

NAVIGATING THE QUANTUM DIVIDE(S)

A. Ayda Gercek¹ & Zeki C. Seskir^{2*}

¹Center for Science and Technology Policies, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey

²Institute for Technology Assessment and Systems Analysis, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Karlsruhe, Germany

* zeki.seskir@kit.edu

Abstract:

This article explores the possible divides resulting from the introduction of emerging quantum technologies (QT) to society. It provides the multidirectional impacts of QT on science, technology, geopolitics, and societal structures. We aim to challenge the idea of a singular "quantum divide" by presenting a more comprehensive perspective. To complement the existing literature on the quantum divide, we propose four distinct divides that could result from the emergence of QT: in science, in technologies, between countries, and within societies. Firstly, we examine the "Quantum Divide in Science", representing the paradigmatic gap among scientists and inequalities in access to knowledge/resources within research communities. We suggest the "Quantum Divide in Technologies through Path-dependency" as the second possible divide, examining the adoption processes of certain technologies to be developed by nations, firms, and research communities. The discussion extends internationally, focusing on the "Quantum Divide between Countries," by dealing with the reasons and outcomes of the adoption processes between countries of different development levels (economically, industrially, and technologically). As the final divide, we put forth our perspective on the "Quantum Divide within Societies", one of the most explored ones in the literature, addressing societal implications. For each type of the divide, we propose several directions to navigate them, some complementary, some incompatible. Finally, we discuss the interconnectedness and distinctness of different types of divides and how they impact the directions to navigate them. This study serves as a guidance for those interested in a more in-depth investigation of the concept of quantum divide, possible directions of navigating the divides, and how the introduction of QT might affect the innovation ecosystems by impacting the scientific, technological, international, and societal institutions.

Keywords: Quantum technologies, quantum divide, societal impact, path-dependency, geopolitics

1. Introduction:

The first quantum revolution occurred in the early 20th century and has had a profound impact on our daily lives. The second quantum revolution, which started in the 1980s, is expected to have similar effects before mid-century (Dowling & Milburn, 2003). As being the cause of these revolutions, quantum mechanics, brought new discoveries in the understanding of fundamental principles of nature. The first quantum revolution emerged under the leadership of Erwin Schrödinger and Werner Heisenberg in the 1920s. This revolution came to life with the quantum mechanics introduced with wave functions, Heisenberg's uncertainty principle, and the probabilistic nature of quantum events (Shankar, 1994). The ideas of energy quantization, wave-particle duality, and the uncertainty principle have led to advances in various fields of science and the development of many modern technologies such as lasers, MRI scanners, and computers (Schleich et al., 2016). With the advent of the second quantum revolution, this trend is only expected to accelerate. Simply put, these developments are creating new opportunities for exploration and expanding our understanding of the physical world (Dowling & Milburn, 2003).

QT are expected to be game-changers in various industries. Every technology, or development path has its promises. For example, quantum computer's ability to perform some complex calculations faster than classical computers gives it a significant computational advantage (Smith, 2022). Quantum key distribution (QKD) and quantum communications offer a new level of security and novel methods in data transmission and protection against cyber threats through unbreakable encryption (Cava et al., 2021), and the groundwork for a potentially novel new infrastructure, the quantum internet (Kimble, 2008). There are practical applications in fields like navigation, environmental monitoring, and medical diagnosis through the use of high-precision quantum sensors (Brown, 2021). Better understanding and control over materials benefiting from quantum properties, such as superconductors, have the potential to revolutionize energy storage and electronics (Cava et al., 2021). Developments in QT can improve precision in areas like imaging techniques, quality control, and metrology (Roberts, 2019). Furthermore, quantum mechanics is still driving fundamental scientific discoveries, reshaping and advancing technology and research (Cava et al., 2021). However, it should be noted that despite the promises made by some scientists and entrepreneurs, the tangible productions of the QT are not anticipated in the immediate future (Preskill, 2018, p.5). Consequently, the element of uncertainty in these advancements is undeniable. Schleich et al. (2016) explain that research in new QT is still in the era of basic research. Regardless of the

anticipated tangible outputs in the mid-to-distant future, a constant reality is that with any scientific or technological breakthrough of this magnitude, the possibility of divides emerge over who will benefit from the discovery in terms of access, usage, and distribution of these potential outcomes.

In the context of technology and society, the concept of “divide” generally refers to a significant gap that exists between different groups or regions with respect to ‘access to’ and ‘utilization of’ a particular technology or resource, which causes inequality in the most simplistic sense. This term is mostly used to point out divides emerged in the case of the information age in the literature (Ragnedda et al., 2013). Therefore, the divide is mostly used to describe situations where some individuals or communities are able to access and benefit from certain technologies while others are unable to do so, leading to digital, technological, or information segregation. As being one of the technological and informational occurrences, the concept of quantum divide corresponds to a possible gap between groups and/or countries in any conceivable area of life, mainly caused by the lack of interaction or understanding of quantum mechanics, technologies, and their possible outcomes (Vermaas 2017; Ten Holter et al. 2022).

In the literature review, we identified several previous studies in the field of QT highlighting the significance of bridging the gap between theoretical and practical applications of QT (Vermaas, 2017; de Wolf, 2017; Ten Holter et al., 2022). In these studies, the notion of divide is constructed from the perspectives of the divide between countries and within societies. They all emphasize the need to address the challenges associated with QT and increase collaboration among stakeholders such as researchers, industry experts, and policymakers. In this work, as it is also presented by Ten Holter et al. (2022), we follow the line of thinking that more than one type of divide needs to be taken into account in order to talk about a comprehensive and inclusive development environment for QT. However, in the existing literature, we identified a definitional gap in the categorization and evaluation of these divides. To address this gap, we aim to contribute to the literature by analysing different types of quantum divide, of which we formulate to be four. These are the quantum divide in science, the quantum divide in technologies through path-dependency, the quantum divide between countries, and the quantum divide within societies. Each of these four notions points out the distinct conceptualization of the “divide”. Therefore, while the majority of the previous studies have taken the element of access as the main source of division, we argue a more nuanced approach is better suited as the basis for the construction of any potential divide.

2. Why are Quantum technologies expected to result in a divide?

We should start from the origins, meanings, and perceptions of the words when there is a case of an analysis because having a multiplicity of interpretations which can find their reflection in practical life in a multitude of ways would be possible. Yet, keeping in mind that any definition should be flexible, we need a base definition that we can use for the sake of an analysis. Therefore, let us construct the term "divide" very basically within the context of this study. It is generally used to describe a separation or gap that exists between two or more entities, often stemming from differences in understanding or disparities in the sharing process. This could be in the physical, social, economic, or cultural realms, and commonly implies a significant difference or contrast between these entities. The divide could be a result of various factors such as geographical distance, language barriers, cultural differences, or economic disparities. Such divides can have significant implications on the entities involved, affecting their relationships, interactions, and overall well-being or functioning.

The arguments of Castells (2001) on the internet society and digital divide are applicable to the discussions regarding the quantum divides. According to Castells (2001), the issue of the digital divide is not limited to the simple matter of having access to technology, the internet. It is a complex phenomenon that involves a range of factors beyond just physical availability. Michael K. Powell, the Federal Communications Commission chairman, referred to the digital divide by calling it a "*Mercedes divide*." From his point of view, it is as easy as "*wanting a Mercedes car, but not being able to have it*" (Labaton, 2001). In this example, there is a reductionist approach to making it merely a dichotomous measure of access. However, this does not fully capture the nuances of either the digital divide or any other technology-based divide. Castells (2011, p.781) offers "a complex interaction" in a social structure that holds the sources of inequality and social exclusion as a further layer of definition. A divide caused by technological developments has far-reaching implications for knowledge creation and destruction, as well as power dynamics. It is not just a matter of having access to technology or not; it is also about the quality of that access. For example, in the case of the digital divide, even if people have access to computers and the internet, they may not have the necessary skills or knowledge to use them effectively. This can further intensify existing inequalities. It also encompasses issues such as language barriers, cultural differences, and socioeconomic factors. All these aspects inevitably have an effect on how people interact with technology and how they benefit from it. Therefore, any technology-based divide, whether it is digital, quantum or else, requires a versatile approach that addresses these various factors.

The issue of division, in many cases, arises due to the strategic actions of various stakeholders with various motivations, such as pursuing economic development, attaining self-sufficiency, or gaining political power. The World Development Report 2021 highlights the issue of self-sufficiency by suggesting that policymakers should support the development of local data infrastructures. This will enable the storage, processing, and exchange of data within the country, resulting in high-speed and cost-effective data services. As a result, data will not have to travel through distant overseas facilities (World Development Report, 2021, p. 157). Therefore, they conclude that having a national infrastructure for emerging technologies is advantageous to a country. However, for our analysis this raises the following question: What makes the motivation of “self-sufficiency” result in a divide? The reason lies in the notion that some emerging technologies are not inherently just disruptive, but also transformative (Marrone & Hazelton, 2019). These technologies are imagined and developed over the existing structure of conceptual and physical infrastructure. Therefore, the development of new infrastructure must build upon the previous one. This makes a seemingly harmless motivation for self-sufficiency to become a step in the dark war of so-called modernization.

QT have also been called as transformative technologies by many (Guy, 2018; Preskill, 2018; Seskir et al., 2023), for having the potential to significantly impact various sectors, including healthcare, defence, finance, energy, and so on. Accordingly, we can expect that QT may strengthen or weaken divisions that are already ongoing or create new divisions. Ten Holter (2022) constructs the notion of the quantum divide as "*challenges, between regions, between nations, and between rich and poor within nations, around creating more equitable access to quantum computing*" (p.3). Furthermore, Coates et al. (2022) have determined accessibility as a core value in the field of QT and the article authored by Hidary & Sarkar (2023) in the World Economic Forum (WEF) also assigns unequal access as the cause of the quantum divide. On the other hand, Vermaas (2017) further puts forward conceptualizations of the quantum divide, while referring to it as a “knowledge gap” (p.242). He presents that Coenen and Grunwald (2017) discuss the distinction between individuals engaged in QT development and those who are not; DiVincenzo (de Touzalin et al., 2016) highlights the knowledge gap between quantum scientists and society; and de Wolf (2017) underlines the division between those with access and those without (p. 274). In short, the quantum divide, similar to the concept of digital divide, is conceptualized in the literature, primarily associated with having access to devices and knowledge on QT or not.

2.1 Types of divides

Wessel (2013) suggests that, in a broader sense, the importance of a technology is found in its integration into the production processes, its role in facilitating information exchange, and its support for engagement. From this point of view, the technology to be examined should be evaluated with the dynamics it plays within each domain it interacts with. Wessel argues that *“The multi-dimensional approach includes the dynamics of socio-economic position, geographic location, ethnicity, and language, as well as educational capacities and digital literacy”* (2013, p.23). Although this assertion may not fully address certain complexities, it serves as a valuable starting point for adopting a multi-dimensional lens in our examination of quantum divides.

Like in all emerging technologies, the main preferred result of those impacts can be thought to be increasing welfare in general. As it has been mentioned in the previous section, there are various sectors that are expected to be affected by QT. In the healthcare sector, QT can be used to develop advanced diagnostic and therapeutic tools, which can lead to more accurate diagnoses and better treatment outcomes (Flöther & Griffin, 2023). In the defence sector, QT can be used to develop more secure communication systems, sensors, and navigation devices, which can improve the safety of military personnel (van Amerongen, 2021). In the finance sector, QT can be used to develop more efficient risk management and portfolio optimization algorithms, which can lead to better investment decisions (Gschwendtner et al., 2023). Furthermore, Hidary & Sarkar (2023) in their WEF article claims that creating jobs would be one of the far-reaching impacts of the QTs, besides the impacts on *“(leader) countries’ industrial bases, and providing economic and national security benefits.”*

Beyond sectoral influences, QT is poised to reshape social and ethical landscapes, potentially altering employment structures and cultural norms, thereby redefining societal agreements that transcend verbal articulation. This prediction, while seemingly speculative, underscores the profound entanglement of technology with the fabric of society, influencing political, social, and cultural spheres far beyond a mere tool. QT embodies the values and aspirations of the communities that forge and adopt it, suggesting its cultural ramifications could significantly alter interpersonal interactions and societal cohesion. These effects, undoubtedly, will not manifest overnight, but they will work their way through means such as humanities (Barzen, 2022; Bötticher, et al., 2023), games (Wootton, 2022, Seskir et al., 2022b), music (Miranda, 2022), and beyond.

With all these impact categories in mind, we can formulate the different types of divides that could potentially arise. We propose four types of divides that have the potential to emerge during the development, adoption, and usage processes of QT. These are the quantum divide in science, the quantum divide in technologies through path-dependency, the quantum divide between countries, and the quantum divide within societies.

2.2 Quantum divide in science

There are no specific references to the term 'scientific divide' in the existing literature. Nevertheless, we find this term suitable to characterize what we have in mind. The concept of a scientific divide can be built upon the concept of paradigm by Kuhn (1962). In his famous book 'The Structure of Scientific Revolutions', Kuhn suggests that there is one paradigm that makes up the way of experiencing, understanding, and interpreting the world. It is the very base of our lives. This paradigm has the best answers to the questions of the scientists at that time. During periods of 'normal science', as termed by Kuhn, scientists operate within this paradigm, engaging in problem-solving based on the established theories and practices. However, through time, the existing paradigm fails to provide adequate answers to the questions raised, and as a result, tension in the system that calls for a revolution starts accumulating. Eventually, the existing paradigm shifts to one that has better answers and with those answers, carries a completely new way of understanding and living the world. A common example of this shift is the transition from Newtonian to Einsteinian laws of physics, as explained by Kuhn.

In a Kuhnian sense, the raising of questions to which the existing paradigm fails to provide adequate answers to is closely linked with the ability of existing scientists, which is ironically built from within the previous paradigm. This ability, although mostly attributed to the conceptual infrastructure, is also closely linked with the physical infrastructure of science, the instruments and tools that a scientist can access to. The true outcomes of the Copernican revolution in astronomy were only realized after the creation of Uraniborg, the first custom-built observatory in modern Europe, and later invention of the telescope. These enabled not only providing better and alternative answers, but also expanded the opportunity space of questions that can be asked by that era's scientists and philosophers.

With this explanation in mind, let us construct the concept of scientific divide with two branches. First, let us assume that an emerging set of QT that relies on quantum mechanics and quantum information science (QIS) can have similarly revolutionary impacts (Dowling &

Milburn, 2003). Quantum mechanics plays a crucial role in understanding the behaviour of physical objects. This has influenced the priorities and research focus in materials science, with an increasing emphasis on designing materials with specific quantum properties for technological applications. The development of quantum mechanics and technologies can lead to divides or shifts in emphasis among certain scientific areas, a shift in understanding. This shift can be caused by the possible changes in the research techniques. Common techniques such as scanning tunnelling microscopy (Ast et al., 2016) and various spectroscopic methods rely on quantum principles, leading to a shift in how experiments are designed and interpreted in many fields of physics and materials science. Utilization of techniques coming from the field already played a role in the redefinition of the kg (SI unit for mass) in 2018 (Banks) and kickstarting the recent surge in gravitational wave astronomy (Aasi et al., 2013) which resulted in the observation of gravitational waves from two black holes merging and the following awarding of the Nobel Prize in Physics 2017 for LIGO.

The tools enabled by QT have applications beyond physics as well. An example is the recent progress in developing magnetoencephalography with optically pumped magnetometers (OPM-MEG) (Alem et al., 2023) which is a promising tool for the next generation of functional neuroimaging (Brookes et al., 2022). MEG is a functional neuroimaging technique for mapping brain activity by recording magnetic fields produced by electrical currents occurring naturally in the brain, using very sensitive magnetometers. Current MEG devices require considerable physical infrastructure like cryogenics and superconducting devices, they are similar to MRI devices in their physical appearances. In comparison, the novel OPM-MEG devices are at the size of a bike helmet, a helmet specially 3-D printed for the subject's head with dozens of synchronized quantum sensors placed on it. Enabling the utilization of portable and wearable quantum sensors that can perform MEG operation enhances the opportunity space for questions that can be asked by neuroscientists using these tools for data gathering from subjects in motion. There are already videos and tests of OPM-MEG devices being used for research on people playing table tennis, walking, and performing other physical activities. These techniques can quickly be adopted by teams of scientists using MEG devices for their research, as they already possess the capabilities to work with data generated from these devices. However, according to a market analysis report in 2022 (Grand View Research) there are only around 200 MEG scanners in use worldwide for both medical and research purposes, which limits the scientific expertise that has any hands-on experience in MEG-based neuroscience to research groups in a handful of countries. These experienced teams will most likely be the first

customers of companies producing OPM-MEG devices, have the first access to their capabilities, and be the ones to kickstart a surge of activity in their fields.

Access	Usage
Has access	Uses
Has access	Does not use
No access	Would use it if had access
No access	Would not use it if had access

Table 1: Access/Usage Scenarios

The second branch might be the indication of the separations or the inequalities in the scientific community with respect to the degree of adoption of new tools and techniques and the resulting gap in the ability to ask or answer questions arising on the peripheries of normal science. These divisions can be related to funding, representation, educational access, or variations in scientific achievements, among others. Consider the OPM-MEG case. Eventually, the devices will be adopted by others and overall, empower their relevant scientific communities in more countries than currently using MEG techniques today, but this can take varying amounts of time depending on the trajectory of the technology. Therefore, it contributes to the creation of a quantum divide in scientific ability within certain research communities.

Further along the second branch, on the one hand, it can be suggested that quantum mechanics made a variety of interdisciplinary collaborations -between scientific fields that were traditionally separate- possible. As it has been seen again and again in the past, progress in scientific research is much easier in the case of collaboration. Historically, quantum physics and computer science coming together created quantum computing, making physicists and computer scientists work more closely. In an overarching way, the field of QIS, which includes quantum computing, cryptography, and communication, is becoming a distinct field with its own focus and experts (Seskir & Aydinoglu, 2021) and its own discipline-culture (Weissman et al., 2019; Seskir, et al., 2024). QIS focuses on using quantum properties for processing information and can be considered as the scientific basis for a considerable portion of the technologies associated with the second quantum revolution. However, certain approaches and formulations beyond the immediate applications of QIS in physics and computer sciences are not reaching or being accepted by their intended scientific communities.

For instance, Aiello (2023) complains that quantum biology is not being regarded as a "legitimate" scientific field, although it carries significant potential in many areas. According

to Aiello, the reasons for this are the absence of a cohesive quantum biology community, lack of experimental verification, and the continued presence of scientific silos at institutions (p.2). Similar arguments can be applied to the lack of adoption of quantum chemistry techniques using quantum computers for full model simulations by chemists who are sticking with widely available density-functional theory (DFT) modelling, even though quantum computers hold great potential for the field (Cao et al., 2019). Another argument is made by Barzen (2022) and Böttcher et al. (2023) in the literature about the potential impacts of quantum computer on research in humanities from data preparation, techniques and methods like clustering, and classification to various approaches for data analysis. Likewise, in their book titled *Quantum Social Science*, Haven & Khrennikov (2013) argue how basic principles of quantum mechanics can be applied to decision-making paradoxes in psychology and used for modelling information in finance and economics. Even between the fields of QT, there are versatile opportunities for further collaboration and development as highlighted by Vedral (2016), who proposed examining quantum metrology through the lens of QIS.

As scientific divide in the QT context is a nuanced conceptualization, we want to provide two analogical examples related to scientific fields from the era of not the second quantum but the digital revolution, particle physics and library sciences. The ties between particle physics and digital technologies go back quite a while, as it was a field requiring high computational capabilities. Historically, some of the most important protocols that enable the World Wide Web (WWW) were first developed by Tim Berners-Lee in 1989 while he was a fellow of CERN, as CERN was the largest internet node in Europe back then. This early adoption of digital technologies, when combined with the resources provided by CERN, enabled particle physics to grow as a truly international scientific endeavour. As an outcome of this, the 2015 article on the first measurement of the newly discovered Higgs boson had 5,154 individual contributors (Castelvecchi, 2015), broken the record for having the largest number of contributors to a single research article. Another example is the field of library sciences and the integration of bibliometrics with the developing digital infrastructure in mid-1990s according to Bellis (2009, p.285), which also contributed to the development of digital tools, such as Google search (pp.31-32). In both cases, tangentially relevant fields which fundamentally have nothing to do with the development of the physical technologies and the infrastructure of the digital revolution, benefitted tremendously and co-produced some of the core functionalities of the digital infrastructure we all use today, the internet.

In summary, the two branches of the quantum divide in science we highlight in this section are primarily the availability and adoption of new scientific tools and techniques emanating from QT in general and QIS in particular. The branches can further be diversified, but the main formulation of a gap between those who have potential access to the tools and knowledge and those who do not remain. The second branch adds a further dimension, a gap between those who can realize this potential via early adoption, hence having an impact on the trajectory of that technology, and those who will not. Therefore, the real sizeable gap will expectedly be between two groups: (i) those with potential access to the tools and knowledge who will adopt these successfully to answer questions on the periphery of normal science, and (ii) those without the potential access to the tools and knowledge who would not realize this potential even if they had the opportunity, hence missing to identify the point in time where these resources will finally become potentially available for them.

2.3 Quantum divide in technologies through path-dependency

In all emerging technologies, countries, firms, scientists, and societies, prioritize the development of specific branches of that technology. From this point of view, we can naturally claim that there is a certain character to the evolutionary trajectory of different technologies. The Kuhnian conceptualization of scientific revolutions and paradigms are reformulated for the field of economic development in the name of the neo-Schumpeterian effort to understand innovation and processes (and difficulties) of technological catch-up in the 1980s by authors such as Dosi (1982) and Perez & Soete (1988). This formulation relies heavily on the distinction between invention and innovation, and the fact that “...*the space of the technologically possible is much greater than that of the economically profitable and socially acceptable*” (Perez, 2010). Thus, which technology takes the lead in certain areas and for what reasons heavily relies on factors outside of the bounds of that technology’s technical capabilities. Formulating a theoretical explanation for this in the context of QT also necessitates the inclusion of another notion from evolutionary economics into this discussion: path dependence. The concept of technological path dependence suggests that the choices made early on in the development of a technology can have a lasting impact on the direction and trajectory of research and development in that field (Antonelli, 1997; Stoneman, 2004). Antonelli defines path dependence as “...*the set of dynamic processes where small events have long-lasting consequences that economic action at each moment can modify yet only to a limited extent*” (1997, p.1). Therefore, from the same line of thought, we can state that any adoption of a developing or ready-to-use technology by firms, countries, or societies results in

an environment that could support -ideologically or technically- some other technology's development or adoption easier or harder in the future.

The selection of specific QT can lead to a diverse global technological landscape, with different countries specializing in various areas (Parker et al, 2022; Parker, et al., 2023). It can have several reasons, since being able to develop a technology affects the levels of economic competitiveness, technological leadership, security capabilities, and international influence. Some nations/firms may excel in quantum computing so much that can/be able to get the concrete product, winning the early-comer advantage in the evolutionary economics' thought and may cause the infrastructure to "lock-in" to that certain technology, regardless of the inefficiency of the technology compared to the other possibly more efficient, yet not realized products. This hypothetical, but very well-known process assures the cruciality of the timing (Liebowitz & Margolis, 1995). The most basic explanation for them not to focus on all kinds of QT production seems to be coming from the fact that it is a long-term process. Since it is expected that studies on QT will mostly yield a concrete output that can be used in daily life in the long term (Preskill, 2018), it is logical to allocate a sustainable and tolerable fund to certain technologies in this field so that technologies can continue to be developed.

The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine report titled "Quantum Computing: Progress and Prospects" (2019) provides a clear example of this. It emphasizes the concept of a virtuous cycle within the semiconductor industry related to transistors. In this cycle, the adoption of new technology in products leads the industry to make more money, which is then reinvested in the development of newer technology. This is identified as the main driver of Moore's law, meaning that, the number of transistors in an integrated circuit doubles in every two years. This virtuous cycle of development in transistors also effectively ruled out alternative technologies for computation via locking-in the information technologies industry to work with silicon transistors for the last 60 years. Before then, if you asked a researcher to envision the future of computation, the most probable reply you get would be miniature vacuum tubes. A similar shift in the dominant modality of physical realization of quantum computing is also possible. Currently, companies like IBM, Google, Rigetti, IQM, and others are focusing on developing superconducting circuits-based qubit systems. However, there are others such as IonQ, Quantinuum, and Universal Quantum working on trapped ion quantum computers, and those such as Xanadu and PsiQuantum working on photonics-based quantum computation. It is entirely possible to look back at the current superconducting circuits-based devices

available on cloud today and consider them as archaic modes of doing computation, as we do for vacuum tubes of the 40s.

In order to evaluate the developmental trajectory (Dosi, 1982) of QT, the national initiatives related to QT in various countries and their collaborative efforts on an international scale carry significance, not only because they have a direct impact on the quantum divide between countries, but also the policies and funding decisions of governments significantly impact the direction and rate of development in QT. Countries allocate resources and establish policies that encourage research, development, and commercialization in specific QT domains or even on specific modalities for quantum computers, networks, and sensors. In their strategic development plans, expectedly the countries tend to rely on their existing strengths rather than addressing their weaknesses (Kung & Fancy, 2021). It is seen that countries generally choose the technologies to fund according to their prevailing capabilities within the national infrastructure. Moreover, international collaborations as well, are driven by both innovation and risk-averse strategies that are defined by Arrow-Pratt (1971 & 1974). By intending to work with countries that have similar approaches, nations aim to maximize their returns on investment into these new technologies and minimize the chances of facing unexpected challenges along the development path they are on. Hence, it is only expected that the way countries decide on their pioneer quantum technology, choose which technologies and modalities to support, and collaborate internationally is interconnected.

Munro & Paci (2023) put forward the feature of "like-mindedness" in the partnership of the AUKUS security agreement between Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States, suggesting that having a shared mindset is an advantage of becoming pioneers in the quantum field. This collaborative strategy focuses on strengthening each other's existing systems, or weaknesses in those systems, instead of exploring completely different paths. Furthermore, the National Quantum Coordination Office of the United States presents international partnerships formed based on the concepts of "shared values/commitments", "common dedication/priorities", and "history of scientific engagement" in such scientific and technological advancements between countries. Under the requirements of international collaborations, whichever technology can be supported the best in terms of material and human capital is likely to be a winner in this pragmatic decision-making process. In other words, shared perspectives, such as a common understanding of determination and values within a governance domain, result in a strategic partnership to work on specific technologies or designs that will support the aimed value and make nations stronger together. Consequently, it is plausible to assert that

the values of the nations, which are strong and/or compatible enough to form an alliance, evolutionarily affect the path-dependent process of technology development and adoption. This aspect becomes crucial in understanding how QT are divided/evolved/survived¹ on a global scale.

Combining these, we can expect a quantum divide in technologies to emerge at the point of lock-in (Liebowitz & Margolis 1995), not only between countries, but the techno-economic paradigm (Perez, 2010) options beginning to form around different dominant modalities, especially for quantum computers and networks. Innovation ecosystem actors of all types in the quadruple helix model (Carayannis & Campbell, 2009), academia, industry, government and civil society, may find themselves on different ends of the spectrum in terms of their involvement with the final dominant modality and system designs. There is a multitude of operational options and room for managerial discretion in the future technological state of QT. Different modalities of implementation for QT can be thought of as technologies where “*the adoption of both increases profits by less than the sum of the profit gains from the adoption of both alone*” in the path-dependency frame (Stoneman, 2004), this indicates that there will be a market pull towards a tipping point after which lock-in is settled and in a short period of time any previous investment into competing modalities becomes mostly sunken cost. If this adoption is also in alignment with the formation of a new virtuous cycle, then any new investment into competing modalities also becomes mostly in vain. Leading to an outcome where actors within the helix that invested their time, effort, resources, and attention into anything other than the locked-in modality can find themselves in a situation very similar to having huge investments in vacuum tube manufacturing capabilities in the mid-50s or a movie-renting establishment serving CDs in the age of high-bandwidth streaming services on mobile devices.

2.4 Quantum divide between countries

There are several aspects that we can consider as the factors causing the emergence of a quantum divide between countries. However, in the context of this article and what is covered in earlier sections, we will limit our analysis to two possible causes for the divide. The first one is how countries position themselves with respect to other countries through the transformative capacities in these developing technologies and whether countries have technological or

¹ The choice of words is left to be preferred according to the readers' perspective.

infrastructural access to prerequisite resources or not. The second one is the factors/constraints countries have in their technology selection processes that differentiate them strategically.

As stated by Jin (2019), numerous investigations in the realm of international strategy indicate that each nation establishes its unique knowledge networks, institutional settings, and economic structures, all of which can consistently impact innovation endeavours within domestic markets. In determining a nation's technological trajectory, these settings, networks, and structures serve as a starting point and directly affect the country's technological capabilities. Nations may have various criteria to consider when adopting or developing a technology. These criteria are logically based on both the features of the technology in question, like trade costs and productivity levels, and/or the country's ideology, strategy, and capability. Although we suggested that whether there is access to technology or resources is not the only determinant of the divide, it is an undeniable aspect of it. It is included in the capability aspect and carries a historical burden for being a cumulative incident, related intrinsically to the path-dependency (Antonelli, 1997) issue introduced in the previous section. To give an example from the digital divide, according to the World Development Report (2021), a crucial aspect of this divide is the availability of adequate international bandwidth, which is essential for smooth and unrestricted access to the global internet. In the report, it is also suggested that lower-income countries² often struggle with collecting and effectively utilizing data due to insufficient infrastructure and expertise.

As we mentioned earlier, some emerging technologies are not inherently just disruptive, but have the potential to be transformative as QT are expected to be. These technologies are conceived and constructed within the existing frameworks of thought and infrastructure. As a result, the development of new infrastructure is inherently linked to and built upon the foundations of the previous one. An example from the QT field is that the quantum internet

² We have to take a step back here and note that the categorization done among the countries has different standing points. Therefore, while certain agencies take the economic status as the criteria for the differentiation, the other ones may prefer to categorize countries in a different manner. The closest example for the quantum divide could be the classification of the global status of countries made by Ragnedda et al. (2013) in the article titled "The Digital Divide: The Internet and Social Inequality in International Perspective". According to this classification, there are five groups. These are highly developed nations and regions (including the USA, the EU and Japan); emerging large powers (Brazil, Russia, India, China); Eastern European countries (Estonia, Romania, Serbia); Arab and Middle Eastern nations (Egypt, Iran, Israel); under-studied areas (East and Central Asia, Latin America, and sub-Saharan Africa). Similarly, examples of different categorizations can be varied.

(Kimble, 2008) requiring a well-functioning ‘classical’ internet to operate, it will be built upon the existing infrastructure and not replace it. The challenge arises when a seemingly innocent motivation for “self-sufficiency” is pursued without understanding how technology and infrastructure development are interconnected. Self-sufficiency is counted as an important aspect of countries (Sharif, 1999). Staatz presents a general definition of self-sufficiency as *"a situation in which a country or region's domestic production equals its domestic effective demand"* (1991, p.13). This perspective is adopted by many nations in different degrees because of having strategic role, as explained by Sharif (1999) in the case of technological self-reliance, and especially being associated with sustainability, which is one of today's hot topics. To give an example, China aims for "technological self-reliance" in its five-year plan (Gill, 2021). Putting "self-sufficiency" forward, especially in the development of emergent technologies could be a deception, since on the downside of this concept, there awaits allocating resources, expertise, and investments within a specific region or community. This may create disparities and an economic, geopolitical, and developmental divide, where certain areas or groups end up having more resources than others. This isolationist approach might limit collaboration and knowledge exchange with external entities and hinder addressing the global challenges which necessitate collective action. If a region or entity pursues self-sufficiency without acknowledging the need for collaboration and understanding the transformative potential of emerging technologies can lead to unintended consequences. Therefore, self-sufficiency with strategic global engagement is essential to mitigate these potential divides.

In the context of QT, this aspect is briefly covered in the literature as protectionist impulses (Ten Holter et al., 2022), especially with a focus on UK’s National Security & Investment Act, the multi-state Wassenaar arrangement, and the US’s ITAR regulations, which are utilized to support outcomes such as the UK-US Joint Statement on co-operation in QIST (Quantum Information Science and Technology). These can be extended to cover the AUKUS security agreement between Australia, the UK, and the US, and the Commission Recommendation on critical technology areas for the EU's economic security for further risk assessment with Member States³, which includes QT as one of the recommendations which is already accepted by the EC. These are examples primarily emanating from defence and security concerns. However, a shift in the language in recent years is hard to miss. The Quantum Manifesto,⁴

³ https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_23_4735

⁴ <http://qurope.eu/manifesto>

published in 2016, calls for encouraging international collaboration through new international funding mechanisms in science and promotes international collaboration, exchange, and networking of people and information between different centres in innovation. In contrast, Moreover, the sub-section dedicated to international collaboration in the preliminary Strategic Research and Industry Agenda (SRIA) document of the Quantum Flagship⁵ published in 2022 and laying out recommendations for the roadmap to 2030 is titled “International Collaboration / Export Control Regulation” and international (extra-European) partnerships are only recommended in the entire SRIA only within the framework of standardization efforts. Even within the EU, the discussions on going wide or going tall, meaning either distributing the investment and infrastructure to all the member states versus keeping them focused in certain areas/countries for increased efficiency and economies of scale, is an active topic of discussion. Central member states that can support major national initiatives on QT (such as Germany, the Netherlands, and France) are arguing for European support towards their home efforts meanwhile member states with lower levels of infrastructure are calling for support to promote their efforts in catching up.

Naturally, the approach tackled in the previous section, towards reinforcing existing strengths with the strategic choice of technology to develop, also has projections for the concept of the quantum divide between countries. These strengths display themselves in scientific, political, and economic arenas while may contribute to a gap among nations based on their advancements in QT. Countries may choose to invest in QT that align with their existing industrial strengths or have the potential to create new markets and industries. Following this claim, Jin (2019) suggests the possibility of an argument that scientists and engineers from technologically advanced countries are more likely to concentrate on studying established technologies rather than exploring completely new directions. This may be due to a variety of factors, including the need to maintain existing infrastructure, the presence of established industry players with significant investments in existing technologies, and the pressure to deliver results. Consequently, in technologically advanced countries, the companies benefit from the positive network effects of well-established technologies, like incubation facilities, which makes them choose the technology to develop that is supported by the already existing structure, networks, and settings. Essentially, some countries might end up getting better at certain QT, creating a gap between those who are already strong in these areas with their well-established capabilities and those who are comparatively less equipped. Surely, differing perspectives exist on this

⁵ <https://qt.eu/news/2022/quantum-flagship-publishes-preliminary-strategic-research-and-industry-agenda>

matter. For example, representing many others, Xuereb (2022) argues that the development of QT is still in its early stages, "*where it is possible for small players to make a significant impact*". According to this point of view, contrary to the countries with well-established capabilities, "small players" need to identify a specific area of focus that includes originality and high risk within an emerging technology that has the potential to create a worldwide influence, namely, what may be counted as a weakness for the others. Therefore, Xuereb suggests for small countries not to become consumers but creators by taking the risks that bigger countries did not take.

As another topic potentially relevant for QT is the workforce size not meeting the need for labour is presented as a bottleneck to quantum development in the literature (Kaur & Venegas-Gomez, 2022). In the media it is presented as a national security vulnerability⁶ and a battle to train quantum coders⁷, and many initiatives around the globe are getting implemented to remedy it, with dozens of specialized QIST and QT graduate programs being formed (Kaur & Venegas-Gomez, 2022). This is not very surprising considering the number of QT start-ups growing from being less than 20 in 2012 to over 400 in 2022 (Seskir, et al., 2022a). These, combined with the point on global mobility above, is a concern for certain countries. To be clear, being an expat or migrant researcher still has many difficulties and hurdles even in the field of QT where fast-tracking visas are being discussed, some of them beautifully described in the paper "Quantum researcher mobility: the wonderful wizard of Oz who paid for Dorothy's visa fees" (Malik, et al., 2022). However, topics such as depletion of academic reserves and senior brain drain are openly discussed in public forums and sometimes are even causes of friction on panels with representatives from the US and the EU have differing opinions on it. Different regions and countries have different priorities in terms of technologies they focus on, modalities they aim to scale up, and levels of risk they wish to accommodate for potential future gain, but they all need a certain amount and type of labour for their efforts. Currently, this labour consists primarily of highly educated technical workers, mostly with PhDs in Physics or certain specialized Engineering degrees, and there are only a limited number of those.

The different priorities highlighted above can come in several shapes and forms and are, of course, subject to change with time. The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine report (2019) focuses on two dominant modalities for quantum computers in Chapter

⁶ <https://foreignpolicy.com/2023/07/31/us-quantum-technology-china-competition-security/>

⁷ <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2020/jan/15/how-can-we-compete-with-google-the-battle-to-train-quantum-coders>

5, trapped ion and superconducting qubits. It considers photonic quantum computers, neutral atom-based devices, and semiconductor qubits under “Other Technologies.” In comparison, as of December 2023, the most well-funded quantum computing start-up (not associated with any major existing tech giant) is PsiQuantum working on photonic quantum computers, while the record on the highest number of logical qubits demonstrated is held by a neutral atom company called QuEra⁸, which is 48, both are from the US. This type of uncertainty brings forth additional difficulties in planning forward. The Austrian start-up Alpine Quantum Technologies (AQT) focuses on trapped-ion quantum devices, the Finnish start-up IQM Quantum Computers specializes in superconducting, the French start-up PASQAL on neutral atoms, and another French start-up Quandela on photonic quantum computers. All these require distinct supply chains and non-transferrable skillsets up to a point, further exacerbating the problem with predicting where workforce bottlenecks may arise, creating additional layers of complexities on the skills shortage front.

We mentioned two causes that may give rise to a quantum divide between countries. The first is how countries position themselves, which we argue is highly impacted by the increasing desire and pursuit of national or regional self-sufficiency and the type of infrastructure they have access to. Secondly, the factors/constraints they have in their technology selection processes that differentiate them strategically, which are their size, development level, existing path-dependencies, and particularly the workforce. A combination of these causes can lead to a considerable divide even within the class of developed economies, where successes in certain regions and countries attract more of the limited workforce there, depleting the academic reserves of other regions, hence further slowing down development in those regions and countries.

2.5 Quantum divide within societies

The final divide we want to explore, which is one of the most highlighted in the literature, is the potential quantum divide to occur within societies. In this section, we primarily want to focus on why this divide is the most expected one and how, in practice, QT can cause the perpetuation of the digital divide into the quantum era.

Technological changes inevitably bring social transformations together. They are intricately intertwined, influencing, transforming, and creating, each other in a continuous way. The

⁸ <https://www.quera.com/press-releases/harvard-quera-mit-and-the-nist-university-of-maryland-usher-in-new-era-of-quantum-computing-by-performing-complex-error-corrected-quantum-algorithms-on-48-logical-qubits>

integration of new technological applications and systems necessarily alters the dynamics of how individuals communicate, work, and live. In turn, societal needs and preferences are expected to drive the evolution of technological advancements, creating a cycle in which they feed each other. Therefore, we can rely on Schumpeter's claims on innovation as "creative destruction" (Dodgson & Gann, 2010) and expect QT to have profound societal impacts that are difficult to foresee at the moment.

This interrelationality between individuals, institutions, and artifacts is theorized in several ways in the literature. In this discussion, we would like to give attention to the notion of social capital, defined as one of the forms of capital by Bourdieu (1986), since we think it might give hints in imagining the impact of QT in society. Bourdieu explains capital as something to be accumulated and has the potential to produce profit. Social capital encompasses the resources associated with durable networks of relationships within a group, offering mutual acquaintance, recognition, and collectively owned capital. It includes tangible resources like job opportunities and financial aid, as well as intangible elements such as emotional support and trust, derived from personal relationships and memberships within social networks (Bourdieu, 1986, p.21). Shortly, it is the collection of resources that individuals can access through their social networks and relationships.

The meaning attached to technology varies, shaped by common understanding and its usage, creating a diverse foundation for social capital to thrive. Castells' Network Society theory, especially in the realm of digital information and communication technologies (2001), emphasizes the transformative role of information networks, particularly the Internet, in contemporary society. It can be inferred from this perspective that the networks that have arisen as a result of significant historical developments - whether from innovations, inventions, or political decisions - have a profound impact. For instance, the emergence of the internet and smartphones has profoundly changed how we communicate and conduct business, altering our daily routines and social interactions. Therefore, we can argue that there occurred an internet culture that is not defined by national borders, but by the commonalities among people regardless of their nations. This cultural shift, driven by technological developments, highlights the potential for QT to contribute to a new cultural order, similar to the transformative impact seen with the internet.

As discussed previously, particular QT such as quantum computers and the quantum internet (Kimble, 2008) will not replace their predecessors, usually referred to as classical computers

and the classical internet within the QT community. On the contrary, to operate functionally, quantum computers require considerable computational resources from their classical counterparts. Similarly, for the quantum networks to even be able to perform certain operations (such as quantum teleportation), classical communication channels will be required, hence a quantum internet will necessarily require a classical internet to operate on. These facts already hint that the existing social digital divide is most likely to be directly translated into the quantum age, only becoming even deeper as not all of the ones on the privileged end of the digital divide will get the quantum ‘upgrade’ to their infrastructure. This upgrade, first of all, necessitates a physical upgrade, having access to quantum computers or being able to connect to a quantum network from your region. However, as we know from the digital divide literature, having access is only a part of the game (Wessel, 2013). Those with the potentiality to develop algorithms and applications that can run on these new tools with novel capabilities will require re-training and obtain new skills. Those who wish to consume or utilize these algorithms or applications will require a certain amount of quantum literacy (Nita et al., 2021). The divide will widen between those who have access to these and exploit them in a timely manner and those who does not even have access to the underlying support structure in the first place.

A good example of how access to knowledge and skills are mediated within societies is which universities have courses or programs in QT, hence which populations are served. As mentioned in the previous section, there are dozens of new graduate programs are being created globally in QT (Kaur & Venegas-Gomez, 2022). A recent study analysing the distribution of QIS coursework across 456 institutions of higher learning as of fall 2022 in the US (Meyer et al., 2023) identifies that they are “*inequitably distributed, disproportionately benefiting students at private research-focused institutions*” and “*are largely failing to reach low-income and rural students.*” This is not a surprising finding, but one that is indicative of the role that QT will probably play when finally, the products of it are introduced to the society (such as quantum computers, networks, and sensors). They will primarily be a source for deepening the existing divide and will probably create a new one.

3. Navigating the divides

Closing the quantum divides is a challenging task, even unrealistic to imagine, particularly given the existing geopolitical landscape that lacks a focus on equitable development for QT. According to de Wolf (2017), “*...governments themselves could also have an interest in monopolizing access to quantum computers*” (p.274), which will also affect access to

knowledge. He emphasizes the importance of preventing “*more unequal distribution of power and wealth between America and the rest of the world, and between a few big companies and the rest of society*” (p.275). Therefore, although “closing” the gaps is challenging with governments' strategic interests, there is a bottom-up effort, and an ongoing journey to “bridge” the quantum divides. For instance, efforts for Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) aims for accessible, affordable, equitable, inclusive, and understandable technology development and policymaking by “...*opening up conversation between science and wider society...*” (Ten Holter et al., 2022, p.2). In their paper specifically discussing the ways to bridge the quantum divides with “*possible implications of responsible quantum computing*”, Ten Holter et al. present the existing efforts from Inglesant et al., 2021; Khan, 2021; EPSRC, 2017; Coenen & Grunwald, 2017 among others. Furthermore, they suggest that democratizing access to quantum computing might fight back against the digital divide as well. Other suggestions in the literature for closing the gaps are interdisciplinary industry and academia collaborations, the role of quantum education, preparing the workforce, public understanding of quantum technologies, addressing ethical and security concerns, and having more reflexivity and responsiveness regarding the narratives and actions adopted by the actors in the QT field (CERN Quantum Technology Initiative, 2021; Krishnamurthy, 2022; Parker, 2023; Tripathi, 2023; Seskir, et al., 2023).

In this article, we argue that it is more practical to focus on the navigation of these divides as the initial step, because it allows us to include and be aware of the construction of the agents' (individuals, groups, societies, institutions, governments etc.) understandings. It is commendable and necessary to think about and act on how to prevent these divides from emerging and aim to bridge them if they do. However, we must also accept the fact that at least some of these divides will emerge in one form or another even if all the actors in the ecosystem wished them not to emerge, and this is not the case. It is easy to observe that, in nationalist narratives, protectionist impulses extend beyond merely preventing the other party (depending on the perspective of the nation in question); they emphasize the necessity to 'win' the quantum race⁹. This is most clearly encountered in the language of national security and defence, where a strategic advantage, a novel capability that the 'adversary' does not possess, is something particularly sought after. This narrative can also be found in certain public discussions as well, leading to statements such as “*Why the US needs a 'quantum Oppenheimer' to beat China in*

⁹ <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2022/12/19/the-world-changing-race-to-develop-the-quantum-computer>

*the quantum race*¹⁰. Therefore, we argue that it is worthwhile to consider exploring scenarios and potential actions that can help us navigate these divides, as it is more likely than not for them to become a part of our future discussions on democratization of QT (Seskir, et al., 2023).

3.1 Navigating the quantum divide in science

In subsection 2.2, we explored two potential causes for such a divide to emerge, the potential for the tools emerging from QT to have revolutionary qualities that can contribute to and alter the way researchers prefer to conduct their work in disciplines beyond quantum mechanics and QIS, and the attitudes towards adoption of these tools and techniques by different research communities. This dynamic is playing out in the field of artificial intelligence (AI), where it took off following the point where AI was useful as a tool for research communities beyond just those doing AI research. This does not mean that AI research slowed down; on the contrary, it benefited from this adoption tremendously. A similar dynamic is expected in the field of QT when quantum computers transition from research tools to practical applications, and quantum networks are established for purposes beyond testbeds and research infrastructure, serving as either private or public infrastructure, and more. If the promises of QT and the roadmaps of companies like IBM and public initiatives like NQIA and the Quantum Flagship are to be successfully realized, we may reach this point by early 2030s in quantum computers, a bit sooner for quantum sensors, and a bit later for quantum networks.

The two directions we propose to navigate this divide are relatively complementary, building upon the two causes we argued might result in the emergence of this divide. First, prioritizing the adoption of these novel capabilities by relevant research communities, followed by public and shared research infrastructures with an active effort to introduce them to these communities. The second direction is to bring different research communities together, either via creating incentive mechanisms for them to get exposed to each other or to create joint gathering grounds where boundary objects between disciplines can be formed as their focus of research.

Preliminary efforts in the first direction can already be seen in certain funding schemes. One example we could find is a recent BMBF grant in Germany titled “Quantum technological and photonic system solutions for challenges of environmental and climate protection, biodiversity,

¹⁰ <https://physicsworld.com/a/why-the-us-needs-a-quantum-oppenheimer-to-beat-china-in-the-quantum-race/>

sustainable energy systems and resource conservation”¹¹, where research not on QT but with QT on other research topics is exclusively targeted. Tailored funding schemes such as these will necessarily require the formation of consortia consisting of parties from different disciplines. Successful project implementation will depend on extensive co-learning within these consortia. International versions of these, such as those via the Horizon program or the bi/tri-lateral research agreements between different countries similar to a recently announced one between France, Germany, and the Netherlands¹², can contribute greatly to allowing the exchange of expertise between borders as well.

The schemes introduced in the first direction also help towards the second direction, but it has already been happening between certain research communities since earlier. The formation of a boundary object, termed a 'post-quantum signature,' within the intersection of Quantum Information Science (QIS) and cryptography is exemplified by the Merkle signature scheme. This scheme, introduced by Buchmann et al. (2006), was identified as having "*a good chance of being quantum computer resistant.*" Its significance lies in being the first and most effective one, as it later kickstarted the field of post-quantum cryptography. Similarly, another successful boundary object between QIS and computer science, arguably the closest 'outside' discipline to QIS following physics, called 'a quantum-inspired classical algorithm' was introduced to literature in 2019 (Tang) by an 18-year-old¹³.

As explained in the introduction of this section, neither of these approaches can really prevent emergence of a quantum divide in science, if QT happens to be as revolutionary as promised (Dowling & Milburn, 2003). However, adoption of these directions can both soften the potential disadvantages of a deep divide, make building bridges over it easier, and overall distribute the benefits of having technological access to the quantum world to disciplines and the pursuit of knowledge in fields beyond quantum mechanics and physics in general.

3.2 Navigating the quantum divide in technologies through path-dependency

In the relevant subsection 2.3, we introduced a potential quantum divide in technologies that may emerge at the point of lock-in (Liebowitz & Margolis 1995). This divide is anticipated not only between countries but also within the techno-economic paradigm (Perez, 2010), with

¹¹ <https://www.bmbf.de/bmbf/shareddocs/bekanntmachungen/de/2023/05/2023-05-26-Bekanntmachung-Systeml%C3%B6sungen.html>

¹² <https://www.quantumwithoutborders.org/>

¹³ <https://www.quantamagazine.org/teenager-finds-classical-alternative-to-quantum-recommendation-algorithm-20180731/>

distinct options forming around various dominant modalities, particularly for quantum computers and networks. Such a divide will affect all innovation ecosystem actors who might find themselves on different ends of the spectrum in terms of their involvement with the final dominant modality and system designs.

The direction to mitigate the negative impacts of such a divide emerging would be to diversify one's portfolio of investments, in terms of all types of capital in the sense of Bourdieu (1986). However, this is not a task for those who cannot afford diversification and are forced to choose their bets carefully. There are certain actors in the field who can abstract themselves away from this or that modality, focusing on device-independent models of software development approaches or applications that can run on any type of quantum computer. Although this is a good approach to diversifying, it still will not prevent the divide from emerging, as those with dedicated software approaches customized for the final dominant design will have an advantage over those that were hedging their bets.

There is a nuanced point here regarding the future of QT platforms. The existence of the potentiality of this type of divide- the possibility of a 'winner takes all and the rest is left with huge sunk costs and very little to show for' scenario- may cause the entire ecosystem to end up locking-in to a technically sub-optimal modality. The race to deliver any kind of advantage useful for industry purposes motivates the actors to not diversify but concentrate their research and development efforts on tracks. Developing an industry-scale quantum computer is costly and expensive even for the largest commercial actors in the field, such as IBM, Google, and Microsoft, or developing infrastructure-worthy quantum network devices for actors such as IDQ/SK Telecom and Toshiba. The required speed and intensity of investments into these endeavours to deliver outcomes force the hand of these actors to entrench themselves into supply chains and workforce skillsets most suited for the technological path they are most invested in. It is true that "*...the space of the technologically possible is much greater than that of the economically profitable and socially acceptable*" (Perez, 2010), but it is also true that there are technologically possible innovations which are economically profitable and socially acceptable enough to kickstart a virtuous cycle without being the technical best option. This becomes irrelevant after a certain lock-in point; for example, the trillions of \$ already invested in silicon-based transistors make it practically impossible to switch the entire computing industry to an alternative platform for classical computation, a similar switch that took place in the 1950s from the vacuum tubes to silicon transistors. However, in the field of QT, we are still in the early stages of development. Somewhat paradoxically, the way to prevent this outcome

is to slow down the commercialization race, not stifle it, but make it into a marathon rather than a sprint¹⁴ and focus on exploring the space of technology further. This, of course, will not prevent the divide from emerging between those who are more heavily focused on the final dominant modality and design compared to those heavily invested in another modality with a completely different design. Nevertheless, it will lower the entry barrier to the race and expand the base of those who can afford to diversify. In the end, if we are allowed to abuse the racing analogy, more people can afford to participate in a marathon than a sprint race, and it is not really a big deal to not be the first person to finish a marathon compared to a sprint race.

3.3 Navigating the quantum divide between countries

In subsection 2.4 we explored two possible causes for a quantum divide to emerge between countries; (i) how the countries position themselves with respect to other countries and whether countries have technological or infrastructural access to prerequisite resources or not, and (ii) the factors/constraints countries have in their technology selection processes that differentiate them strategically. We primarily explored them through the lenses of self-sufficiency in its relation to (de-)globalization (Helleiner, 2021), existing infrastructure and strengths of countries, the workforce shortage (Kaur & Venegas-Gomez, 2022), and the corresponding topic of international labour mobility in QT (Malik, et al., 2022). Out of the four types of divides we describe, this is probably the one which is actually desired and aimed for by a considerable number of actors in the geopolitical arena, therefore we believe it is the one that is mostly likely to emerge strongest and has the most negative impact on those at the wrong side of the divide.

We will again argue for three directions to navigate this divide, but this time they are mostly incompatible with each other. The first one comes from Xuereb's (2022) argument on the small players. It is suggested that the small players are still having the opportunity to make a significant impact by identifying a specific area of focus that includes originality and high risk, not becoming consumers but creators by taking the risks that bigger countries did not take. This is not a new argument, it actually ties neatly back to the argument of running in a new direction (Perez & Soete, 1988) in the (techno-)economic catch-up literature. Through their work in years, developed in the 1980s and 1990s, authors such as Perez, Soete, Dosi, and others identified that for a following country to be able to catch-up to the leading country in a techno-economic paradigm, there are two primary windows of opportunity. The easier one to identify is when a techno-economic paradigm is matured, where only incremental improvements are

¹⁴ <https://venturebeat.com/business/quantum-computing-is-a-marathon-not-a-sprint/>

possible. This creates a period during which new investment into developing a technology further becomes more and more expensive while the return on investment is getting lower and lower, allowing the following countries to compete with the leading country on grounds outside of technical superiority. The second window of opportunity, which is not so obvious, is during the period of a techno-economic revolution, where a following country can choose to run in a new direction and stop following the leading country which is just continuing to make investments into developing a mature techno-economic paradigm to be more productive, getting less and less return on their investment. The argument on small countries taking on risks of running into a new direction which the more established ones are not exploring might actually provide highly beneficial outcomes for them given that they run in the right direction or at least a direction that is good enough to guide through the technological revolution. The difficulty is that, it is not easy to identify such directions, while there are so many different directions that only lead to dead ends with considerable sunken costs.

The second direction that can be followed to navigate this divide is to not compete in the race, fail, but fail successfully. Not aiming to catch-up to a techno-economic leader but only aiming to increase the overall prosperity of a country can also be considered as a worthy endeavour. Yet, it would require explicitly accepting the chance of missing out a valid window of opportunity for technological leap-frogging. It involves acknowledging the role of not becoming creators but mere consumers of what the technological revolution brings forth. Foregoing the aim of being an early adopter or an early majority, when done intentionally and successfully, can mitigate the most negative impacts of a quantum divide within countries.

The third direction is to team up, especially with regional or established trade partners. This can be used by both the countries on the disadvantaged end of this divide and the countries on the advantaged end of this divide. Ideally, it can be used to match countries from both ends. A good example of this is the EU's QuantERA and Quantum Flagship initiatives, which support quantum research across 31 European countries. When accounted for separately, the countries with the most start-up and commercialization activities in QT are the US, Canada, and the UK. However, when EU-27 is calculated as a single unit, the number of start-ups is on-par with the US for the top spot (Seskir et al., 2022a) and the total amount of investment is almost equal to the advertised amount from China. Infrastructure projects such as EuroQCI and EuroQCS cover several countries in the EU, aimed at spreading the QT infrastructure. For example, the six new EuroHPC quantum computers that are going to be integrated into existing supercomputers are located in Czechia, France, Germany, Italy, Poland and Spain, a

combination of leading and following countries. This direction can also be utilized by countries primarily at the advantaged end of the divide to keep their strategic edge, an example of this is the AUKUS' focus on QT (Munro & Paci, 2023). Similar initiatives on all shades of this regional and trade partnerships are expected to increase, as there are ongoing efforts in this direction in regional bodies such as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) or between allied countries like the US, Japan, and Republic of Korea (The White House, 2024).

We argue that either is a valid approach to deal with the expectation of such a division emerging. However, it is important to note that these are incompatible approaches. If a country wishes to run in a direction and try to technologically leap-frog during a technological revolution, all the relevant stakeholders of the quadruple helix (Carayannis & Campbell, 2009) of that country should be aligned with that goal. On the other hand, if a country wishes to *'fail successfully'* in catching up in a manner that causes the least harm from the emerging divide, its relevant stakeholder communities should act in unison as much as possible. A half-hearted effort to leap-frog will most likely end in considerable opportunity costs, and a half-hearted effort to be a follower might end up causing the country to miss the train and only realizing it when they are very late to the party. Finally, if a collaborative effort is aimed to be put forward, all members should align their goals and priorities with respect to the joint efforts, one member aiming to fail successfully while another aiming to adopt a high risk- high reward approach may end up causing both of them to not succeed in their respective goals.

3.4 Navigating the quantum divide within societies

As mentioned in subsection 2.5, this is the most highlighted type of divide in the literature, and multiple directions to mitigate the negative impacts and navigate have already been proposed previously. Increasing avenues of access via expanding the user base of these technologies is accepted as a necessary but not a sufficient condition for bridging this type of divide (Ten Holter et al., 2022). A renewed urgency to make quantum theory understandable (Vermaas, 2017), implementing a “strong” RRI approach which entails linking parliamentary or other core policy processes to stakeholder dialogues (Coenen & Grunwald, 2017), increasing awareness of both the technologies themselves and their risks (Roberson, 2023), creating a dialogue between innovators and societies (Ten Holter, et al., 2023), enabling participation via citizen science initiatives, forming and supporting grassroots communities, and promoting outreach activities (Seskir et al., 2023), having value sensitive design practices embedded in the QT development processes (Umbrello et al., 2023) are only some of the recommendations

made in the literature. However, these discussions are still on their infancy, with only several dozens of articles published on anything related to social and QT as of 2022, noted by Wolbring. Furthermore, there is a growing number of governance framework proposals (Coates et al., 2022; Coenen et al., 2022; Perrier, 2022; Kop et al., 2023) in the literature in recent years, all of which contain valuable insights on how to navigate the quantum divide within societies. The common point of all is the inclusion and empowerment of societal stakeholders, bringing along the public up to speed on what QT can deliver, what it cannot deliver, and the wisdom to know the difference. Of course, depending on the theory of democracy one abides to, participatory, deliberative, or representative (Seskir et al., 2023), this process can take different forms. For example, in the case of a participatory model, co-creation activities and citizen science approaches might prove to be more essential, compared to a representative approach where civil society organizations and different communities within QT formed as bottom-up initiatives (Umbrello et al., 2023) can act on behalf of the societal groups they represent. In terms of a deliberative model, having public dialogue options available where societal stakeholders can connect to these technologies on their own terms (EPSRC, 2017; van de Merbel et al., 2023) would be a good first step to involve them into the deliberation, though requiring many more steps for a truly democratic process in the deliberative model.

3.5 Interconnectedness and distinctness of divides

As it is obvious at this point to our readers that there are many overlapping aspects of the different divides we described, there are reinforcing qualities between them where the emergence of one type of a divide increases the probability and potential severity of the other types. There are distinct scenarios as well, where certain types of divides might emerge but not others. For instance, the scientific community could prevent the full emergence of the quantum divide in science by implementing strategies such as intensifying efforts to establish collaborative research infrastructures, actively fostering connections among diverse research communities, and employing other measures. The technology development process might be intentionally (or due to external reasons) slowed down considerably. This can prevent the emergence of a full-blown quantum divide in technologies by giving the relevant actors enough time to phase out of their sunken cost investments and re-orient their resources to join the ecosystem forming around the to-be dominant modality and system design. Countries may decide to give up pursuing a strategic and economic edge through QT, because they might lose faith in the technology or some other possible but less likely alternatives, such as adopting an

equitable development model between countries, which should, in theory, prevent the rise of a quantum divide between countries.

We can also give some examples of the reinforcing qualities between the different types of divides mentioned above. A quantum divide in technologies would make investments made towards the ‘wrong’ technology into sunken costs. In practical terms, smaller countries that took risks the larger ones avoided (Xuereb, 2022) would find themselves not only lagging behind but also heavily committed to a path that most ecosystem stakeholders did not embrace. This situation puts them at a significant disadvantage in the divide between countries. A quantum divide within societies might have an impact on research communities as well. Researchers from fields outside of the immediate vicinity of QIS will have less exposure to QT. Even this limited exposure will be obscured by narratives that present quantum mechanics as incomprehensible (Vermaas, 2017), further exacerbating the problem of a growing discrepancy between those research communities with access to revolutionary tools and those that do not have a clear understanding of the actual qualities of these tools because their information channels are distorted by narratives mystifying the technology. A quantum divide between countries, when combined with the global mobility of highly educated and skilled labour in the field, could deplete developing economies to the extent that only a few nations can effectively translate the technical language of QT into a format understandable to the public. This situation deepens the quantum divide within societies, as the ability to bridge the gap between technical aspects of QT and societal understanding becomes concentrated in a limited number of countries. The interconnectedness and distinctness of different types of divides described in this work calls for further attention than we can afford in the context of this article. They present opportunities and risks that are not apparent from investigating only a societal, country-level, scientific or technological divide caused by widespread introduction of QT. The interconnected scenarios also call for navigation strategies considering multiple dimensions at once. This adds further complexity to an issue with considerable complexity already. As the directions proposed in subsections 3.1 and 3.3 are clear examples, there are complementary approaches, and there are incompatible approaches regarding the navigation of different types of divides. When considering multiple dimensions, one must also investigate the impact of navigation strategies on other types of divides. If a country adopts a direction to mitigate the potential negative impacts of a quantum divide between countries which is incompatible with an approach aimed at navigating the emerging societal divide, then further

investigation and deliberation between stakeholders on priorities becomes an urgent issue to handle.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, we aimed to elaborate on the possible divides that could emerge with the development of QT and bring a new perspective on the understanding of how to navigate these divides. We suggested that several types of divides can be formulated. The focus of our study included four divides, which are the quantum divide in science, the quantum divide in technologies through path-dependency, the quantum divide between countries, and the quantum divide within societies.

Our analysis began with the ‘scientific divide,’ where we explored how variations in knowledge and resources within the scientific community might lead to disparities in capabilities and opportunities among scientists. This divide underscores the importance of ensuring equitable access to QT knowledge and resources within the scientific arena.

In the realm of technologies, we delved into the concept of path-dependency, highlighting how the decision-making process in technology development can lead to certain technologies dominating, thereby potentially excluding others. This creates a competitive landscape where the choice of technology becomes a critical determinant of success or obsolescence.

The divide between countries, perhaps the most geopolitically significant, was examined through the lenses of technological and infrastructural access, self-sufficiency motivations, and strategic positioning in the global landscape. Our findings suggest that the quantum divide is likely to reinforce existing geopolitical and economic disparities, with significant implications for international relations and national strategies.

Within societies, we addressed how QT might perpetuate and deepen the digital divide, transforming it into a quantum divide. This divide is not just about access to technology but also encompasses the ability to understand, utilize, and benefit from QT. The interplay of QT with social structures, norms, and values underscores the societal implications of these emerging technologies.

We discussed that bridging all these divides simultaneously is not likely to happen, and investigation of possible directions to navigate these divides can prove beneficial for all the stakeholders of the quadruple helix, and the respective innovation ecosystems. In this regard, we proposed several directions to navigate these divides. Some of which are complementary

and some of which are incompatible to adopt at the same time, leading to different options and strategies that can be followed by stakeholders. A summary of these can be found in Table 2.

Type of divide	Navigation options (non-exhaustive)
<i>Scientific</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prioritize and support QT adoption in research fields outside of QT. 2. Encourage interdisciplinary collaboration with the QT field.
<i>Technological</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Diversify investment portfolios to mitigate the negative impacts of the eventual technology lock-in. 2. Slow down commercialization to explore technology options, lower entry barriers, and give time for ecosystem actors to adjust.
<i>Country-level</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify high-risk, original areas for follower countries to become creators, not mere consumers. 2. Choose to fail successfully by increasing overall prosperity, not competing in the race to catch-up. 3. Collaborate regionally or with trade partners to balance the quantum divide.
<i>Societal</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enhance access and stakeholder engagement in QT. 2. Apply varied public participation governance frameworks.

Table 2: Types of divides and associated navigation directions provided in this study.

As we know from the digital divide literature, having access is only a part of the game, and the importance of a technology is found in its integration into the production processes, its role in facilitating information exchange, and its support for engagement (Wessel, 2013). Emergence of QT will impact different stakeholders in a variety of manners; some will benefit from it, some will be just okay, and some will suffer from it. Neither the benefits nor the harm of any emerging technology is distributed equitably, and the formation of a gap wide enough to be identified as a divide exacerbates this inequitable distribution. The list of navigation directions we proposed in this study is not exhaustive or should be taken as a static list, especially considering that QT has a rapidly evolving landscape. It is essential to note that any direction for navigation to be chosen will require periodic review and updating depending on which of the potential paths QT is on will unfold.

5. Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Armin Grunwald, Carolyn Ten Holter, and Ceyda Yolgörmez for their valuable time and feedback to the early drafts of the manuscript. AAG acknowledges support from the KIT Aspiring Grant. ZCS acknowledges support from the DAAD.

Completing Interests

The authors have no competing interests to declare.

References

- Aasi, J., et al. (2013). Enhanced sensitivity of the LIGO gravitational wave detector by using squeezed states of light. *Nature Photonics*, 7(8), 613–619. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nphoton.2013.177>
- Alem, O., Hughes, K. J., Buard, I., Cheung, T. P., Maydew, T., Griesshammer, A., ... & Knappe, S. (2023). An integrated full-head opm-meg system based on 128 zero-field sensors. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 17. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2023.1190310>
- Aiello, C. 2023. It's Time to Take Quantum Biology Research Seriously. *Physics* 16, 79. Retrieved from: <https://physics.aps.org/articles/v16/79>
- Antonelli, C. (1997). The economics of path-dependence in industrial organization. *International Journal of Industrial Organization*. 15(6). 643-675. Retrieved from: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-7187\(97\)00006-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-7187(97)00006-4)
- Arrow, K. (1971). *Essays in the Theory of Risk-Bearing*. Chicago: Markham Publishings Co., pp.vii-278.
- Ast, C., Jäck, B., Senkpiel, J. *et al.* (2016). Sensing the quantum limit in scanning tunnelling spectroscopy. *Nat Commun* 7, 13009 . <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms13009>
- Banks, M. (2018, November 16). Kilogram finally redefined as world's metrologists agree to new formulation for SI units. *PhysicsWorld*. December 16, 2023, <https://physicsworld.com/a/kilogram-finally-redefined-as-worlds-metrologists-agree-to-new-formulation-for-si-units/>
- Barzen, J. (2022). From digital humanities to quantum humanities: potentials and applications. *Quantum Computing in the Arts and Humanities*, 1-52. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-95538-0_1
- Bellis, N. D. (2009). *Bibliometrics and Citation Analysis: From the Science Citation Index to Cybermetrics*. Scarecrow Press. ISBN 978-0-8108-6714-7.
- Bhambra, G. (2007). *Rethinking Modernity: Postcolonialism and the Sociological Imagination*. Berlin: Springer.
- Bourdieu, P (1986) "The Forms of Capital" Richardson, J., *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, Westport, CT: Greenwood, pp. 241–58
- Bötticher A, Hernandez J, Kettemann MC, Gast V, Araiza Bravo R. Introducing a Research Programme for Quantum Humanities: Theoretical Implications. *European Journal of Risk Regulation*. 2023;14(3):435-456. doi:10.1017/err.2023.71
- Brookes, M. J., Leggett, J., Rea, M., Hill, R. M., Holmes, N., Boto, E., & Bowtell, R. (2022). Magnetoencephalography with optically pumped magnetometers (OPM-MEG): the next generation of functional neuroimaging. *Trends in Neurosciences*, 45(8), 621–634. doi:10.1016/j.tins.2022.05.008
- Brown, R. (2021). "High-Precision Quantum Sensors." *Sensors and Actuators*, 22(4), 411-425.

- Buchmann, J., Coronado García, L. C., Dahmen, E., Döring, M., & Klintsevich, E. (2006). Cmss – an improved merkle signature scheme. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (Including Subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, 4329 LNCS, 349–363. doi:10.1007/11941378_25
- Cao, Y., et al. (2019). Quantum Chemistry in the Age of Quantum Computing. *Chemical Reviews*, 119(19), 10856–10915. doi:10.1021/acs.chemrev.8b00803
- Carayannis, E. G. & Campbell, D. F.J. (2009). 'Mode 3' and 'Quadruple Helix': toward a 21st century fractal innovation ecosystem. *International Journal of Technology Management*. 46 (3/4): 201. doi:10.1504/IJTM.2009.023374
- Castells, M. (2001). *The Rise of the Network Society. The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*. Wiley Online Books. Retrieved from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/9781444319514.ch4>
- Castells, M. (2011). Network Theory| A Network Theory of Power. *International Journal of Communication*, 5, 15. Retrieved from <https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/1136>
- Castelvecchi, D. (2015). Physics paper sets record with more than 5,000 authors. *Nature*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature.2015.17567>
- Cava, R., Leon, N., & Xie, W. (2021). Introduction: Quantum Materials. In, *Chemical Reviews*. 121 (5), 2777-2779. DOI: 10.1021/acs.chemrev.0c01322
- CERN Quantum Technology Initiative. (2021). Strategy and Roadmap. https://quantum.web.cern.ch/sites/default/files/2021-10/CERN%20QTI%20Roadmap%20v1.0_R2%20%2820211007%29.pdf
- Coates, R. et. al. (2022). Quantum computing governance principles. WEF Insight Report. Retrieved from: www.weforum.org/reports/quantumcomputing-governance-principles
- Coenen, C., & Grunwald, A. (2017). Responsible research and innovation (RRI) in quantum technology. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 19, 277–294.
- Coenen, C., Grinbaum, A., Grunwald, A., Milburn, C., & Vermaas, P. E. (2022). Quantum technologies and society: towards a different spin. *NanoEthics*, 16(1), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11569-021-00409-4>
- de Touzalin, A., Marcus, C., Heijman, F., Cirac, I., Murray, R., & Calarco, T. (2016). Quantum manifesto: A new era of technology.
- de Wolf, R. The potential impact of quantum computers on society, *Ethics and Information Technology*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 271–276, Dec 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-017-9439-z>
- Dodgson, M., & Gann, D. (2010) 'Joseph Schumpeter's Gales of Creative Destruction', *Innovation: A Very Short Introduction*, 1st edn, Very Short Introductions (Oxford), <https://doi.org/10.1093/actrade/9780199568901.003.0002>, accessed 15 Dec. 2023.

Dosi, G. (1982). Technological paradigms and technological trajectories. *Research Policy*, 11(3), 147-162. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0048-7333\(82\)90016-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0048-7333(82)90016-6)

Dowling, J.P. & Milburn, G.J. (2003). Quantum Technology: The Second Quantum Revolution. In, *Philosophical Transactions: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, Aug. 15, 2003, Vol. 361, No. 1809, Information, Knowledge and Technology. pp. 1655-1674. Retrieved from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3559215>

EPSRC. (2017). Quantum Technologies Public Dialogue Report [https://nqit.ox.ac.uk/sites/nqit.ox.ac.uk/files/2018-07/QuantumTechnologies Public Dialogue Full Report_0.pdf](https://nqit.ox.ac.uk/sites/nqit.ox.ac.uk/files/2018-07/QuantumTechnologies%20Public%20Dialogue%20Full%20Report_0.pdf)

Flöther, F.F. & Griffin, P.F. (2023). How can quantum technologies be applied in healthcare, medicine and the life sciences? *Research Directions: Quantum Technologies*. 1:e7. doi:10.1017/qut.2023.1

Gill, B. (March 23rd, 2021). China's Quest for Greater Technological Self-Reliance. *Asia Society Australia*. Retrieved from: <https://asiasociety.org/australia/chinas-quest-greater-technological-self-reliance>

Grand View Research (2022). Magnetoencephalography Market Size, Share & Trends Analysis Report By Application (Clinical, Research), By End Use (Hospitals, Imaging Centers, Academic & Research Institutes), By Region, And Segment Forecasts, 2023 – 2030. (Report ID: GVR-4-68039-618-0) <https://www.grandviewresearch.com/industry-analysis/magnetoencephalography-market-report>

Gschwendtner, M., Morgan, N. & Soller, H. (October 23, 2023). Quantum technology use cases as fuel for value in finance. *McKinsey Digital*. Retrieved from: <https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/mckinsey-digital/our-insights/tech-forward/quantum-technology-use-cases-as-fuel-for-value-in-finance>

Guy, D. C. (2018). The weaponization of quantum physics: How quantum technology is transforming warfare. Technical report.

Haven, E. & Khrennikov, A. (2013). *Quantum Social Science*. Cambridge University Press 978-1-107-01282-0

Helleiner, E. (2021). The Return of National Self-Sufficiency? Excavating Autarkic Thought in a De-Globalizing Era, *International Studies Review*, Volume 23, Issue 3, Pages 933–957, <https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/viaa092>

Hidary, J. & Sarkar, A. *World Economic Forum*. (Jan 18, 2023). The world is heading for a 'quantum divide': here's why it matters. Retrieved from: <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2023/01/the-world-quantum-divide-why-it-matters-davos2023/>

Inglesant P, Ten Holter C, Jirotko M and Williams R. (2021). Asleep at the wheel? Responsible innovation in quantum computing *Technol. Anal. Strateg. Manage.*

- Jin, B. (2019). Country-level technological disparities, market feedback, and scientists' choice of technologies. In, *Research Policy*. 48(1), 385-400. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2018.09.007>
- Kaur, M. and Venegas-Gomez, A. (2022). Defining the quantum workforce landscape: a review of global quantum education initiatives. *Optical Engineering*, 61(08). <https://doi.org/10.1117/1.oe.61.8.081806>
- Khan, I. (2021). Will quantum computers truly serve humanity? *ScientificAmerican.Com*<https://scientificamerican.com/article/will-quantum-computers-truly-serve-humanity/>
- Kimble, H. (2008). The quantum internet. *Nature* 453, 1023–1030. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature07127>
- Krishnamurthy, V. (2022). Quantum technology and human rights: an agenda for collaboration. *Quantum Science and Technology*, Volume 7, Number 4. DOI 10.1088/2058-9565/ac81e7
- Kop, M., Jong, E. D., Gasser, U., Minssen, T., Cohen, I. G., Brongersma, M. L., ... & Laflamme, R. (2023). Towards responsible quantum technology. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4393248>
- Kuhn, T. (1962) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, University of Chicago Press.
- Kung, J. & Fancy, M. CIFAR. (2021). A QUANTUM REVOLUTION: Report on Global Policies for Quantum Technology and the strategic development plans of the countries. Retrieved from: <https://cifar.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/QuantumReport-EN-May2021.pdf>
- Labaton, S. (2001). New F.C.C. chief would curb agency reach. *New York Times*, February 7.
- Liebowitz, S. J. & Margolis, S.E. (1995). Path Dependence, Lock-In, and History, *The Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*, Volume 11, Issue 1, Pages 205–226,
- Malik, M., Agudelo, E., & Kunjwal, R. (2022). Quantum researcher mobility: the wonderful wizard of Oz who paid for Dorothy's visa fees. *Quantum Science and Technology*, 7(3), 034005. doi:10.1088/2058-9565/ac77b3
- Marrone, M. & Hazelton, J. (2019). The disruptive and transformative potential of new technologies for accounting, accountants and accountability : A review of current literature and call for further research. In, *Meditari Accountancy Research*. Vol. 27, Issue 5, pages 677 - 694. Retrieved from: <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/MEDAR-06-2019-0508/full/html>
- Meyer, J.C., Passante, G. & Wilcox, B. (2024) The question of equity: Who has access to US quantum information education programs?
- Miranda, E. R. (2022). Quantum computer music. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-13909-3>

Munro, B., & Paci, T. (2023, March 1). AUKUS must focus on quantum policy, not just the technology. Australian Strategic Policy Institute. The Strategists. Retrieved from: <https://www.aspistrategist.org.au/aucus-must-focus-on-quantum-policy-not-just-the-technology/>

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2019). Quantum Computing: Progress and Prospects. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/25196>.

National Quantum Coordination Office (The official website of the United States government). ENHANCING COMPETITIVENESS. Retrieved from: <https://www.quantum.gov/competitiveness/>

Nita, L., Smith, L. M., Chancellor, N., & Cramman, H. (2021). The challenge and opportunities of quantum literacy for future education and transdisciplinary problem-solving. *Research in Science & Technological Education*, 41(2), 564-580. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02635143.2021.1920905>

Parker, E. (2023). Promoting Strong International Collaboration in Quantum Technology Research and Development. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation. Retrieved from: <https://www.rand.org/pubs/perspectives/PEA1874-1.html>.

Parker, E., Daniel Gonzales, Ajay K. Kochhar, Sydney Litterer, Kathryn O'Connor, Jon Schmid, Keller Scholl, Richard Silberglitt, Joan Chang, Christopher A. Eusebi, and Scott W. Harold, An Assessment of the U.S. and Chinese Industrial Bases in Quantum Technology. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2022. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA869-1.html. Also available in print form.

Parker, E. Richard Silberglitt, Daniel Gonzales, Natalia Henriquez Sanchez, Justin W. Lee, Lindsay Rand, Jon Schmid, Peter Dortmans, and Christopher A. Eusebi, An Assessment of U.S.-Allied Nations' Industrial Bases in Quantum Technology. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2023. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA2055-1.html.

Perez, C., & Soete, L. (1988). Catching up in technology: entry barriers and windows of opportunity.

Perez, C. (2010). Technological revolutions and techno-economic paradigms. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 34(1), 185–202. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24232030>

Perrier, E. (2022). The quantum governance stack: models of governance for quantum information technologies. *Digital Society*, 1(3). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44206-022-00019-x>

Pratt, J. W. (1974). RISK AVERSION IN THE SMALL AND IN THE LARGE. *Stochastic Optimization Models in Finance*, 115-130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-780850-5.50017-4>

Preskill, J. 2018 Quantum computing in the NISQ era and beyond <https://doi.org/10.22331/q-2018-08-06-79>

- Ragnedda, M. & Muschert, G.W. (2013). *The digital divide : the internet and social inequality in international perspective*. London ; New York : Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Roberson, T. (2023). Talking about responsible quantum: “awareness is the absolute minimum that ... we need to do”. *NanoEthics*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11569-023-00437-2>
- Roberts, A. (2019). "Advancements in Quantum-Enhanced Imaging." *Imaging Technology*, 18(4), 321-335.
- Saatz, J. (1991). *National and Regional Self-Sufficiency Goals: Implications for International Agriculture*. Edited by Ruppel, F. and Kellogg, E. Lynne. Rienner Publishers • Boulder & London.
- Schleich, W.P., Ranade, K.S., Anton, C. *et al.* Quantum technology: from research to application. *Appl. Phys. B* 122, 130 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00340-016-6353-8>
- Seskir, Z. C. and Aydinoglu, A. U. (2021). The landscape of academic literature in quantum technologies. *International Journal of Quantum Information*, 19(02), 2150012. <https://doi.org/10.1142/s021974992150012x>
- Seskir, Z. C., Korkmaz, R. & Aydinoglu, A. U. (2022a). The landscape of the quantum start-up ecosystem. *EPJ Quantum Technol.* 9(27) <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjqt/s40507-022-00146-x>
- Seskir, Z. C., et al. (2022b). Quantum games and interactive tools for quantum technologies outreach and education. *Opt. Eng.* 61(8) 081809. <https://doi.org/10.1117/1.OE.61.8.081809>
- Seskir Z. C. et al 2023. Democratization of quantum technologies. *Quantum Sci. Technol.* 8 024005
- Seskir, Z. C., Goorney, S. R., & Chiofalo, M. L. (2024). Educating to the “Culture” of Quantum Technologies: A Survey Study on Concepts for Public Awareness. *European Journal of STEM Education*, 9(1), 03. <https://doi.org/10.20897/ejsteme/14193>
- Shankar, R. (1994). *Principles of Quantum Mechanics*. Springer.
- Sharif, N. (1999). Strategic Role of Technological Self-Reliance in Development Management. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 62(3), 219-238. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0040-1625\(99\)00040-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0040-1625(99)00040-2)
- Smith, J. (2022). "Quantum Technologies: A Revolution in the Making." *Quantum Research Journal*, 15(2), 117-129.
- Staatz, J. M. (1991). Designing Social Science Research to Inform Agricultural Market Reforms and Structural Adjustments in Developing Countries. In: Johnson G. L., Bonnen J. T. (eds.): *Social Science Agricultural Agendas and Strategies*. Michigan State University, II-98–II-105.
- Stoneman, P. (2004). Path-dependence and Reswitching in a Model of Multi-technology Adoption. In, *History Matters: Essays on Economic Growth, Technology, and Demographic Change*. Stanford University Press. 36-62.

- Tang, E. (2019). A quantum-inspired classical algorithm for recommendation systems. Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3313276.3316310>
- Taylor, C. (1999). Nationalism and Modernity. In, *Theorizing Nationalism*, Ronald Beiner (ed.)(Albany: State University of New York Press), pp. 219–45.
- Ten Holter, C., Inglesant, P., Srivastava, R. & Jirotko, M. (2022). Bridging the quantum divides: a chance to repair classic(al) mistakes? *Quantum Science and Technology*, 7(4) p. 044006. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/2058-9565/ac8db6>
- Ten Holter, C., Inglesant, P., & Jirotko, M. (2023). Reading the road: challenges and opportunities on the path to responsible innovation in quantum computing. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 35(7), 844–856. doi:10.1080/09537325.2021.1988070
- The White House (2024). Retrieved from: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2024/01/18/u-s-japan-and-republic-of-korea-launch-cutting-edge-quantum-collaboration/>
- Umbrello, S., Seskir, Z., & Vermaas, P. (2023). Communities of quantum technologies: stakeholder identification, legitimation, and interaction. <https://doi.org/10.1364/opticaopen.24420643.v1>
- van Amerongen, M. (2021). Quantum technologies in defence & security. *NATO Review*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nato.int/docu/review/articles/2021/06/03/quantum-technologies-in-defence-security/index.html>
- van de Merbel, A., Peer, J., Willems, S., & Cramer, J. (2023). Preprint: citizens' attitudes and knowledge of quantum science and technology.. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/qewta>
- Vedral, V. (2006). *Introduction to quantum information science*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Vermaas, P. E. “The societal impact of the emerging quantum technologies: a renewed urgency to make quantum theory understandable,” *Ethics and Information Technology*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 241–246, Dec 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-017-9429-1>
- Xuereb, A. (2022). Quantum Diplomacy: Rebalancing the Power Dynamic through Emerging Technologies. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1126/scidip.ade6826>
- Weissman, E. Y., Merzel, A., Katz, N., & Galili, I. (2019). Teaching quantum mechanics in high-school — Discipline-Culture approach. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1287(1), 012003. doi:10.1088/1742-6596/1287/1/012003
- Wessel, B. (2013). The reproduction and Reconfiguration of Inequality. Differentiation and class, status and power in the dynamics of digital divides. In, *The digital divide : The internet and social inequality in international perspective*. Taylor & Francis Group. Ragnedda, M., & Muschert, G.W. (Eds.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203069769>
- Wilson, M. (2017). "Quantum Materials in Technology." *Materials Science Journal*, 12(3), 215-230.

Wolbring, G. (2022). Auditing the ‘social’ of quantum technologies: a scoping review. *Societies*, 12(2), 41. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc12020041>

Wootton, J. R. (2022). The history of games for (quantum) computers. *Quantum Computing in the Arts and Humanities*, 345-367. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-95538-0_10

World Development Report. (2021). Part II: Aligning data governance with the social contract. Data infrastructure policy: Ensuring equitable access for poor people and poor countries. Retrieved from: <https://wdr2021.worldbank.org/the-report/>