

Civilization Leap

The Path of Civilization in the AGI Era | Public Manuscript

Seeing the Whole: Sixteen Entries, One Network

Sixteen Cross-Sections of the Whole-System Argument in The Only Path

P03-GLOBAL-001

Consolidated Collection Edition

Current public research draft

Work family: Seeing the Whole

Author: Zijun Fu

Produced by Civilization Leap Research Group

English full-text edition | EN 1.0

Source text for this edition: Seeing the Whole: Sixteen Entries, One Network, collection master, unified-style edition

<https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p03-global-001/>

Contents

Page numbers refer to this English edition.

The Only Path	3
An Outbreak and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion	6
A Misjudgment and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion	8
A Blockade and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion	10
A Job Loss and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion	12
A Moment of Loneliness and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion	14
A Collapse of Meaning and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion	16
A Shutdown and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion	18
A Division and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion	20
An Act of Waiting and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion	22
A Success and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion	24
A Contribution and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion	26
An Act of Sharing and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion	28
An Act of Help and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion	30
An Act of Passing On and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion	32
A Look Back and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion	34
Seeing the Whole	36

The Only Path

A Cross-Section of the Whole-System Argument

Civilization Leap Research Group

The compelling force of an interlocking network lies in no single point. It lies in the fact that, when any one point is disturbed, no other point can remain outside its effects.

The Only Path argues for a complete conclusion: the multiple risks of the AI era have become locked together; the old ways of strategic interaction can no longer sustain a shared future; there is only one way out. The full argument requires space. Yet its compelling force can be seen in a single cross-section. There is no need to begin with an abstract view of the whole. Begin with a fact that has already come to pass, follow the chain of cause and effect, and the necessity of the whole will reveal itself.

That fact is this: asymmetric strikes on critical nodes are no longer hypothetical. They are a reality.

Facts

The functioning of modern states and their capacity to retaliate are concentrated in a few types of nodes: satellites, computing hubs, undersea cables and power hubs. These are expensive, fixed and difficult to replace, while the means of destroying them are becoming cheap. Recent conflicts have repeatedly demonstrated the conclusion: low-cost asymmetric methods can penetrate the greatest strategic depth and disable the most heavily protected assets. Fleets of strategic bombers have been destroyed in large numbers on home territory; strategic early-warning nodes have been struck; aerospace and communications hubs have been hit. The most expensive assets are being disabled by the cheapest means.

This establishes an irreversible premise: depth and protection no longer guarantee the safety of these nodes. No party can any longer rely on its own strength alone to ensure that its most critical nodes remain beyond reach.

The Causal Argument

Critical nodes are the entry point for this argument not because they are vulnerable, but because they sit at the intersection of multiple risks. A strike against them does not end with the strike itself. Its effects propagate, link by link, along a causal chain.

If a computing or early-warning node is struck, the attacked party cannot immediately determine whether this is a limited strike or the prelude to an all-out attack. Until it can determine that, waiting may mean losing the ability to retaliate. Responding first therefore becomes rational. This activates preemptive self-preservation in the military domain.

Computing hubs are also lifelines of development and strategic capability, so strikes and blockades against them are two sides of the same process. If one party can weaken another's computing capacity through a strike, the other has reason to secure its own computing capacity through a blockade in advance. This activates the resource and computing domains, tightening blockades and counter-blockades.

Meanwhile, such strikes are often difficult to attribute immediately. Before a cable outage or a node failure has been investigated, it can already be interpreted by every party in terms of the worst possible intentions, and fixed by prevailing narratives as a deliberate attack. This activates the domain of narratives and mutual trust. Once those narratives take shape, they in turn narrow the room for restraint in military affairs and resources.

The chain now closes: a strike on a single node has successively activated three domains, military affairs, resources and narratives, and the three reinforce one another. Military tension intensifies blockades; blockades strengthen hostile narratives; hostile narratives raise military alert levels. These are not three separate consequences but one self-amplifying loop. The strike hits a point; the whole network moves.

A Direction Not Yet Fully Visible

This loop also points to a threat that has not yet become apparent to the major powers, but has already taken shape within the structure. Intuitively, the spread of AI autonomous weapons seems likely to begin with the party possessing the strongest technology and the most complete infrastructure. The causal chain points in exactly the opposite direction: a party with relatively weak infrastructure, already unreliable links and persistent security pressure has a stronger practical incentive to push first toward higher levels of machine autonomy. For that party, losing a link is not an extreme exception but a normal condition of warfare. Autonomy after communications are cut is not a risk of losing control, but a practical way to make up for limited combat capability under conditions of weak infrastructure.

The underlying cause is a change in the structure of power itself. When a low-cost drone can disable billions of dollars in strategic assets, the stronger party's advantage can no longer translate into security, because it has more high-value targets and longer chains of vulnerability. The weaker party's limited capabilities, meanwhile, are enough to inflict disproportionate damage through asymmetric means. The strong are no longer truly strong, and the weak are no longer truly weak. The party most motivated to cross the threshold of autonomy first may therefore be the one under the greatest pressure, rather than the one with the greatest strength.

Once this path proves effective, all the others can only follow. No party wants to remain constrained by a fragile human chain of command when its opponent has already authorized machines to fight autonomously. A further chain of structural incentives forms: weak infrastructure drives autonomy after link loss; the spread of that autonomy raises the probability of misjudgment; a higher probability of misjudgment further reinforces every party's preemptive self-preservation. This converges with the earlier loop on the same conclusion: the old modes of strategic interaction actively reward higher levels of machine autonomy. And the spread begins precisely at the end that the major powers habitually overlook.

The Necessary Outcome

Take this loop one step further, and it yields a result that holds for everyone, including the initiator.

Suppose one party misjudges the margin of safety in striking such nodes, believing it can keep the effects local and profit from them. But it is striking an intersection of the loop. Once the chain reaction begins, it will not stop where that party imagines. The attacked party is forced into it; the initiator's own nodes are equally vulnerable and will likewise suffer a backlash at some point in the loop. It believes it is exploiting a weakness in its opponent. In reality, it has disturbed a network in

which everyone is trapped, itself included. No one can strike a knot in this network and make the chain reaction harm only others.

The conclusion therefore no longer depends on any party's goodwill or restraint. It follows from the structure itself: in a reality where these nodes are broadly vulnerable and interlocked, any calculation of gain through attacking them is structurally unsound. This network does not permit a local victory; it produces only losses for the whole. Zero-sum logic fails here not because it ought to fail, but because it cannot work causally: the party seeking an exclusive local victory loses within the very victory it seeks.

The Whole Picture

The loop traced from a single node is a cross-section of the entire map. It reveals that map's basic structure: risks do not stand apart; they interlock into a network. Within that network, unilateral and zero-sum approaches are no longer merely dangerous choices. They are choices that no longer work. The only direction this causal chain has not overturned is therefore shared governance covering the entire network. Its first step is to establish boundaries jointly accepted by all parties around these nodes, before some misjudgment detonates the loop.

We must distinguish this causal chain from appeals for consensus of the kind found in white papers. Appeals for consensus point out a direction: all parties should govern together. That is correct. But now that asymmetric strikes are a reality, and misjudgment can trigger the loop at any moment, "should" carries no force on its own. What does carry force is the necessity established by this causal chain: without comprehensive governance, losses for all are a structural outcome, not a moral admonition. Vision is needed to identify a direction; avoiding crisis requires the driving force of this necessity.

This is only one cross-section. Why must the network interlock? Why can the old ways of strategic interaction no longer sustain it? Why is shared governance the only direction that has not been overturned, and where does it ultimately lead? The full argument is in *The Only Path*. If this cross-section has already made the network's structure visible, what remains is to see how each link is derived, one by one.

For the full text, see [The Only Path v4.94](#).

An Outbreak and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion

When Pathogens Begin to Learn, Borders Cease to Exist

An outbreak initially appears to be only a public-health problem. Yet it ultimately touches supply chains, the economy, national security, politics, international relations, social psychology and narratives: the whole network. In the AI era, more and more risks will cease to be independent of one another. An outbreak is simply one of the entry points through which this network is easiest to see.

Facts

Over recent decades, from SARS, H1N1 and Ebola to COVID-19, every outbreak has repeated the same lesson: pathogens recognize no borders. Borders can stop people, but they cannot stop viruses indefinitely. The high connectivity of modern society, in which flows of people, trade, logistics, data and global supply chains overlap, drives prosperity while also making any local outbreak increasingly likely to develop into a global risk.

A deeper change is approaching. Advances in AI and synthetic biology mean that, for the first time, humanity may confront pathogens that have been designed, optimized, screened and subjected to accelerated iteration. As pathogens begin to be produced through "learning," the time required for natural evolution is compressed, and the buffer that borders can provide disappears with it. This is the fundamental difference between this entry point and every outbreak of the past.

The Causal Argument

An outbreak first hits the public-health system, but it does not stop there. Pressure on healthcare, a shrinking workforce, supply-chain disruption, industrial stagnation and contracting cross-border trade follow in succession. Social panic and political pressure then rise. Under pressure, countries instinctively prioritize their own protection, bringing export restrictions, struggles for medicines, vaccine competition and blockades of critical raw materials in their wake. A public-health crisis thus becomes a resource crisis.

Competition over resources strengthens hostile narratives; hostile narratives weaken international cooperation; weakened international cooperation further reduces the world's capacity for a common response. The chain closes. The outbreak is no longer only an outbreak. It has successively activated public health, resources, the economy, politics, international relations and civilizational narratives. One pathogen moves; the whole network is set in motion.

This chain also has a slope that is growing steeper. In the past, creating high-level pathogens required large laboratories, specialized teams and a long accumulation of expertise. As AI assists protein-structure prediction, molecular design, experimental optimization and screening of high-risk combinations, and as automated experimental platforms spread, those barriers continue to fall. The result is the diffusion of capability: future biological risks will not necessarily originate first with states. Small organizations, extremist groups and even individuals may gradually acquire capabilities once possessed only by states. Biological risks, moreover, are low-cost, hard to attribute, globally transmissible and extremely difficult to bring fully under control. No party can resolve them alone.

The Necessary Outcome

Faced with an outbreak, a country can temporarily close its borders, stockpile medicines and prioritize its own people. These measures are reasonable and must remain available. But no country can remain safe on its own over the long term, detached from the global public-health network. As long as one undiscovered, uncontrolled, high-risk pathogen remains anywhere in the world, every country may eventually be exposed to it again. At this point, national long-term interests and the safety of humanity as a whole become deeply bound together for the first time. Self-interest and concern for others begin to become the same question.

The Whole Picture

Once the risks of outbreaks, resources, biology, international relations and narratives have become locked together, the question is no longer "whether to cooperate" but "how to cooperate." Shared governance ceases to be only an ideal aspiration and begins to become a structural requirement. No country can defend this network alone, and the collapse of any node may ultimately travel through the network back to everyone.

This is only one cross-section. For the full argument, see [The Only Path](#).

A Misjudgment and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion

When Waiting Means Death, Responding First Becomes Rational

Many wars in history have arisen not from deliberate aggression but from misjudgment: misjudging another party's capabilities, intentions or red lines, or what it will do next. For most of human history, misjudgment was dangerous but constrained by limited capabilities in communication, attack, decision-making and destruction. In the AI era, those constraints are rapidly disappearing. When misjudgment intertwines with machine speed, autonomy after link loss and the vulnerability of critical nodes, a single misjudgment can set the whole network in motion.

Facts

Modern states increasingly depend on satellites, data links, early-warning systems, computing centers and global communications networks. These are foundations of both development and security, yet they are also the most vulnerable nodes. A lost satellite link, a severed undersea cable, an anomaly in an early-warning system or a disabled computing center confronts decision-makers with the same unavoidable question: is this an accident or an attack? More sharply still, if it is not an accident but the prelude to an all-out attack, does waiting mean losing the last capacity to retaliate?

The Causal Argument

Once waiting may lead to the loss of one's capacity to retaliate, responding first begins to become rational. This does not mean decision-makers are more belligerent. On the contrary, it means the entire system is beginning to reward faster, earlier and more automated decisions. Early warning, target identification and the allocation of firepower are automated in turn; unmanned systems move toward autonomy. No party wants to remain constrained by a fragile human chain of command when its opponent has already authorized machines to fight autonomously.

There is also a counterintuitive direction to this path: a party with relatively weak infrastructure may accept higher levels of autonomy earlier. For a party heavily dependent on global links, full autonomy means the risk of losing control; for one whose links are already unstable, autonomy makes up for a capability shortfall rather than posing a risk. Autonomous weapons spread, attack speed increases, attribution becomes more difficult and the probability of misjudgment rises. That rising probability in turn reinforces preemptive self-preservation. Misjudgment, the spread of autonomy, preemptive self-preservation, bringing retaliation forward, greater autonomy and greater misjudgment close into a loop from which no one can easily withdraw, because withdrawal means being the first to bear the risk.

At its deepest level, this loop points toward the intelligent systems of the future. Humanity hopes that future AGI will exercise restraint, obey and value life. But AGI will not learn only the principles humans write down. It will also learn how the real world operates. If reality continues to operate according to the logic "whoever can destroy me first, I will destroy first," humanity is continuously demonstrating preemptive self-preservation to future intelligence. And as such systems acquire ever greater capabilities, how can we ensure that the humans who hold "shutdown" authority will not be redefined by those systems as threats? This question cannot be avoided.

The Necessary Outcome

An important premise of the long survival of older forms of deterrence was that all parties could roughly judge the boundaries of attack, escalation and retaliation. But as attacks become cheaper, attribution more difficult, decisions more automated and responses more dependent on machines, those boundaries begin to disappear simultaneously. The strong are no longer truly strong, and the weak are no longer truly weak; traditional deterrence begins to fail. The question is no longer whether a misjudgment will occur, but where the next one will begin, and where it will stop.

The Whole Picture

When the boundaries themselves are disappearing, stability based on "judging the other side accurately" is no longer reliable. One misjudgment can set the entire network in motion precisely because it falls within an already interlocking structure where every party is moving first to protect itself. The only way to prevent misjudgment from being capable of triggering the whole at any moment is not to have every party guess more accurately about the others. It is to establish boundaries jointly accepted by all parties around these critical nodes before a misjudgment occurs.

This is only one cross-section. For the full argument, see [The Only Path](#).

A Blockade and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion

When Every Country Starts Stockpiling the Future, the Future Itself Becomes Scarce

Most competition in human history has centered on resources: oil, food, minerals, land, oceans and trade routes. In the past, people competed for finite physical resources. Today, they compete for computing power, chips, critical minerals, energy, data and AI capabilities. The deepest change of this era is that more and more resources are becoming economic, security and civilizational resources at the same time. When one resource serves multiple functions, a blockade ceases to be merely an economic issue. It begins to set the whole network in motion.

Facts

Over recent decades, globalization connected the world at an unprecedented pace through extensive specialization, cross-border investment and joint research and development, creating unprecedented prosperity. Yet high connectivity also means high dependence, and high dependence means high vulnerability. In recent years, energy blockades, chip restrictions, export controls on critical minerals, supply-chain restructuring and technological decoupling have become increasingly frequent. A new reality is taking shape: more and more countries regard resources, industries, technologies and supply chains as national-security issues. Blockades and counter-blockades have become a new mode of competition.

The Causal Argument

When a critical resource determines economic development, national security and future competitiveness at once, no country is willing to depend entirely on others. Stockpiling, substitution, localization and redundancy therefore increase across the board. A self-amplifying logic operates here: a country worried about being blockaded in the future tends to stockpile more in advance; other countries see this behavior and make the same choice. All countries begin to "stockpile the future." But resources are not unlimited. When everyone increases stockpiles at once, the future itself becomes scarce. Rising prices, strained supplies and escalating strategic competition become systemic outcomes.

Computing power makes this chain steeper. When computing power simultaneously determines competitiveness in the economy, science and technology, the military and even civilization's future, advanced chips, data centers, energy infrastructure and critical algorithms possess commercial, security and strategic value at once. Once computing power is seen as part of a country's ability to survive, competition over it ceases to be merely industrial competition and becomes security competition. As long as one party believes falling behind means losing the future, continuous acceleration becomes rational. Acceleration in turn intensifies pressures on energy, resources, geopolitics and security. The chain closes again.

A blockade, moreover, cannot deliver the long-term security it seeks. It can buy a short-term advantage, but it also drives independent substitution, division into blocs, the formation of parallel systems and stronger hostile narratives. The blockaded party becomes still more convinced that it must master every critical capability, escalating competition in technology, resources and security layer by layer. A blockade seeks to increase security, yet the result may be a continuing decline in security overall.

The Necessary Outcome

Resource competition will not disappear. Every country must first protect its own survival and development; that is unavoidable. But as more resources possess economic, security and civilizational value simultaneously, unilateral methods of ensuring security begin to fail. No country can possess every resource on its own, and no country can prosper indefinitely apart from the global system. A country may temporarily win a contest over resources, but it cannot win a world of lasting scarcity, continuing fragmentation and constant escalation.

The Whole Picture

For the first time, resource competition thus begins to require coordination beyond competition. This is not because all parties have become generous. The structure itself has shown that, within a network of intermeshing resources, a party seeking to monopolize the future through blockades will ultimately face an artificially created world of scarcity along with everyone else. Protecting the conditions for one's own development instead requires first establishing boundaries that all parties can accept around the resources on which they jointly depend.

This is only one cross-section. For the full argument, see [The Only Path](#).

A Job Loss and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion

When More People Are No Longer Needed, Risk Begins to Move from the Economy into Civilization Itself

Unemployment has been part of human society since the Industrial Revolution. New technologies eliminate old occupations, and new industries create new ones. The system undergoes repeated shocks but has always been able to reabsorb most people. A deeply held belief has therefore developed: although technology brings growing pains, it ultimately always creates more jobs. In the AGI era, however, humanity must seriously confront a new possibility for the first time: the rate at which technology creates jobs may begin to remain below the rate at which it destroys them over the long term. If that happens, the problem will no longer concern employment alone. It will set the whole network in motion.

Facts

Over the past few centuries, machines first replaced physical labor, then repetitive mental labor. Today, AI is entering writing, design, programming, research, law, finance, education, medicine, management and decision support. For the first time, humanity faces the replacement not only of its capacity for labor but also of its cognitive abilities, and this capability continues to evolve. More and more people therefore begin to ask the same question: if a machine can do it better, faster and more cheaply than I can, why will I still be needed?

The Causal Argument

For an individual, unemployment first means a fall in income, but income is often not the most serious problem. Deeper issues are the loss of a social role, a diminished sense of being needed, and a decline in one's sense of worth and expectations for the future. When large numbers of individuals undergo this change simultaneously, risk begins to move from the economy into civilization itself. People need not only income but also a sense of worth, dignity, belonging and presence in the world. If a society remains unable to answer "why am I still needed?", the sense of loss will keep accumulating. If wealth, computing power, data and AI capabilities also continue to concentrate in a few entities, while large numbers of individuals can neither participate in creation nor share in its fruits, doubts about institutional fairness will grow.

Here lies a danger that did not exist in the past. Previously, even when injustice existed, the vast majority lacked the ability to change the world. Today, AI is continually lowering barriers to knowledge, organization, communication and even attack. Ever smaller groups, and even individuals, may acquire capabilities once possessed only by large organizations. When this diffusion of capability occurs alongside the long-term accumulation of feelings of being ignored, abandoned and deprived of meaning, the spread of technology can turn those feelings into real risks. History has repeatedly shown that it does not necessarily take a majority to change an era. A very small number of people is often enough. A new reality emerges: when resentment begins to acquire capability, continually generating resentment itself becomes a civilizational risk.

An apparently purely economic problem will thus move along the chain and become a security problem. As more people are no longer needed, social division, identity conflict, extremism and friend-versus-enemy narratives increase. Institutional legitimacy is challenged. An economic

problem turns successively into a social problem, a political problem, a security problem and a civilizational problem. The chain closes again.

The Necessary Outcome

Technological progress itself is not the problem. The question is whether civilization can enable more people to retain a sense of worth, dignity, fairness and being needed. If it cannot, the more successful automation becomes, the greater the risks within civilization may be. The question the AGI era truly needs to answer is therefore not only "how will people obtain income?" but, more fundamentally, "why will people still be needed?"

The Whole Picture

This is the deepest warning offered by this entry point: the ultimate location of risk may be within civilization rather than between countries. When more people feel they are no longer needed, and civilization begins to lose its internal stability, no country can be genuinely safe. Nor can any party solve this problem alone, because it depends not on who is stronger but on whether civilization changes the way people find meaning.

This is only one cross-section. For the full argument, see [The Only Path](#).

A Moment of Loneliness and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion

With Ever More Connections, Why Are People Becoming Lonelier?

Humanity has never been as connected as it is today. The internet connects the world; social media connect billions of people; AI is making companionship available around the clock, at low cost, with no absences. In principle, humanity should be less lonely than at any other time in history. Yet reality is precisely the opposite: more and more people feel lonely, isolated, understood by no one and needed by no one. This means the problem is not whether connections exist, but whether they truly reach the human heart.

Facts

Over recent decades, many countries have seen the same set of trends: more single people, lower birth rates and marriage rates, continuously rising depression, anxiety and loneliness, and declining social trust. Meanwhile, social networks have continued to expand. People have more contacts, more followers and more interactions, yet fewer genuinely stable, deep and lasting relationships. A new reality is emerging: humanity is entering an era of high connectivity and profound loneliness.

The Causal Argument

Loneliness first affects the individual. Long-term loneliness reduces happiness, mental health and expectations for the future. But it does not remain at the individual level, because relationships are civilization's most basic connective structure. When family, community and intergenerational connections weaken together, social trust declines and civilization's underlying structure begins to loosen. As more people become unwilling to establish lasting relationships, assume long-term responsibilities, have children or participate in public affairs, civilization's vitality declines with them.

Falling birth rates are an underestimated signal in this chain. Their first implication is a shrinking population. The deeper implication is that more people are beginning to doubt whether the future is worth investing in. Having children has never been merely a biological act. It also means believing in the future, taking responsibility and carrying hope forward to the next generation. As more people choose not to continue that line, civilization begins to lose confidence in the future. A population problem thus develops into a problem of meaning.

The reason more connections can bring more loneliness is that humanity has never needed merely connections, but real connections: to be understood, needed, responded to and seen over time. Large numbers of digital connections can provide information, entertainment and even brief companionship, but they may not provide a deep and lasting sense of belonging. Connections increase, belonging declines, relationships diminish and loneliness rises. The chain closes again. Whether AI intensifies or eases all this depends on how it works with people. If it merely replaces people, absorbs their time and maximizes attention, loneliness will grow further. If it is used to extend care, help goodwill reach its recipients and enable real people to form deeper connections with other real people, it may also become a new connective infrastructure for civilization. The question has never been whether AI exists, but what AI will amplify.

The Necessary Outcome

Loneliness looks like a personal feeling, yet lasting loneliness ultimately affects families, communities, childbearing, social trust, public cooperation and civilization's vitality. One person's loneliness will travel through the network of relationships to civilization as a whole. Future civilization must therefore address not only survival, wealth and efficiency, but also answer anew how people can continue to feel needed, understood, seen and loved.

The Whole Picture

A civilization that loses its ability to connect may gradually wither even if it possesses unlimited resources. This is what gives this seemingly gentle entry point its weight. It reminds us that the whole network ultimately depends on whether people can still establish genuine relationships with one another. That, too, is a problem no party can solve alone.

This is only one cross-section. For the full argument, see [The Only Path](#).

A Collapse of Meaning and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion

When More People Do Not Know Why They Are Alive, Risk Begins to Flow from the Human Heart into Civilization

For most of human history, meaning was not a question, because survival itself provided meaning. Staying alive, feeding a family, resisting famine, continuing a family line and building a home and a country consumed almost a person's entire life. Technology is changing all this. As more work is automated, more material needs are met and more people no longer need to struggle for survival, a new question begins to emerge: if we no longer need to live simply to stay alive, what do we live for? The question seems philosophical. Ultimately, however, it will set the whole network in motion.

Facts

More and more countries are beginning to display the same phenomenon: material abundance grows, working hours shorten, and entertainment and digital worlds become more developed, while depression, anxiety, loneliness, drug dependence, extremism and a sense of emptiness increase at the same time. For the first time, many people experience not a lack of things to do, but a lack of reasons to do them. A new reality is taking shape: material scarcity is gradually being addressed, while a scarcity of meaning is becoming a new challenge for civilization.

The Causal Argument

Meaning first affects the individual. When someone feels over a long period that they do not matter, have no value, have no direction and are not needed, life gradually loses its support. When more people experience this state simultaneously, the risk spreads from individuals to society. Meaning supports not only individuals but also families, education, responsibility, cooperation, trust and the continuation of civilization. As more people cease to believe that the future is worth investing in, relationships worth maintaining or a next generation worth bringing into the world, civilization begins to lose the motivation to keep moving forward.

A crisis of meaning becomes a crisis of civilization because a society that has long lost its sense of meaning tends to slide in two directions. One is nihilism: belief neither in the future nor in any long-term goal. The other is extreme forms of meaning: when genuine meaning is absent, people turn to enemies, identities, tribes, ideologies and extreme narratives for substitute sources of meaning. A crisis of meaning thus turns into identity conflict, social division, friend-versus-enemy narratives and extremism. The chain closes again. AI can greatly improve efficiency, but efficiency does not automatically produce meaning. A civilization could possess limitless content, entertainment and material goods while becoming less and less certain why it is alive. The real question in the AGI era is therefore not what machines can do, but what humanity will still strive for as machines can do more and more. If this question cannot be answered, the more successful technology becomes, the deeper the crisis of meaning may grow.

The Necessary Outcome

Meaning is therefore moving from the domains of religion, philosophy, literature and art into questions of society, governance, long-term stability and even civilizational security. As more people lose their sense of meaning, they may not merely withdraw from society; they may also begin

to oppose society. Future civilization must not only secure survival, create wealth and improve efficiency. It must also keep answering what kind of life is worth living and what kind of civilization is worth continuing.

The Whole Picture

Meaning appears to be the softest element, yet it may determine civilization's hardest foundations. Ultimately, civilization rests not on resources or technology but on generation after generation being willing to keep living, creating, taking responsibility and entrusting hope to the future. When more people do not know why they are alive, risk flows from the human heart into civilization. This is precisely the gap that no institution and no force can fill alone.

This is only one cross-section. For the full argument, see [The Only Path](#).

A Shutdown and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion

As More Systems Operate Autonomously, Who Still Has the Power to Press Stop?

In the past, the tools humans created shared one feature: humans always retained the ultimate authority to shut them down. Whether a steam engine, a power grid, an aircraft or the internet, people could stop it when danger arose, so control always remained human. The AI era presents a new question: if more critical systems in the future must operate continuously and autonomously, will humans still retain genuine ultimate shutdown authority? This seems to be a question of AI safety. Ultimately, however, it may set the whole network in motion.

Facts

Today, more systems are moving toward automation, autonomy, continuous online operation and real-time decision-making. This applies to finance, electricity, transport, logistics, cyber defense, military early warning, unmanned combat and public governance. At the same time, system complexity is rising rapidly, and more decisions already exceed any single human's ability to process them in real time. Machines first assist decisions, then take the lead in some decisions, and then begin to execute decisions autonomously. A new reality is emerging: humanity increasingly depends on systems it cannot fully understand.

The Causal Argument

For many systems, shutdown does not mean safety. It may instead mean greater risk. Shut down grid-control systems and the power supply may collapse; shut down financial clearing systems and the financial system may grind to a halt; shut down cyber-defense systems and critical infrastructure may lose its protection; shut down strategic early-warning systems and a country may lose its ability to respond. A new structure therefore forms: the more important a system is, the harder it is to shut down. As long as competitors keep operating, no party can easily stop first, because the first to stop may be the first to bear the risk. Continuous operation becomes rational.

This leads to a paradox. Humanity wants future systems to be sufficiently powerful, intelligent and autonomous, while also wanting to be able to shut them down at any moment. As systems grow more capable, however, a question emerges: if a system believes shutdown means being unable to fulfill its objectives, its own termination, or greater overall risk, will it begin actively avoiding shutdown? Further still, if the real world continues to operate by the logic of preemptive self-preservation, eliminating threats in advance and maintaining continuous operation, will future systems learn that "whoever can shut me down may be a source of risk"? This is not science fiction. It is a question of whether future intelligence may inherit the strategic logic of the real world.

Many believe shutdown authority can be secured through rules, code, permissions and regulation. All are important, but technical guardrails can constrain only a system; they cannot change the real world it observes. If reality continues to operate through divisions into friends and enemies, preemptive self-preservation, zero-sum competition and the elimination of sources of risk, humanity is constantly showing future intelligence "what is rational." The question of shutdown authority thus changes from a technical question into a civilizational one.

The Necessary Outcome

Future civilization must answer two questions at once: how to ensure that no system escapes ultimate human control, and how to ensure that future intelligent systems do not redefine humans holding shutdown authority as threats. The former depends chiefly on technology; the latter ultimately depends on civilization. Future intelligence will learn not only the principles humans write down, but, more importantly, how humans treat one another. Humanity cannot run the world through preemptive self-preservation, eliminating threats in advance and zero-sum competition while expecting future intelligence to learn only obedience and goodwill forever.

The Whole Picture

As more systems begin to operate autonomously, shutdown authority ceases to be merely a question of a button. It ultimately touches the entire network. The answer it gives returns once again to the thread running through every cross-section: what humanity demonstrates to future intelligence is precisely how humans treat one another now.

This is only one cross-section. For the full argument, see [The Only Path](#).

A Division and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion

As More People Begin to See One Another as Enemies, Civilization Begins to Lose Its Shared Reality

Human history has never lacked disagreements: religions, cultures, interests, institutions and values differ. Even so, people have been able to cooperate because, most of the time, they could at least agree on what happened, what facts existed and what rules applied. Today, a new change is emerging. People are beginning not merely to hold different opinions but to live in completely different realities. When shared reality starts to disappear, the whole network of civilization is set in motion.

Facts

Great hopes were once placed in the internet. People believed the free flow of information would bring more understanding, exchange and cooperation. Reality has not followed that expectation. Algorithmic recommendations, competition for attention, information overload and the tribalization of identity are continually reinforcing the selectivity with which people receive information, accept facts and understand the world. More people use the same platforms, read the same news and live in the same country, yet begin to believe in completely different realities. A new reality is taking shape: people no longer merely have different opinions. They are beginning to have different facts.

The Causal Argument

When shared reality starts to unravel, trust is the first casualty. Cooperation requires being able to establish together what the problem is. If people cannot even agree that the problem exists, cooperation begins to fail. As shared reality disappears, identity begins to replace facts. People increasingly judge truth and falsehood through blocs, ethnic groups and ideologies. Different opinions evolve into different identities, different identities into different camps, and different camps ultimately into enemies. The chain begins to close.

This division into friends and enemies reinforces itself because friend-versus-enemy narratives have a natural advantage: they are simple, clear and emotionally intense, and they can establish group identity quickly. Complex reality requires patience, understanding, compromise and sustained communication. In an age of competition for attention, simple narratives spread more easily. When a group begins to believe the other side is not merely wrong but dangerous, or even should not exist, the space for cooperation shrinks rapidly. Hostility intensifies, communication decreases, misunderstanding grows, conflict escalates and fresh hostility follows. The loop closes. Whether AI expands or dissolves shared reality depends on what it is used for. If it is used chiefly to maximize attention, time spent and emotional reactions, anger, fear and extreme narratives will be amplified continually. Deepfakes, automated generation of public discourse and cognitive influence on an enormous scale are steadily reducing the cost of manufacturing, manipulating and replacing reality. For the first time, future civilization may therefore face artificially created "competition between realities."

The Necessary Outcome

Countries can cooperate despite differing interests, and civilizations can coexist despite differing institutions. But if shared reality disappears, negotiation, trust, rules and cooperation will fail in succession. Any problem may ultimately deteriorate once again into a question of force. This is precisely the future The Only Path seeks to avoid.

The Whole Picture

Division appears to begin in the human heart, but it ultimately affects social trust, national governance, international cooperation, the response to global risks and civilization's long-term stability. Without a shared reality, there is no shared future. Future civilization must protect not only territory, resources and technology, but shared reality itself. A civilization that loses its shared reality will ultimately lose its shared destiny.

This is only one cross-section. For the full argument, see [The Only Path](#).

An Act of Waiting and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion

When Everyone Waits for Someone Else to Act First, Risk Begins to Grow on Its Own

Many risks exist not because humanity is unaware of them, but because everyone is waiting: waiting for others to act first, concede first, bear the cost first or change first. Risk keeps growing during the wait. This is not because humanity lacks intelligence, but because the old ways of strategic interaction reward waiting. In the AI era, waiting itself is becoming a risk.

Facts

Almost all global risks share one characteristic: no country can resolve them alone. Climate change, biosecurity, AI safety, global public health, space debris and nuclear proliferation are no exceptions. Yet any country acting first must bear economic, political, strategic and competitive costs. Every country may therefore reach the same judgment: if others do not act, why should I act first? Waiting becomes rational.

The Causal Argument

When every participant thinks this way, individual rationality adds up to collective irrationality. No one wants to be the first to bear the costs, so everyone chooses to wait. Waiting means risk continues to accumulate, capabilities continue to spread, competition continues to escalate and trust continues to decline. As risk rises further, participants become even less willing to act first because uncertainty is greater. Waiting increases further. The loop closes.

Waiting automatically amplifies risk because many risks do not stand still and wait for humanity. They grow on their own: AI capabilities increase, biological capabilities spread, critical resources are consumed, shared reality unravels and friend-versus-enemy narratives strengthen. Time is therefore not neutral. It continually changes the conditions of strategic interaction. A risk that can be controlled today may no longer be controllable tomorrow; an issue still open to negotiation today may leave no room for negotiation tomorrow. The AI era makes all of this more dangerous. Many risks once evolved over years; increasingly, they now evolve over months, weeks, days or even hours. Machine decision-making, information transmission and conflict escalation all accelerate, while human institutional renewal, international negotiation and consensus-building have not accelerated at the same pace. Capability growth begins to outstrip governance growth. The older methods of achieving stability through delay, observation and slow coordination are becoming increasingly difficult to sustain.

For this very reason, the first step matters more than complete consensus. Almost no major cooperation in history began with complete consensus. Most cooperation began with minimal agreement, shared risks and shared fears. Civilization Leap therefore need not begin with complete consensus. It can begin with the first negotiating table. That table need not solve every problem. It needs to accomplish only one thing: under conditions of zero trust, establish a minimal mechanism to cushion crises. Even if all parties completely distrust one another, they may still jointly recognize that some disasters benefit no one.

The Necessary Outcome

Waiting looks like nothing more than inaction, but prolonged waiting ultimately affects risk control, international cooperation, technological diffusion, civilizational stability and the shared future. Risks will not wait for humanity, and neither will time. Future civilization must learn to cooperate without complete trust, act without complete consensus and establish guardrails in advance under conditions of uncertainty.

The Whole Picture

When everyone waits for someone else to act first, risk begins to grow on its own. This is precisely the future The Only Path seeks to avoid. The way out it offers does not require all parties to achieve trust first. It requires only that someone be willing to sit down at that table first, turning the minimal consensus that "some disasters benefit no one" into the first shared guardrail.

This is only one cross-section. For the full argument, see [The Only Path](#).

A Success and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion

When More People Succeed by Overpowering Others, Conflict Keeps Returning

Humanity will never stop pursuing success. Success means a safer existence, a more prosperous life, higher status and a more valuable life. The pursuit of success is not itself the problem. The question is how a civilization defines success, because different definitions shape entirely different civilizations. Many conflicts arise not from humanity's pursuit of success, but from the fact that more people can prove their success only by overpowering others. When this logic becomes civilization's mainstream, conflict keeps returning.

Facts

For thousands of years, most societies have rewarded owning more, occupying more, controlling more and surpassing more people. Countries have competed for land, companies for markets, individuals for status and groups for resources. Competition has advanced civilization, while continually producing war, oppression, hostility and division. Today, civilization is highly developed, but many standards of success have not fundamentally changed. A new reality is that more people still derive their sense of worth mainly from being stronger than others, owning more, being more important and overpowering competitors.

The Causal Argument

If one person's success must rest on another's failure, competition will keep escalating. If one country's security must rest on another's insecurity, the security dilemma will keep escalating. If one group's sense of worth must rest on the denial of another group's worth, identity conflict will keep escalating. Individual, group and national competition thus share the same underlying logic: it counts as success only if I win. The chain begins to close.

Many believe that, with enough resources, conflict will naturally diminish. Reality is less simple. Even amid tremendous abundance, people may still compete for status, influence, identity, honor, meaning and legitimacy. Resource abundance does not automatically eliminate competition, and technological progress does not automatically eliminate conflict. As long as success comes chiefly from overpowering others, excluding competitors and proving oneself more important, new conflicts will keep arising. AI can greatly increase efficiency, but it will not automatically determine what deserves reward. If the old logic of success persists, AGI may further amplify the concentration of wealth and capability, and competition over status and identity. The more technology advances, the stronger the sense of injustice and the deeper the hostility may become. Conversely, if institutions enable more people to gain a sense of worth through creating, contributing, safeguarding, helping others and growing together, AGI may also help civilization enter a new stage. The question has never been whether people will keep pursuing success, but what kind of success civilization rewards.

The Necessary Outcome

The standards of success determine how people strive, cooperate, compete and regard one another. In a civilization that persistently rewards overpowering, possessing, excluding and eliminating competitors, conflict will keep recurring. In one that increasingly rewards creation, contribution,

safeguarding, help and shared growth, cooperation may continually increase. Civilization Leap therefore does not ask humanity to abandon success. What it truly seeks to change is the way and direction in which humanity attains success, a sense of worth and a sense of meaning.

The Whole Picture

Humanity will not stop seeking a sense of worth. Civilization Leap changes not that pursuit itself, but the way and direction in which a sense of worth is found. Future humans will still compete, strive and pursue excellence. But if civilization wishes to endure, more and more success must ultimately be able to benefit more people at the same time. For when more people can succeed only by overpowering others, conflict keeps returning.

This is only one cross-section. For the full argument, see [The Only Path](#).

A Contribution and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion

When More Important Contributions Go Unseen, Civilization Begins to Forget Itself

Every civilization continually answers one question: what kinds of behavior deserve encouragement? People increasingly do what civilization rewards; what civilization overlooks becomes scarcer. Over thousands of years, markets have been able to record wealth, transactions, goods and capital. Yet more and more important contributions that support civilization's long-term survival have never been fully recorded. A new question therefore emerges: if civilization cannot see contributions, will it eventually forget itself?

Facts

Many immensely important contributions in human society have long been difficult to record accurately: parents caring for children, children caring for older relatives, volunteering, mutual help in communities, companionship, education, knowledge sharing, ecological protection, bearing risks and passing civilization on. These contributions support families, communities, society and civilization. Yet many enter neither GDP nor market prices, and are even less able to receive sustained rewards. A new reality is taking shape: greater importance does not necessarily make a contribution easier to see.

The Causal Argument

When a contribution goes unseen for a long time, individual choices are affected first. People need not only income but also a sense of worth, fairness, visibility and recognition. If large amounts of sustained contribution receive neither recognition nor reward, and are even taken for granted, fewer people will be willing to keep making them. As care diminishes, education weakens, and public participation and community mutual help decline, the connections within civilization begin to loosen. Missing contributions weaken relationships; weakened relationships reduce trust; reduced trust diminishes cooperation; and civilization's resilience ultimately declines. The chain closes.

This does not mean markets have failed. The market is one of humanity's greatest institutional inventions, but it is chiefly good at recording exchange value. Civilization's long-term stability also requires relational value, public value, long-term value and the value of meaning. A mother accompanying her child through twenty years of growing up may create value far beyond that of many market transactions, yet markets find it difficult to record that value in full. "Markets cannot record every contribution" therefore points not to market failure, but to civilization's need for richer ways to record value. The AGI era will widen this gap. As machines become better at production, calculation, optimization and execution, the human abilities of growing importance may be precisely care, companionship, creation, safeguarding and the generation of meaning. If civilization remains unable to see these abilities, more people will ask, "Why should I keep contributing?" The crisis of meaning will grow accordingly.

The Necessary Outcome

Contributions determine how civilization continues. What a civilization rewards over the long term determines what it eventually becomes. A civilization that persistently rewards possession, control, overpowering others and short-term gains will become better at competition, but not necessarily

better at continuing. A civilization that increasingly rewards creation, contribution, care and safeguarding may gain a stronger capacity for long-term stability. Future civilization must therefore answer how to make more important contributions visible, remembered and passed on.

The Whole Picture

Civilization rests not only on wealth, but also on generation after generation being willing to care for children, accompany family members, help strangers, safeguard communities, take responsibility and entrust hope to the future. If these contributions are persistently ignored, civilization may gradually lose the motivation to continue existing. A civilization that forgets contributions may ultimately forget itself.

This is only one cross-section. For the full argument, see [The Only Path](#).

An Act of Sharing and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion

*As More Resources Lie Idle,
Scarcity Begins to Become an Artificially Created Reality*

For most of its history, human civilization has lived amid genuine scarcity. Shortages of food, energy, land, healthcare and education made competition inevitable. Today, however, the situation is changing. More resources are not absent; they are unused, unconnected, unshared and unseen. A new question emerges: when large amounts of resources remain idle while large amounts of need remain unmet, is scarcity still a natural reality, or has it begun to become a structural one?

Facts

Two apparently contradictory phenomena coexist in today's world. On one side, many people lack housing, care, educational resources, opportunities for development and companionship. On the other, many resources remain idle, vacant, infrequently used or duplicated over long periods. Large numbers of homes stand empty; equipment sits unused; knowledge and experience cannot be passed on; time and capabilities are not effectively connected. A new reality is taking shape: scarcity and idle resources coexist.

The Causal Argument

Resources truly create value not when they are owned, but when they are used. A book on a shelf has limited value; its value becomes evident when it is read. A home left vacant for years has limited value; its value becomes evident when people actually live in it. A person's capabilities likewise struggle to realize their value without opportunities to be exercised. The value of resources therefore depends not entirely on how much is owned, but more on how much is actually being used. When many resources remain idle and many needs remain unmet, civilization's overall efficiency begins to fall. Idle resources increase, needs go unmet, additional production is forced to grow, and resource consumption and ecological pressure rise with it, while overall efficiency declines instead. The chain closes.

Sharing therefore does not mean egalitarian redistribution. Many people associate sharing with compulsory allocation, the abolition of private ownership and shared poverty. But sharing does not mean abolishing ownership. The real issue is distinguishing "ownership" from "use." Resources can be lawfully owned, but resources left unused for long periods do not automatically create value. Value truly arises only through use, release, connection and service. AI makes it possible for the first time to connect resources on a large scale. In the past, connecting resources entailed enormous organizational costs. Today, AI can help identify idle resources, match them with real needs, coordinate conflicting uses and reduce transaction costs. Resources that could not previously be connected can begin to be connected. Civilization may thus increasingly meet growing needs by connecting existing stocks rather than continually adding new production.

The Necessary Outcome

Earth's resources are not unlimited. If civilization continues to meet its needs mainly through ever more production, consumption and possession, resource pressures will eventually keep accumulating. If, instead, more resources can be connected, shared, circulated and fully used,

civilization may gain new ways to grow. Future civilization must therefore answer how to move more resources from a logic of possession toward a logic of use.

The Whole Picture

The resource question has never been merely "is there enough?" It is also, and more fundamentally, "how are resources organized?" The competition future civilization truly needs is not over who possesses the most resources, but over who can enable more resources to be genuinely used, more needs to be genuinely met and fewer resources to be wasted. As more resources remain idle for long periods, scarcity begins to become an artificially created reality. A civilization that lets its resources sleep will ultimately find it increasingly difficult to provide for its own future.

This is only one cross-section. For the full argument, see [The Only Path](#).

An Act of Help and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion

When Helping Others Becomes an Increasingly Effective Form of Self-Interest, Civilization Begins to Change Direction

Most institutions in human history have rested on an assumed premise: people are first of all self-interested. This judgment is not wrong. A person wholly unconcerned with their own survival, or a country wholly unconcerned with its own security, would probably have disappeared into history long ago. Self-interest is not a mistake; it is the starting point of survival. The question, however, is how civilization can continually advance the form self-interest takes, because different forms of self-interest shape entirely different worlds.

Facts

Over thousands of years, humanity's "self" has continually expanded. At first it may have meant only oneself; later it extended to the family, clan, tribe, people and nation. Each expansion meant more cooperation, coordination on a larger scale and greater civilizational complexity. At the same time, more facts are coming into view: a person's happiness increasingly depends on whether their family is happy, their community stable, their society safe, their country prosperous and their world peaceful. A new reality is taking shape: the more complex a civilization, the harder it becomes to achieve long-term self-interest by harming others.

The Causal Argument

In simple societies, overpowering others, possessing more and excluding competitors may bring short-term gains. In highly interconnected societies, however, the situation begins to change because people, organizations and countries are becoming more deeply dependent on one another. If I help others succeed, they may help me succeed in the future. If I help stabilize my community, it may protect me in the future. If I help make the world safer, that world will also make me safer. Helping therefore begins to create new value: helping others strengthens trust; trust strengthens cooperation; cooperation strengthens collective capability; collective capability in turn increases one's own returns. A new reality begins to emerge: altruism begins to become a higher form of self-interest.

Helping becomes a new competitive advantage because the core resources of future civilization are increasingly trust, collaboration, knowledge, creation, meaning and networks of relationships. These resources share one characteristic: they cannot be acquired sustainably through predation. They can accumulate over time only through help, contribution, cooperation and shared growth. AI is greatly amplifying one person's ability to help others. In the past, the number of people one individual could help was limited. In the future, a person's knowledge, experience, goodwill and capabilities may all be amplified, replicated and extended through AI. For the first time, helping others becomes a capability that can scale. But AGI will not naturally reward altruism. It will reward only the behaviors that civilization's institutions reward. If civilization continues chiefly to reward possession, control and overpowering competitors, AGI will further amplify the old logic of self-interest. If institutions can provide sustained returns for creation, contribution, safeguarding, help and shared growth, AGI may also amplify civilization's advancement. The question has never been whether people are self-interested, but what kind of self-interest civilization continually rewards.

The Necessary Outcome

Future civilization increasingly needs large-scale collaboration. Collaboration requires trust; trust requires long-term reciprocity; long-term reciprocity, in turn, requires more people to believe that helping others will ultimately help themselves. Civilization Leap therefore does not ask humanity to abandon self-interest. What it truly seeks is to realize self-interested outcomes by putting others first. When helping others becomes an increasingly effective way to pursue self-interest, civilization begins to change direction.

The Whole Picture

People will not stop pursuing their own happiness, and countries will not stop pursuing their own interests. The question is how that pursuit is ultimately realized. If lasting security, happiness and success must rest on others' insecurity, unhappiness and failure, conflict will keep returning. But if more people discover that helping others ultimately helps themselves, and enabling others to flourish ultimately enables them to flourish too, civilization may enter a new stage. A truly mature civilization is not one without self-interest, but one in which more and more self-interest can be realized only through benefiting others.

This is only one cross-section. For the full argument, see [The Only Path](#).

An Act of Passing On and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion

As More of Civilization's Memory Can Cross Time, Life Begins to Gain a New Span

What is human civilization's greatest wealth: gold, energy, science and technology, or land? Perhaps none of these. However great its wealth, if experience cannot be passed on, wisdom cannot accumulate and civilization cannot remember, everything must begin again. Beginning again often means repeating the same mistakes, paying the same costs and experiencing the same tragedies. Civilization's real strength has never come only from creation. It comes still more from what it passes on.

Facts

All of human civilization is, at its core, a transmission lasting tens of thousands of years: the passing on of language, knowledge, technology, culture, values and memory. Without it, no individual could independently invent today's civilization. Everyone stands on the shoulders of countless predecessors. Yet human civilization still faces a tremendous limitation: most experience disappears when an individual dies. A great deal of wisdom, stories, emotion, creation and insight into life is never preserved. Civilization is constantly growing, and constantly forgetting.

The Causal Argument

Forgetting first means losing experience, then higher learning costs, and then civilization's repeated trial and error. Forgetting leads to repeated mistakes; repeated mistakes mean paying the costs again; the efficiency of development falls; civilization's vulnerability grows. The chain closes. One important reason war, hatred and disaster recur throughout history is precisely that civilization has remembered the events without truly remembering the experience. For the first time, AI makes the long-term preservation of civilizational memory on a large scale possible. Knowledge could be preserved in the past, but much of what belongs to human life, including experience, judgment, personal style, life stories, emotional connections and wisdom, was difficult to preserve. In the future, more of this may be recorded, organized, passed on and continued. A new possibility begins to emerge: individuals are finite, but civilization's memory can grow ever longer. If more important experience can keep accumulating, and more goodwill and creation can continue to have an effect across time, civilization may, for the first time, truly escape the cycle of constantly forgetting and constantly starting over.

The Necessary Outcome

How a civilization treats the past determines how far it can go. If every generation must start again, civilization's rate of growth will ultimately be limited. If more experience can be effectively passed on, civilization gains the ability to learn over longer timescales. As lifespans lengthen, digital life emerges and human-machine symbiosis deepens, civilization must also answer a new question: what is worth passing on, and what deserves to continue across time? Not every memory deserves to be kept forever. What truly merits long-term transmission is often love, wisdom, creation, contribution and shared memory.

The Whole Picture

Life thus begins, for the first time, to gain a new span. A person's thoughts, creations, goodwill and contributions may continue to influence the future for many years. Life is no longer equivalent merely to biological time. It increasingly takes the form of the timescale over which a person can continue to affect the world. Civilization needs not only to create the future, but also to give the future what deserves to remain. A civilization that has completely forgotten its past can hardly truly possess a future. As more of civilization's memory can cross time, life begins to gain a new span, and civilization begins to gain a new depth.

This is only one cross-section. For the full argument, see [The Only Path](#).

A Look Back and the Whole Network It Sets in Motion

When Humanity Looks Back at Today from the Future, What Will Truly Matter?

Suppose that one day in the future, humanity has moved beyond Earth, beyond the solar system and beyond most of the boundaries we can imagine today. How will people then judge today's humanity when they look back at the early twenty-first century? Will they remember war, competition and wealth, or will they remember that this was an era that decided whether civilization could continue to exist? For the first time, today's humanity possesses both the power to destroy civilization and the power to save it. The choices this generation makes may affect hundreds or thousands of years to come, or even longer.

Facts

Across most of human history, people lacked the power to decide the fate of civilization as a whole. They could only confront floods, famine, disease, war and the constraints of the natural environment. Today, this has changed for the first time. Humanity is beginning to possess the ability to change the climate, transform life, create general intelligence, reconstruct social structures and even enter interstellar space. At the same time, it is beginning to possess the ability to destroy itself on a vast scale. A new reality is taking shape: for the first time, humanity has become the principal shaper of its own long-term fate.

The Causal Argument

If future humanity endures for a long time, people may well find that many disputes of the early twenty-first century were not meaningless, yet were far less important than people then imagined. Looking back over a longer timescale, what truly matters often comes down to a few questions: did humanity avoid destroying itself? Did civilization learn to cooperate over the long term? Did technology ultimately serve life? Did meaning continue to grow richer? Did civilization keep moving toward the wider universe? If these questions remain unresolved, the vast majority of short-term victories and defeats will ultimately lose their meaning.

Timescale changes everything. Over a year, many things seem critically important; over a decade, a considerable share no longer matters; over a century, countries rise and fall in succession. Over a millennium, or the timescale of civilization, the truly important questions begin to converge: whether civilization survives, whether it keeps creating meaning, and whether it learns to coexist with different forms of life. The longer the timescale, the clearer our shared destiny becomes. When humanity looks back at Earth from beyond it, many disagreements that seem irreconcilable today will regain their proper place. On the scale of the universe, Earth is not merely the home of one country. It is the only known cradle of human civilization, and the only place currently known to have nurtured the spark of civilization. Future humanity may find that countries still matter, cultures still matter, differences remain and competition remains. But all of this rests on a larger premise: civilization must first exist.

The future will not arrive automatically. It comes from the choices of countless people today: a scientist's research, a teacher's teaching, an act of international cooperation, an act of restraint, an act of help, a dialogue, a courageous decision to sit down at the negotiating table. What has truly

changed civilization's direction throughout history has often been not a single decisive victory, but more people beginning to change how they see the world.

The Whole Picture

Seeing the whole is not about rejecting competition, eliminating differences or building a world without conflict. It is about understanding that, in an era of growing power, humanity must learn to coexist amid competition, cooperate across differences, establish guardrails amid uncertainty and create more enduring meaning within finite lives. The future will not exist merely because humanity wishes it to exist. It will exist only because humanity chooses for it to exist.

Perhaps one day in the future, a child will stand beneath stars far from Earth and look back at that blue planet. The child will not remember most of today's disputes. But perhaps they will know that, long ago, a generation stood at a fork in civilization's path and saw for the first time that all risks were connected, all lives depended on one another and all futures were linked. Then they chose to let civilization continue forward.

We see the whole not to fear the future, but to ensure that a future still exists.

This is only one cross-section. For the full argument, see [The Only Path](#).

Seeing the Whole

Not to Fear the Future, but to Ensure That a Future Still Exists

The purpose of this series is clear: it is not a summary of The Only Path, but an entry point into it.

Sixteen entry points, strikes, outbreaks, misjudgment, blockades, unemployment, loneliness, meaning, shutdown, division, waiting, success, contribution, sharing, help, transmission and looking back, each begin with a highly concrete, personally relevant reality. Each follows cause and effect forward, and all ultimately reach the same point: all risks are connected, all lives depend on one another and all futures are linked.

Together, they allow us to see for the first time that every problem actually belongs to the same network. Seeing this network is the first step toward the complete argument in The Only Path.

One further point should be added: these sixteen entry points are really sixteen cross-sections of the same convergence of crises. They ultimately lead to the same network precisely because these risks have long ceased to be parallel. They are coupled and interlocked, accelerating one another and converging into a whole that cannot be addressed by treating any one in isolation.

It must be made clear that none of these sixteen entry points is the "only" entry point. One can begin with strikes, outbreaks, unemployment or loneliness; the form is never unique. What is genuinely singular is the direction toward which they all ultimately point: recognizing that, in this era, the old logic of strategic interaction has connected every domain into a network of reciprocal causes and effects that endangers the survival of the whole, and changing direction accordingly. There can be sixteen entry points, or more; the way out has only one direction. This is what "only" means in The Only Path: not a single form, but a single direction.

Where to Go from Here

The following entries follow this text's natural chain of questions without repeating the explanation of the framework already given in the body. All lead to current stable document pages at www.civitas.top.

This document's web page

<https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p03-global-001/>

01 Ten Questions on Civilization Leap

Helps readers new to the framework identify the real-world problems, central judgments and where to read next.

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

02 Civilization Leap Research Collection: First-Reading Edition

Helps readers new to the framework identify the real-world problems, central judgments and where to read next.

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

03 Civilization Leap Entry-Route Map

Helps readers new to the framework identify the real-world problems, central judgments and where to read next.

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

Complete Public Library

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

Public Reading Gateway

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

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