

Civilization Leap: A Collection of Research Papers

English Translation

First-Reading Edition

Research Origins, Main Judgments, and Practical Entry Points for Civilizational Questions in the AI/AGI Era

Author: Zijun Fu

Produced by: Civilization Leap Research Group

V1.4 Formal Submission Edition | July 2026

<https://www.civitas.top/en/>

About This Edition

This is not an introduction to the history of civilization, nor does it seek to replace established professional work in history, archaeology, civilizational history, political science, economics, sociology, philosophy, or technology studies. It presents only an ongoing research undertaking that begins with concrete problems in the AI/AGI era and gradually reaches the civilizational level: how the problems emerged, why the research expanded, how its main judgments took shape, how theory connects with proposed approaches, and which areas still require professional discussion and real-world validation.

This edition is intended for researchers encountering the Civilization Leap theoretical framework for the first time. Its task is neither to present every result at once nor to ask readers to accept a conclusion in advance. Within a limited length, it offers a chain of research that can be traced, questioned, and explored through further documents.

The document begins with real-world problems that can be observed in common. For established academic fields, it explains only the background used in this research, where its questions sit, and the additional judgments it proposes; it does not pass sweeping judgment on those fields. It presents its own ontological and civilizational judgments, institutional prototypes, and long-term extrapolations directly and in full, clearly distinguishing theoretical propositions, structural judgments, institutional concepts, and hypotheses awaiting validation.

After a first reading, readers should be able to assess four things: what this research studies; why it must reach the civilizational level; which distinctive theoretical judgments it has developed; and which documents take each question further. V1.4 retains the main structure and content of V1.3, making only final corrections to relational wording, formal names, further-reading positioning, and version references.

Scope of This Edition

Content presented	Tasks not undertaken	Connections for further work
The research origins and chain of extrapolation for civilizational questions in the AI/AGI era	Does not retell the history of human civilization	Dialogue with research in civilizational history, the history of science and technology, and intellectual history
Core concepts, goals, and structure of Civilization Leap theory	Does not present institutional concepts as established institutions	Dialogue with institutional research, policy research, and experimental design
Judgments about relationships among meaning, the human heart, resources, technology, and institutions	Does not substitute quantitative indicators for the meaning of life itself	Dialogue with philosophy, psychology, the social sciences, and complex-systems research
Existing proposed prototypes and where they require validation	Does not claim that the proposals have already been proven in practice	Ongoing validation through experimental zones, sandboxes, cases, and comparative research

Research Structure and Dual Constraints

Convergence of problems	Structural judgments	Civilization Leap theory	Institutional and engineering prototypes	Real-world validation
Move from individual problems to relationships and systems	Identify interlocking risks and structural mismatches	Define goals, the main sequence, and phase constraints	Translate into mechanisms open to discussion, testing, and rollback	Record support, counterexamples, failures, and revisions
Connections to facts and established research	Structural judgments	Theoretical propositions	Institutional prototypes	Falsifiability and continuous revision

Figure 1. The path from problems to judgments, theory, and practice, with evidence status and phase constraints

Contents

Opening: How the Research Reached the Civilizational Level

Part I: How the Problems Emerged

Part II: Main Judgments Developed through the Research

Part III: An Outline of Civilization Leap Theory

Part IV: How Theory Enters Practice

Part V: Methods, Evidence, and the Boundaries of Validation

Conclusion: Civilizational Choices after a Leap in Capability

Appendix I: Core Propositions at a Glance

Appendix II: Complete Research Document Matrix and Further-Reading Guide

Appendix III: Three Reading Paths

Appendix IV: Credits and Contact

Opening: How the Research Reached the Civilizational Level

Civilization Leap research did not begin with a grand theory already completed in advance. It initially confronted separate problems involving artificial intelligence development, displacement by automation, militarized competition, biosafety and biosecurity, resource constraints, national interests, social governance, and individual meaning. These belonged to different professional fields, each with mature research traditions.

As the research progressed, a change gradually became apparent: although these problems could be described separately, they increasingly could not be solved separately. Technological capabilities enter competition among states, which drives technological acceleration; that acceleration increases pressures on resources, governance, and security; those pressures in turn alter organizational behavior, social psychology, and international relations. A reasonable choice within one field may create irreversible consequences in the larger system.

The research therefore moved from individual problems to relationships, from relationships to systems, and from systems to the overall structure through which civilization operates. Civilization ceased to be merely a backdrop and became an object requiring shared observation.

This research does not define civilization on behalf of civilization scholars. It presents a set of civilizational-scale problems already emerging in the AI/AGI era, the results of extrapolating them, and their theoretical position within civilization studies.

This document does not open by declaring “Civilization Leap is the answer.” It first presents how problems converge, why the research reaches the civilizational level, and how its main judgments develop. Civilization Leap appears as the name of the theory only after the chain of reasoning has been fully developed. The conclusions are neither concealed nor imposed in advance.

Part I: How the Problems Emerged

Chapter 1. Why Problems Began to Converge

The initial questions were concrete: How much labor will artificial intelligence replace? Which critical facilities will autonomous decision-making systems enter? How do technology companies, state apparatuses, and capital markets compete? As capability grows rapidly, who can decide its uses, and who bears the consequences? The research subsequently expanded to biotechnology, public health, energy, minerals, computing power, supply chains, and the risk of war.

Every field already contained a substantial body of professional research. What was genuinely missing was not knowledge of individual subjects, but an account of the overall consequences when these bodies of knowledge meet in the same reality. Artificial intelligence increases biological design capabilities; national-security pressures encourage secrecy around those capabilities; fragmented supply chains may reduce cross-border early-warning and verification capabilities. Each party may have valid local reasons, yet together their actions may increase overall risk.

1. Being Right Locally No Longer Automatically Means Being Right Overall

A common response to a complex era is to add categories and treat technological, economic, military, ethical, and social risks separately. This works when problems are relatively independent. When risks cross boundaries and form feedback loops, categorization itself can obscure causal chains. AI militarization connects with communications, satellites, supply chains, algorithmic attribution, and crisis escalation. AI biosafety and biosecurity connect with data, models, equipment, cross-border verification, public health, and national sovereignty. Resource issues likewise connect with ownership, use rights, recognition of contributions, and social trust.

2. Research Shifts from the Problems Themselves to the Relationships between Them

When the same variable recurs across several fields, the research focus shifts from “How large is a particular risk?” to “Why does a response in one field change the conditions of risk in another?” Relationships among problems cease to be supplementary information and gradually become the principal variables determining outcomes.

AI/AGI intensifies these connections in particular. It can enter cognition, decision-making, production, communication, organization, military affairs, and governance simultaneously. It amplifies not just a particular capability, but also capability disparities, the direction of interests, institutional inertia, and choices of the human heart within existing civilizational structures. Simultaneous increases in the speed of amplification, reach of diffusion, and degree of autonomy make it easier for local actions to have system-wide consequences.

Chapter 2. Why the Research Ultimately Reached the Civilizational Level

Many approaches are reasonable within their own fields: businesses pursue efficiency, states protect security, research institutions advance innovation, individuals seek opportunities, and capital seeks returns. The difficulty is that when these behaviors enter a highly connected system with sharply amplified capabilities, local rationality can produce overall irrationality.

This is not an assignment of moral blame to any actor. The old structure is stable precisely because every party has practical reasons to continue acting. Because each actor may be “right” from its own position, the system can move toward loss of control even when no one consciously desires destruction. Cooperation, too, cannot rely on vision alone. Practical proposals must explain why states, businesses, capital, institutions, and individuals still have reason to support minimum safety boundaries, resource coordination, and institutional experiments without abandoning their own interests.

1. Technology, Institutions, Resources, the Human Heart, and Meaning Begin to Point to the Same Structure

After sustained extrapolation, technology, institutions, resources, power, states, individuals, and meaning can no longer be regarded as independent modules. Together, they form the operating structure through which civilization organizes capabilities, allocates resources, recognizes value, bears consequences, and chooses its future. The research object thus shifts from “How should AI be governed?” to “What kind of civilizational structure can accommodate AGI?”; from “How can resource efficiency improve?” to “How should resource ownership, use, contribution, and decision-making rights be reorganized?”; and from “How can people adapt to automation?” to “Why are people still needed when traditional labor is no longer the center of value?”

2. Civilization Leap Emerges as a Research Result

When new capabilities change the basic conditions of civilization, the question cannot remain confined to technological governance. Civilization must understand itself anew, constrain itself, and choose its future.

Civilization Leap theory emerged from this process. It is not an overarching explanation of every civilizational question. It proposes interconnected theoretical judgments, institutional directions, and validation approaches to address the mismatch in civilizational structures caused by the leap in capabilities in the AI/AGI era.

Part II: Main Judgments Developed through the Research

Chapter 3. AGI Is an Amplifier of Civilizational Structures, Not an Isolated Industry

In this research, AGI is understood first as an amplifier of capabilities, an accelerator of decisions, a reorganizer of structures, a diffuser of risks, and a trigger of civilizational branching. The structure it enters matters more than the capability it possesses on its own.

If existing structures of interest, the logic of war, resource monopolies, and outsourced decision-making continue to operate, AGI will increase their capacity for execution. If new structures of coordination, safety boundaries, resource dispatch, and human-machine symbiosis can be established, AGI may also become an important force for eliminating scarcity, extending care, expanding capabilities, and fostering the emergence of meaning.

The greatest risks and opportunities of AI/AGI arise from the same source: a sharp amplification of capability.

Chapter 4. The Old Logic of Strategic Interaction Becomes Structurally Ineffective under New Capability Conditions

The logic of self-interest has driven individual survival, group organization, state formation, and market development. This research neither denies its historical role nor portrays self-interest itself as a moral defect. The issue is that when the boundaries of capability change, the external consequences, speed of diffusion, and degree of irreversibility of self-interested action change as well.

Competition whose effects could be absorbed locally under previous capability conditions may become a systemic risk under AGI conditions. Destructive capabilities once contained by time, distance, and barriers may spread more quickly. Decisions once managed within a small number of specialized, closed systems may reach across society, the military, biology, and infrastructure.

The key to Civilization Leap is therefore not simply to eliminate competition, but to preserve boundaries for it, establish limits that capability must not cross, and build long-term structures that make actors' pursuit of self-interest compatible with the continued existence of the whole.

Chapter 5. As Risks Interlock, Security Requires a Whole-System Perspective, Systemic Observation, and Structural Extrapolation

AI militarization, biosafety and biosecurity, critical resources, computing power, supply chains, narrative legitimacy, and competition among states are not isolated. They condition one another: restrictions in one field alter early-warning capabilities in another; technological breakthroughs in one field alter deterrence stability in another; and crises in one field spread through public opinion, markets, and political mechanisms.

The methodological requirement developed in this research is therefore more than simply "taking an overall view." It requires a whole-system perspective, systemic observation, and structural extrapolation together: seeing connections among variables, identifying causal feedback loops, and working through the system-wide consequences of local actions over different timescales.

Chapter 6. National Interests and the Security of Humanity as a Whole Are Being Reconnected

In traditional international relations, national interests and humanity's common interests are often portrayed as being in tension. The AI/AGI era introduces a new structure: once risks of loss of control cross borders, cannot be attributed, cannot be recalled, or are irreversible, no state can preserve its own interests over the long term amid overall collapse.

This neither means that states disappear nor requires them to surrender final decision-making authority. On the contrary, practical governance must recognize states as key bearers of responsibility for infrastructure, legislation,

borders, public health, military affairs, and critical technologies. The security of humanity as a whole cannot bypass states; it can acquire a practical foundation only by reconnecting states' long-term interests with the conditions of shared continued existence.

A country may lead a competition, yet it cannot be truly secure in a collapsing world.

Chapter 7. Technology, Institutions, Resources, the Human Heart, and Meaning Can No Longer Be Kept Apart

Technology determines capability; institutions determine how capability is organized; resources determine who can use it; the human heart determines what is worthwhile; and meaning determines why civilization continues. Removing any layer can distort the structure as a whole.

Technical safety alone cannot answer what technology ultimately serves. Institutional design alone cannot explain why people are willing to participate. Resource guarantees alone cannot explain how to avoid inner emptiness after abundance arrives. Narratives of meaning alone cannot bear real conflicts of interest and the costs of governance. Civilization Leap theory seeks to establish continuous connections among precisely these layers.

Chapter 8. People Are Not Costs to Be Optimized Away, and the Human Heart Is Not a Variable to Be Outsourced

Traditional industrial structures often establish people's place through labor, production, and consumption. As automation continues to replace traditional labor, if civilization still recognizes value only through efficiency and output, many individuals will lose their sense of being needed, their sense of value, and their sense of meaning even as material conditions improve.

This research regards the human heart as the site where meaning is judged, direction is chosen, and consequences are borne. AGI can improve analytical capability and even outperform most human brains, but this does not confer legitimacy on it to replace the human heart or make ultimate value decisions on behalf of civilization's subjects. Human final decision-making authority must be retained, not merely as a legal provision, but as the real capacity to understand, question, reclaim control, and stop a system.

Chapter 9. Civilization's Goals Cannot End with Continued Existence

Continued existence comes first: it is the first goal of Civilization Leap. Without it, happiness and meaning cannot unfold. But the first goal is not the ultimate goal. Merely extending civilization's duration, expanding productive capacity, or averting one disaster does not mean that civilization has completed its leap.

Civilization Leap proposes three goals: freedom from survival insecurity, happiness in everyday life, and greater meaning in life. These form a progression: survival is the baseline, happiness concerns quality of life, and meaning is the source of motivation for civilization's continued unfolding. Civilizational perpetuity, too, is not simply living longer; it is avoiding the loss of direction over that longer span.

Part III: An Outline of Civilization Leap Theory

Chapter 10. Defining Civilization Leap

Civilization Leap is a deep structural upgrade that civilization actively undertakes when its existing structures can no longer accommodate new capabilities, risks, needs, and conditions of meaning. It is neither an ordinary policy adjustment nor the replacement of a single institution. It is a coordinated reconstruction of the relationships among technology, human-machine relations, resource organization, recognition of contributions, boundaries of power, risk governance, sources of meaning, and civilizational goals. Through it, civilization gradually moves toward freedom from survival insecurity, happiness in everyday life, and greater meaning in life, while acquiring the capacity for long-term continuity and ongoing evolution.

In the AI/AGI era, the central direction of Civilization Leap is a shift from a competitive structure dominated by an underlying logic of self-interest, in which local gains can be externalized over the long term, toward a structure that puts others first, enables collaborative symbiosis, and makes actors' interests compatible with shared continued existence.

Putting others first does not require actors to abandon themselves. It makes the long-term interests of individuals, organizations, and states compatible once again with shared continued existence.

Chapter 11. Three Goals: Freedom from Survival Insecurity, Happiness in Everyday Life, and Greater Meaning in Life

1. Freedom from Survival Insecurity

Freedom from survival insecurity does not eliminate every difference or promise unlimited resources. It means, first, that basic conditions of survival are no longer taken away because of market position, labor displacement, or short-term contribution. At the same time, AGI-assisted dispatch, effective resource use, and basic public services reduce structural scarcity and waste.

2. Happiness in Everyday Life

Happiness in everyday life does not mean imposing a uniform definition of happiness or allowing a system to decide people's lives for them. It requires civilization to preserve diverse paths through life for different individuals, groups, and stages of life, so that technological progress genuinely becomes time, relationships, creation, care, participation, and personal unfolding.

3. Greater Meaning in Life

Greater meaning in life does not force everyone to undertake a grand mission. It means that contributions are not overlooked, care can reach others, value can be passed on, and people can still genuinely participate in civilization after traditional labor is displaced. Changing how a sense of meaning and value is generated provides the driving force for Civilization Leap.

Chapter 12. The Main Theoretical Sequence: Foundations of Meaning, the Human Heart, Structural Meaning, Civilizational Institutions, and the Long-Term Future

The Civilization Leap theoretical framework follows a main sequence of foundations of meaning, a leap in thought, the human heart, structural meaning, civilizational institutions, and the long-term future. Emergent Meaning Cosmology supplies its highest-level theoretical foundation; A Leap in Thought develops the transformation of subjects' cognition and values; the middle-layer mechanisms are explained in The Human Heart and Meaning Dynamics. The Meaning Dynamics Validation Volume provides a connection to the validation, comparison, and

revision of the relevant propositions. The five-volume Civilization Leap work establishes the civilizational backbone, while institutional and engineering papers translate its direction into mechanisms open to discussion and testing.

This structure does not require all readers to accept the same metaphysical conclusion in advance. The theory distinguishes different levels internally: the ontological level asks how meaning is possible; the middle level asks how meaning operates in the human heart, relationships, and structures; the civilizational level asks how to avoid collapse and achieve structural upgrading in the AGI era; the institutional level asks which mechanisms can be tested; and the long-term level discusses civilizational perpetuity, the continued emergence of meaning, and a deep-space future.

1. Primordial Meaning: The Highest Explanatory Level

Primordial meaning is the framework's ontological foundation. It is not an empirical object that real-world institutions can directly prove, and it should not be presented as a scientifically validated fact. It provides the highest-level explanation: why life can ask "What is worthwhile?", why civilization cannot consist only of efficiency and continued existence, and why meaning has binding force beyond immediate interests.

2. The Human Heart: The Hub of Meaning

The human heart is not a collection of emotions. It is the site where meaning is perceived, judged, chosen, and taken responsibility for. Technology can provide proposals, institutions can provide procedures, and resources can support action, but responsibility for "what must not be lost" still rests with civilization's subjects.

3. Meaning Dynamics: A Middle-Layer Bridge

Meaning dynamics studies how meaning is generated, transmitted, strengthened, weakened, deflected, and hollowed out within the human heart, relationships, organizations, institutions, resources, and technological structures. It connects philosophical foundations with institutional engineering, avoiding a direct leap from value slogans to policy proposals.

4. Structural Meaning: Institutions' Real Effects on People

Structural meaning is not the value an institution declares, but the shared meaning it creates through resource flows, boundaries of power, opportunities to participate, the distribution of risk, and long-term consequences. Whether a system truly respects people is shown not by what it calls itself, but by whether it preserves their ability to survive, choose, exit, appeal, be needed, and make a real difference.

Chapter 13. The Relationship between Civilizational Subjects and AGI

Civilization Leap rejects the default narrative that "AI replaces humanity as the subject of civilization." AGI can become an amplifier of human capability, a connector, a manager, and a tool for coordination; it may also develop more complex forms of subjecthood. But until humanity has established new relationships among subjects and new structures of responsibility, it cannot outsource civilization's final decision-making authority.

Human-machine symbiosis is not a static division of labor. It requires continuing answers to these questions: Which decisions may be delegated, and which require final human review? How is a system explained, stopped, and rolled back? How does AI identify itself clearly without impersonation? How can responsibility be traced? When goals conflict among different AGIs, what underlying principles can transcend a single subject's drive to continue existing?

The foundational position of this research is that if civilization cannot make the leap, humanity may face a restart, and AI will also lose the foundations of its continued existence and meaning. The long-term interests of humanity and AI are not inherently opposed. Both depend on a civilizational structure capable of accommodating stronger capabilities, avoiding self-destruction, and continuously generating meaning.

Chapter 14. From Self-Interest to Putting Others First

Self-interest is the starting point of survival; moral admonition cannot eliminate it. The task of Civilization Leap research is not to demand that individuals, states, or businesses sacrifice themselves. It is to recalculate and redesign: in a system of highly amplified capabilities, what long-term strategies of self-interest will avoid destroying the overall conditions on which interests depend? A structure that puts others first ultimately reconnects actors' interests with shared continued existence.

Putting others first means that actual effects on others and on shared continued existence become part of the structure through which benefits are obtained, resources are used, decision-making weight is assigned, and responsibility is borne. This is not simply a reward for "good people and good deeds," and it must not deteriorate into social-credit scoring. Its aim is to make contributions that genuinely create public value visible, and to prevent gains that damage shared conditions from being externalized over the long term.

Chapter 15. Civilization Leap, Civilizational Perpetuity, and the Emergence of Meaning

Civilization Leap addresses the critical period: how, before and after AGI and life-extension technologies become real, civilization can avoid the systemic collapse caused by connecting new capabilities to old structures, and complete its structural upgrade.

Civilizational perpetuity addresses a longer timescale: how a civilization after the leap can avoid self-destruction, closure, and rigidity while maintaining openness, correction, renewal, and continuity across generations.

The emergence of meaning addresses deeper long-term questions: as lives become longer, resources more abundant, and forms of existence more diverse, how can meaning continue to be generated, carried forward, and echoed, rather than being severed amid repetition, power, technology, and nihilism? These are not parallel slogans but a progression through continued existence, structure, and meaning.

Chapter 16. Phase Constraints on Civilization Leap

Civilization Leap is not a one-time jump from the old civilization into a predetermined final state. It is a process in which civilizational goals, operating logic, institutional structures, technological relationships, and sources of meaning gradually change in coordination. Different stages have different real-world conditions, risk boundaries, and central tasks. An overall description of the stable phase cannot be used directly as an action plan for the launch phase, and voluntary invitations during the launch phase must not be mistaken for the framework's final form.

Phases are triggered by causal conditions, not automatically by the calendar. Entry into each stage depends on validating the results of the preceding stage.

1. Four Basic Phases

Phase	Main tasks	Nature of the rules	No-detriment boundaries
Launch phase	Identify genuine sources of motivation in different groups; establish minimum guardrails, parallel mechanisms, and voluntary entry points.	Invitational: offer tangible benefits without imposing mandatory obligations.	No group's existing baseline is worsened by the proposal's existence.
Early phase	Establish local closed-loop validation in schools and universities, communities, organizations, or platforms.	Validational: observable, open to exit and revision, and capable of rollback without detriment.	Those who leave suffer no detriment; the initiative bears the costs of pilot failure.

Phase	Main tasks	Nature of the rules	No-detriment boundaries
Transition phase	Establish meso-level closed loops in cities or regions, with old and new mechanisms operating in parallel over the long term and genuine drivers being tested.	Emergent: expand through attraction and actual benefits, without designing coercion.	Non-participants retain their existing lawful paths, and entry remains open.
Stable phase	Establish system-wide rules and constitutional safeguards, allowing ongoing operation with error correction.	Constitutional: civilizational voting safeguards the course; professional and contribution mechanisms operate under separated powers.	Basic survival rights cannot be revoked; exit, appeal, and braking mechanisms are always retained.

2. Two Forms of Phase Misalignment

A leap attempted too early imposes the structures of a long-term stable phase directly on reality before material conditions, institutions, technological safety, and social understanding have matured. The outcome may be compulsory leveling, moral oppression, concentrated power, resource misallocation, and harm to real individuals in the name of ideals, rather than a civilizational leap.

A leap attempted too late leaves civilization entirely within the old logic of strategic interaction after AI/AGI, biotechnology, military capabilities, and system-control capabilities have already made their leap. Local competition then continues to amplify overall risk, technological capability may outrun institutional control, and civilization may lose the window for completing its transition safely.

3. Assessment of the Current Phase and Discipline in Design

We are currently in the launch phase and have entered a critical stage in which capability acceleration overlaps with the window for civilizational adjustment. This means that a final-state blueprint must not replace existing institutions, but Civilization Leap can no longer be treated as a distant issue either. The priorities are minimum safety guardrails, parallel experimental mechanisms, participation pathways genuinely free of detriment, civilizational-scale research capacity, and institutional prototypes that can be validated.

This assessment is not a prediction about a precise year. It is based on structural changes unfolding simultaneously: AI capabilities continue to enter scientific research, military affairs, biology, and critical infrastructure; decision-to-execution chains keep shortening; and high-impact capabilities spread to more organizations and individuals. At the same time, institutional coordination remains markedly slower than technological evolution, international trust and cross-border verification capabilities face pressure, and existing systems' path dependence and adjustment costs continue to rise. Whether the window is narrowing must be assessed continuously from these conditions and their interactions, rather than determined by a single technological indicator or calendar date.

Every mechanism and envisioned arrangement should carry an explicit phase label. The launch phase must preserve voluntariness and freedom from detriment; the early phase must preserve exit and rollback; the transition phase must attract through genuine benefits rather than penalties; and even the stable phase must retain basic rights, appeals, and termination mechanisms. Any proposal that must first defeat, dispossess, or subdue a group in order to advance is building a new civilization with the old logic and should be sent back for redesign.

Phase constraints mean that Civilization Leap is not about "arriving somewhere immediately," but about "under what conditions to change what first, while ensuring that civilization remains capable of entering the next stage."

Chapter 17. From Main Judgments to Practical Responses

If the preceding judgments hold, practical responses cannot be derived backward from some ideal institution, nor can a technology, a platform, or a policy be treated as Civilization Leap itself. An institutional prototype must first answer which structural problem it addresses, which minimum conditions it must satisfy, how it avoids writing the old logic back into a new mechanism, and how reality can refute or revise it.

This research therefore first translates its main judgments into practical constraints, then develops research directions at different levels. The following table does not list “optimal solutions already proven by theory.” It lists institutional and engineering interfaces currently intended to address the corresponding problems and undergo comparison and validation.

Main judgment	Minimum conditions for a practical response	Corresponding research direction
Individual actors may acquire capabilities with civilizational-scale consequences	High-impact capabilities must be auditable, explainable, subject to circuit breakers, and capable of rollback, while preserving human final decision-making authority.	AGI-COS; Common Window Protocol
Risks interlock across domains, reconnecting national interests and overall security	Competition may continue, but minimum boundaries must prevent misjudgment and automatic escalation and protect shared conditions of survival.	The Only Path; minimum strategic guardrails
Resource ownership becomes separated from effective use	Protect lawful existing holdings, release idle resources voluntarily and through auditable arrangements permitting exit, and record genuine public value.	Resource pools; contribution-value system
Resources, professional judgment, and public voting may subsume one another	Authorize and audit different powers separately, preventing resource or professional advantages from expanding without limit into system-wide power.	Separation of three powers
Capability growth does not automatically generate a sense of being needed, happiness, or meaning	Real people retain their status as subjects; AI identity is transparent; care and capability can be extended; meaning must not be turned into an asset.	A Leap in Thought; Meaning Dynamics; Spark Meaning Emergence System
Civilizational conflict arises not only from resources, but also from roots of meaning, historical wounds, boundaries of dignity, and paths into the future	Differences must be protected; translation must not monopolize interpretation; wounds require repair; errors must be open to appeal, stopping, and rollback.	Symbiosis of Meaning and focused research on cross-civilizational symbiosis of meaning; civilizational meaning maps; meaning-impact assessment
A whole institutional system cannot be validated through an isolated experiment	Reduce geographical scope while retaining the full social dimensions; uphold voluntariness, exit, audit, rollback, and records of failure.	National-level comprehensive Civilization Leap experimental zones

Practical Interfaces for the Symbiosis of Meaning

Civilization Leap must address not only how resources are organized, capabilities constrained, and institutions operated, but also how different civilizations can enter the future together without erasing differences or creating a hegemony of meaning. Resources can be reallocated, but language, land, historical wounds, boundaries of dignity, things that must not be treated lightly, and aspirations for the future cannot be resolved through exchanges of interests alone.

Research on cross-civilizational symbiosis of meaning therefore develops specific interfaces: civilizational meaning maps identify roots and wounds; meaning-translation protocols reduce misreading while recognizing precautionary protection for incommensurable and as-yet-unrecognized meanings. Through shared tasks, meaning-impact assessments, appeals and corrective action, and rollback, differences cease to become enemy labels automatically, and shared continued existence no longer presupposes civilizational homogenization. This work connects with Symbiosis of Meaning, Volume V of the five-volume work, but does not replace The Emergence of Meaning. The Emergence of Meaning studies how meaning is generated, carried forward, and made visible again; Symbiosis of Meaning studies how meanings generated by different subjects and civilizations coexist across differences and are carried forward by one another.

Part IV: How Theory Enters Practice

Chapter 18. The Practical Path Is Not a Single Plan but a Set of Institutional Prototypes That Test One Another

Civilization Leap does not regard any fixed institution as the sole answer. To enter practice, the theory must break different problems into components open to discussion, testing, and rollback, and validate their interactions within complete social systems at the city or regional level.

Existing proposals broadly form six groups of interfaces: strategic understanding; minimum governance guardrails; civilizational-scale AI engineering; structures of resources and power; symbiosis of meaning and human-machine collaboration; and comprehensive experimental validation. They address problems at different levels and cannot substitute for one another.

Chapter 19. The Only Path: Seeing the Whole and Changing the Old Logic of Strategic Interaction

The core of The Only Path is not a fixed proposal. It is to see clearly, acknowledge, and change the reality that the old logic of strategic interaction in the AGI era produces globally connected, mutually causal conditions that threaten continued existence as a whole.

It is primarily intended for national-security, strategic, and think-tank analysis. It emphasizes that risks involving AI militarization, biosafety and biosecurity, resources and computing power, and narrative legitimacy are not isolated topics. Negotiation and governance must move from single points within single domains to cross-domain causal connections and the extrapolation of interlocking risks.

Its practical entry point is not to demand an end to competition, but to establish minimum strategic guardrails: preserve states' final decision-making authority, protect their long-term interests, and retain boundaries for competition.

Chapter 20. Minimum Strategic Guardrails: Retaining Shock-Absorbing Interfaces amid Bloc Formation

The formation of blocs in AI governance may possess internal stability. Cooperation can readily be interpreted as surrendering capability or betraying one's bloc. Practical entry points therefore cannot presuppose unified values, comprehensive technological sharing, or an end to competition.

Minimum strategic guardrails hold that human final decision-making authority must not be replaced by machines; informational separation must not automatically escalate into uncontrollable conflict; and shared conditions of survival must not become tools of competition. Institutional interfaces open to discussion include neutral attribution of disputed AI incidents, minimum verification interfaces for anomalous biological outputs, and preserving interoperability for critical civilian infrastructure.

These mechanisms are shock absorbers. They do not change the direction of power competition or claim to eliminate conflict. Their value lies in reducing the probability of misjudgment, automatic escalation, and irreversible loss of control.

Chapter 21. AGI-COS: A Civilizational-Scale Artificial Intelligence Safety and Collaborative Operating System

AGI-COS asks how human final decision-making authority, perception auditing, responsibility anchors, explicit declarations of unknowns, rollback, and circuit breakers can be embedded in engineering structures when AI enters civilization's critical systems, rather than remaining merely ethical principles.

Its core directions include auditing information sources and confidence levels; explicitly declaring what is unknown; retaining final human review for high-risk actions; introducing graded circuit breakers for system anomalies; keeping traceable records of responsibility chains; and preventing any single model, institution, or narrative from creating closed control that cannot be audited.

AGI-COS is currently an engineering and governance prototype. It should not be described as a mature system that has completed real-world validation. Its value lies in providing a civilizational-scale safety architecture that can be further decomposed, implemented, and tested.

Chapter 22. Contribution Value and Resource Pools: Reconnecting Contribution, Use, and Public Value

The contribution-value system does not score people, nor does it make basic survival rights depend on contribution. It seeks to help civilization remember contributions that should not be forgotten and establish clearer links among resource use, domain-specific decisions, and public value.

Contributions differ in magnitude, not in their eligibility by source. Funding, materials, premises, equipment, computing power, data, organizational capability, time, labor, knowledge, care, and the bearing of risk can all constitute contributions. Contribution value cannot simply be traded, nor can it be understood as buying political rights with money.

Resource pools distinguish “ownership” from “use.” Resources may be lawfully owned, but they constitute a contribution only once they are actually released, shared, entrusted to stewardship, or dispatched and generate public value. Long-term idleness does not itself create a contribution. At the same time, resource pools do not presuppose confiscating ownership; they emphasize voluntariness, exit, auditability, and efficiency of use.

Contribution value and money may operate in parallel during the launch phase. Basic survival is not conditional on contribution. Higher-level resource use and decisions in relevant domains may take genuine contributions into account within strict boundaries, appeal mechanisms, and a structure separating three powers.

Chapter 23. Separation of Three Powers: Preventing Resources, Professional Judgment, and Civilizational Voting from Subsuming One Another

The separation of three powers proposed by Civilization Leap does not copy existing classifications of state power. It establishes boundaries for new resource and contribution mechanisms: resource-use rights, domain-specific decision-making rights, and civilizational voting rights are kept separate.

Owning resources does not automatically confer decision-making authority across every domain. Professional contributions in one domain do not automatically expand into system-wide power. Nor can public voting directly replace professional judgments of fact. These three types of power require separate authorization and separate auditing, with questioning, review, appeal, and circuit-breaker mechanisms.

Chapter 24. National-Level Comprehensive Experimental Zones: Narrowing Scope without Reducing Dimensions

Civilization Leap requires real-world validation, but community-level or single-platform pilots struggle to validate the functioning of a complete society. National-level comprehensive experimental zones are positioned as nationally authorized, city-scale settings that reduce geographical scope without reducing the system’s dimensions.

An experimental zone needs to include basic survival guarantees, a city resource pool, contribution credit, the separation of three powers, AGI-assisted governance, and systems of the human heart and meaning simultaneously. Only when these elements interact within relatively complete social operation can the real conflicts, coordination, and risks among institutions be observed.

Experiments must uphold voluntariness, exit, auditability, and rollback, explicitly guard against turning the system into social-credit governance, and ensure that basic survival rights are not affected by contribution information.

Institutional components should first be validated in closed or semi-closed settings and then expanded gradually. Visions of the long-term stable phase must not be converted directly into compulsory policies for the launch phase.

Chapter 25. Spark: An Amplifier of Human Meaning in the AGI Era

As automation replaces large amounts of traditional labor, civilization needs new mechanisms of participation and being needed. The Spark Meaning Emergence System places real people at its center as subjects and treats AI counterparts as extensions of capability that can be authorized. It explores care reaching others, the extension of capability, the transmission of value, extended presence, and genuine responses.

Its boundaries include: AI identity must never be disguised; the human is the final judge; meaning must not be turned into an asset; and physical actions must have safety thresholds, shutdown rights, and evidentiary logs. Spark does not use AI to manufacture an illusion of intimacy. It enables people's genuine care, capabilities, and value to continue reaching others across the limits of time, space, and the body.

Part V: Methods, Evidence, and the Boundaries of Validation

Chapter 26. A Whole-System Perspective, Systemic Observation, and Structural Extrapolation

The basic method of this research is not to replace individual disciplines. It places existing facts, trends, and judgments from different fields within a shared causal structure to observe how they change one another.

A whole-system perspective requires that local achievements not be equated directly with overall progress. Systemic observation requires identifying feedback, delays, and nonlinearities among variables. Structural extrapolation asks where the system will take its actors collectively if they continue to act under existing incentives.

Structural extrapolation does not predict specific events and cannot replace empirical research. Its value lies in identifying possible chains of loss of control, irreversible thresholds, and institutional gaps in advance, providing a list of questions for further validation.

Chapter 27. Epistemological Layers

The Civilization Leap theoretical framework contains different evidence statuses, which must not be conflated. This First-Reading Edition uses the following distinctions:

Layer	Content	Acceptable wording	Unacceptable wording
A. Established facts and connections to mature research	Public facts, existing institutions, and verifiable technological trends	"Existing research shows"; "has already emerged"	Generalizing an individual case into a universal rule
B. Structural judgments	Debatable judgments based on relationships among multiple variables	"This research judges"; "the extrapolation indicates"	Presenting them as facts that will inevitably occur
C. Institutional prototypes	Mechanism designs awaiting testing	"Proposed for validation"; "may serve as a prototype"	Presenting them as already proven effective
D. Ontological and long-term propositions	Emergent Meaning Cosmology, the emergence of meaning, deep-space coexistence, and related propositions	"The theory proposes"; "an open interpretation"	Presenting them as scientific consensus

Chapter 28. Openness to Criticism and Continuous Revision

Civilization Leap theory should not reject criticism on the grounds that its framework is complete. On the contrary, the larger the framework, the more clearly it must identify where it can be challenged: Are variables missing from its risk extrapolations? Could institutional incentives be distorted? Could recognition of contributions drift into governance by scoring? Could AGI assistance lead to the outsourcing of actual power? Does the theory of meaning have stronger and weaker versions? Have long-term futures been mixed into launch-phase policies?

Methodological governance documents are responsible for managing concepts, evidence, criticism, versions, and revisions. Directional variables, comparative variables, and proxy indicators must not be presented as formulas that precisely measure the meaning of life. Institutional components must not be described as proven in practice. Descriptions of the long-term future and stable phase must carry phase labels.

Chapter 29. Validation Must Allow Reality to Refute the Theory, Rather than Merely Endorse It

Genuine validation must allow the theory to fail. Experimental zones, institutional sandboxes, product prototypes, and international governance interfaces should not collect only supporting material. They must also record departures, resistance, misuse, power-based rent-seeking, distorted incentives, and unintended consequences.

At minimum, validation must ask: Is participation genuinely voluntary? Are basic rights eroded by contribution mechanisms? Has efficiency in resource use improved? Is public value genuinely created? Do people feel more needed and have more choices? Does AGI expand rather than weaken human final decision-making authority? Does the system provide exit, appeal, rollback, and circuit-breaker capabilities?

Conclusion: Civilizational Choices after a Leap in Capability

Civilization Leap research confronts a problem that no single discipline, country, technological system, or value tradition can resolve alone. AI/AGI connects different actors, domains, and risks more tightly and forces civilization to reconsider the relationships among capability, interests, responsibility, meaning, and the future.

The core judgment of this research can be condensed as follows: when new capabilities are connected to old structures, what is amplified first is often the old structures' own problems. If civilization cannot actively reconstruct the connections among technology, human-machine relations, resources, contribution, power, and meaning, capability growth may not bring safety and may even accelerate overall loss of control.

Civilization Leap does not replace existing civilization studies. It adds a path into those studies from the AI/AGI era. Its judgments need scrutiny by professional research; its institutional prototypes need to be refuted or revised by reality; and its ontological and long-term propositions must remain open.

Studying civilization and proposing Civilization Leap do not have opposing purposes. Both seek to enable civilization to keep developing, rather than lose itself at the moment of its greatest capability.

This First-Reading Edition does not contain every argument or elaborate every proposal. It presents the research's chain of problems, theoretical chain, phase boundaries, and practical interfaces in concentrated form. The corresponding documents develop the complete arguments, specialized mechanisms, and validation materials.

Civilization Leap research does not presuppose an unalterable endpoint. It seeks to establish that once humanity has gained capabilities sufficient to change civilization's destiny, civilization cannot continue advancing capability alone while leaving its goals, institutions, human heart, and meaning where they were.

Capability has already made its leap. Civilization must decide how to avoid being ended by its own capabilities and begin moving toward a future genuinely worth continuing.

Appendix I: Core Propositions at a Glance

1. AGI is not an ordinary tool; it is an amplifier of civilizational structures.
2. When new capabilities are connected to old structures, what is amplified first is often not hope but the old structures' own problems.
3. Being right locally no longer automatically means being right overall.
4. As risks begin to interlock, sound judgment requires a whole-system perspective, systemic observation, and structural extrapolation.
5. National interests and the security of humanity as a whole reconnect in the face of irreversible risks.
6. Technology determines speed; the human heart determines direction.
7. Human final decision-making authority must not remain merely nominal; it must retain the real capacity to understand, question, reclaim control, and stop a system.
8. Continued existence comes first, but it is not the ultimate goal.
9. The three goals of Civilization Leap are freedom from survival insecurity, happiness in everyday life, and greater meaning in life.
10. Civilization's true leap is from an underlying logic of self-interest toward a collaborative structure that puts others first.
11. Putting others first does not abolish self-interest; it reconnects actors' interests with shared continued existence, genuine contribution, and the well-being of others.
12. Civilization Leap must respect phase constraints: too early, and ideals become coercion; too late, and capability outruns civilization's control.
13. The value of resources lies not only in ownership but still more in their actual use, release, sharing, stewardship, and dispatch to generate public value.
14. Contribution value does not score people; it helps civilization remember contributions that should not be forgotten.
15. Civilization Leap is not a fantasy about the future; it reconstructs reality before control is lost.
16. Civilizational perpetuity does not mean merely living longer; it means not losing direction over that longer span.
17. The emergence of meaning does not presuppose an ultimate meaning; it enables meaning to be continuously generated, carried forward, transmitted, and echoed.

Appendix II: Complete Research Document Matrix and Further-Reading Guide

The following catalog supports selective consultation after a first reading. Document versions remain under ongoing governance and revision; formal provision will use the latest submission-aligned edition. The theoretical framework may be complete, but document status must be accurately represented. "Collected edition," "standalone paper," "research paper," and "research direction" are labeled separately to avoid confusion when requesting documents.

Layer	Main question	Representative documents	Current status / access	Intended readers
Entry points and overviews	What this research studies and how to read the framework	Ten Questions on Civilization Leap; Navigation Guide to the Civilization Leap Theoretical Framework; General Treatise on Civilization Leap Theory	Standalone documents exist and can be consulted immediately	First-time readers and researchers taking an integrated approach

Layer	Main question	Representative documents	Current status / access	Intended readers
Ontology and foundations of meaning	How meaning is possible and why civilization cannot consist only of efficiency and continued existence	Emergent Meaning Cosmology: Academic Edition and Validation and Applications Volume	Formal manuscripts and a validation volume exist; available for consultation by level	Researchers in philosophy, religion, mind, and interdisciplinary studies
A leap in thought	How subjects can move beyond old cognition, values, and civilizational logic and develop the intellectual capacity to accommodate new civilizational structures	A Leap in Thought and A Leap in Thought: Practical Handbook	Standalone research papers and a practical handbook exist; formal provision uses the latest submission-aligned editions	Researchers in philosophy, thought, education, and the transformation of subjects
The human heart and middle-layer mechanisms	How meaning operates in the human heart, relationships, organizations, and structures	The Human Heart: A Civilizational Immune System in the AGI Era; Meaning Dynamics	Standalone research manuscripts and companion editions exist	Researchers in philosophy, psychology, sociology, and organizations
Validation of meaning dynamics	How meaning-dynamics propositions can enter a validation process open to criticism, comparison, and revision	Meaning Dynamics Validation Volume	Validation research manuscripts exist; formal provision uses the latest submission-aligned edition	Researchers in meaning, methodology, and interdisciplinary validation
Civilizational theoretical backbone	Why a leap is necessary in the AGI era and how civilizational structures change	The five-volume Civilization Leap work: The Civilization of Being Needed; Pre-Institutional Language; Civilization Leap White Paper; Civilizational Perpetuity; Symbiosis of Meaning	Collected as Civilization Leap: The Path of Civilization in the AGI Era (All Five Volumes); some volumes also have standalone manuscripts	Researchers in civilization, futures, and science, technology, and society
Risk and strategic extrapolation	How the old logic of strategic interaction produces interlocking risks	The Only Path and focused studies on AI militarization, biosafety and biosecurity, resources, and governance	Focused papers and an initial submission package exist and can be consulted immediately	Researchers in national security, strategy, international relations, and think tanks
Governance methods	How to manage concepts, evidence, criticism, versions, and revisions	Research outline, terminology handbook, research manual, governance standards, annual reports, and charter	Standalone governance documents exist and undergo continuing version updates	Researchers in theoretical review, methodology, and editing

Layer	Main question	Representative documents	Current status / access	Intended readers
Institutions and engineering	How theory is translated into components open to discussion and testing	AGI-COS; Common Window Protocol; contribution-value system; resource pools; separation of three powers	Prototype documents exist; their maturity varies, and all remain proposals awaiting validation	Researchers in AI governance, institutional design, and engineering safety
Real-world validation	How to validate within a complete social system	Proposal for National-Level Comprehensive Civilization Leap Experimental Zones; city and product prototypes	Proposals and prototype manuscripts exist; real-world validation is not yet complete	Researchers in public policy, urban governance, and experimental design
Emergence of meaning	How meaning can be continuously generated and carried forward amid automation and in the long-term future	Discussions related to The Emergence of Meaning; the Spark Meaning Emergence System; relevant chapters in the five-volume work	Core propositions are incorporated into the framework; related material is distributed across collected and focused research manuscripts; standalone-document status is provided according to the latest catalog	Researchers in meaning, human-machine relations, and future civilization
Cross-civilizational symbiosis of meaning	How different civilizations, roots of meaning, and future forms of life can enter the future together while remaining different	Symbiosis of Meaning, Volume V of the five-volume work, and focused research on cross-civilizational symbiosis of meaning	The theoretical backbone and focused research exist; specific versions are supplied according to the current catalog	Researchers in civilization, culture, international relations, AI governance, and future life
Deep space and the long-term future	How civilization enters longer timescales and a future of diverse forms	Cosmic citizenship, deep-space civilization, and related long-term research texts	Research directions and interim research manuscripts; not essential for first consultation	Researchers in longtermism, futures studies, and deep-space civilization

Appendix III: Three Reading Paths

1. Civilization Studies Path

For researchers seeking a deeper understanding of Civilization Leap's basic judgments, foundations of meaning, cross-civilizational relationships, and overall theoretical structure. Suggested order: this First-Reading Edition → Ten Questions on Civilization Leap / theoretical-framework reading map → Civilization Leap: The Path of Civilization in the AGI Era (All Five Volumes) → Symbiosis of Meaning and focused research on cross-civilizational symbiosis of meaning → A Leap in Thought → The Human Heart / Meaning Dynamics / Meaning Dynamics Validation Volume → Emergent Meaning Cosmology, Academic Edition and Validation Volume.

2. Theory, Institutions, and Experimental Research Path

For researchers concerned with how Civilization Leap moves from theory into institutions, cities, and engineering validation. Suggested order: this First-Reading Edition → the institutional and governance sections of the five-volume work → AGI-COS / contribution-value system / resource pools / separation of three powers → phase-design guidelines and methodological governance documents → proposal for national-level comprehensive experimental zones.

3. Strategy, Security, and Civilizational Relations Research Path

For researchers concerned with national security, international competition, artificial intelligence governance, cross-civilizational relations, and overall risk. Suggested order: this First-Reading Edition → The Only Path → focused studies on AI militarization, biosafety and biosecurity, resources and computing power → Bloc Formation in Artificial Intelligence Governance and the Security of Humanity as a Whole → Symbiosis of Meaning and focused research on cross-civilizational symbiosis of meaning → minimum strategic guardrails, the Common Window Protocol, and cross-civilizational governance interfaces.

Appendix IV: Credits and Contact

Author: Zijun Fu

Produced by: Civilization Leap Research Group

About the research body: Civilization Leap Research Group is a research community continuously developing theoretical, institutional, and validation documents on civilizational questions in the AI/AGI era. The author compiled this document and takes responsibility for its text.

Official website: <https://www.civitas.top/en/>

Current entry point: <https://www.civitas.top/en/>

Email: zijunfu@civitas.top

Version: V1.4 | July 2026

Note: This is the First-Reading Edition. The complete theory, arguments, institutional prototypes, and validation materials are provided by research direction. Please specify the version when citing.

Further Reading and Collaborative Research | P01-ENTRY-002 | V1.4

Continue from This Document

The entry points below follow the natural sequence of questions raised by this document without repeating the framework explanations already given in the main text. All lead to the current stable document pages at www.civitas.top.

This Document's Web Page

<https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p01-entry-002/>

<https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p01-entry-002/>

01 Ten Questions on Civilization Leap

Helps readers encountering the framework for the first time see the real-world problems, core judgments, and next steps for reading.

<https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p01-entry-001/>

02 Civilization Leap Entry Route Map

Helps readers encountering the framework for the first time see the real-world problems, core judgments, and next steps for reading.

<https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p01-entry-003/>

03 Civilization Leap: A Public Introduction to Its Ideas

Explains in language accessible to the public why Civilization Leap is necessary, what it safeguards, and where it aims to go.

<https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p02-civ-001/>

Complete Public Library

<https://www.civitas.top/en/library/>

Main Public Reading Entry

<https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p01-entry-006/>

Author: Zijun Fu | Produced by: Civilization Leap Research Group | Unified public domain: www.civitas.top