic exposed these vulnerabilities clearly. Factory closures, port congestion, and transport disruptions produced cascading effects across sectors (Ivanov & Das, 2020). Goods shortages emerged not because demand changed dramatically, but because minor disturbances interacted with long, tightly coupled networks (Rinaldi et al., 2001). What appeared to be resilient global supply chains proved to be metastable systems that could shift rapidly once stress exceeded thin buffers (Ivanov & Das, 2020; Rinaldi et al., 2001).

Ecological Systems

Ecological systems display threshold behaviour with particular clarity. Degradation often occurs gradually, even when surface conditions remain stable. Wetlands can tolerate nutrient loads until algal blooms and hypoxic events abruptly transform ecosystem function. Coral reefs may temporarily withstand bleaching events, but once their regenerative capacity weakens, collapse can accelerate.

These transitions reflect the depletion of latent buffers. Slow variables such as soil integrity, biodiversity, and groundwater recharge shape ecological thresholds. As these variables deteriorate, recovery slows and resilience declines (Lenton et al., 2008; Scheffer et al., 2009). The system may appear stable until a final perturbation causes it to transition into a new configuration.

Governance and Institutional Capacity

Political and administrative systems can also exhibit metastability. Institutions may continue to function despite resource constraints, leadership instability, and declining trust. Outward performance masks diminishing absorptive capacity. Staff turnover increases, institutional memory erodes, and response capability weakens.

Sri Lanka's 2022 crisis illustrates this pattern. Long before fuel shortages and political unrest became apparent, sovereign debt had accumulated, foreign reserves had dwindled, and governance capacity had eroded. The eventual crisis appeared sudden, but it reflected years of intensifying hidden stress that ultimately led to institutional thresholds being crossed (Berkes & Ross, 2013; Tainter, 1988).

Infrastructure and Energy Systems

Critical infrastructure systems—electricity grids, water networks, and transport corridors—depend on maintenance, redundancy, and reserve margins. These systems can remain functional for long periods despite ageing assets, rising demand, and underinvestment. Their apparent stability conceals internal weakening.

Threshold conditions, such as heatwaves, peak loads, or droughts, can push these systems beyond their operational limits. When this occurs, failures can cascade across sectors. The 2021 Texas grid failure demonstrated how extreme weather interacting with limited redundancy and high interdependence can trigger a rapid systemic breakdown (Rinaldi et al., 2001).

Comparative Patterns across Cases

Although these cases differ in domain, scale, and institutional context, they share several structural patterns.

Common Patterns

- Hidden stress accumulation: leverage, supply-chain consolidation, ecological degradation, institutional fatigue, and infrastructure deterioration build quietly over time (Boulton et al., 2015).
- Metastability: outward stability conceals internal weakening (Berkes & Ross, 2013).
- Threshold behaviour: when stress exceeds absorptive capacity, systems shift rapidly (Lenton et al., 2008; Scheffer et al., 2009).
- Cascading effects: interconnected networks transmit disturbances across sectors (Rinaldi et al., 2001).

Points of Divergence

- Temporal scales differ: financial transitions may unfold within hours, while ecological transitions may take decades.
- Agency matters: governance decisions, regulatory interventions, and institutional reforms can alter thresholds in social systems (Ostrom, 2010; Walker et al., 2004).
- Harm is unevenly distributed: some groups experience disproportionate impacts during transitions. Community-resilience research demonstrates that local adaptive capacity, social capital, and community competence strongly influence how disruptions are absorbed or amplified (Berkes & Ross, 2013; Norris et al., 2008).
- Interpretation varies: societies frame disruption through cultural, political, and historical narratives.

Where the Analogy Holds and Breaks

The phase-change metaphor aligns with patterns of hidden accumulation, metastability, and threshold activation. It diverges when considering agency, power, and ethical responsibility. Social systems involve decision-making and value judgments that have no thermodynamic equivalent. Recognising these limits ensures that the metaphor remains an analytical tool rather than a deterministic model (Taleb, 2012).

Taken together, these patterns highlight the importance of designing institutions and infrastructures that can absorb stress, detect emerging thresholds, and reorganise without disproportionate harm.

Policy Implications: Designing for Graceful Failure and Adaptive Recovery

Understanding fragility through the phase-change lens reveals that abrupt transitions are shaped not only by external shocks, but also by the internal structure of systems: how stress accumulates, how thresholds emerge, and how tightly components are coupled (Boulton et al., 2015). If modern failures resemble phase transitions rather than linear degradation, then governance must focus not only on preventing shocks but also on enabling systems to fail gracefully and recover adaptively. The goal is to preserve core function, identity, and coherence even under severe strain (Walker et al., 2004).

Buffering, Slack, and Redundancy

Redundancy provides absorptive capacity, analogous to latent heat in thermodynamic systems, serving as reservoirs of stability that delay threshold crossing (Dakos et al., 2012). Diverse supply chains, distributed energy backups, and decentralised data infrastructures reduce single-point vulnerability.

A widely cited example of systemic redesign following failure is Estonia's response to the 2007 cyberattacks. A politically motivated distributed denial-of-service campaign disrupted government, media, and banking networks. The event exposed highly centralised digital dependencies. Estonia's subsequent reforms established distributed and internationally hosted "data embassies," ensuring continuity even in the face of severe digital disruption (Tikk et al., 2010). The redesign increased redundancy, reduced coupling, and strengthened institutional metastability.

Social redundancy matters as well: independent media ecosystems, civil society networks, and Indigenous knowledge systems offer interpretive and organisational diversity. These parallel structures provide alternative pathways for information, coordination, and meaning-making when central systems falter. Such diversity acts as a buffer against narrative or governance capture, supporting systemic resilience (Norris et al., 2008).

Modularity and Decentralisation

Modularity limits the extent and the speed of failure propagation. Ecological studies have shown that modular food-web structures can reduce trophic cascades (Lenton et al., 2008). Empirical research shows that modular or compartmentalised ecological and infrastructure networks are more resilient because disruptions remain localised rather than propagating system-wide. Studies of coral reef ecosystems, for example, demonstrate that spatially patchy and partially decoupled reef modules recover more effectively from bleaching events and are less prone to trophic cascades (Hughes et al., 2010). Similar findings in network ecology show that compartmentalisation increases the persistence of complex food webs by preventing minor disturbances from amplifying across the entire system (Stouffer & Bascompte, 2011).

Institutional modularity performs a similar function. During the 2021 surge of the Delta variant in India, the state of Kerala adopted decentralized public health measures—including transparent reporting, community mobilization, and targeted restrictions—that outperformed national averages. Likewise, several US states acted independently during the early weeks of the COVID-19 pandemic, procuring equipment and designing public health interventions while federal coordination lagged. These modular responses slowed systemic propagation and preserved local capacity (Wang et al., 2020).

Feedback Sensitivity and Early Warning Capacity

Approaching thresholds, both physical and social systems exhibit "critical slowing down": disturbances take longer to recover from, signalling declining resilience (Scheffer et al., 2009). Effective governance depends on sensing these signals early.

Technical systems rely on real-time monitoring of grid stability, emissions, hydrological flows, or epidemiological patterns. Social systems require equally robust feedback mechanisms: whistle-blower protections, open-data environments, participatory science, and avenues for protest or grievance.

Taiwan's response to COVID-19 demonstrated the value of rapid feedback activation. Drawing on lessons from SARS, Taiwan established its Central Epidemic Command Center early, utilised real-time data integration, and maintained transparent public communication. The resulting public trust and early intervention helped slow system loading and prevent a threshold breach during the pandemic's early phase (Wang et al., 2020).

Polycentric Governance

Polycentric systems distribute authority across multiple, overlapping centres. Rather than relying on a single hierarchical command, they allow for local experimentation and mutual adjustment. Political scientist Elinor Ostrom argues that such arrangements manage commons more effectively under conditions of uncertainty (Ostrom, 2010).

Climate governance illustrates this well. Cities such as Copenhagen and Melbourne have pioneered adaptation strategies—including blue-green infrastructure, urban-cooling corridors and community-led water harvesting—that feed into national planning and global learning networks. Similar dynamics are also evident in agriculture: Andhra Pradesh's agroecological programs originated from farmer-led experimentation with natural farming methods, influencing broader debates on sustainable food systems.

Polycentricity increases systemic resilience by diversifying governance responses and preventing policy failure at a single level from cascading across the entire system (Berkes & Ross, 2013).

Scenario Planning and Foresight

Because phase-change dynamics are nonlinear, prediction models often fail to predict accurately near thresholds. Scenario planning, war gaming, and stress testing cultivate readiness for discontinuity and reveal system behaviour under extreme conditions rather than average ones (Boulton et al., 2015).

A clear example is provided by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD] (2014), which documented whole-of-government risk management frameworks that utilize regular national-level exercises to test multisector coordination during compound crises, such as cyberattacks coinciding with pandemics or port shutdowns. These exercises demonstrated that minor logistical delays in food-import flows could quickly cascade into energy and health sectors, prompting the government to diversify storage, increase local production capacity, and modify port-priority rules.

Similarly, the United Kingdom's "Exercise Cygnus" stress-tested pandemic preparedness and revealed significant vulnerabilities in surge capacity, PPE logistics, and information systems (House of Commons Health and Social Care Committee & Science and Technology Committee, 2021). Although not all insights were implemented prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, the exercise provided a detailed structural map of potential failure points, demonstrating the value of stress testing as an early-warning tool, even when political commitment varies.

In the climate domain, the Netherlands' "Room for the River" program embraced hydrological uncertainty by redesigning floodplains, relocating dikes, and creating designated overflow zones (Klijn et al., 2013). This approach reframes risk management from resisting thresholds to adapting landscapes so that threshold crossing does not trigger catastrophic cascade failure.

Education, Meaning Systems, and Cultural Capacity

Resilience is not solely technical. It is also cognitive, emotional, and cultural. Educational systems that cultivate systems thinking, ethical reasoning, and adaptive problem-solving strengthen a society's capacity for coherent response. New Zealand's curriculum emphasises competencies such as critical thinking, civic engagement, and emotional intelligence, preparing citizens for complex and uncertain environments.

Developmental research suggests that resilience develops in supportive environments that foster self-regulation, flexible thinking, and moral reasoning (Masten, 2001). At the community level, rituals, narratives, and shared meaning systems help populations interpret disruption and maintain coherence (Norris et al., 2008).

The post-earthquake recovery in Christchurch illustrates this. Early top-down interventions provided speed but lacked legitimacy. Later participatory processes, such as the Share an Idea initiative and the co-creation model of Regenerate Christchurch, enhanced community agency and produced more durable, context-sensitive recovery pathways (Berkes & Ross, 2013; Norris et al., 2008). These cultural capacities reduced the risk of fragmentation and supported collective reorganization.

Managing the Efficiency–Resilience Trade off

Efficiency reduces slack. It lowers redundancy and tightens coupling, making systems more susceptible to threshold crossing. This dynamic aligns with arguments about antifragility, which emphasise that systems optimised for efficiency alone become increasingly vulnerable to disorder and volatility (Taleb, 2012). Resilience requires recognising that small sacrifices in short-term efficiency can produce significant gains in long-term stability (Walker et al., 2004).

Critical infrastructure demonstrates this tension. Energy grids optimized for peak efficiency often lack reserve margins, which increase the risk of cascading failure during heatwaves, cold snaps, or fuel shortages. More balanced designs integrate redundancy, local storage, microgrids, and adaptive load-management strategies (Rinaldi et al., 2001).

Designing for Safe Failure

Not all failures can be prevented, but their consequences can be contained. Aviation safety exemplifies this principle: redundant controls, failsafe mechanisms, and rigorous scenario testing ensure that individual component failures do not result in catastrophic outcomes. Food-safety frameworks such as HACCP similarly identify critical control points to prevent small failures from escalating.

Designing for safe failure acknowledges that thresholds will sometimes be crossed. The goal is to avoid disproportionate harm and support rapid reorganisation (Gunderson & Holling, 2002).

Aligning Incentives with Resilience

Institutional incentives often prioritise short-term performance over long-term stability. Resilience-oriented incentives reshape regulatory frameworks, funding models, and performance metrics to value maintenance, diversification, and adaptive capacity (Boulton et al., 2015).

Examples include infrastructure investment rules that reward redundancy, public health funding models that sustain community-level capacity, and corporate reporting standards that incorporate systemic risk indicators.

Cross-Sector Coordination

Because modern systems are interdependent, stresses often propagate across sectors. Energy grids depend on water availability. Food systems depend on transport networks. Public-health systems depend on supply chains.

Cross-sector coordination identifies shared vulnerabilities and reduces the risk that a disturbance originating in one domain will spread to and impact others. Integrated planning across energy, water, health, and transport sectors allows institutions to anticipate joint thresholds and design interventions that reduce systemic fragility (Rinaldi et al., 2001).

Ethics of Metaphor and the Moral Stakes of Systemic Transition

Metaphors are not neutral. They conduct conceptual work, shaping how societies perceive disruption, assign responsibility, and envision possible futures. Scientific metaphors in particular can carry authority that obscures contestable assumptions. The phase-change metaphor is analytically powerful, yet it must be used ethically to avoid misrepresenting agency, flattening inequity, or naturalising harm (Taleb, 2012).

Ethical Frameworks for Evaluating Metaphor Use

Three ethical traditions help clarify when a metaphor illuminates and when it distorts.

- Consequentialist ethics focuses on outcomes: does the metaphor support policies that reduce harm and enhance resilience?
- Justice-oriented ethics examines distribution: does the metaphor reveal or obscure who bears the burdens of systemic stress and who benefits from existing arrangements?
- Narrative and hermeneutic ethics evaluate meaning: does the metaphor shape how societies understand themselves, their histories, and their responsibilities?

These frameworks emphasize that metaphors are not merely rhetorical tools, but also influence how societies frame problems and select solutions (Norris et al., 2008).

Ethical Strengths and Risks

The phase-change metaphor has several ethical advantages. It highlights hidden stress, making previously invisible vulnerabilities visible. It foregrounds threshold dynamics, reminding policymakers that slight delays in intervention can have disproportionate consequences (Lenton et al., 2008). It underscores the importance of buffers and equitable recovery capacity.

However, the metaphor also carries risks:

- Risk of determinism: Physical thresholds are fixed; social thresholds are shaped by policy, culture, and power. Treating social change as inevitable obscures agency.
- Risk of depoliticisation: Portraying collapse as a natural process can mask political decisions that weakened resilience.
- Risk of flattening inequity: The metaphor does not inherently account for differential vulnerability or compounding disadvantage.

Ethical use requires that these limitations be made explicit.

Case Illustrations

Sri Lanka's 2022 crisis shows how threshold dynamics can be misinterpreted. The crisis appeared sudden, but it reflected long-term policy failures, sovereign debt accumulation, and erosion of governance. A deterministic reading—"Sri Lanka crossed a threshold"—would obscure the decisions that produced vulnerability (Tainter, 1988; Taleb, 2012).

Ecological transitions offer similar lessons. Coral-reef collapse is often described as a tipping point; however, local governance, fishing pressure, and pollution management significantly influence where these thresholds lie. A purely physical framing neglects human agency (Scheffer et al., 2009).

Global supply-chain fragility exhibits a similar dynamic: consolidation, deregulation, and hyper-efficiency were political and economic choices that increased the risk of cascading failures (Rinaldi et al., 2001).

Avoiding Misuse: Principles for Responsible Application

To ensure ethical use of the phase-change metaphor, four principles are essential:

- Maintain agency: Emphasise that thresholds shift with policy, culture, and governance.
- Centre equity: Analyse who absorbs stress, who crosses thresholds first, and who benefits from resilience investments (Berkes & Ross, 2013).
- Preserve contingency: Acknowledge that transition pathways are not predetermined.
- Support deliberation: Use the metaphor to enhance democratic engagement, not bypass it.

Reflexive Use and Metaphor Awareness

Responsible use requires reflexivity: acknowledging that metaphors shape and filter our perception. Analysts should examine how their own interpretive frameworks shape what they see as signal or noise, fragility or resilience.

The metaphor should prompt inquiry rather than foreclose it. Its purpose is to clarify structural dynamics while amplifying attention to social complexity, institutional design, and ethical responsibility (Norris et al., 2008).

CONCLUSION

Abrupt systemic transitions typically reflect long periods of hidden stress, weakening resilience, and declining recovery capacity. The thermodynamic phase-change metaphor offers a structured heuristic for interpreting these dynamics while acknowledging its limitations. It highlights how systems can absorb stress quietly before crossing thresholds that trigger rapid transformation (Lenton et al., 2008; Scheffer et al., 2009). It clarifies why apparent stability may conceal deep fragility and why nonlinear transitions can occur once absorptive capacity is exceeded (Bak et al., 1987).

However, the metaphor must be used carefully. Physical thresholds are fixed, whereas social thresholds shift in response to governance, meaning, institutional design, and collective action. Social systems embed agency, power, and contestation in ways that physical systems do not. The ethical use of the metaphor requires attention to its distributional impacts, political responsibility, and the cultural meanings through which societies interpret disruption (Norris et al., 2008).

Policy implications follow from this structural understanding. Building resilience requires buffering, redundancy, and diversified systems (Walker et al., 2004). It requires modularity to limit the speed and spread of failures, feedback sensitivity to detect emerging thresholds, and polycentric governance to enable experimentation and adaptive response (Boulton et al., 2015). It requires foresight practices that prepare for discontinuity and cultural capacities that maintain coherence during periods of transition (Masten, 2001). Above all, it requires aligning incentives with long-term stability rather than short-term efficiency (Taleb, 2012).

The phase-change lens does not predict specific events. However, it provides a disciplined approach to recognizing fragility, interpreting emerging risks, and designing governance systems that can absorb stress, anticipate thresholds, and reorganize without disproportionate harm. As global systems become more interconnected and optimisation-driven, this structural awareness becomes essential for navigating an increasingly unstable world.

Author Contributions

The author solely conceived, researched, and wrote this manuscript. No other individuals contributed to the design, analysis, or writing of the article. The views expressed in this article are solely those of the author and do not represent the views of the Australian Government or any affiliated institution.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

Data Availability

No datasets were generated or analysed during the current study. All data and sources referenced are publicly available or cited accordingly.

Ethical Approval

This study did not involve human participants, animals, or sensitive personal data and thus did not require ethics approval.

Declaration of Artificial Intelligence Use

ChatGPT assisted in editing and formatting.

Acknowledgments

The author gratefully acknowledges colleagues and reviewers who contributed feedback on earlier drafts.

REFERENCES

Albert, R., Jeong, H., & Barabási, A.-L. (2000). Error and attack tolerance of complex networks. Nature, 406, 378–382. https://doi.org/10.1038/35019019

Bak, P., Tang, C., & Wiesenfeld, K. (1987). Self-organized criticality: An explanation of the 1/fnoise. Physical Review Letters, 59(4), 381–384. https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.59.381

Barabási, sA.-L. (2002). Linked: The new science of networks science of networks. Perseus Books Group.

Berkes, F., & Ross, H. (2013). Community resilience: Toward an integrated approach. Society & Natural Resources, 26(1), 5–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920.2012.736605

Boulton, J. G., Allen, P. M., & Bowman, C. (2015). Embracing complexity : Strategic perspectives for an age of turbulence. Oxford University Press.

Dakos, V., Carpenter, S. R., Brock, W. A., Ellison, A. M., Guttal, V., Ives, A. R., Kéfi, S., Livina, V., Seekell, D. A., van Nes, E. H., & Scheffer, M. (2012). Methods for detecting early warnings of critical transitions in time series illustrated using simulated ecological data. PLoS ONE, 7(7), e41010. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0041010

Folke, C., Carpenter, S. R., Walker, B., Scheffer, M., Chapin, T., & Rockström, J. (2010). Resilience thinking: Integrating resilience, adaptability and transformability. Ecology and Society, 15(4). https://doi.org/10.5751/es-03610-150420

Gibbon, E. (1776–1788). The history of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire (Vols. 1–6). W. Strahan & T. Cadell.

Gorton, G. B. (2008). The panic of 2007. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City Economic Review, 93(4), 63–118.

Gunderson, L. H., & Holling, C. S. (Eds.). (2002). Panarchy : Understanding transformations in human and natural systems. Island Press.

House of Commons, Health and Social Care Committee, & Science and Technology Committee. (2021). Coronavirus: Lessons learnt to date (HC 92). UK Parliament. https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/7496/documents/78687/default/

Hughes, T. P., Graham, N. A. J., Jackson, J. B. C., Mumby, P. J., & Steneck, R. S. (2010). Rising to the challenge of sustaining coral reef resilience. Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 25(11), 633–642. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2010.07.011

Ivanov, D., & Das, A. (2020). Coronavirus (COVID-19/SARS-CoV-2) and supply chain resilience: a research note. International Journal of Integrated Supply Management, 13(1), 90–102. https://doi.org/10.1504/ijism.2020.107780

Klijn, F., de Bruin, D., de Hoog, M. C., Jansen, S., & Sijmons, D. F. (2013). Design quality of Room for the River measures in the Netherlands: Role and assessment of the quality team (Q-team). International Journal of River Basin Management, 11(3), 287–299. https://doi.org/10.1080/15715124.2013.811418

Lenton, T. M., Held, H., Kriegler, E., Hall, J. W., Lucht, W., Rahmstorf, S., & Schellnhuber, H. J. (2008). Tipping elements in the earth's climate system. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 105(6), 1786–1793. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0705414105

Luhmann, N. (1995). Social systems (J. Bednarz & D. Baecker, Trans.). Stanford University Press.

Masten, A. S. (2001). Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. American Psychologist, 56(3), 227–238. https://doi.org/10.1037//0003-066x.56.3.227

Norris, F. H., Stevens, S. P., Pfefferbaum, B., Wyche, K. F., & Pfefferbaum, R. L. (2008). Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness. American Journal of Community Psychology, 41(1-2), 127–150. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-007-9156-6

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2014). Risk management and corporate governance. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264208636-en

Ostrom, E. (2010). Polycentric systems for coping with collective action and global environmental change. Global Environmental Change, 20(4), 550–557. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2010.07.004

Rinaldi, S. M., Peerenboom, J. P., & Kelly, T. K. (2001). Identifying, understanding, and analyzing critical infrastructure interdependencies. IEEE Control Systems Magazine, 21(6), 11–25. https://doi.org/10.1109/37.969131

Scheffer, M., Bascompte, J., Brock, W. A., Brovkin, V., Carpenter, S. R., Dakos, V., Held, H., van Nes, E. H., Rietkerk, M., & Sugihara, G. (2009). Early-warning signals for critical transitions. Nature, 461, 53–59. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature08227

Spengler, O. (1918–1922). The decline of the West (C. F. Atkinson, Trans.; Vols. 1–2). Alfred A. Knopf.

Stouffer, D. B., & Bascompte, J. (2011). Compartmentalization increases food-web persistence. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 108(9), 3648–3652. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1014353108

Tainter, J. A. (1988). The collapse of complex societies. Cambridge University Press.

Taleb, N. N. (2012). Antifragile : Things that gain from disorder. Random House.

Tikk, E., Kaska, K., & Vihul, L. (2010). International cyber incidents: Legal considerations. Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence. https://ccdcoe.org/uploads/2018/10/legalconsiderations_0.pdf

Toynbee, A. (1934–1961). A study of history (Vols. 1–12). Oxford University Press.

Walker, B., Holling, C. S., Carpenter, S. R., & Kinzig, A. P. (2004). Resilience, adaptability and transformability in social-ecological systems. Ecology and Society, 9(2). https://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol9/iss2/art5/

Wang, C. J., Ng, C. Y., & Brook, R. H. (2020). Response to COVID-19 in Taiwan: Big data analytics, new technology, and proactive testing. JAMA, 323(14). https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.3151

How to cite this article:
Walker, R. J. (2025). Phase Change and the Limits of Resilience: A Physics-Inspired Lens on Societal Fragility and Collapse. Recoletos Multidisciplinary Research Journal 13(2), 99-109. https://doi.org/10.32871/rmrj2513.02.10