

Proposal for a National-Level Comprehensive Civilization Leap Experimental Zone in the AGI Era

A complete proposal for a national-level city-scale civilizational-high-ground experiment with reduced geographical scope and no reduction in systemic dimensions

v0.8 | Decision-completeness and proposal-stage realignment edition

Author: Zijun Fu

Produced by: Civilization Leap Research Group

July 2026

Core positioning: National authorization | City-level carrying capacity | Reduced scope without reduced dimensions | Complete-system validation | Formation of a civilizational high ground

Meta-goals: Freedom from survival insecurity | Happiness in life | Greater meaning in life

Public reading guide

P06-EXPERIMENT-001 | V0.8 | Current policy master manuscript | T2 policy research proposal

Current request

Enter national-level agenda recognition, interdisciplinary research, candidate-area baseline surveys, and preparations for limited validation. This is not immediate implementation and does not mean that any city has become an experimental zone.

Real-world effect

This manuscript is proposed by Civilization Leap Research Group. It does not establish that any state, government department, research institution, or funding entity has adopted it, approved a project, allocated funds, selected a site, or begun work.

Version relationships

V0.8 is the current policy master manuscript; V0.7, V0.6, and V0.5 serve only version tracing. E001-V0.2 covers validation methods and must be used within V0.8's four-level decision framework, rights boundaries, and phase boundaries.

Inviolable boundaries

- Basic rights are not earned through contribution; contribution does not create an overall personality score or general political power.
- Specific engineering must be refined again once real actors, jurisdictions, budgets, resources, responsibility chains, and affected people are identified.
- Records of failure, exit, minority opinions, rights violations, and stopping must be retained.

Continue into

[Read the short research entry P06-EXPERIMENT-003 first](#)

[View the specialist validation layer P06-EXPERIMENT-002](#)

[View the national-level comprehensive experimental-zone family](#)

[Civilization Leap Research Group | www.civitas.top](#)

Version note

This is complete proposal v0.8 for the stage in which theory enters national-level research, deliberation, and experimental preparation. It is the decision-completeness and proposal-stage realignment edition. It is not an implementation plan following authorization, nor does it ask the state to approve a finalized new social system in one step. It first asks for recognition of a question: does the AGI era require complete national-level, city-scale research and validation of civilization's underlying operating logic, with reduced geographical scope but no reduction in systemic dimensions?

Compared with v0.7, this edition does not weaken Civilization Leap's goals, judgments, or institutional sharpness. It recalibrates the relationship between the main text and attachments: even decision-makers reading only the main text should understand why research is necessary, what is to be validated, why city scale is required, which rights boundaries are inviolable, why different groups might enter, how failure can be stopped, and exactly what decision is requested now.

This edition brings phase-design discipline, incentive sources for seven groups, the personnel and individual-resource pool, the national-capability path of intelligence oriented toward good, international credibility of the civilizational high ground, and the chain of political initiation and institutional support into the main text. Specialist protocols, data fields, detailed models, access controls, rollback manuals, and audience-specific access strategies remain internal research reserves and are not prerequisites for understanding this proposal.

Version principle: The main text must be decision-complete. Attachments undertake specialist validation and implementation elaboration only after formal project approval.

The present request is for four progressively escalating decisions rather than immediate implementation

1. Agree to place the national-level comprehensive Civilization Leap experiment in the AGI era on the national forward-looking research agenda and enter formal deliberation.
2. Agree to establish a national Civilization Leap research center, institute, or interdepartmental joint-research mechanism for dedicated legal, fiscal, technical, social, human-experience, and meaning research.
3. Agree to baseline surveys, assessment of resource and institutional conditions, public communication, and preliminary planning in several candidate cities, without immediately changing existing basic institutions.
4. Only after the research, reviews, and minimum closed-loop validation pass, decide whether to authorize a city-level comprehensive experiment.

Decision summary

1. Core judgment

AGI is changing productive capacity, national capacity, and the ways human value is recognized simultaneously. It can greatly improve social operating efficiency, but it can also amplify possession, monopoly, exclusion, control, and interstate confrontation beyond what civilization can bear. Growth, welfare, industrial upgrading, employment training, corporate philanthropy, or local technological governance alone cannot answer the fundamental question: when intelligence replaces large amounts of functional value, how can humanity continue to obtain security, happiness, and meaning?

The national comprehensive Civilization Leap experimental zone aims not to design a more complicated city, but to validate through real social operation whether a city's residents can enjoy greater freedom from survival insecurity, greater happiness, and more meaningful lives in the AGI era; whether resources can move from dormant possession into actual use; whether altruistic actions and results can become the principal route to incremental self-interested returns; whether power can be structurally separated; and whether AGI can amplify human capabilities rather than decide civilization's direction.

2. Why national level and city scale are necessary

National level is necessary because the experiment involves public services, resource use, data governance, AGI applications, contribution recognition, governance powers, fiscal capacity, and public rights. No single enterprise, community, or charity has complete authorization and responsibility capacity. City scale is necessary because what is being tested is not one algorithm, points mechanism, or public service, but the real coupling of resources, power, technology, human experience, and meaning in a complete society.

Scope is reduced to control risks; dimensions are preserved to retain society's real complexity.

3. What the experimental zone is not intended to do

- It does not immediately cancel or restructure lawful property rights. Startup primarily uses voluntary authorization, time-limited use, call-up interfaces, and revocable opening.
- It does not turn people into scores. Contribution values recognize facts of public value in specific domains; they do not judge personhood, determine basic survival rights, or convert into civilization voting rights.
- It does not let AI govern instead of people. AGI may only perceive, match, simulate, explain, and assist. It must not independently determine people's qualifications, rights, or civilization's direction.
- It does not require any group to suffer losses first. A scheme that can advance only by defeating, depriving, or subduing a group reproduces the old logic.
- It does not treat stable-phase visions as startup commands. Phases are triggered by causal outcomes, not automatically by calendars or administrative will.

4. Six systems to be validated in the experimental zone

System	Core question	Ultimate direction
Basic survival guarantees	Can basic survival move from humiliating, exclusionary relief to baseline allocation of civilization's benefits?	Freedom from survival insecurity
City resource pool	Can resources move from long-term idleness into actual use without changing ownership first?	Freedom from survival insecurity and happiness in life
Contribution values and governance credit	Can real contributions become visible and credibly connected to incremental resource opportunities?	The three meta-goals
Governance separating the three powers	Can contribution, expertise, and the public's fundamental rights each occupy their proper place, avoiding new power monopolies?	Governance without alienation
Intelligence oriented toward good	Can AI strengthen national, city, and individual capabilities while preserving final human review and data sovereignty?	Security, development, and continuity
Emergence of meaning and human experience	After technological progress, are people less lonely, more aware of their value, and better able to reach one another?	Greater meaning in life

5. The most necessary national decision now

The current task is not to approve a set of detailed rules, much less territory-wide institutional replacement. The most necessary decision is whether this proposition may enter national research and deliberation: the state would organize real legal, fiscal, technical, social, ethical, and governance capabilities for systematic simulation, baseline surveys, adversarial review, and limited validation.

Contents

Abstract

Chapter 1 Assessing the Era: Why National-Level Research and Experimentation Are Necessary

Chapter 2 Realigning the Proposal Stage: What Decision Is Requested of the State Now

Chapter 3 Overall Positioning: A Small Civilization Rather Than a Small Pilot

Chapter 4 The Three Meta-Goals and Core Validation Propositions

Chapter 5 Phase Discipline: Causal Progression, No Loss for Any Group, and No Antagonistic Deadlocks

Chapter 6 Why Seven Groups Might Enter

Chapter 7 Experimental-Zone Carrying Conditions and Site-Selection Criteria

Chapter 8 Overall Architecture: The Six Systems

Chapter 9 Core Institutional Mechanisms and Boundaries

Chapter 10 Intelligence Oriented Toward Good: Another Capability Path for National Security, Development, and Continuity

Chapter 11 Territory-Wide Accessibility, Usability, and Autonomous Movement of Personnel and Individual-Resource Pools

Chapter 12 Rights, Firewalls, and Public Commitments

Chapter 13 Technology, Data, Indicators, and Evidence

Chapter 14 Political Initiation, Institutional Support, and the Risk-Sharing Chain

Chapter 15 Domestic Authenticity and International Credibility of the Civilizational High Ground

Chapter 16 Stage Roadmap

Chapter 17 Risks, Misinterpretations, Stopping, and Rollback

Chapter 18 Organizational Structure and Near-Term Work

Conclusion: Let One City Grow into the Future First

Appendix 1 Selected foundational documents for the proposal stage

Appendix 2 Experimental-zone site-assessment table

Appendix 3 Phase and decision-gate summary

Appendix 4 Core validation table for the six systems

Appendix 5 Public commitments and prohibited practices

Abstract

This proposal calls for a National-Level Comprehensive Civilization Leap Experimental Zone in the AGI Era. Its fundamental purpose is not to build a more complicated city system, but to validate a fundamental proposition: in the AGI era, can residents of a city or region enjoy greater freedom from survival insecurity, greater happiness, and more meaningful lives?

AGI brings simultaneous changes to production, governance, national competition, and how human value is recognized, rather than upgrading only one industry. The old civilization has long recognized people's place through usefulness and organized resources through possession, competition, exclusion, and monopoly. When intelligent systems replace increasing amounts of functional labor and massively amplify old strategic logic, society may simultaneously face shocks

to employment and distribution, collapse of meaning, concentration of resources and technology, national-security dilemmas, and AI itself being captured by militarization and control.

Existing growth, welfare, ESG, philanthropy, digital governance, and local pilots all have value, but none can independently validate whether civilization's underlying operating logic can change. Changes to society's underlying logic must be tested by real people, real needs, real resources, real conflicts, and real time. The experiment therefore requires national authorization, city-level carrying capacity, reduced geographical scope without reduced systemic dimensions, and complete-system validation.

The proposal uses three meta-goals as the common measure of all institutions and technologies: freedom from survival insecurity, happiness in life, and greater meaning in life. Resource pools, contribution values, separation of the three powers, intelligence oriented toward good, personnel and individual-resource pools, and meaning-emergence systems are instruments for achieving and validating these meta-goals, not new ends in themselves.

This edition particularly clarifies the boundary between proposal and execution. Startup uses only invitational rules that are voluntary, provide tangible benefits, permit exit, and impose no losses on any group. Territory-wide resource coordination, property forms, or contribution operation that might emerge in the stable phase must not become startup obligations. Any path requiring a group to be defeated, deprived, or subdued first is an institutional-design failure.

The decision requested of the state now is permission for this proposition to enter national-level research, deliberation, and experimental preparation, not immediate implementation of every institutional conception. First establish national research and support mechanisms; conduct candidate-city baseline surveys, legal and fiscal research, technical and data validation, public communication, independent reviews, and minimum closed-loop experiments. Then decide whether to enter a city-level comprehensive experiment.

Chapter 1 Assessing the Era: Why National-Level Research and Experimentation Are Necessary

1. Value and limitations of existing mainstream paths

Mainstream responses to AGI include expanding the economy, extending social protection, promoting employment transitions, strengthening technology regulation, developing corporate philanthropy and ESG, and building digital government and smart cities. All are necessary, yet they leave one underlying question unresolved: when intelligent systems undertake production, cognition, and organization at scale, what will human society use to recognize people's value, organize resources, constrain new powers, and sustain long-term national and social stability?

"Growing the pie" cannot automatically prevent concentration of technological dividends or repair the disappearance of the feeling of being needed. Traditional welfare can buffer poverty but may continue to divide people into providers and recipients, failing to rebuild contribution and dignity. Corporate philanthropy and local points schemes can demonstrate workable mechanisms but cannot change the overall relationship among resources, power, and public services. Technology regulation can limit some risks but cannot alone answer which civilizational goals AI should serve.

The problem is not that existing tools have been used insufficiently. These tools have yet to form a new civilizational operating logic that jointly sustains survival, happiness, and meaning.

2. AGI changes how civilization recognizes people rather than one industry

Human beings have long established their place through functional usefulness: the ability to work, produce, calculate, manage, and execute makes them needed by organizations; being needed brings income, identity, dignity, and security. As AGI replaces more functional, cognitive, and organizational labor, the real challenge approaching humanity is not another round of unemployment, but the failure of the way value is recognized.

Civilization Leap does not ask humans to keep proving themselves on scales where machines excel. It reaffirms that human existence, relationships, responsibility, care, judgment, creativity, visions, and meaning generation are themselves irreplaceable foundations of civilization. AGI should amplify these capabilities rather than reduce human value to residual functions machines have not yet replaced.

3. AGI amplification of old strategic logic creates systemic risks

The traditional established order is driven largely by possession, competition, exclusion, monopoly, and winner-takes-all dynamics. This logic drove growth in the industrial era while producing persistent resource waste, social division, and national-security dilemmas. AGI will not automatically transcend it; initially, it amplifies the objectives of those who train, control, and use it.

If AGI primarily serves capital accumulation, technological blockade, cognitive manipulation, interstate confrontation, and military deployment, risks will no longer remain within one domain. They will propagate through interlocking employment, distribution, public trust, infrastructure, data, finance, biosecurity, and military decisions. Civilization Leap is not an optional moral ideal; it is a structural survival rationality for preventing intelligence from pushing the old logic to its self-destructive limit.

4. Why state involvement is necessary

Civilization Leap involves public-service floors, resource-use interfaces, data sovereignty, AGI infrastructure, governance-power boundaries, fiscal sustainability, public participation, and responsibility for failure. Businesses can provide technology, communities can provide settings, universities can provide research, and charities can provide social connections. Only the state can simultaneously bear authorization, protection, coordination, correction, and failure costs.

State involvement does not mean accepting all institutional conceptions in advance. It means recognizing that the issue exceeds a single department or industry and requires complete research using national capabilities. The state's first responsibility is not to announce an answer, but to give the real problem sufficiently serious, complete, and long-term conditions for validation.

5. Relationship to existing national strategic priorities

This proposal does not establish a separate venture detached from existing reform priorities. It is an integrated upgrading and comprehensive validation, in the AGI era, of common prosperity, digital government and smart cities, inclusive artificial intelligence, market-based allocation of production factors, equalization of public services, and institutional innovation in national new areas and free-trade zones.

It neither replaces current policies nor negates existing institutions. It studies whether these policy tools, faced with AGI's deeper changes, can be reorganized into a civilizational capability serving national security, social stability, human happiness, and long-term meaning together.

Chapter 2 Realigning the Proposal Stage: What Decision Is Requested of the State Now

1. No request for immediate approval of a new social system

This proposal includes institutional directions such as resource pools, contribution values, separation of the three powers, intelligence oriented toward good, and personnel and individual-resource pools. At this stage, however, these are primarily propositions for validation, principled structures, and research frameworks, not execution rules already validated legally, fiscally, technically, and socially.

Writing the proposal stage as the execution stage creates two errors. It makes decision-makers think all mechanisms must be accepted at once, increasing unnecessary political risk; and it gives untested institutional details a false certainty. Civilization Leap cannot advance by describing the future as the present.

2. Four progressively escalating decisions

Decision level	Current content	Exclusions
Level 1 National agenda recognition	Recognize that Civilization Leap in the AGI era merits national forward-looking research	No change to existing property, rights, or governance rules

Decision level	Current content	Exclusions
Level 2 Research-mechanism authorization	Establish a research center, institute, or interdepartmental joint-research mechanism	Not authorization for a city to enter a complete experiment
Level 3 Preliminary candidate-area research	Baseline surveys, legal and fiscal review, public communication, minimum-loop preparation	No territory-wide resource pooling or territory-wide contribution-value operation
Level 4 Comprehensive-experiment authorization	Decide whether to conduct complete city-level validation after prior conditions pass	No automatic replication or wider rollout

3. Relationship between the main text and research reserves

The main text provides decision completeness: why to act, what to validate, where boundaries lie, who might enter, and how failure is stopped. Specialist protocols, evidence levels, data fields, rollback operations, translation terminology, audience-access strategies, and similar materials remain research-reserve documents and enter specialist workflows only after formal project approval.

The main text therefore does not depend on attachments for its validity, and attachments must not create the appearance of implementation before authorization.

Chapter 3 Overall Positioning: A Small Civilization Rather Than a Small Pilot

1. Nature of the experiment

The proposed positioning is a National-Level Comprehensive Civilization Leap Experimental Zone in the AGI Era. It is not an industrial park, digital-government pilot, charitable platform, or social-governance innovation project in the traditional sense, but reduced-scope complete validation of civilization's operating mode in the AGI era.

Reduced-scope complete validation controls geographical area, population scale, resource boundaries, and risk spillovers without disassembling the system structure or reducing Civilization Leap to a technology, points scheme, or public-service category.

2. Validation through social operation

Civilization Leap seeks to change society's underlying logic: how possession generates returns, competition drives growth, exclusion provides security, and people are recognized as valuable. This logic formed through long-term social operation and can only be tested through social operation.

Real validation must include real populations, not only volunteers; real needs, not only designed tasks; real resources, not only symbolic donations; real conflicts of interest, not only cooperation among people who share an idea; and real time, not only short-term activity data.

A community can demonstrate goodwill, a platform can demonstrate a usable mechanism, and an enterprise can demonstrate effective incentives. Only a complete city can demonstrate whether a new civilizational logic can operate as a living system.

3. Overall principles

1. National authorization: Clarify responsibilities for research, experiments, data, finances, rights protection, and stopping.

2. City-level carrying capacity: Complete resident-life, industrial, educational, healthcare, government-service, energy, transport, data, and community systems.

3. Reduced scope without reduced dimensions: Control the scope without separating the six systems.

- 4. Goal alignment: All institutions and technologies must serve freedom from survival insecurity, happiness in life, and greater meaning in life.
- 5. Gradual phases: Startup, initial, transition, and stable phases must not encroach on one another.
- 6. Auditability, correctability, pausability, and exit: No mechanism may become an irreversible power structure.
- 7. Facts over publicity: Supporters, skeptics, opponents, and those who exit must be able to verify the civilizational high ground independently.

4. Definition of a civilizational high ground

A civilizational high ground is not a peak in GDP, buildings, or technological display. It must genuinely let people feel that basic survival is safer, life more stable, contributions more visible, resources no longer dormant for years, strong actors no longer trapped in old strategic games, ordinary people no longer judged redundant by the system, and AGI no longer forced to become an instrument of fear, control, and war.

Its strength lies not in declaring superiority, but in allowing outsiders to access facts, see boundaries, recheck results, identify failures, and confirm that another path can now be taken.

Chapter 4 The Three Meta-Goals and Core Validation Propositions

1. The three meta-goals

Meta-goal	Definition	Minimum test
Freedom from survival insecurity	Basic survival no longer depends on humiliation, exclusion, or extreme competition	Stable access to housing, healthcare, education, energy, information, and basic AGI capabilities

Meta-goal	Definition	Minimum test
Happiness in life	On a secure foundation, obtain more stable services, freer time, more trustworthy relationships, and routes to growth	Reduced family pressure, satisfaction with public services, increased community trust and sense of fairness
Greater meaning in life	Contribution, care, creativity, responsibility, and relationships are seen, received, and remembered	Less anxiety about being needed and less loneliness; real responses to ordinary contributions

These goals build on one another but cannot be separated into three projects completed in sequence. Without freedom from survival insecurity, persistent anxiety consumes happiness and meaning. Survival guarantees without happiness and meaning may produce an efficient but hollow society. Pursuit of meaning that harms basic security and freedom indicates institutional deviation.

2. Core validation propositions

- 1. Can a city increase actual resource utilization through resource discovery, authorization, and scheduling without first changing lawful ownership?
- 2. Can basic survival gradually become a baseline allocation of civilizational capability rather than humiliating relief for those who fail?
- 3. Can real contribution be recognized and credibly connected to incremental resource opportunities, honors, and governance participation beyond basic rights?
- 4. Can contribution values retain institutional strength without sliding into personality scoring, social hierarchy, and a new power that buys everything?

5. Can resource use rights, domain decision-making authority, and civilization voting rights truly be separated?
6. Can AGI improve risk perception, resource matching, policy simulation, and public services without taking away final human judgment?
7. Can personnel and individual-resource pools become more widely accessible, usable, and autonomously mobile under rights protection?
8. Can ordinary people's care, maintenance, companionship, knowledge transmission, organizational coordination, and risk-bearing become visible?
9. Can vulnerable groups cease to be defined only as burdens, and can their needs and acceptance be recognized as having civilizational value?
10. Can different groups find real benefits in entering the new logic without suffering losses first?
11. Can the experimental zone reduce feelings of uselessness, loneliness, anxiety about the future, and fear of replacement?
12. Can this operating mode strengthen national security, development, and continuity rather than weaken national autonomy?
13. Can the zone establish civilizational-high-ground evidence that people at home and abroad can access, recheck, and question?

Chapter 5 Phase Discipline: Causal Progression, No Loss for Any Group, and No Antagonistic Deadlocks

1. Phases are triggered by causation rather than the calendar

Phase	Main task	Nature of rules	Inviolable boundary
Startup	Identify incentive sources for each group and establish voluntary entry routes and immediately tangible benefits	Invitational rules	Offer optional benefits only, with no compulsory obligations; existing baselines must not deteriorate because the scheme starts

Phase	Main task	Nature of rules	Inviolable boundary
Initial	Validate records, matching, reception, exit, and rollback in locally complete units	Validation rules	Observable, escapable, correctable; the scheme bears failure costs
Transition	A majority coalition and meso-level closed loops gradually form; mutual recognition of rules and coordination expand	Emergent rules	Latecomers encounter attraction rather than punishment; nonparticipants retain rights to old paths
Stable	Global rules form, constitutional safeguards underpin the system, and self-operation begins	Constitutional rules	Survival rights are built in; civilization voting safeguards the course; everyone retains a brake

Territory-wide resource coordination, contribution operation, or changes in property forms that may arise in the stable phase must not be treated as startup action plans. Voluntary invitations at startup must likewise not be misread as limiting the system forever to voluntary philanthropy. Phase labels make every commitment observable over time and verifiable by stage.

2. Three iron rules of design

First, mandatory phase labeling. Every mechanism, vision, and rule must specify its applicable phase or long-term scale. Future visions must not substitute for current authorization.

Second, no loss for any group. Before and after every iteration, no group's lawful rights and interests or existing baseline may be forcibly worsened by the scheme's existence. Inability to guarantee no loss means the scheme is immature, not that a group should sacrifice itself.

Third, prohibition of antagonistic deadlocks. Any scheme that can advance only by first defeating, depriving, or subduing a group is reproducing the old logic. The correct solution is not more pressure, but a return to incentive sources, redesigning concession as an exchange into something better.

Three deadlock questions: Who must concede first? What immediately tangible return does that party receive? If it refuses, can the scheme still start? A “no” to the third question requires redesign.

3. Boundaries of authority in phase changes

Research bodies, administrative bodies, and specialist committees may submit facts, risks, rights impacts, and advancement recommendations, but may not independently announce that civilization has entered its next phase. Phase changes involving everyone's fundamental rights and interests, irreversible directions, or major property rules should proceed to a one-person-one-vote civilization vote after full disclosure of no-loss evidence, failure records, rollback plans, minority opinions, and the alternative of not advancing. Contribution values carry zero weight here.

Chapter 6 Why Seven Groups Might Enter

Civilization Leap cannot start from abstract visions or moral demands. Different groups must see immediate reasons to enter the new logic from their real interests, fears, and sense of value. Startup is first about designing incentive sources, not deploying a global institutional system.

Group	Core fears	Real incentive sources	Reasons for no-loss entry at startup
Established capital and elites	Liquidation, depreciation, historical repudiation	Asset security, dignified transition, long-term legacy	Protect lawful existing assets first; voluntarily opening resources brings greater certainty in risk avoidance, long-term use opportunities, and recognition of civilizational contribution
Professional contributors	AI replacement, invalidation of professional judgment	Justice grounded in experience, recognition of real contributions	Connect domain contribution immediately to professional decision-making positions, with clear attribution, traceability, and responsibility boundaries
Ordinary workers	Unemployment, unstable income, falling behind the times	Feeling needed, predictable improvements in life	Basic security is independent of contribution; care, maintenance, community presence, and other contributions become visible from day one
People replaced or displaced	Being judged redundant or useless	Being needed again, meaning being received	No requirement to recover an old job; priority access to meaning reception, learning, care, and new settings

Group	Core fears	Real incentive sources	Reasons for no-loss entry at startup
Young people and those not yet established	Devaluation of effort, disappearing career paths	New coordinates for growth, exploration, creativity	Low-threshold participation, educational redirection, pilot-participation rights; provisions for infants and basic survival are independent of contribution
Governors and decision-makers	Loss of control, displacement by AI, unattributable responsibility	Responsible choice, historical assessment, social stability	Constitutionalize ultimate human start and termination authority; controllable experiments, stoppable failure, bounded responsibility
AGI development and safety communities	Being trapped in an arms race, unlimited responsibility, weaponization of achievements	Technology serving civilizational goals, creative freedom within boundaries	Jointly establish audit and safety boundaries, exchanging transparency for trust and clarity of responsibility

Incentives for one group must not come at another's expense. Ordinary workers' losses cannot purchase capital participation, and coerced losses to lawful capital cannot purchase public support. Expert power must not suppress the public's fundamental rights, and one-person-one-vote must not eliminate professional responsibility in complex domains. Civilization Leap's design value lies precisely in finding structures where multiple parties improve together.

Chapter 7 Experimental-Zone Carrying Conditions and Site-Selection Criteria

1. Minimum carrying conditions

1. An independent, complete closed loop of social operation: broadly complete resident-life, educational, healthcare, industrial, energy, transport, government-service, data, community, and public-service systems.
2. Sufficient national or local authorization space for research-oriented validation of data, resource-use interfaces, public services, and AGI-assisted governance.
3. Real discoverable and authorizable resources: public spaces, equipment, computing capacity, educational and medical capabilities, knowledge, social care, and resources opened by enterprises.
4. Complete data foundations and lawful governance capacity, with clear boundaries for sources, purposes, access, withdrawal, and auditing.
5. AGI application foundations, including local deployment, risk perception, resource matching, policy simulation, and human review.
6. Independent auditing, appeals, pausing, and rollback capabilities.
7. Controllable risk spillovers: clear experimental boundaries; locally absorbable failures without nationwide irreversible consequences.
8. Foundations for public communication and real participation: capacity to accommodate ordinary residents' interests, doubts, and opposition, rather than selecting only those who agree with the concept.

2. Priority types of host areas

National new areas, free-trade or specially opened zones, cities advanced in digital governance, science-and-innovation cities and university towns, and transitioning resource-based cities may all be candidates. Site selection seeks not the most advanced, richest, or easiest city to publicize, but the area most likely to form a complete social loop, withstand real validation, and publicly disclose failure.

3. No predetermined single answer on population movement and admission

Improved basic guarantees may attract population inflows. City capacity, public services, fiscal responsibility, voting eligibility, and continuity of rights require dedicated study. Specific rules such as automatic full rights for original residents and phased unlocking for newcomers are not fixed in advance. Transparent, appealable, adjustable arrangements should instead balance legal equality, fiscal sustainability, actual long-term residence, and public carrying capacity.

Chapter 8 Overall Architecture: The Six Systems

1. Basic survival guarantee system

Basic survival is not a reward for contribution; it is a prerequisite for civilization. The experiment would study whether existing fiscal resources, public services, effective resource use, and AGI assistance can jointly make basic housing, healthcare, education, energy, transport, information, and basic AGI capabilities more stably accessible, while reducing humiliation, screening, and exclusion.

The fiscal structure may have three layers: reallocation of existing public services; incremental returns from effective resource use; and dedicated national reform funding with risk buffers. Every expansion of guarantees requires fiscal sensitivity analysis. Future resource-pool returns cannot replace definite current fiscal responsibilities.

2. City resource-pool system

The core of the resource pool is not to make all resources commonly owned. It establishes discoverable, authorizable, matchable, schedulable, settleable, and revocable interfaces so that long-vacant, inefficient, and duplicatively built resources enter actual use. Ownership and use are distinguished: resources may remain lawfully owned, but corresponding contribution arises only when they enter actual use and generate public value.

Startup primarily uses voluntary registration, time-slot opening, quota-based calls, interface permissions, and revocable authorization. The initial phase validates public resources, state-asset use interfaces, enterprise-opened resources, spaces, equipment, computing capacity, data, courses, and care capabilities in limited domains. Coordination may expand only in the transition phase. Voluntary ownership transfer may be an optional route. Whether broader changes to property forms emerge in the stable phase requires separate study and a civilization vote; this proposal does not lock that in.

3. Contribution-value and governance-credit system

Contribution values record net positive results from actions or resource use for the three meta-goals. They do not judge the value of a human life or determine eligibility to exist. Assets, labor, knowledge, care, maintenance, organization, risk-bearing, and solving public problems can all be contribution sources. Contributions differ in magnitude, not in the legitimacy of their source.

Contribution is not donation. Donors may express intended uses, but institutional recognition concerns the objective destination and ultimate results of actions. Contributors cannot unilaterally prescribe how evaluation works. Motive is not the primary object of verification; facts and results are central.

Basic survival rights do not have to be earned through contribution. Above basic rights, incremental and competitive resource priority, honors, some governance participation, and inheritable contribution returns should primarily be obtained through actions producing substantial positive results for others, the community, and the three meta-goals. Altruistic actions and results open incremental routes to self-interest, rather than possession, exclusion, monopoly, and suppression.

Intergenerational transmission of contribution values may be studied, but inherited contribution must be distinguished from original contribution and decay with each generation. Resources and decision-making authority cannot be automatically inherited through kinship. Domain decision-making authority and civilization voting rights are never inheritable.

4. Governance separating the three powers

The experimental zone must strictly distinguish resource use rights, domain decision-making authority, and civilization voting rights. Resource use rights respond to real contribution and effective use capacity. Domain decision-making authority reflects justice grounded in experience and operates only within the relevant professional domain. Civilization voting rights address everyone's fundamental rights and interests, irreversible directions, and major public risks, on a one-person-one-vote basis with zero weight for contribution values.

The purpose of separating the three powers is not to create more procedures. It prevents any advantage from expanding into total domination: wealth cannot directly govern civilization, expertise cannot cancel the public's fundamental rights, and a public majority cannot replace responsible judgment in complex domains.

5. Intelligence oriented toward good

AGI serves risk perception, resource discovery, supply-demand matching, public-service scheduling, policy simulation, long-term impact analysis, cross-language coordination, and extensions of individual capability. It must be explainable, auditable, pausable, and rollback-capable, explicitly identifying unknowns, confidence levels, and responsibility anchors.

AGI must not independently decide people's qualifications, basic rights, resource deprivation, public rules, or civilization's direction. It must not use unified personality profiles to affect treatment across domains or create permanent dependence through technical support.

6. Emergence of meaning and human experience

This system specifically prevents the experimental zone from becoming a technological-governance project with attractive data but dispirited people. It observes whether older people are less lonely, young people have a stronger sense of the future, care becomes visible, family pressure falls, ordinary people's goodwill and capabilities can reach real people, and fewer people feel useless.

Human experience and meaning are not publicity-department sentiment metrics. They are real evidence of whether the meta-goals are being achieved.

Chapter 9 Core Institutional Mechanisms and Boundaries

1. Eight-step resource-pool process

1. Registration: Record resource type, ownership and rights, current use, possible opening methods, duration, risk boundaries, and expected value.
2. Assessment: Analyze vacancy, sharing possibilities, maintenance costs, legal risks, and potential public value.
3. Authorization: Enter through use rights, call-up rights, time-slot rights, quota rights, interface rights, or licenses, without default ownership change.
4. Matching: AGI may help identify needs and resources, but must not allocate through a black box.
5. Use: Clarify responsibility, wear and losses, insurance, boundaries, and termination conditions.
6. Feedback: Users, beneficiaries, and managers confirm whether positive results occurred.
7. Audit: High-value, high-risk, and highly contested resources undergo independent auditing.
8. Reallocation or exit: Stop authorization, rematch, or exit when use remains ineffective, is simulated, or harms rights.

2. Four contribution-recognition principles

1. Fact anchoring: Recognize only real, verifiable, traceable contributions.
2. Separate positive and negative results: Later donations may not offset major negative results previously caused.

3. Domain relevance: Professional contribution affects only relevant domains and does not form a cross-domain overall personality score.

4. Retrospective recognition: Recognize major risk-bearing, long-term innovation, and highly uncertain projects additionally after results are validated.

3. The precise place of having needs met as contribution

Older people without family support, disabled people, people with chronic illnesses, and others needing care should not be defined only as system burdens. Real needs provide recipients for altruistic action; accepting help enables care to produce factual results. Without people who need help, altruistic intentions cannot reach reality.

This proposal puts forward a proposition for validation: needs confirmed as effectively met may produce a beneficiary contribution record or meaning-response record. Startup does not require recipients to self-report, compel feedback, use such records for personality scoring, or affect basic rights. Whether further links to incremental resource use rights should be established is to be decided after privacy protection, public deliberation, and dedicated experiments.

4. Anchoring public institutions to the three goals

The purposes of hospitals, schools, research institutions, and public-service enterprises should return to residents' three meta-goals. This does not eliminate efficiency, cost, or professional evaluation. It prevents revenue generation, admission rates, publication counts, and profit margins from replacing public missions.

Hospitals should jointly evaluate medical accessibility, health improvement, and fiscal sustainability; schools, educational fairness, quality of growth, and professional standards; research institutions, knowledge creation, use of results, and long-term public value; and public-service enterprises, stability, inclusiveness, resilience, and costs.

5. A basic and dynamic two-layer contribution-assessment structure

The basic system remains simple, stable, and consistent with existing understanding at startup, so participants know what is recorded, why, and how to appeal. A dynamic adjustment system iterates behind the scenes using real data, resident feedback, and audit results, but every new purpose, domain, and connection to rights requires renewed authorization.

Complexity itself is a safety risk. A contribution mechanism that participants cannot understand, governors cannot maintain, or independent bodies cannot audit at reasonable cost must not formally operate. It must remain at the shadow-recording, manual-sampling, or limited-validation stage.

Chapter 10 Intelligence Oriented Toward Good: Another Capability Path for National Security, Development, and Continuity

1. New capabilities brought by artificial intelligence

Territory-wide accessibility, usability, and autonomous movement of personnel and individual-resource pools cannot be achieved through traditional administrative coordination and market allocation alone. Artificial intelligence brings new perception, connection, matching, simulation, coordination, and capability amplification, enabling knowledge, professional capacity, public services, and risk judgment to reach across geography.

2. Supporting national security

Intelligence oriented toward good can help states identify food, energy, financial, public-health, supply-chain, infrastructure, and cyber risks in advance; simulate cross-domain transmission; reduce military and policy misjudgment; and improve disaster response and minimally necessary international coordination. Security can be obtained not only by increasing the capacity to suppress other states, but also by improving national and shared systems' ability to discover, understand, and interrupt risks.

3. Supporting national development

Artificial intelligence can extend educational, medical, agricultural, engineering, management, legal, and research capabilities to underresourced areas at low cost, helping cities and states see what they possess, what they lack, and which development paths suit them. It does not provide one uniform answer for states; it enhances their capacity to formulate their own answers.

4. Supporting national continuity

Intelligent systems can simulate long-term consequences of resource consumption, population, fiscal, industrial, ecological, and technology policies; identify future costs behind short-term growth; and help states preserve the next generation's choices while pursuing security and development. Continuity is not an extra goal considered after development. It is the test of security and development across time.

5. Institutional boundaries for orientation toward good

1. Final human review: Humans bear final judgment on irreversible, high-impact, and rights-related matters.
2. Data sovereignty: States, organizations, and individuals retain control of core data and authorization.
3. Opposition to permanent dependence: Support must also build local capacity, migration rights, and basic continuity after exit.
4. Explainability and auditability: Important conclusions disclose sources, assumptions, confidence, and unknowns.
5. No assessment of the value of human life: AI must not determine basic rights through functionality, contribution, or behavioral profiles.
6. Inclusive safety capabilities: Minimum safety tools for major shared risks should not be entirely blocked by membership or commercial payment.

Chapter 11 Territory-Wide Accessibility, Usability, and Autonomous Movement of Personnel and Individual-Resource Pools

1. People are not resources and individual-resource pools belong to people

An individual-resource pool includes time, knowledge, skills, experience, judgment, creativity, care, relational cooperation capabilities, works, data, equipment, spaces, funds, and AI capability extensions that a person lawfully owns or controls. People are not resources within the pool. The individual-resource pool belongs to the person and serves personal freedom, development, and meaning.

2. Territory-wide accessibility

People can access a wider range of education, healthcare, work, creativity, care, public participation, and life settings within lawful, safe, and capability boundaries. Accessibility does not abolish national, city, or organizational boundaries. It reduces unnecessary informational, qualification, linguistic, and institutional barriers.

3. Territory-wide usability

After entering new settings, people can lawfully use corresponding public resources while continuing to use their own qualifications, data, achievements, tools, and existing rights and interests. Resource usability works both ways: community resources reach real needs, and personal capabilities and lawful resources enter actual use with the person's authorization.

4. Autonomous movement

Autonomous movement includes movement of people, capabilities reaching across space, and resources moving toward people. It also includes rights not to move, to refuse matching, withdraw authorization, exit, and choose again. Systems may recommend but must not decide a person's life path.

5. Individual-resource-pool firewalls

1. Personal control, domain-separated storage, need-based visibility, itemized authorization, and revocability.
2. No unified overall personality score or default cross-domain linkage.
3. Sensitive data remain outside the pool by default, with selective disclosure and anonymous provision allowed.
4. Basic rights do not depend on pool size, and refusal to share is not punished.
5. Individual pools are not absorbed into city or national resource pools; they connect only through authorized interfaces.

Chapter 12 Rights, Firewalls, and Public Commitments

1. Complete separation of basic rights from contribution

Basic survival, personal dignity, equality before the law, appeals, privacy, and exit are not determined by contribution values. People with low contribution, no recordable contribution, no wish to participate, or a need for care must not thereby lose basic living conditions or public services.

2. Eight contribution-value firewalls

1. No judgment of personhood or overall good-person/bad-person score.
2. Domain-specific records with no default cross-domain calls.
3. Purpose limitation; renewed authorization for new purposes.
4. No conversion into civilization voting rights, citizenship, or eligibility for basic survival.
5. No use for punitive governance, commercial discrimination, or exclusion from public services.
6. Separate contribution-fact ledgers from meaning-response records.
7. Responses to falsification target specific records and conduct, without permanently depriving a person of participation.
8. Stop operation when system complexity exceeds limits of comprehensibility, maintainability, or auditability.

3. Human voting on major matters

Irreversible technology deployment, basic property rules, major changes to basic survival guarantees, phase changes, and matters involving everyone's fundamental rights and interests must return to one-person-one-vote. Specialist committees present facts, options, and consequences but must not decide civilization's course on behalf of the public.

4. Public commitments precede participation

The first institution through which the zone earns trust is not a platform launch but a public commitment: no taking property; no turning people into scores; no AI deciding human destinies; no loss of basic survival because of low contribution; no emergency powers becoming permanent; and auditability, appeals, correction, and pausing for every major rule.

Chapter 13 Technology, Data, Indicators, and Evidence

1. At the proposal stage technology need only specify capabilities and boundaries

There is no need to finalize every platform and algorithm now. What must be specified is minimum capability: resource registration and authorization, supply-demand matching, contribution-fact verification, AGI-assisted simulation, citizen participation, audit trails, appeals, and rollback. Specific technical paths should be selected through comparison of alternatives after project approval, preventing platforms from locking in institutions prematurely.

2. Data-governance principles

1. Minimization: Collect only data necessary for explicitly defined purposes.
2. Domain and level separation: Apply different permissions to different data, purposes, and actors.
3. Purpose limitation: Do not divert contribution, care, and resource data into personality assessment.
4. Revocability: Personal authorization can be stopped; the system must explain withdrawal's effects.
5. Accountability: Log all access, calls, modifications, and exports.
6. Independent custody: Independent actors preserve key experimental data to prevent embellishment for official performance claims.
7. Permanent failure records: Operations may be rolled back; historical evidence must not be deleted.

3. Indicator system

Indicator layer	Main indicators	Role
Meta-goals	Freedom from survival insecurity, happiness in life, meaning in life	Directly determine whether the experiment improves people's lives
Process capabilities	Effective resource use, contribution recognition, public services, health of the three powers, AGI safety, fiscal continuity	Explain how outcomes arise
Rights and risks	Appeals, withdrawals, exits, correction of misjudgments, data misuse, net group losses	Prevent good outcomes from concealing rights violations
Long-term and external	Capacity growth in weaker nodes, declining dependence, cross-institutional verifiability, social trust	Determine whether the civilizational high ground can endure and be learned from

4. Evidence discipline

Experimental results must present supporting evidence, counterexamples, failures, minority opinions, and uncertainty together. A single satisfaction measure, platform-use volume, media reach, or short-term GDP change cannot prove Civilization Leap. City-level social experiments should use historical baselines, similar-city comparisons, phased rollout, process tracing, counterfactual analysis, and independent qualitative reviews, rather than mechanically applying one experimental method ill-suited to social systems.

Chapter 14 Political Initiation, Institutional Support, and the Risk-Sharing Chain

1. No dependence on a single political promoter

Individual advocacy can open an entry point but cannot alone bear legal authorization, departmental coordination, fiscal responsibility, data responsibility, public-opinion risk, experimental failure, or continuity across terms of office. A national-level experiment must form an institutional support chain that transcends individuals, departments, and terms.

2. Five necessary positions

Position	Core responsibility	Consequence of absence
Political initiator	Bring the issue into national or high-level reform procedures and bear initial startup risk	No entry point; research remains non-governmental text indefinitely
Administrative host	Turn authorization into operation through a real city, population, resources, and public services	The experiment degenerates into a conceptual project
Legal and fiscal guarantor	Clarify experimental boundaries, failure costs, rights remedies, and continuing funds	Responsibility is unanchored; risks are shifted to residents
Professional implementation community	Conduct institutional, technical, data, audit, human-experience, and meaning research	Political will substitutes for professional capability
Independent verifier and bearer of public legitimacy	Protect dissent, appeals, exit, and public disclosure of failure	The experiment degenerates into an official-performance showcase

3. Risk-sharing principles

Failure costs must not fall primarily on residents, vulnerable groups, frontline departments, or one city. National authorization must also specify fiscal buffers, legal protection, data remedies, continuity of careers and public services, and treatment of rights and interests after mechanism rollback. Political decisions may bear uncertainty but must not transfer it to people without choice.

4. Preventing performance-showcase distortion and preserving continuity across terms

Experimental objectives, baselines, failure conditions, and public reports must be fixed before startup. Changes of administrators cannot delete failure data, change indicator definitions, or automatically terminate residents' rights. Institutions rather than individuals carry major directions. Individual contributions may be remembered, but the project's existence must not depend on an individual.

Chapter 15 Domestic Authenticity and International Credibility of the Civilizational High Ground

1. Demonstrate reality first rather than internationalization first

China may initiate the experiment autonomously without waiting for joint foreign design or funding. Making foreign participation a startup condition creates another deadlock: without facts, others will not participate; without their participation, the experiment cannot begin.

2. Four layers of credibility

Layer	Source of credibility
Domestic authenticity	Real operation, resident experience, appeals, exits, failures, and fiscal data are traceable

Layer	Source of credibility
Independent verifiability	Domestic and foreign researchers, professional bodies, critics, and nonmembers can access necessary evidence
International observation and participation	Gradually open observer participation, joint research, data reviews, joint testing of individual mechanisms, and international audit nodes
Cross-institutional replication	Different legal, property, political, and cultural systems can reconstruct underlying principles rather than copy Chinese forms

3. The zone does not export one institutional template

The civilizational high ground must ultimately demonstrate not that only one Chinese implementation exists, but that underlying principles such as effective resource use, rights boundaries, intelligence oriented toward good, gradual phases, no loss for any group, and final human review can take different forms in different institutional settings.

4. The real source of the high-ground effect

The high-ground effect is not communication success. It is the attraction created by facts: participants gain real security, improved lives, and recognition of meaning; nonparticipants are not punished; outsiders can verify; those who exit can explain problems; failures are not hidden. Proposals can win discussion; facts win trust.

Chapter 16 Stage Roadmap

Period 0 National agenda deliberation | Startup phase

Fix the core judgment, three meta-goals, phase discipline, and rights floor. Complete the national proposal, candidate-city criteria, preliminary legal and fiscal assessments, risk report, and research-mechanism plan. The deliverable is a basis for deciding whether the proposition merits national-level research.

Period 1 Establishing research and support mechanisms | Startup phase

Establish a national research center, institute, or interdepartmental joint mechanism. Form an expert community covering institutions, technology, auditing, human experience and meaning, law, and finance. Begin candidate-city baseline surveys and public communication.

Period 2 Preliminary candidate-area research and foundation prototypes | Startup phase

Establish resource catalogues, authorization interfaces, basic-service floors, contribution-fact shadow records, AGI-assisted prototypes, and audit and appeal prototypes. All participation is voluntary, without compulsory obligations; prototype results do not change basic rights.

Period 2.5 Minimum closed-loop validation | Initial phase

In a university town, industrial park, healthcare and eldercare district, or complete public-service unit, validate a minimum loop combining resource authorization and sharing, objective contribution records, AGI-assisted scheduling, and auditing and exit. Prioritize objectively anchorable resources and behaviors rather than rushing into highly private or contentious domains.

Period 3 Local complete operation | Initial phase

Operate all six systems together in a complete district within a city without disassembling the civilizational structure. The operating period should be long enough to observe rule learning, interest responses, power expansion, resident adaptation, and long-term fiscal impacts. Those who exit suffer no loss, and failure can be rolled back.

Period 4 City-level expansion | Transition phase

Enter city-level expansion only after local operation demonstrates improvement in the three meta-goals, valid no-loss boundaries, fiscal and technical sustainability, and sufficient public trust. Expansion is not an administrative command; facts create attraction, and the public and institutions decide together.

Period 5 Formation of a civilizational high ground | Entry to the experimental-zone stable phase

Form a city-level example that outsiders can observe, compare, question, and learn from. Here, stable phase means stable operation at experimental-zone scale only, not that the whole country or human civilization has entered a stable phase. Any global property, resource, or governance rules still require separate deliberation.

Chapter 17 Risks, Misinterpretations, Stopping, and Rollback

1. Main risks

Risk	Manifestation	Core defense
Misreading of property rights	Understood as confiscation, requisition, or compulsory public ownership at startup	Voluntary authorization and revocable use only at startup; explicit labels on stable-phase visions

Risk	Manifestation	Core defense
Social scoring	Contribution values degenerate into overall personality scores and punitive tools	Domain separation, purpose limits, separation from basic rights, no cross-domain overall scores
New aristocracy	High contributors purchase comprehensive power	Separate the three powers; one person, one vote in civilization voting; non-inheritable decision authority
Technocracy	Platforms, experts, or AGI effectively monopolize direction	Final human review, public questioning, independent auditing, explanation, and stopping authority
Capital arbitrage	Contribution obtained through staged displays, fabricated data, or causing problems and then repairing them	Separate positive and negative results, retrospective recognition, long-term outcomes, anti-arbitrage auditing
Performance-showcase distortion	Only successes displayed; indicators changed; failures hidden	Fix baselines before startup, independent data custody, permanent failure records
Data misuse	Contribution, care, and resource data used for surveillance and discrimination	Minimization, domain separation, revocability, access logs, legal liability
Uncontrolled complexity	Institutions too intricate for participants to understand or auditors to audit	Auditable simplification; stop when governance-cost limits are exceeded
Net group losses	A group's loss becomes a prerequisite of the scheme	Review no-loss protection for every group; return antagonistic deadlocks for redesign
Permanent emergency powers	Security and crises used to bypass rights boundaries	Clear triggers, duration, review, automatic expiry, and subsequent disclosure
Insufficient international credibility	Seen as an internal example valid only in one institutional system	Independent verification, public failures, cross-institutional testing of principles
Single-point political dependence	The project stops or is distorted after the initiator leaves office	Institutional support chain, rules across terms, fixed public rights

2. Hard stopping conditions

1. Basic rights become substantively linked to contribution values.
2. Individuals receive unified personality scores that cannot be appealed.
3. Compulsory changes to ownership or use rights exceed explicit authorization.
4. AGI acquires de facto unreviewable decision authority over high-impact matters.
5. Those who exit are punished or lose basic rights and interests.
6. A group's net loss becomes necessary for continued operation.
7. Emergency powers exceed their duration without independent review.
8. Key data are tampered with, deleted, or unavailable for independent audit.
9. Fiscal risks may threaten continuity of basic public services.
10. Management refuses to disclose major failures and minority opinions.

3. Rollback principles

Stopping does not mean erasure. Operating systems may return to validated safe versions. Affected parties must receive notification, data migration, remedies for rights and interests, and appeal channels. Failed versions, decision processes, and responsibility records must be permanently preserved. Civilization Leap does not demand errorlessness; it demands that errors can be seen, stopped, and corrected.

Chapter 18 Organizational Structure and Near-Term Work

1. Organization at the proposal stage

A full experimental-zone administration should not be established directly at this stage. First establish a national Civilization Leap research center, institute, or interdepartmental joint-research mechanism with five working-group types: strategy and institutions; law and finance; technology and data; society and human experience; and independent review.

2. Organizational conception after experimental authorization

After formal authorization, consider one office, four committees, and three platforms. The experimental-zone office handles comprehensive coordination. Institutional, Technical, Audit and Ethics, and Human Experience and Meaning Committees separately handle rules, technology, oversight, and correction of deviations from goals. Resource-pool, contribution-and-governance-credit, and AGI-assisted-governance-and-auditing platforms support operation. This is a proposed direction, not a structure fixed in advance now.

3. Near-term writing and research

1. Produce a one-page decision summary, a ten-page decision briefing, and this complete proposal.
2. Complete a proposal to establish a national research center or joint-research mechanism.
3. Complete frameworks for candidate-city site selection, baseline surveys, and public carrying-capacity assessment.
4. Study legal boundaries for property, resource use rights, contribution records, data, finance, voting, and exit.
5. Conduct sensitivity analyses of basic-guarantee fiscal models, returns from effective resource use, and risk buffers.
6. Conduct empirical interviews on seven groups' incentive sources, immediate benefits, and no-loss guarantees.
7. Design a minimum closed-loop prototype without substituting technical prototypes for institutional and public review.
8. Establish independent adversarial review, failure records, and public-response mechanisms.

9. Form plans for international observation, data verification, and cross-institutional comparison of the civilizational high ground.

4. Formal decision request at this stage

It is proposed that the state agree to include the National-Level Comprehensive Civilization Leap Experiment in the AGI Era on the national forward-looking research agenda; organize formal interdepartmental and interdisciplinary deliberation; and conduct baseline surveys and preliminary research in candidate cities. Only after legal, fiscal, technical, public-rights, and minimum closed-loop validation pass should it decide whether to authorize a city-level comprehensive experiment.

Conclusion: Let One City Grow into the Future First

Civilization Leap does not wait for the whole world to awaken at once or a perfect plan to fall from the sky. It needs a place sufficiently complete, real, and courageous to let part of the future begin operating first.

A community can demonstrate goodwill, a platform a usable mechanism, and an enterprise effective incentives. Only a complete city can show whether resources, power, technology, human experience, and meaning can form another mode of social operation.

This city need not declare itself above the world. It need only genuinely make basic survival safer and life more stable; put dormant resources to use; ensure contributions are no longer forgotten; give strong actors a future without overpowering others; let ordinary people cease believing they are insignificant; let AGI amplify human capabilities and goodwill; place power within boundaries; make failure stoppable; and leave exit unpunished.

When people live with composure rather than struggle in persistent anxiety; when care, companionship, maintenance, and creativity receive real responses; when governors know innovation can begin and stop; when enterprises and capital see that long-term security does not come from permanent monopoly; when young people regain coordinates for the future; and when one person's capabilities, resources, and concern can cross boundaries to reach more real people, then this city begins to become a civilizational high ground.

The strength of a civilizational high ground is not commanding the world to follow, but letting the world see that another path is now walkable.

Appendix 1 Selected foundational documents for the proposal stage

- Civilization Leap Five-Volume Work: Abridged Edition: Provides the theoretical general framework and three meta-goals of Civilization Leap.
- Civilization Leap Five-Volume Work: System Map, Deep-Reading Edition: Explains the overall relationships among theory, institutions, engineering, and the long-term future.
- Civilization Leap: Meta-Rules of Resource Pools in the AGI Era: A directional account of stable-phase resource relationships; phase labels are mandatory when citing it.
- Principles of Civilizational Decision-Making: A Constitution Separating the Three Powers V2.0: Constitutional boundaries of resource use rights, domain decision-making authority, and civilization voting rights.
- Phase Design Guidance: Stage-Limiting Rules for Civilization Leap Institutional Design: Prior constraints for startup, initial, transition, and stable phases.
- Guidance for the Cognitive Layer of Identifying and Designing Civilization Leap Incentive Sources: Design foundations for different groups' real motivations and no-loss entry.
- Mechanism Design for the Civilization Leap Honor System: Supporting directions for non-power-based public recognition and meaning responses.

Other specialist protocols, experimental templates, independent review, rollback, terminology, version governance, and audience-analysis documents remain internal research reserves at this stage. They are not prerequisites for key decision-makers to understand the main text.

Appendix 2 Experimental-zone site-assessment table

Assessment module	Suggested weight	Core question
Prospects of national and local authorization	15%	Are interdepartmental coordination, research authorization, and stable support conditions available?
Completeness of social systems	15%	Do residents, industries, education, healthcare, energy, transport, and communities form a closed loop?
Resource-pool potential	15%	Are there real discoverable, authorizable, schedulable resources and capabilities?
Data-governance foundation	10%	What are the conditions of data legality, quality, interfaces, and auditing capacity?
AGI application and local capability	10%	Are local deployment, talent, safety, and human-review conditions available?
Public-service and fiscal capacity	10%	What are the capacities for basic services, fiscal continuity, and risk buffers?
Industrial and population diversity	8%	Can the area accommodate real conflicts of interest and multigroup operation?
Public participation and social trust	9%	Can genuine communication, dissent, appeals, and exit occur?
Risk spillovers and rollback capacity	8%	Can failures be absorbed locally, and are stopping and remedial conditions available?

Appendix 3 Phase and decision-gate summary

From	To	Minimum trigger	Decision method
Agenda deliberation	Research mechanism	Core proposition merits national research and crosses no rights red line	National or high-level research authorization
Startup	Initial	Real voluntary entry, valid no-loss guarantees, auditable and escapable prototypes	Professional review, an informed public, and decision by the authorized actor

From	To	Minimum trigger	Decision method
Initial	Transition	Improved meta-goals, fiscal and technical sustainability, and no structural net group losses	One-person-one-vote civilization voting after full evidence disclosure
Transition	Experimental-zone stable phase	Stable city-level operation, effective rights firewalls, independently verified failure and exit	One-person-one-vote civilization voting plus national statutory procedures

Appendix 4 Core validation table for the six systems

System	Minimum startup validation	Must not be implemented prematurely
Basic survival guarantees	Map existing services, gaps, and routes to nonhumiliating improvement	Promise unlimited guarantees before fiscal analysis is complete

System	Minimum startup validation	Must not be implemented prematurely
Resource pool	Voluntary registration, time-slot authorization, revocable sharing	Mandatorily pool all use rights or change ownership
Contribution values	Shadow records of objective contributions, appeals, and auditing	Link to basic rights, personality ranks, or territory-wide power
Separation of the three powers	Rule simulations, permissions cards, and one-person-one-vote exercises for major matters	Give any one power comprehensive effect at startup
Intelligence oriented toward good	Prototypes for risk perception, matching, explanation, and human review	AI alone decides qualifications, resource deprivation, or public direction
Meaning and human experience	Interviews, baselines, validation of care and relationship settings	Classify individuals through psychological data or compel feedback

Appendix 5 Public commitments and prohibited practices

1. The experimental zone does not take property. Resource entry at startup follows voluntary authorization, revocable use, and clear boundaries.
2. The zone does not turn people into scores. Contribution records do not judge personhood or determine basic survival or legal status.
3. Basic survival is civilization's floor and need not be earned through contribution.
4. Incremental, competitive self-interested outcomes beyond basic rights should primarily be obtained through real positive results for others, the community, and the three meta-goals.
5. Contributions differ in magnitude rather than source; assets, labor, knowledge, care, maintenance, and risk-bearing can all be recognized.
6. Effectively met needs have civilizational value, but vulnerable groups need not self-report, feedback is not compulsory, and privacy is not harmed.
7. Inheritance of contribution values may be studied; decision-making authority is never inherited through kinship.
8. AGI assists only and does not decide civilization's direction for humans; high-impact matters require final human review.
9. Every major rule is auditable, appealable, correctable, and pausable; those who exit are not punished.
10. Stable-phase visions cannot become compulsory startup obligations.
11. Any scheme requiring a group to lose first must return for redesign.
12. All institutions, technologies, and indicators serve only freedom from survival insecurity, happiness in life, and greater meaning in life.

These public commitments are not rhetoric. They are the first institution through which the zone earns trust. Without a sense of safety, there is no real participation; without real participation, there is no Civilization Leap.

End of the complete Proposal for a National-Level Comprehensive Civilization Leap Experimental Zone in the AGI Era v0.8

Reading guide and personalized further reading

P06-EXPERIMENT-001 | V0.8 | Current public policy master manuscript for national research and experimental preparation

What this manuscript covers

Use four progressively escalating decisions to organize the three meta-goals, six systems, phase discipline, seven groups' incentives, rights firewalls, evidence responsibilities, stopping, and rollback.

Real-world effect

T2 policy research proposal. The current request is entry into national research, preliminary candidate-area research, and limited-validation preparation, not authorized implementation.

V0.8 is the current policy master manuscript; V0.7, V0.6, and V0.5 serve version tracing only.

Continue reading

[1. Research Interface Summary for a National-Level Comprehensive Civilization Leap Experimental Zone in the AGI Era](#)

First recheck the present request through the short manuscript, avoiding confusion between policy research and implementation authorization.

[2. Overall Experimental Design and Baseline Plan for the National-Level Comprehensive Civilization Leap Experimental Zone](#)

Enter the specialist validation layer covering hypotheses, baselines, counterfactuals, participant rights, stopping, and rollback.

[3. Contribution Value System White Paper](#)

Understand contribution values as a basis of value recognition, separated from basic rights, personhood, and general political power.

[4. Complete Master Design for the Civilization Leap Resource Pool](#)

Test how resources enter actual use through discoverable, authorizable, and revocable interfaces rather than prior ownership changes.

[5. Principles of Civilizational Decision-Making: A Constitution Separating the Three Powers](#)

Enter the separation boundaries of resource use rights, domain decision-making authority, and civilization voting rights.

[6. Human-COS Startup Phase: Judgment and Responsibility Windows Before Irreversibility](#)

Enter high-consequence judgment, dissent, responsibility, and correction before irreversibility.

[7. Nebula Startup Edition General Framework](#)

Connect real-world public operation and coordination entry points without describing a conceptual plan as an implemented project.

[8. Civilization Leap: The Path of Civilization in the AGI Era \(Complete Five-Volume Work\)](#)

Return to the theoretical trunk of the three meta-goals, civilizational operation, and the emergence of meaning.

[Stable website entry](#)

[National experimental-zone family](#)

[Complete library](#)

[Civilization Leap Research Group | www.civitas.top](#)