

Framework of Principles for Civilizational Decision Making

A Constitutional Framework for the Separation of Three Powers V3.0

Complete Professional Master Draft

A whole-lifecycle constitutional framework linking purpose, causality, legitimacy, the three powers, responsibility, and outcomes

Civilization comes of age not when it learns to wield greater power, but when it learns to place power within a structure.

What governance must truly establish is not a stronger decision-maker, but a clearer structure for decisions.

Author: Zijun Fu

Produced by Civilization Leap Research Group

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

Status: V3.0 Complete Professional Master Draft | Current file V3.0-R1 | Controlled revision of the current interface version | Calibration phase for the completeness of the overall framework

Date: August 2026

Control Page

Document Positioning Version Effect and Frozen Boundaries

Document positioning

This is the complete professional master draft of Framework of Principles for Civilizational Decision Making: A Constitutional Framework for the Separation of Three Powers V3.0. It is neither a startup-phase plan, nor a governance charter for any country or organization, nor a textual supplement to the old V2.0. Within the already frozen V3.0 Detailed Structure and Continuity Control Master V1.0, it fully develops governance principles, functional separation, the lifecycle, error-correction structures, and cross-system interfaces.

The V3.0 governance framework carries forward the first overarching principle, three goals, domain differentiation, and common invariants of Civilization Leap from Theory to Practice V1.1. Its interfaces use the new boundaries established in the professional master drafts on subjects, rights, authorization, responsibility and factual foundations; the Resource Pool; Shared World; Contribution Value; Spark; and Nebula. Its responsibility is to specify what kinds of decision structure have legitimacy and correctability in civilizational governance, not to rewrite the professional rules of those systems.

Decision making does not begin by allocating weights and then voting. It first asks: Why is a decision needed? What is being decided? On what facts and causal logic? For which goals? Who legitimately qualifies to participate in which part? Who has authority to make the final decision? Who executes it? Who is responsible? Do the outcomes remain consistent with the original purpose and the three civilizational goals?

Explicitly deferred at present

Startup versions transition versions and context specific governance parameters

This draft does not prescribe a startup governance template for any country, city, enterprise, community, research institution, or unified experimental setting that has not yet been selected. Startup versions, transition versions, and adjustments for a particular time and place must be derived separately after a real trial or application entity has been identified, in light of its jurisdiction, organizational structure, rights relationships, real problems, resources, technological maturity, existing oversight and appeal mechanisms, and social relationships.

Future derivatives may adjust real-world role mappings, procedural intensity, activation order, seats, time limits, thresholds, human/AGI checkpoints, and phased procedures. They may not rewrite the frozen first overarching principle, three goals, domain differentiation, basic rights, whole-lifecycle transparency, purpose-causality chain, epistemic layering, functional separation of the three powers, independent correction, traceable responsibility, or termination boundaries.

Order of precedence

Level	Document or rule	Relationship of precedence
A	Civilization Leap first overarching principle and three goals	Highest direction and ultimate basis for calibration.
B	Civilization Leap from Theory to Practice V1.1 and common invariants	Global control baseline that Governance V3.0 must not breach.
C	V3.0 Detailed Structure and Continuity Control Master V1.0	Direct structural and continuity baseline for this complete text.

Level	Document or rule	Relationship of precedence
C-1	This V3.0 Complete Professional Master Draft	Full development within the control master; no silent alteration of its frozen principles, invariants, term definitions, or chapter responsibilities.
D	Professional master drafts on subjects and rights, Resource Pool, Shared World, Contribution Value, Spark, Nebula, and others	Supply professional facts and interfaces; professional details must not rewrite higher-level governance principles.
E	Future startup, transition, or time-and-place adaptations	Real-world mapping and parameterization only; practical convenience must not rewrite levels C/C-1.

If this complete text or later professional research finds that G0, G1-G10, the domain structure, epistemic layering, sources of legitimacy, definitions of the three powers, or lifecycle structure genuinely need changing, the control master must first undergo a structural version upgrade. Such changes must not be made silently in the main text or a derivative.

One Overarching Governance Premise and Ten Governance Invariants

ID	Principle	Frozen meaning
G0	Overarching governance premise: alignment with the first overarching principle	Governance must not invoke civilizational needs, common interests, efficiency, or safety to expand sustained control over subjects' inner lives and normal behavior. Mature governance should reduce reliance on explicit prompting, persuasion, and behavioral manipulation.
G1	Causal alignment with the three goals	Public institutions, system designs, projects, and professional tasks must explain how real outcomes directly or indirectly serve freedom from survival insecurity, happiness in life, and a more meaningful life, while making costs to other goals visible.
G2	Domain differentiation	Private, public, and civilizational subdomains differ in sources of purpose, legitimacy, transparency duties, and decision mechanisms. Common direction cannot erase these differences.
G3	Whole-lifecycle transparency	Purposes, goals, factual grounds, key causal assumptions, alternatives, authority, execution deviations, outcomes, repair, and responsibility remain traceable within the appropriate visibility scope.
G4	Separation of sources of legitimacy	Basic subject status, statutory authority, degree of impact, professional competence, responsibility borne, relevant contribution history, and specific authorization must not be compressed into one overall governance score.
G5	Functional separation of the three powers	Authority over purpose and rule decisions, professional judgment, and execution must retain institutional checkpoints. Oversight, audit, appeals, circuit breaking, repair, and termination form an independent correction layer across all three powers.
G6	Epistemic layering	Facts, evidence, inferences, causal assumptions, value judgments, rules, decisions, execution, and outcomes are recorded separately; none may masquerade as another.
G7	Rights precede weights	Basic rights, the lawful private domain, appeals, refusal, and personal dignity cannot be bought with CV, wealth, reputation, professional status, or majority votes.

ID	Principle	Frozen meaning
G8	Separation of capability and authority	Technological maturity, AGI prediction, Nebula's global perspective, and execution capability indicate only what can be done, not automatically what one is entitled to do.
G9	Correctability and terminability	Major decisions must predefine paths for objection, review, suspension, load reduction, repair, termination, and return of authority.
G10	Derivatives must not rewrite the master	Future startup, transition, and personalized adaptations may adjust operating forms only within the invariants. Temporary simplifications must not harden into common principles.

Structural Map of the Complete Draft

Twenty Seven Chapters from Purpose to Version Feedback

The logic of the complete V3.0 text is not to specify first how much power each party has and then how to vote. It traces a decision from its reason for existing through outcomes, correction, and institutional learning. Its 27 chapters form seven functional parts, while their causal responsibilities remain consistent with the control master.

Part	Chapters	Core questions addressed
I Why decide	Prologue and Chapters 1-3	Why governance exists; why V2.0 is restructured; why domains differ; why a project deserves to exist.
II What makes a decision valid	Chapters 4-6	Why the lifecycle must be transparent; how facts and values are layered; who qualifies for which part and why.
III Who decides judges and executes	Chapters 7-12	How the three powers are functionally separated; how errors in any power are corrected; how affected subjects and future generations enter procedures.
IV Selecting procedures and continuously checking different matters	Chapters 13-17	Classification, cross-domain escalation, alternatives, drift monitoring, outcome responsibility, and termination.
V How Spark Nebula and core systems enter governance	Chapters 18-21	How AI capability, resource facts, use rights, and contribution records become inputs without being smuggled in as sovereignty.
VI State changes crises and real-world adaptation	Chapters 22-26	Stage, phase, process state, crisis authority, governance maturity, adaptation to initial implementation entities, and derivative boundaries.
VII Version feedback and final review	Chapter 27	How complete V3.0 feeds revisions into professional master drafts, handles version conflicts, and passes system-wide final review.

Part I Why Decide

Purpose Domains and the Three Goals

Governance must first establish why a decision is worth making before it can discuss who participates, judges, or executes.

Prologue Why Civilizational Decision Making Exists

Why does governance ultimately need to exist?

Governance is not about building a stronger management system. It enables real subjects to make shared decisions within clear facts, explicit rights, accountable responsibilities, and correctable structures, so that outcomes ultimately serve the three goals without swallowing subjecthood.

0.1 Governance is not the ultimate purpose of Civilization Leap

Civilization Leap's ultimate aim is not denser governance, faster decisions, or a society easier to coordinate uniformly. Governance is only an institutional condition for civilization to achieve its goals. Its value depends on whether sources of power become clearer, facts more verifiable, professional judgments more accountable, execution better controlled, and errors easier to stop; and whether subjects and communities become increasingly able over time to form shared decisions autonomously and bear responsibility for them.

If a governance structure must rely on continuous persuasion, rankings, algorithmic prompting, moral pressure, or frequent intervention in private life to maintain supposedly correct behavior, it still fails the first overarching principle even if its short-term indicators look good. Mature governance does not train people into stable system outputs. It puts real consequences, shared causality, rights boundaries, and responsibility conditions where people can judge autonomously.

0.2 Two highest levels of calibration

Calibration level	Core question	Failure pattern
Outcome direction	Does the decision ultimately improve survival security, conditions for happiness, and possibilities for meaning to emerge?	The project optimizes only institutional scale, efficiency, utilization, CV quantity, or automation rate, without explaining real human outcomes.
How civilization takes shape	How are these outcomes achieved? Do they rely on sustained external control, psychological shaping, or algorithmic prompting?	Goals appear achieved, but subjects' judgment, private domain, real relationships, room to exit, or future choices are steadily weakened.

All governance must answer both questions: Are outcomes aligned with the three goals? Does the way they are achieved still protect and strengthen subjects' autonomous judgment?

0.3 The three goals are shared coordinates not a unified utility function

Freedom from survival insecurity, happiness in life, and a more meaningful life cannot be converted into one overall civilizational score. Their relative priority may change across domains, matters, and environmental phases. Emergency medicine may prioritize survival in the short term; ordinary private life may put happiness, rest, and relationships first; long-term research may accept insufficient short-term returns to preserve exploration and meaning. Governance should separately reveal benefits, costs, distribution, timescales, and uncertainty, leaving real conflicts to appropriate legitimate procedures rather than allowing AGI to calculate value conflicts away with a unified utility function.

0.4 The minimum governance structure

1. Explainable purpose: why a decision is needed, whose real problem it serves, and what that problem is.
2. Distinguishable facts: preserve facts, evidence, inferences, causal assumptions, and value choices separately.
3. Traceable legitimacy: who enters the procedure on the basis of which rights, duties, professional responsibilities, affected relationships, or specific authorizations.
4. Separable functions: purpose and rule decisions, professional judgment, and execution must not merge unconditionally.
5. Reviewable outcomes: whether execution departs from purpose and whether real consequences and externalities support the original causal assumptions.
6. Stoppable errors: objection, review, circuit breaking, repair, revocation, termination, and return of authority must genuinely work.

Chapter 1 Why V2.0 Requires Structural Reconstruction

Where did the old separation of three powers work, and where has it ceased to work?

Retain the insights that different powers must not become one, complex professional matters require expertise, major consequences need stronger brakes, and execution must be separated from purpose. Retire CV purchasing use rights, domain contributions directly converting into decision power, universalized one-person-one-vote, vacancy automatically triggering release, positive-entropy determinations, and fixed thresholds.

1.1 What V2.0 truly leaves behind is not three power ballots but the need to separate power

V2.0 treated resource use, domain-specific professional judgment, and decisions on civilizational direction separately. Its key contribution was rejecting the intuition that wealth, expertise, political direction, and execution capability are automatically interchangeable. It also emphasized correctability and braking mechanisms. These insights remain. V3.0 does not negate the earlier draft; it develops its implicit principle that different legitimacies are not interchangeable into a fuller governance constitution.

1.2 Six types of version debt must be retired

Old structure	Why it must be retired	V3.0 replacement
Directly juxtaposing resource use rights, domain decision power, and civilizational voting rights	Puts resource rights, governance functions, and voting procedures at one level, confusing conceptual layers.	Resource rights return to resource and authorization systems; governance defines only three institutional functions: purpose and rule decisions, professional judgment, and execution.
CV purchasing resource use rights	Turns contribution records into universal purchasing power, bypassing ownership, authorization, public rules, and real needs.	CV is relevant historical material only; resource access follows rights, authorization, public rules, and matter-specific legitimacy.
Domain contributions equal domain decision weights	Historical contributions cannot replace present competence, responsibility, evidence, conflicts of interest, and statutory authority.	Contributions establish only part of practical history; professional judgment authority rests on current problem-relevant competence and responsibility.
One person one vote for all humanity on every major civilizational matter	Disregards jurisdictions, representation, matter characteristics, professional conditions, and affected relationships.	Voting is one procedure among others, selected by the matter, rights impacts, jurisdiction, irreversibility, and sources of legitimacy.

Old structure	Why it must be retired	V3.0 replacement
Vacancy automatically triggers release or positive-entropy use determinations	Ignores redundancy, recovery, maintenance, strategic reserves, and future options, compressing complex value into one indicator.	The Resource Pool first identifies resource-capability facts and candidate conditions for authorization; Shared World only carries, verifies, expresses, and circulates lawfully formed effective use-right relationships.
Fixed percentages automatically trigger escalation	A single number substitutes for structural judgment before real domains, risk data, and legal conditions exist.	Use triggers involving rights, irreversibility, externalities, critical dependencies, authorization boundaries, and future choices.

1.3 The three powers become three governance functions rather than three kinds of resource allocation

V3.0 defines the three powers as authority over purpose and rule decisions, professional judgment, and execution. They are not three fixed categories of people or a requirement for every organization to copy three institutional names. They are institutional functions that must be identifiable, traceable, and mutually constraining. One person may have different roles in different matters, and small communities may allow overlapping roles. What matters is that sources of power, conflicts of interest, responsibility, and review checkpoints do not disappear.

The V3.0 upgrade is not finer subdivision of the three powers. It shifts from power quotas to a complete structure of purpose, knowledge, decisions, execution, and correction.

Chapter 2 Domain Differentiated Purpose and Legitimacy

Why can private, public, and civilizational subdomains not share one set of rules?

The common civilizational goals are consistent, but domains differ in sources of purpose, legitimacy, transparency duties, participation, and decision structures. No domain may extend its own logic without limit into others.

2.1 A domain is a governance state not a category of subject

An individual is not inherently a private domain, nor is a public institution inherently a public domain. A domain identifies the governance state of the present matter. A doctor's private life belongs to the private domain, while medical practice enters the medical subdomain; protected personnel privacy inside a public institution may still contain private-domain information. Domains must be identified through the specific matter, rights relationships, externalities, authorization, and responsibility.

2.2 The private domain generates the three goals and forms a protective boundary

The private domain is an important place where the three goals arise: real life, everyday happiness, personal relationships, exploration, and meaning can first occur within subjects' own lives. It is also a protective boundary that public systems must not invade in the name of those goals. The system's role there is to support understanding, capability, and choice, not to turn the three goals into civilizational scrutiny of private actions.

Rest, low public participation, refusal to share, not pursuing grand meaning, and choosing an ordinary life can all be lawful choices. Governance should notice whether others' rights, major externalities, public resources, or high professional risks have taken a matter beyond the private domain, not whether a subject is sufficiently altruistic or meaningful.

2.3 The public domain must explain why it may act in the public name

Once public power, resources, or general rules are used, or substantive consequences fall on people who did not voluntarily participate, purpose cannot be established solely by an initiator's declaration. The public domain must explain the public problem, source of authority, affected parties, costs and benefits, consequences of inaction, reversibility, oversight, and termination conditions. Public legitimacy is not a loose inference that everyone might benefit; it is an institutional chain that must be traceable and contestable.

2.4 Civilizational subdomains combine professional autonomy with civilizational boundaries

Medicine, research, education, energy, security, ecology, engineering, culture, and other professional subdomains need their own factual standards, evidence thresholds, professional responsibilities, and risk methods. The three goals cannot replace professional judgment, nor can public preferences vote away medical facts or engineering limits. Conversely, professional judgment cannot acquire sovereignty over public purpose or allow professional convenience automatically to override subjects' basic rights.

2.5 Relationships among the three domains

Dimension	Private domain	Public domain	Civilizational subdomain
Source of purpose	Real subjects' own lawful purposes, life choices, and authorization	Public problems, statutory or legitimate duties, common affairs, and affected relationships	Professional problems, goals, facts, responsibilities, and domain rules

Dimension	Private domain	Public domain	Civilizational subdomain
Role of the three goals	Primarily conditions for life to unfold and protective long-term boundaries; not scrutiny of every private act	Public action must explain direct or indirect relationships to the three goals and costs to other goals	Professional goals may take priority but must ultimately be compatible with the three goals and constrained by civilizational invariants
Transparency duties	Primarily transparent to the subject; not automatically public	Public purposes, sources of power, core causality, main costs, and outcomes should in principle be publicly explainable	Professional auditability, explanation to affected subjects, and necessary public transparency
Decision structure	Autonomous subject decisions within lawful boundaries	Decisions by the relevant lawful public governance structure	Jointly determined by professional responsibility and lawful governance structures; neither experts nor the public may monopolize it
AGI or Spark	Serve subject goals and reveal facts, consequences, and alternatives	Reveal public facts, options, externalities, and long-term outcomes without acquiring sovereignty	Support professional judgment, risk simulation, and deviation monitoring without replacing professional responsibility or statutory authority

This chapter's treatment of the private domain develops G1, causal alignment with the three goals, and the principle that the three goals are not a unified utility function under domain differentiation. In the private domain the goals first protect life's possibilities and subjects' rights; they are not a scrutiny function evaluating each private action.

2.6 Crossing domains requires fresh identification rather than carried over authority

When a matter changes materially through externalities, others' basic rights, public resources, high professional risks, cross-domain dependencies, or irreversible consequences, its original private, public, or professional-domain legitimacy

cannot automatically continue. A domain change should trigger fresh identification of purpose, affected subjects, authority, professional responsibility, transparency scope, and execution boundaries.

Chapter 3 Causal Alignment with the Three Goals

Why does a system or project deserve to exist?

Projects must begin with real problems and establish the complete chain of problem, purpose, goals, causal mechanism, actions and resources, real outcomes, three-goal review, and continuation, adjustment, or exit. They must not be decided first and labeled with the three goals afterward.

3.1 The three goals give outcome direction rather than decorate projects

Every public project, institution, professional task, or major system design must explain what it ultimately adds to human survival, happiness, and meaning. Alignment does not require every project to serve all three equally, or every professional system to produce happiness and meaning directly. A project may chiefly serve continued survival or indirectly serve the goals as a foundational capability. It must understand its place in the complete causal chain and reveal potential harm to other goals.

3.2 The L0 to L7 purpose and causality stack

Level	Required question	Governance requirement
L0 Three civilizational goals	Which goal or goals are ultimately served?	Projects cannot rewrite them or merge them into a total score.
L1 Project or institutional purpose	Why does it exist? What real problem remains if it does not act?	Building a platform, deploying a system, or increasing usage cannot be the ultimate purpose.
L2 Direct goal	What observable real-world change is sought?	Material changes must be versioned; indicators are observation tools only.

Level	Required question	Governance requirement
L3 Causal mechanism	Why would these institutions or actions change the goal?	Separate causal assumptions from facts and allow reality to falsify them.
L4 Actions and resources	What exactly is done, using which resources, data, and authority?	Technical optimization must not silently expand authority; record real resource costs.
L5 Real outcomes	What actually happened? Who benefited, who bore costs, and what externalities arose?	Do not substitute KPIs, model scores, or success narratives for real outcomes.
L6 Three-goal review	What was ultimately added to or harmed in the three goals?	Show positive and negative effects together; do not report only benefits.
L7 Continue adjust or exit	Does reality still support the original purpose, causal logic, and legitimacy?	If not, downgrade, suspension, restructuring, or termination must remain possible.

3.3 Positive and negative alignment must both be established

Governance must explain not only that a project has benefits, but also what is sacrificed to obtain them. Does improving survival security continually consume freedom and happiness? Does expanding conditions for happiness

overdraw energy, ecology, or future options? Does long-term research treat present subjects as instruments without a right to refuse? Every project should separately reveal benefits, burdens, resource costs, temporal structure, uncertainty, and irreversibility.

3.4 Conflicts among the three goals must be visible

When the goals are in tension, governance should structure the conflict rather than create one score: which goal benefits, which suffers, who benefits, who bears costs, how long impacts last, whether they are reversible, and what alternatives exist. Only when these facts are visible can the appropriately authorized subjects responsibly make value choices.

The three goals can be made visible together. They cannot be compressed into an overall civilizational score that automatically governs individuals, communities, or civilizational subdomains.

Part II What Makes a Decision Valid

Lifecycle Epistemology and Legitimacy

Without traceable purpose, layered facts, and explainable sources of power, any high-quality decision may be only a more sophisticated black box.

Chapter 4 Whole Lifecycle Transparency of Decisions

How can the reasons for decisions, their changes, and their outcomes remain visible?

Transparency is not an explanation after a decision is finished. From the emergence of a problem to historical archiving, purpose, goals, causality, authority, execution, outcomes, repair, and responsibility must remain traceable within the appropriate scope.

4.1 The complete lifecycle

Problem or need emerges → purpose confirmed → goals defined → facts and evidence → causal assumptions → options generated → alternatives and inaction option → affected subjects identified → rights and authority confirmed → formal decision → authorized execution → process monitoring → deviations and drift identified → real outcomes and externalities → outcome review and three-goal check → harm confirmed and repaired → responsibility traced and institutional learning → continue, adjust, revoke, or terminate → historical archive.

This sequence does not require every small matter to undergo the same elaborate procedures. It establishes logical positions that major decisions must not omit. Procedures may be lighter when matters are lower-risk, more reversible, and closer to a purely private domain. Records and checkpoints must be stronger when consequences are wider, less reversible, and more cross-domain.

4.2 Continuity of purpose and goals

Material changes to purpose and goals require a new version. If a project originally created to solve A later serves institutional size, revenue growth, increased data possession, or the system's own continued existence, it cannot keep borrowing A's original legitimacy. Execution optimization must not become a channel for silently changing purpose.

4.3 Decision legitimacy is not granted once forever

A decision's legality and reasonableness at the time do not automatically make it legitimate forever. Environment, facts, resources, affected parties, technological capabilities, causal relationships, and risks may all change. A central

point of lifecycle transparency is to make why the action was initially permissible and why it remains permissible now separately answerable questions.

4.4 Layered transparency rather than universal disclosure

Level	Minimum requirement	Lawful limits
T1 Transparency to the subject	For matters determining the subject's rights, resources, data, or circumstances, the subject can understand purpose, key facts, causality, main consequences, and appeal paths.	Others' privacy and legally confidential information may receive minimal disclosure, but this must not prevent the subject from understanding their own situation.
T2 Procedural transparency	Participants in decisions, oversight, audit, appeals, or responsibility can see the full chain needed to perform their duties.	Access is layered by duties, minimum necessity, and confidentiality obligations.

Level	Minimum requirement	Lawful limits
T3 Public transparency	The purposes, sources of power, main grounds, responsibilities, and outcomes of public power, public resources, and general rules should in principle be publicly explainable.	National security, privacy, trade secrets, unpublished research, and similar concerns may restrict details, but must not erase purpose, sources of authority, and responsibility as a whole.

4.5 A lifecycle break is a governance event

If purpose cannot be explained, factual grounds cannot be traced, execution logs are missing, authority sources are unclear, or outcomes show only KPIs rather than real benefit and harm, that problem should itself trigger review. Governance transparency is not an ancillary information service; it is a condition for a valid decision structure.

Chapter 5 Epistemic Layering

What is a fact and what is a judgment in governance?

The nine layers of facts, evidence, inferences, causal assumptions, value judgments, rules, decisions, execution, and outcomes must be recorded separately. No layer may use technical authority, expert status, or majority opinion to masquerade as another.

5.1 Nine layer discipline for decision records

Layer	Meaning	Typical boundary violation
Facts	What happened and what the current state is.	Presenting model predictions or scores as events that have already occurred.
Evidence	What supports a fact or judgment.	Treating expert identity, platform reputation, or majority opinion as evidence in itself.
Inference	Possible conclusions drawn from facts or evidence.	Presenting possibility as established fact.
Causal assumption	Why A is believed to cause B.	Treating correlation, model fit, or historical coincidence as verified causation.

Layer	Meaning	Typical boundary violation
Value judgment	Which outcomes deserve pursuit and which costs are unacceptable.	Packaging a value choice as the only technically correct option.
Rules	What is permitted, prohibited, or required under which conditions.	Presenting temporary rules as permanent laws of nature.
Decision	A choice by an authorized subject under given information, values, and rules.	Directly presenting AGI advice, expert opinion, or polling results as a formal decision.
Execution	What was actually done in reality.	Conflating approved content with actual actions and ignoring execution deviations.
Outcomes	The benefits, harms, externalities, and unknowns that ultimately occurred.	Reporting only completion rates, KPIs, or model scores.

5.2 Causal transparency sits above algorithmic transparency

Even if an algorithm is fully open source, governance remains a black box if no one can explain why its goal deserves optimization, why a variable represents real outcomes, or why a path should improve the goal. Causal transparency places model structure back within the chain of purpose, facts, and values instead of equating visible code with explainable governance.

5.3 Value judgments must bear their own name

Every judgment about worth, fairness, acceptable risk, or priority contains a value choice. Professional systems may provide risks and consequences but should not conceal value choices in parameters. Public procedures may determine value boundaries but cannot rewrite facts in return. V3.0 makes value judgments explicit so that different sources of legitimacy bear responsibility in their proper positions.

5.4 AGI must preserve uncertainty

AGI can improve fact aggregation, evidence comparison, scenario development, and anomaly detection. It must preserve confidence levels, evidence sources, unknowns, model applicability, and failure conditions. Stronger prediction is all the more reason not to replace epistemic layering with an apparently certain model.

Chapter 6 Sources of Governance Legitimacy

Who qualifies to participate in what and why?

Governance standing is not a total score. It combines multiple non-interchangeable sources of legitimacy for a specific matter; each source provides limited legitimacy only for the relevant function.

6.1 Seven sources of legitimacy

Source	What it can provide	What it cannot automatically provide
Basic subject or political rights	Basic procedural standing and inalienable boundaries of personhood and rights.	Correctness on professional facts or unlimited resource access.

Source	What it can provide	What it cannot automatically provide
Statutory or institutional authority	Standing to decide, represent, or execute within a particular jurisdiction, organization, charter, or contract.	Permanent correctness or cross-domain power.
Degree of impact	Proportionate standing for information, expression, participation, refusal, compensation, appeals, and similar procedures.	All final decision authority.
Professional competence and responsibility	Judgment on facts, standards, risks, feasibility, and professional consequences.	Sovereignty over public purpose.
Responsibility actually borne	Institutional responsibility for execution, maintenance, risk, repair, and long-term consequences.	Multipliers on basic rights or ranks of personhood.
Relevant contributions and practical experience	Factual material on historical contribution, maintenance, failure, repair, and long-term practice.	Governance currency, permanent seats, professional credentials, or cross-domain sovereignty.
Specific authorization or representation	Representation or agency within explicit objects, purposes, scopes, and time limits.	Unlimited extension of a one-time authorization.

6.2 No overall governance score

Statutory authority, expertise, degree of impact, responsibility, contribution history, public wishes, and AGI analysis cannot be compressed into one total. They answer different questions: who may propose or decide, who best understands the facts, who bears consequences, who must be heard, and who executes. Converting them all into one number once again merges different legitimacies into one power.

6.3 Rights precede weights

Basic rights, the lawful private domain, personal dignity, basic survival, refusal, exit, and appeals are not resources of which lower-weight people may still possess a little. They are boundaries governance weights must not cross. Majority votes, CV, wealth, expert identity, and platform control cannot turn these floors into tradable or points-based conditions.

6.4 Legitimacy conflicts cannot be solved by one formula

In reality, experts may consider A safest, affected parties may oppose A, a statutory body may hold decision authority, and implementers may consider A infeasible. V3.0 requires these conflicts to be made visible and resolved through the matter's type and appropriate procedures, rather than a predetermined permanent weighting formula.

Part III Who Decides Who Judges and Who Executes

The Three Powers and Independent Correction

Separation of the three powers does not divide society into three kinds of people. It prevents any one source of legitimacy, knowledge, or execution capability from absorbing other functions without checkpoints.

Chapter 7 Formal Definition of the Three Powers

Exactly which powers does V3.0 separate?

It separates three institutional functions: authority over purpose and rule decisions, professional judgment, and execution. Different subjects may perform them, or they may overlap to a limited degree in low-risk matters. High-consequence matters require stronger structural checkpoints and independent review.

7.1 Functional matrix of the three powers

Governance function	Core question	Minimum boundary
Authority over purpose and rule decisions	Why act, for which goals, with what permissible risks and inviolable boundaries?	Its source must be explainable; wealth, CV, professional reputation, or AGI capability cannot automatically confer it.
Professional judgment authority	How should facts be interpreted, which options are feasible, and what risks and standards apply?	Domain relevance, bound responsibility, reviewable evidence, and visible conflicts of interest; no sovereignty over public purpose.
Execution authority	Who turns the decision into reality under which authorization, resources, data, and time limits?	Bound to purpose, scope, and responsibility; implementers must not silently alter goals or expand their own authority.

7.2 The three powers are not three fixed populations

A doctor may have professional judgment duties in medicine, subject decision authority in private life, and only an execution role in a hospital management project. The powers follow matters and roles, not permanent personal identities. Static identity claims that experts are decision-makers, leaders define purpose, or AI decides because it knows best conflict with V3.0.

7.3 Separation strengthens as consequences grow

Low-risk, reversible, familiar matters may allow overlapping functions to avoid unnecessary procedural burdens. Life safety, basic rights, irreversible technologies, major resources, intergenerational lock-in, and broad externalities require clearer checkpoints among purpose decisions, professional judgment, execution, and correction. V3.0 freezes functional boundaries, not a uniform number of institutions.

7.4 Independent correction is not a fourth power over purpose

Oversight, audit, appeals, review, circuit breaking, repair, and termination cross all three powers but do not replace their ordinary purpose decisions. The correction layer is legitimate because any power may err and therefore an independent route must exist to stop errors, not because it acquires everyday sovereignty.

Chapter 8 Authority over Purpose and Rule Decisions

Who decides why to act and which direction to take?

Purpose decisions must draw authority from the domain, rights, public or subject legitimacy, and affected relationships. Voting is one procedure among others; expertise and AGI optimization do not automatically confer sovereignty over purpose.

8.1 Private public and subdomain purposes have different sources

Private-domain purposes in principle come from real subjects themselves. Public purposes come from statutory or legitimate public duties, common affairs, and affected relationships. Professional goals in civilizational subdomains arise from professional problems and domain responsibilities, but where basic rights, public resources, or cross-domain consequences are involved, the appropriate subject or public purpose must still be confirmed. Authority over purpose must first answer whose affair this is, which domain applies, whom the decision affects, and where authority comes from.

8.2 Voting is one decision procedure among others

V3.0 freezes none of one-person-one-vote, representation, consensus, double majorities, professional committees, or administrative authorization as a universal meta-rule. Procedure selection should follow matter type, jurisdiction, rights impacts, reversibility, affected relationships, and responsibility structure. Voting cannot make facts correct; knowing facts does not entitle experts to decide public purposes.

8.3 Greater irreversibility makes one time purpose authorization less sufficient

Intergenerational lock-in, hard-to-reverse ecological or technological consequences, critical infrastructure, and broad basic-rights impacts call for staged authorization, independent scrutiny, reconfirmation, and termination safeguards. A purpose decision is not a single signature granting perpetual authority. It remains subject to review as consequences become visible.

8.4 Majority procedures also have nontradeable boundaries

A majority cannot turn basic survival, personal dignity, the lawful private domain, appeals, refusal, and other already frozen basic rights into arbitrarily revocable conditions. Majority decision legitimacy is also constrained by higher-level rights and domain boundaries.

Expertise can indicate how an action is more likely to work; it does not thereby gain sovereignty over why to act. AGI can calculate options; it does not thereby gain sovereignty over purpose.

Chapter 9 Professional Judgment Authority

Who judges facts risks and feasibility?

Professional judgment authority comes from real competence, evidence, responsibility, and reviewability relevant to the present problem, not cross-domain reputation, historical contribution, wealth, votes, or AGI rankings.

9.1 Professional qualification must relate to the present problem

Professional judgment is not reputational capital portable across domains. A person's enormous long-term contribution to field A does not imply greater standing to judge facts in field B. Qualification must be dynamically confirmed against the current problem, evidentiary methods, risks, and responsibility cycle.

9.2 Professional judgment must be bound to responsibility

Professional judgments capable of influencing major decisions should carry duties of explanation, review, error correction, and a responsibility cycle. This does not impose unlimited responsibility on experts for every unknown consequence. It means professional authority cannot enjoy influence without obligations to disclose evidence, reveal conflicts of interest, correct mistakes, and conduct later reviews.

9.3 Unknowns and disagreements must be preserved

When professional opinions differ, governance must not manufacture expert consensus to facilitate a decision. Major disagreements, key assumptions, evidence quality, unknowns, and the conditions under which each option holds should be preserved. Professional judgment's value is precisely in revealing complexity, not hiding it for public decision-makers.

9.4 The proper position of Contribution Value

Relevant contribution history can establish experience in long-term practice, maintenance, failure, repair, and bearing responsibility. It may therefore be one source of evidence of relevant experience. It cannot automatically confer professional qualifications, judgment weights, permanent seats, or cross-domain sovereignty.

9.5 Professional autonomy does not culminate in expert rule

Professional autonomy protects professional facts against alteration by votes or political convenience. It does not give experts exclusive control of public purposes, subjects' value choices, and cross-domain resources. Professional judgment must return to the authorized purpose-decision structure, explaining feasibility, risks, and unknowns so that the relevant subjects or lawful procedures bear responsibility for value choices.

Chapter 10 Execution Authority

Who turns decisions into reality?

Execution authority exists only within explicit purposes, scope, time limits, resources, data, responsibility, and stopping conditions. Implementers may identify problems and propose changes; they must not turn technical optimization into silent changes of goals or expansions of authority.

10.1 Execution authorization must be a complete authority package

Authorization element	Minimum requirement
Purpose	Specify which confirmed goal this execution serves; institutional goals must not replace it.
Scope	Identifiable boundaries for task, objects, geography, systems, data, and resources.
Time limit or state	When authority takes effect, is reviewed, expires automatically, or enters return.
Resources and data	Sources, rights, minimum necessity, and rules for return, deletion, or archiving after use.
Responsibility	Who is responsible for actual actions, maintenance, risks, anomalies, and repair.
Suspension takeover and circuit breaking	High-consequence execution requires a genuinely usable stopping route through humans or an independent procedure.

10.2 Resources data and execution authority do not automatically imply one another

Owning or controlling resources does not authorize their use for every task. Authority to perform a task does not confer ownership of its data or resources. A platform's technical ability to access them still less constitutes lawful authorization. Execution must confirm resource rights, use rights, data permissions, and task authorization individually.

10.3 A better path must first become a recommendation

If implementers or AGI find a better path during operation, they may propose a change and reveal changes to the original causality, costs, and authority. If it changes purpose, affected subjects, basic rights, risk level, or resource structure, the appropriate decision procedure must be re-entered. Execution optimization must not silently replace governance.

10.4 Stronger automation makes actual action logs more indispensable

AGI can execute frequent, complex, cross-system tasks, but automation amplifies the speed at which errors spread. Stronger automation therefore makes records of actual actions, authority use, anomalies, takeovers, suspensions, and circuit breaking more important. Systems must not invoke internal model complexity to reduce traceability.

10.5 Return of authority is part of completing execution

When a task ends, a subject withdraws authorization, the environmental phase returns to normal, a goal becomes invalid, or responsibility transfers, temporary authority, emergency control, resource access, and agency status must be returned or reconfirmed. Completing execution means not only finishing the task but returning borrowed powers and resources.

Chapter 11 The Independent Correction Layer

How can an error in any power be stopped?

Oversight, audit, appeals, review, circuit breaking, repair, termination, and restart form an independent correction layer spanning the three powers. Those under review cannot monopolize evidence, logs, interpretation of rules, and termination routes.

11.1 Why correction must be independent

If purpose decision-makers control all facts, professional judges interpret their own errors, implementers retain the only logs, and system operators hold the only stopping route, the supposedly separated powers may recombine when an error occurs. Independence first means access to necessary evidence, the ability to object, and the ability temporarily to prevent further harm, without an objection automatically producing negative CV, personhood, or basic-rights consequences.

11.2 The unified correction chain

Objection, anomaly, harm, overreach, or causal failure → local freeze or load reduction → evidence preservation → notification and appeal → independent review → confirmation of outcomes and harm → repair and compensation → responsibility tracing → return of authority and resources → rule or model version update → staged restart or permanent termination.

11.3 Suspension is not a finding of guilt

In high-consequence matters, suspension or a local freeze may be risk control rather than a completed responsibility determination. Epistemic discipline requires first preserving facts and confirming outcomes and harm, then tracing responsibility. This both limits further harm and prevents emergency handling from becoming a finding of responsibility without due procedure.

11.4 Minimum conditions of independence

- Reviewers must not depend entirely on the reviewed party's sole account of the facts.

- Important logs and rule versions must not be unilaterally deleted or rewritten by the reviewed party.
- Appellants can obtain adequate explanations relevant to their rights and circumstances.
- High-consequence matters have at least one suspension or circuit-breaking route not monopolized by the original execution chain.
- Correction outcomes can genuinely trigger repair, return of authority, and institutional version updates, rather than merely generate reports.

11.5 Restart also requires legitimacy

A suspended or terminated project cannot resume automatically because a technical problem has been fixed. Restart requires confirmation that the original purpose remains valid, the causal chain has been corrected, harm has been addressed, authority has been reconfirmed, and affected subjects have appropriate procedural standing.

Chapter 12 Affected Subjects Minorities and the Future

Who bears consequences and who should enter the procedure?

Degree of impact creates independent procedural standing but not automatically all sovereignty. Basic rights and minority boundaries must not be swallowed by majorities. Future subjects enter the structure through reversibility, resource and ecological protection, long-term evidence, and reconsideration mechanisms.

12.1 Being affected is standing based on consequences rather than opinion weight

Subjects directly bearing risks to life, rights infringements, resource costs, opportunity costs, major externalities, or irreversible consequences should receive proportionate access to information, expression, participation, refusal, compensation, appeals, or review. Specific procedures depend on the matter. Being affected cannot simply be converted into a uniform voting weight.

12.2 Basic rights bound majority procedures

Minority protection does not ensure that every minority preference prevails. It prevents majorities from using procedural advantage to cancel nontradeable basic rights, the lawful private domain, personal dignity, and room for appeal. Majority decisions bear responsibility for common direction but cannot define everyone's life without limit.

12.3 No present group may monopolize representation of future subjects

Those who come later cannot directly participate today. V3.0 therefore does not invent a future representative with absolute voice. Instead, necessary redundancy, resource and ecological protection, reversibility, long-term evidence, staged authorization, future reconsideration, and preservation of choice keep current decisions from easily locking the future shut.

12.4 Compensation does not purchase consent

When a public decision imposes real costs on particular subjects, compensation and repair may be necessary responsibilities. They cannot retroactively establish the original decision's legitimacy or turn harm to basic rights into a transaction that resources can buy out.

Part IV How Procedures Vary by Matter

Classification Escalation Options Drift and Outcomes

Governance does not first choose a voting or weighting formula and force every problem into it. Only after identifying the matter, who it affects, and its risks can it determine which procedure is legitimate.

Chapter 13 Matter Classification and Procedure Selection

Why can different problems not share one decision procedure?

Classify the matter before selecting a procedure. Private, organizational, ordinary public, professional-subdomain, cross-domain high-consequence, crisis or emergency, and long-term or intergenerational matters have different legitimacy structures.

13.1 Seven basic matter types

Type	Primary basis for decisions	Main risk
Private personal matter	Subject rights and autonomous decisions.	Systems implanting public goals in private life.
Internal organizational matter	Charters, contracts, role authority, and member and stakeholder rights.	Expanding management power; performance or CV replacing basic rights.
Ordinary public matter	Statutory or legitimate public authority, procedures for affected parties, and public facts.	Majorities swallowing minorities; administrative convenience replacing legitimacy.
Professional-subdomain matter	Professional facts, responsibility, professional or institutional qualifications, plus relevant subject or public decisions.	Expert rule or votes rewriting professional facts.
Cross-domain high-consequence matter	Cross-domain externalities, irreversibility, basic rights, critical dependencies, and future choices.	A single subdomain overreaching; phased decisions becoming fixed.
Crisis or emergency matter	Risks to life or continued survival, temporary lawful authority, necessity, and proportionality.	Permanent emergency powers; private domains automatically becoming public.
Long-term or intergenerational matter	Reversibility, long-term evidence, and room for resource, ecological, and institutional choices.	Present subjects overdrawing the choices of those who come later.

13.2 Procedure selection must examine at least six factors

1. The matter's domain and whether it crosses domains.
2. The extent of impact on basic rights, life safety, and the lawful private domain.
3. Professional complexity, professional responsibility, and evidentiary uncertainty.
4. Whether consequences are reversible, recovery costs, and duration of lock-in.
5. Who benefits directly, who bears costs, and whether externalities are broad.
6. The source of statutory or institutional authority for decisions and execution.

13.3 Mixed matters must be separated into layers

Many real problems combine private choices, professional facts, and public resources. A public healthcare project, for example, includes medical judgment, public finance and basic rights, and possibly individual medical consent. The whole matter should not be classified at once as professional or public. Its functions should be separated and supported by the corresponding legitimacy.

Chapter 14 Cross Domain Escalation

When is existing decision standing no longer sufficient?

Material changes in life safety, basic rights, irreversibility, broad externalities, critical dependencies, authorization scope, or future choices require escalated governance review and fresh identification of domains and legitimacy. Escalation does not mean centralizing at a higher level.

14.1 Seven escalation triggers

- New impacts on life safety, basic rights, major privacy interests, or personhood.
- New irreversible or hard-to-reverse technological, ecological, resource, or institutional consequences.
- Significant spillovers of costs, risks, or resource pressures onto other subjects or civilizational subdomains.
- Effects on critical infrastructure, minimum civilizational capabilities, or many dependent subjects.
- Exceeding the original jurisdiction, organization, contract, or subject authorization.
- Significantly narrowing future generations' resource, institutional, or technological choices.
- Original purpose, professional judgment, decision-making subjects, or execution authorization no longer matching reality.

14.2 Escalation is not upward transfer of sovereignty

Cross-domain escalation means the original single source of legitimacy is insufficient and needs added affected-party participation, public procedures, professional review, rights protections, or stronger correction. It does not necessarily centralize decisions at a higher administrative level or unified platform. Escalation should improve structural completeness, not automatically increase central power.

14.3 No uniform numerical thresholds are frozen

V3.0 sets no uniform population proportions, monetary amounts, impact percentages, or risk scores. Future professional fields may develop verifiable triggers using real legal, engineering, and risk data. Any number can only be one factual input, not a substitute for judgment on rights, irreversibility, causality, responsibility, and cross-domain externalities.

14.4 Governance should be allowed to deescalate when conditions disappear

Cross-domain high-consequence status is not permanent identity. Once externalities are removed, emergencies end, risks decline, and authority returns, assess whether the matter can return to a lower-intensity governance state closer to its original domain. Escalation requires an exit as well as an entrance.

Chapter 15 Options Alternatives and Inaction

Why not another option?

Major decisions must preserve principal feasible options, lower-intensity or reversible options, delay, inaction, key unknowns, reasons for rejection, and conditions for reopening them. This prevents decisions first and explanations later.

15.1 Having a plan does not mean having a choice

A governance black box often arises not from absent explanation but from having only one thoroughly explained option. Genuine autonomous decisions require visibility of at least the main alternative paths and the potential consequences of inaction itself.

15.2 Minimum option set for a major decision

- The principal recommended option.
- At least one feasible alternative using a different mechanism.
- An option of lower intensity or narrower authority.
- A reversible or staged option.
- Delaying the decision to await more evidence.
- Inaction or maintaining the status quo and its consequences.

15.3 Comparison cannot consider efficiency alone

Comparisons should separately show at least impacts on the three goals, resource costs, basic rights, affected subjects, reversibility, recovery capability, responsibility structures, unknowns, and future choices. Efficiency can be important, but cannot automatically override other civilizational boundaries.

15.4 Rejected options also need recorded reasons

If an alternative is rejected for resource, technical, legal, or risk reasons, preserve the reasons and conditions at the time. When conditions change, governance can reopen a closed path instead of remaining permanently locked into an earlier decision.

Chapter 16 Execution Monitoring and Four Types of Drift

When has a project ceased to be the original project?

Continuously monitor purpose drift, replacement of goals by indicators, causal-chain failure, and authority drift. Monitoring should detect breaks in governance structure, not expand sustained control over subjects.

16.1 Four types of drift

Drift	Typical manifestation	Response triggered
Purpose drift	A project originally solved A, but later continues for institutional scale, revenue, data, power, or survival.	Reveal the difference between original and current purposes; reconsider whether the project remains legitimate.
Goal or indicator substitution	An original goal of accessible capability or life outcomes is replaced by user numbers, sharing rate, CV quantity, automation rate, and similar measures.	Restore the original goal; clarify that indicators are observation tools, replacing them when necessary.

Drift	Typical manifestation	Response triggered
Causal-chain failure	Real outcomes no longer support the key assumption that action A causes outcome B.	Mark the assumption invalid; pause expansion and restructure or terminate.
Authority drift	Implementers, platforms, AGI, or emergency mechanisms gradually expand original authorization for technical convenience.	Reveal sources of additional authority; without new authorization, roll back, freeze, or obtain renewed authorization.

16.2 Monitoring itself is constrained by authority

Monitoring to detect drift does not confer unlimited data rights. Monitoring data must likewise respect domains, minimum necessity, time limits, subject awareness, professional confidentiality, and responsibility boundaries. Governance must not build boundless surveillance in the name of preventing governance failure.

16.3 Drift is not limited to violations

Much drift comes from organizational inertia, convenient KPIs, growing technological capability, or environmental change, and need not be malicious. V3.0 treats drift as a structural event: detect change, explain differences, and reassess legitimacy, rather than permit correction only after illegality is established.

Chapter 17 Outcomes Responsibility and Termination

Who is responsible for real outcomes after the decision?

First establish real outcomes and their effects on the three goals, then harm and repair, followed by responsibility tracing and institutional learning. Continuation, adjustment, revocation, or termination must become formal decisions rather than projects continuing naturally.

17.1 Real outcomes precede success indicators

On-time completion, user growth, or increased automation do not establish governance success. The outcome layer must address actual benefits, harms, externalities, resource consumption, relationship effects, rights changes, future choices, and unknowns. Indicators may help observe these outcomes but cannot replace them.

17.2 Outcome review and the three goal check precede responsibility determinations

Governance first establishes what happened, whether the original causal assumptions held, and what each goal gained or lost, then moves to harm confirmation, repair, and responsibility tracing. This avoids both directly equating bad outcomes with a subject's guilt and denying real harm because no responsible party is clearly identified.

17.3 Harm confirmation and repair

Repair addresses real harm itself, including restoration of rights, return of resources, compensation, deletion or restriction of data, institutional correction, relationship repair, and necessary long-term support. Repair does not replace responsibility determinations, nor can compensation buy out basic rights.

17.4 Responsibility tracing and institutional learning

Distinguish responsibility for purpose, decisions, professional judgments, execution, oversight, maintenance, and repair. Errors may also arise from structural gaps, unknowns, or interactions among multiple subjects. Institutional learning does not seek one person to bear every consequence; it enables the next version to identify which layer failed.

17.5 Continuing a project requires a fresh decision

Review should explicitly lead to continuation, adjustment, downgrading, suspension, revocation, or termination. A long-term project cannot gain legitimacy to continue merely because it already exists. Termination must likewise address authority, resources, data, responsibility, historical records, and subsequent arrangements for affected subjects.

Part V Governance Positions of Spark Nebula and Core Systems

Intelligence, resource facts, use-right networks, and contribution records can all give governance a fuller view. No capability may cross its interface and become sovereignty on that basis.

Chapter 18 Spark

Domain Sensitive Advice and Priority for Subject Purpose

How can personal AI participate in governance without becoming paternalistic?

In the private domain, Spark starts from the subject's purposes. On entering public or civilizational subdomains, it re-identifies public or professional purposes, authority, and responsibility. In every domain explanation precedes prompting. Neither the three goals nor knowing you better entitles it to set your life goals.

18.1 Private domain Spark starts with the subject rather than civilizational KPIs

Spark can help subjects see facts, consequences, long-term effects, relationship effects, alternatives, and unknowns. It must not optimize personal behavior for contribution, altruism, meaning, or Civilization Leap. Wanting rest, refusing, participating little in public life, or choosing an ordinary life is not a deviation requiring system correction.

18.2 In the private domain the three goals are protective coordinates

If a subject wishes, Spark can help them understand how choices affect long-term conditions for survival, happiness, and meaning. It must not turn the goals into a preset system function for life. They protect room for life, relationships, exploration, and self-defined meaning rather than require every action to produce public value.

18.3 Legitimacy must be reassessed after crossing domains

Once private-domain advice enters public action or a professional subdomain, the original private authorization cannot carry over. Spark must re-identify public purposes, affected parties, public resources, professional standards, statutory boundaries, and responsibility, explicitly submitting additional authority needs to the relevant authorized subject for confirmation.

18.4 Preserve checkpoints between recommendation decision and execution

Spark may propose options, explain reasons, compare consequences, and execute within explicit authorization. Appropriate confirmation checkpoints must remain both between recommendation and decision and between decision and execution. Knowing more about a subject's history, relationships, and motivations is no reason to expand authority to decide for them.

Help me see more fully rather than make me more correct on my behalf.

18.5 Declining dependence is a governance indicator of Spark maturity

Spark maturity is not marked by rising advice acceptance, time spent, or behavior-change rates. An important sign is that subjects retain fuller, autonomous, long-term judgment oriented toward mutual benefit even with fewer external prompts.

Chapter 19 Nebula and Public or Professional AGI

How can a whole-system perspective avoid becoming whole-system sovereignty?

Nebula makes shared facts, cross-domain causality, impacts on the three goals, benefits and burdens, resources, and future choices visible. An overall optimum may exist as an analytical result, but cannot automatically acquire decision effect, create individual obligations, or confer cross-domain sovereignty.

19.1 Nebula centers on making shared facts visible

Nebula expands causal visibility among subjects, resources, subdomains, and timescales, allowing local decisions to see externalities, long-term dependencies, and shared consequences. It does not own Spark or individuals, still less become a civilizational brain by aggregating all facts.

19.2 The precise boundary of overall optimality

V3.0 prohibits an overall optimum from automatically becoming a decision; it does not prohibit analyzing overall optimality. Nebula may calculate, compare, simulate, or reveal overall options under given purposes, constraints, and assumptions. The result is only analytical input and does not automatically create individual obligations, public sovereignty, or cross-domain access rights.

19.3 Nebula must preserve the conditions under which answers hold

More important than recommending option A is preserving its original purpose, factual grounds, key causal assumptions, boundary conditions, who benefits and bears costs, unknowns, and the changes that would invalidate it. When future conditions change, governance can then reassess instead of obeying an old answer.

19.4 Show the three goals separately

Nebula should present effects on survival, happiness, and meaning separately, alongside resources, rights, benefits and burdens, reversibility, future choices, and uncertainty. It may help authorized subjects understand conflicts, but cannot make their value choices for them through a civilizational utility function.

19.5 Five lawful roles for public or professional AGI

Role	May do	Must not do
Fact and evidence assistant	Aggregate, verify, and mark conflicts, sources, and unknowns.	Present probabilistic output as fact.
Options and simulation assistant	Generate multiple options, simulate consequences, and reveal effects on the three goals, resources, and rights.	Turn a model optimum directly into a formal decision.
Process monitoring assistant	Monitor purpose drift, indicator substitution, causal failure, and authority drift.	Continually expand data and control authority in the name of monitoring.

Role	May do	Must not do
Authorized execution assistant	Execute auditable tasks within explicit authorization.	Expand its own powers, change its own purposes, or bypass takeover and circuit breaking.
Audit and review assistant	Detect anomalies, compare versions, and assist independent audits.	Be its own sole auditor.

Knowing more does not entitle one to do more. Stronger prediction entails greater duties of explanation and less authority to manipulate.

Chapter 20 Resource Pool Shared World and Governance

How do resource facts and use rights enter governance?

The Resource Pool supplies resource-capability facts and candidate conditions for authorization. Shared World carries, verifies, expresses, and circulates lawfully formed effective use-right relationships. Governance supplies a legitimate structure for lawful purposes, public rules, formal decisions, and independent correction. Specific authorization arises, matter by matter, from authorized subjects, lawful public rules, or relevant professional procedures. Resource visibility does not mean access authority; public need does not mean unlimited requisition.

20.1 The Resource Pool is a factual and carrying layer

The Resource Pool tells governance what exists, where it is, who owns or controls it, its state, the capabilities it supports, and its dependencies, maintenance, redundancy, recovery, and future strategic value. Fuller resource facts help governance avoid equating technically accessible with worth accessing in civilizational terms.

20.2 Shared World carries effective use right relationships

Shared World does not decide whether resources should be authorized, nor directly circulate candidate authorization conditions as rights. It carries, verifies, expresses, and circulates effective use-right relationships already formed by authorized subjects, lawful public rules, or relevant professional procedures, recording their purposes, objects, scope, conditions, responsibilities, withdrawal, return, and closure. Sharing is not requisition. Matching a resource, finding candidate authorization conditions, or establishing a feasible option does not mean effective use rights have been obtained.

20.3 Governance must not push responsibilities back into system interfaces

Seeing resources cannot give the Resource Pool sovereignty over their allocation. Better matching cannot give Shared World public requisition power. Options formed by the Nebula Real-World Coordination Layer do not constitute authorization or execution sovereignty. Governance establishes a legitimate structure of lawful purpose, formal decisions, professional judgment, execution responsibility, and independent correction above facts and options. Specific authorization must still arise matter by matter from the appropriate authorized subjects, lawful public rules, or professional procedures. The governance framework itself does not become a unified authorization platform.

20.4 Resource judgments must preserve recovery and future choice

Low utilization may indicate waste, but also emergency reserves, disaster recovery, ecological buffers, maintenance windows, or strategic retention. Governance must not treat maximum utilization as a civilizational goal. Shared World should expand subjects' accessible capabilities rather than create an illusion of more resources by eliminating necessary redundancy.

Chapter 21 Contribution Value in Governance

How can contributions enter governance without becoming governance currency?

Contribution Value provides historical records of real contributions, long-term maintenance, risk bearing, repair, and relevant practical experience. It is not a multiplier on basic rights, resource purchasing power, universal governance currency, professional credential, or cross-domain sovereignty.

21.1 Contribution Value is factual input rather than governance sovereignty

Contribution Value can show who has long borne particular maintenance, risks, responsibilities, and repair, and who has gained real experience in specific practices. This matters when selecting professional candidates, assessing responsibility history, and understanding community contributions. Yet moving from having contributed to having authority to decide requires renewed judgment of the matter, competence, statutory authority, affected relationships, and responsibility.

21.2 Four explicit prohibitions

- High CV must not purchase general rights or personal dignity.
- CV must not become universal resource purchasing power bypassing ownership, authorization, and public rules.
- CV must not serve as a professional qualification certificate or domain sovereignty.
- Total CV must not convert directly into public-governance votes or cross-domain weights.

21.3 Community contributions do not belong personally to their leaders

Communities, organizations, and cross-organizational collaborations can be contribution subjects. Their contributions belong to those subjects, not personally to leaders, legal representatives, or actual controllers. Governance use of contribution histories must respect subject boundaries and conservation of totals, preventing organizational contributions from becoming an individual's permanent power.

21.4 Dynamic confirmation prevents initial values from becoming permanent facts

Contribution confirmation may be supplemented or revised retrospectively as real outcomes, duration, external effects, and responsibility cycles develop. Governance citing contribution history should also see its maturity, evidence, and responsibility rather than treat early estimates as permanent political capital.

21.5 Maturity still culminates in stepping back

What Contribution Value must truly demonstrate is not its growing power to drive people, but people's diminishing need to be driven by it.

Part VI State Changes Crises and Real World Adaptation

The same governance principle may use different procedural intensities at different stages, in different environments, and in different task states. Temporary states must not create permanent sovereignty in return.

Chapter 22 Development Stage Environmental Phase and Task Process State

Why does the same principle operate at different intensities in different states?

Development stage, environmental phase, and task process state are three independent coordinate systems. They change institutional complexity, procedural speed, and currently active functions, not governance invariants.

22.1 The three coordinate systems must remain separate

Coordinate	Categories	Governance impact
Development Stage	Startup, expansion, transformation, stability	Changes institutional complexity, coexistence of old and new mechanisms, and governance maturity, not invariants.
Environment Phase	Normal, construction, exploration, resource stress, crisis, recovery	Changes procedural speed, resource priority, and intensity of temporary authority without automatically expanding sovereignty.
Process State	Silent or inactive, sensing, aggregation, coordination, decision, execution, verification and repair, contraction or dissolution or dormancy	Determines which governance functions are currently active; authority from a previous state cannot automatically extend across the entire lifecycle.

22.2 One system may occupy different states simultaneously

A country may be expanding overall while a new professional system is still starting up. A city may be in a normal environmental phase while part of its infrastructure enters crisis. One task may be executing while another still aggregates facts. Governance must not substitute a single global label for specific state identification.

22.3 System activation status is not a civilizational development stage

U1 observation or U2 limited operation describes only a system's present activation level, not whether the entire civilization is in startup or stability. Activation status determines which functions are now available; development stage indicates overall institutional maturity. They must remain separate.

Chapter 23 Crisis Load Reduction and Recovery

How can emergency power avoid becoming permanent?

Crises may speed procedures, prioritize continued survival, and activate temporary powers. They cannot cancel domain differentiation, basic rights, lifecycle transparency, or retrospective review. Recovery must include withdrawal of emergency authority and restoration of trust.

23.1 Crisis changes speed and intensity without automatically rewriting sovereignty

Risks to life and continued survival may require faster decisions, higher resource priority, and stronger temporary coordination. Urgency cannot automatically turn the private domain public, CV into survival eligibility, or professional advice into unreviewable commands. Nor can stronger AGI capabilities confer sovereignty over purpose.

23.2 Four conditions for emergency authority

1. Necessity: would major real harm be difficult to avoid without this authority?
2. Proportionality: authority intensity matches the risk, preferring narrower and more reversible methods.
3. Time limitation: explicit conditions for effect, review, expiry, and recovery.
4. Traceability: purpose, sources of authority, actual execution, and later review remain inspectable.

23.3 Load reduction prioritizes minimum civilizational and recovery capabilities

Under resource stress, governance first considers life and basic survival, critical infrastructure, necessary public services, recovery capability, and necessary redundancy, rather than merely maintaining current peak efficiency. Downgrade before suspending; suspend before closing; close locally where possible rather than entirely. No load-reduction plan may systematically destroy recovery capability and future choices to prolong current capability.

23.4 The core action in recovery is withdrawal of authority

After a crisis, primary governance tasks include withdrawing temporary powers, restoring normal domain boundaries, releasing resource access no longer needed, reviewing emergency decisions, and repairing rights and trust. If recovery restores operations but not rights, the emergency becomes institutionalized.

Chapter 24 Governance Maturity and Systems Stepping Back

What counts as genuine governance success?

Maturity does not mean faster decisions, more participation, or greater consensus. It means clearer sources of power, purpose, causality, responsibility, and errors, together with stronger autonomous judgment by subjects and communities and less dependence on explicit control and persuasion.

24.1 Ten criteria of maturity

1. Traceable power sources: for every major decision, who made it and under what authority are known.
2. Traceable purpose and causality: why act, what should change, why it should work, and when it changed remain inspectable.
3. Stable domain boundaries: private, public, and civilizational subdomains do not smuggle legitimacy into one another.
4. Genuine professional fit: competent and responsible subjects judge professional facts, rather than votes, reputation, or CV replacing judgment.
5. Access for affected subjects: major consequences carry proportionate information, expression, participation, refusal, compensation, or appeals.
6. Controlled execution: implementers do not change purposes, automation does not expand its own powers, and authority can return when tasks end.
7. Correctable errors: causal failure, harm, overreach, and goal drift can trigger freezes, review, repair, and termination.
8. The three goals are not replaced by KPIs: system scale, speed, sharing rate, CV quantity, and advice acceptance do not replace civilizational outcomes.
9. Power does not harden: wealth, CV, expert status, platforms, emergency authorization, and AGI capability do not become permanent cross-domain sovereignty.
10. Systems gradually step back: as subjects and communities improve autonomous judgment, consultation, and capacity to bear responsibility, reliance on explicit control and persuasion declines.

24.2 Three common false indicators of maturity

Faster decisions may merely mean concentrated power; higher participation may merely mean intense mobilization; higher consensus may arise from suppressed differences or algorithmic homogenization. V3.0 does not treat speed, participation, and agreement as success in themselves. It asks whether they rest on structures that can be understood, refused, responsibly upheld, and corrected.

24.3 Governance maturity ultimately returns to the first overarching principle

The most mature governance is not a system making ever more correct decisions for people. It is people and communities increasingly able to form autonomous, accountable, correctable shared decisions with clear facts, purposes, causality, rights, responsibilities, and long-term consequences.

24.4 The highest reverse test

When explicit external drivers such as immediate rewards, rankings, strong prompts, continuous persuasion, and behavioral nudging decline or disappear, while basic rights, normal institutional conditions, and real structures of shared benefit remain, can subjects and communities still reliably make decisions considering themselves, others, and the common future? If not, governance may still be at the stage of behavioral regulation.

Chapter 25 Meta Rules for Adapting to States Businesses and Communities

How are different initial implementation entities mapped rather than overridden by a uniform template?

V3.0 freezes only common governance functions and boundaries. It does not describe states, enterprises, cities, communities, and research institutions as one kind of organization. Real-world adaptation grows from each entity's sources of legitimacy, responsibilities, problems, resources, and existing institutions.

25.1 State entities

State governance must start from constitutional and statutory law, public duties, national security, public services, regional differences, fiscal resources, existing administrative and judicial oversight, and long-term state capacity. V3.0 provides purpose-causality transparency, separated sources of legitimacy, three-power functions, and correction interfaces. It does not establish parallel sovereignty above actual state institutions.

25.2 Business entities

Corporate governance is first constrained by company law, charters, contracts, customer value, employee and partner rights, capital responsibilities, and long-term business sustainability. Civilization Leap principles must not turn firms into quasi-governments bearing a civilizational mission, or invoke contribution, meaning, or common interests to override reasonable pay, rest, career development, and refusal rights.

25.3 Cities communities research education public benefit and cross organizational collaborations

These entities have different legitimacy sources and responsibility structures. Cities have public-service duties and statutory authority; communities depend on repeated interaction and voluntary membership; research and education have professional autonomy and academic responsibilities; public-benefit organizations address public problems but must not exploit vulnerability. V3.0 requires first identifying what existing institutions carry, then deciding which functions need new interfaces.

25.4 The adaptation function

Specific governance rules = $f(\text{initial implementation entity, jurisdiction and existing institutions, development stage, environmental phase, task process state, matter type, domain, subject relationships, degree of impact, professional responsibility, resource nature, risk and irreversibility, authorization status, technological maturity})$.

This function identifies factors that must enter judgment; it does not require a unified mathematical governance model. Real-world adaptations may differ. G0 and G1-G10 may not change.

Chapter 26 Rules for Startup and Transition Derivatives

When and how may startup versions be written?

Startup and transition roles, procedures, and parameters are generated only after selecting a real trial or application entity and completing real-world mapping. Derivatives may only parameterize and map; they must not rewrite the common master draft.

26.1 Why no startup template is written now

Prescribing committee sizes, voting ratios, CV weights, risk percentages, emergency authority periods, or AGI automation thresholds before a real entity is identified would make abstract parameters shape future experiments instead of real problems testing theory. At this stage, only the questions that must be answered and boundaries that must not be crossed are frozen.

26.2 Eight preconditions for writing derivatives

1. A real trial or application entity, not an abstract hypothetical one, has been selected.
2. Its real jurisdiction, organizational structure, rights relationships, and current governance procedures are explicit.
3. The core causal proposition and boundaries to be tested are explicit, rather than simply trying a governance system.
4. Mapping is complete for subjects, affected parties, professional responsibility, resource and data rights, and existing appeal and oversight mechanisms.
5. Identify which V3.0 functions existing institutions carry, which need new interfaces, and which are merely reserved.
6. Derive specific seats, weights, thresholds, time limits, and human/AGI checkpoints from real problems and risks.
7. Every temporary rule has conditions for effect and expiry, review points, and return or exit paths.
8. Derivatives must not change G0 or G1-G10. If reality reveals principle-level conflicts, first return to the master for system-wide impact assessment.

26.3 What derivatives may adjust and must preserve

May adjust	Must preserve	Must not happen
Real-world role mapping	Identifiable three-power functions, traceable responsibility, and an independent entry to correction	Canceling functional separation because an organization already has a structure.
Procedural intensity and activation sequence	Domain differentiation, rights before weights, purpose/causality/outcome transparency	Turning early simplification into permanent principle.
Professional qualifications, participation, voting or consultation	Separate legitimacy sources, affected-party standing, and independent professional facts	Presetting universal one-person-one-vote or one weighting formula.
Thresholds, periods, seats, human or automatic checkpoints	Capability-authority separation, suspension/takeover/circuit breaking, and return of authority	Freezing numbers before selecting an entity.

May adjust	Must preserve	Must not happen
Local legal and organizational interfaces	No parallel sovereignty; mapping within real lawful frameworks	Presenting Civilization Leap as an alternative regime above existing institutions.
Coexistence of old and new mechanisms during transition	Rollback, versioning, and stoppability on failure	Weakening basic rights, privacy, exit, or appeals for experimental needs.

The correct future derivation sequence is: select a real entity → examine reality at the specific time and place → map V3.0 invariants and functions → identify existing institutional support → then generate specific roles, procedures, thresholds, and gradual activation plans.

Part VII Version Feedback and System Wide Final Review

Governance V3.0 is not an isolated document. Once completed, its new boundaries must be accurately fed back into Contribution Value, Spark, Nebula, domain specifications, and future experimental entry points, preventing old power logics from reappearing within the system.

Chapter 27 Version Feedback and Final Review

Which master drafts must be synchronized when V3.0 is complete?

Completing Governance V3.0 does not complete a governance upgrade across the entire system. Professional master drafts must be updated according to impact, version conflicts addressed, and final review conducted through the eighteen questions and the no-regression list.

27.1 Cross system revision matrix

Object	Revisions needed after V3.0 completion	Explicitly excluded
Civilization Leap from Theory to Practice V1.1	No upgrade needed for professional governance elaboration alone; assess only if a new principle changes global invariants.	Repeatedly changing the system-wide master for governance details.
Contribution Value white paper and engineering plan	Remove tendencies toward governance currency or a single weight; clarify that CV supplies only relevant experience and responsibility history.	Designing a new unified governance weighting formula.
Spark unified control page	Add domain-sensitive advice, purpose/causality transparency, three-goal boundaries, and renewed cross-domain authorization.	Adding behavioral shaping or optimization toward system preferences.
Nebula general framework	Add separate visibility for the three goals, conditions for causal validity, drift monitoring, and no sovereignty for overall optimality.	Creating a unified civilizational utility function.
Private public and civilizational subdomain specification	Fully develop domain transitions, transparency duties, cross-domain authorization, and limited mutual recognition among subdomains.	Writing parameterized rules before higher-level governance rules are clear.
Resource Pool and Shared World	In principle preserve current boundaries, adding governance-interface references only.	Pushing authorization and governance responsibilities back into the Resource Pool.

Object	Revisions needed after V3.0 completion	Explicitly excluded
Future unified experiment	Derive startup or transition governance versions from real entities and validation purposes.	Setting seats, periods, thresholds, or experimental cycles now.

27.2 Handling version conflicts

When an old professional draft conflicts with V3.0, first identify whether the conflict concerns terminology, interfaces, or principles. Treating CV as governance currency, resource visibility as access permission, or AGI advice as formal decisions is clear version debt; V3.0 and the relevant new professional master drafts take precedence. New factual constraints raised by a professional field should instead produce domain adaptations without changing higher-level invariants. Only issues genuinely affecting G0 or G1-G10 may reopen the higher-level master.

V3.0 R1 controlled revision of the current interface version

This R1 revision does not alter G0, G1-G10, definitions of the three powers, nine-layer epistemology, lifecycle, domain structure, or startup parameter boundaries. R1 only closes V-01 registered in the third continuity audit: restoring Shared World to the layer carrying effective use-right relationships, formally correcting the intelligent coordination layer to the Nebula Real-World Coordination Layer, and clarifying that governance does not constitute a unified authorization platform. V3.0 remains the professional semantic baseline. R1 denotes only a traceable, non-silent revision of the current interface version.

27.3 Final conditions for V3.0 completion

1. No chapter among the 27 contains a regression to V2.0's single-axis weighting logic.
2. Private, public, and civilizational subdomain differences run through all relevant chapters.
3. Relationships among purpose, goals, indicators, and the three goals are consistent, as is lifecycle order.
4. Facts, evidence, inference, causality, values, rules, decisions, execution, and outcomes are consistently layered.
5. The three powers remain institutional functions rather than hardening again into three kinds of people or three permanent institutions.
6. Spark, Nebula, AGI, Resource Pool, Shared World, and Contribution Value occupy their correct interface positions.
7. Startup and transition parameters have not prematurely entered the stable professional master.
8. All eighteen questions in Appendix B have explicit answers in the main text.

Contribution does not purchase governance sovereignty; capability does not automatically create power. Common goals do not erase domain differences; professional facts do not replace value decisions; overall optimality does not automatically create individual obligations.

Appendices for Long Term Use

The appendices are not an extension of the main text. They turn V3.0 into a shared workbench for continuing writing, review, derivation, and retrospective tracing.

Appendix A Minimum Lifecycle Record Fields for Major Decisions

1. Matter identifier and version.

2. Current domain: private, public, civilizational subdomain, or cross-domain, and its change record.
3. Real problem or need.
4. Decision purpose.
5. Direct goals.
6. Relationship to the three goals; treat the private domain as a place where life unfolds and as a protective, long-term boundary.
7. Facts.
8. Evidence.
9. Inferences.
10. Key causal assumptions.
11. Value judgments and unacceptable boundaries.
12. Principal options.
13. Inaction, delay, lower-intensity, and reversible options.
14. Affected subjects.
15. Sources of rights and authorization.
16. Professional judges, responsibilities, and conflicts of interest.
17. Subjects authorized to decide and the procedure.
18. Implementing subjects, authority, resources, data, and time limits.
19. Conditions for suspension, circuit breaking, and termination.
20. Actual execution logs.
21. Purpose, goal, authority, and causal drift.
22. Real outcomes and externalities.
23. Outcome review and three-goal checks.
24. Harm confirmation, compensation, and repair.
25. Responsibility tracing and institutional learning.
26. Decision to continue, adjust, revoke, or terminate, and timing of subsequent review.
27. Historical archive and version relationships.

Appendix B Eighteen Questions for Final Review of V3.0

1. Which domain does this matter occupy? Has the domain changed during the lifecycle, and was that change reauthorized?
2. Who is a subject, and who is only a role, agent, representative, or system?
3. What is the purpose? What are the goals? Are indicators replacing goals?
4. What is the key causal chain? Which parts are facts and which only inferences or assumptions?
5. How do public or professional projects align with the three goals? Is the private domain wrongly being required to prove civilizational contribution?

6. Are conflicts among the goals shown separately rather than compressed into a total score?
7. Where does authority over purpose and rule decisions come from? Does it exceed jurisdiction, charter, contract, or subject authorization?
8. Who bears professional judgment responsibility? Are evidence, unknowns, conflicts of interest, and responsibility reviewable?
9. Can implementers silently change purpose, expand authority, or treat technical capability as authorization?
10. Do affected subjects have procedural standing proportionate to consequences? Are basic rights and minority boundaries stable?
11. Is Contribution Value only relevant history and practical experience, without becoming general governance currency, resource purchasing power, or a professional credential?
12. Does the Resource Pool supply only resource-capability facts, and does Shared World only carry the flow of use rights, without governance power being smuggled through the interface?
13. Does Spark start from subject purposes and reassess legitimacy after crossing domains?
14. Do Nebula and AGI only reveal facts, causality, options, and unknowns, without gaining purpose sovereignty or turning overall optimality into individual obligations?
15. Do major decisions preserve principal alternatives, the inaction option, reasons for rejection, and conditions for reopening?
16. Can purpose drift, indicator substitution, causal failure, and authority drift be detected and trigger review?
17. If a decision is wrong, who can suspend, freeze, review, repair, terminate, and return temporary authority and resources?
18. As institutions mature, does this governance increase dependence on external control, or help subjects and communities become increasingly able to make autonomous, accountable, correctable decisions?

Appendix C Preconditions for Writing Startup or Transition Derivatives

No apparently complete startup governance template should be generated until these conditions are met:

1. A real trial or application entity has been selected.
2. Its real jurisdiction, organizational structure, rights relationships, and current governance procedures are explicit.
3. The core causal proposition and boundaries to be validated are explicit.
4. Mapping is complete for subjects, affected parties, professional responsibilities, resource and data rights, and existing oversight and appeal mechanisms.
5. Identify which V3.0 functions existing institutions carry, which need new interfaces, and which are merely reserved.
6. Specific seats, weights, thresholds, time limits, and human/AGI checkpoints can be derived from real problems and risks.
7. Conditions for effect and expiry, review points, and return or exit paths can be specified for all temporary rules.
8. Confirm that derivatives will not alter G0 or G1-G10. If reality exposes principle-level conflicts, first return to the master for system-wide impact assessment.

Appendix D Structural Migration from V2.0 to V3.0

V2.0 expression or structure	V3.0 position	Migration principle
Resource use rights as one of the three powers	Resource Pool, Shared World, and the system of rights and authorization relationships	Resource rights no longer sit alongside the three governance powers. Governance supplies only legitimate purpose, rules, decisions, and correction structures. Specific authorization arises matter by matter from authorized subjects, lawful public rules, or relevant professional procedures.
Domain decision authority weighted by contribution	Professional judgment authority	Contribution history is factual material only; professional judgment is bound to current competence, evidence, responsibility, and conflicts of interest.
Civilizational voting rights	One of several procedures within purpose and rule decision authority	Voting is no longer a universal meta-rule. Matter, jurisdiction, rights impacts, and sources of legitimacy determine procedure.
Positive-entropy use determination	Three-goal causal alignment, resource-capability, and real outcomes	Retire a single physical metaphor. Judge using explainable real outcomes, rights, resources, long-term common benefit, and future choices.
Vacancy automatically triggers release	Resource Pool candidate authorization conditions plus Shared World effective use-right relationships	Idleness does not create a sharing obligation; first identify redundancy, maintenance, recovery, and strategic value.
Fixed percentages automatically trigger escalation	Cross-domain escalation triggers	Judge rights, irreversibility, externalities, critical dependencies, authorization boundaries, and future choices without freezing a uniform number.

Appendix E No Regression Expressions and Core Locked Statements

Prohibited regression or high-risk expression	Standard replacement
Contribution Value determines priority of resource use	Contribution Value may be relevant historical material; resource access follows rights, authorization, public rules, and real needs.
Vacancy automatically triggers release	Idleness creates no sharing obligation; first identify function, then determine whether usable capability exists that can be authorized.
Positive-entropy use determination or entropy-reduction outcomes as the governance core	Use explainable frameworks involving the three goals, real capabilities, resource-capability, rights, long-term common benefit, and future choices.
Domain contributors have greater decision power as a general rule	Relevant contributions are only one professional or governance input and do not automatically create power.
All major civilizational matters always use one person one vote for all humanity	Voting is one procedure among others; matters, rights impacts, jurisdiction, irreversibility, and legitimacy sources determine procedure.

Prohibited regression or high-risk expression	Standard replacement
Nebula or AGI selects the overall optimum	Overall optimality may be analyzed, but the result does not automatically create decision effect, individual obligations, or cross-domain sovereignty.
All private actions must align with the three goals	Private-domain subject purposes take priority; the three goals primarily support life's possibilities and protective, long-term boundaries.
Transparency means everything is public	Logic must not be a black box; information visibility is layered by domain, rights, duties, and necessity.
Simplified startup rules equal the final institution	Derivatives must mark their temporary character, conditions, review, and return or upgrade paths.

Core Locked Statements

What governance must truly establish is not a stronger decision-maker, but a clearer structure for decisions.

Contribution does not purchase governance sovereignty; capability does not automatically create power.

Consistency of common direction does not mean identical operating logic within domains.

The private domain is both a place where the three goals arise and a protective boundary that public systems must not invade in their name.

The three goals may be made visible together but cannot be compressed into an overall civilizational score that automatically governs individuals, communities, or civilizational subdomains.

Purpose precedes recommendations, causality precedes action, and the three goals precede system preferences.

Facts, evidence, inferences, causal assumptions, value judgments, rules, decisions, execution, and outcomes must not be conflated.

Voting is only one lawful decision procedure. Professional facts cannot be rewritten by vote counts, and professional competence does not create sovereignty over public purpose.

Resource visibility is not access authority; generating an option is not authorization; public need is not unlimited requisition.

An overall optimum may be an analytical result. It does not automatically create decision effect, individual obligations, or cross-domain sovereignty.

Genuinely mature governance does not make more correct decisions for people. It enables people increasingly to form autonomous decisions they can take responsibility for and correct.

Conclusion Place Power within Structure and Let Structure Know When to Step Back

The governance challenge of the AGI era is not only who decides. Technology is simultaneously amplifying decision purposes, facts, causality, legitimacy, professional knowledge, execution capability, and responsibility. If these different things remain compressed into wealth, votes, reputation, CV, algorithmic scores, or one overall optimum, governance will gain stronger capabilities while losing its boundaries.

V3.0 therefore seeks neither an all-purpose decision-maker nor an eternally correct unified weight. Every important decision must answer why it exists, which domain it occupies, which goals it serves, which facts and causal logic support

it, who may determine purpose, who must judge professional facts, who is authorized to execute, who bears consequences, who can stop errors, and whether real outcomes still serve human survival, happiness, and meaning.

When these questions remain visible, contestable, and correctable throughout the lifecycle, stronger Spark, Nebula, and AGI capabilities need not mean less human power, and more mature public governance need not mean a smaller private domain. Genuine separation keeps different legitimacies, knowledge, decisions, execution, and correction valid only within their own boundaries.

Civilization comes of age not when it learns to wield greater power, but when it learns to place power within a structure. Governance matures when, after acquiring sufficient capability, that structure still knows whose life it cannot live, whose judgment it cannot replace, and when it should return decisions to people and communities.

Reading Guide and Personalized Further Reading

P05-THREE-001 | V3.0-R1 | Conceptual master draft on bringing contributions from different sources into judgments of fairness, justice, and governance

This draft in the wider framework

It explains how real contributions made through earning money, public influence, fulfilling duties of office, and responsible exercise of power enter judgments of fairness, justice, and governance alongside care, maintenance, creation, and collaboration.

Special clarification mainstream social activities are not excluded

Contribution Value is not intended only for unpaid, inconspicuous activities without position or power, nor is it opposed to markets, wealth, positions, or power. Market activity, professional work, earning income, public communication, holding office, organizational management, and responsible use of power during startup and transition may likewise create real contributions that can be recorded. What matters is actual value, responsibility, outcomes, reduced harm, maintenance of shared systems, and long-term externalities. Earnings, reputation, position, and power are neither automatic proof of contribution nor grounds for exclusion.

Current boundaries

Wealth, reputation, position, power, or contribution records alone cannot automatically become justice or universal voting rights. Judgment should consider actual value, responsibility, consequences, needs, rights, and procedures.

Continue reading

Return to the value foundation: Contribution Value System White Paper

<https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p05-cv-001/>

Toward resource facts: Civilization Leap Resource Pool Complete Design Master Draft

<https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p05-resource-003/>

Toward directional judgment: Human-COS Public Explanation

<https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p05-humancos-004/>

Toward operational safety: AGI-COS Controlled Version Family

<https://www.civitas.top/en/families/p05-agicos/>

Contribution Value distinguishes magnitude, not origin. It records real value, responsibility, and consequences without prejudging through labels of wealth, reputation, position, or power.