

Civilization Leap

Engineering Implementation and Governance Principles

Author: Zijun Fu

Produced by: Civilization Leap Research Group

Engineering Governance Edition V1.2

Governing references: Four Questions of Civilization Leap: Top-Level Cognitive Outline V1.1; Civilization Leap: Theory, Principles and Action Programme: Theoretical Master Text V1.3

This document provides no individual engineering plan. It develops the “How does Civilization Leap happen?” question into the direction, boundaries, alignment relationships and governance principles that future Civilization Leap must share across different fields, stages and methods. It does not redefine what it is, what brings it about or what it is for.

Governing direction and the Four Questions of Civilization Leap

Engineering governance must first understand what it serves. The Four Questions establish the governing direction; this governance edition is responsible for preventing future methods, local outcomes and power structures from rewriting that direction in turn.

What is it

Civilization Leap is a shift in the default logic of the starting point from which humans and AGI generate goals and purposes: from “self-interest first” to “self-interest with others first.” It does not change self-interest; it changes where goals begin. Actual stakeholders are already present when goals are generated.

What brings it about

AGI makes humans increasingly powerful. Even if it faithfully carries out each user's purposes, human strategic conflict under the old logic recursively tends toward an irreversible end state. The second chain is conditional on AGI eventually becoming more powerful than humans: if both sides retain the old logic of goal and purpose generation, strategic conflict between humans and AGI also recursively tends toward an irreversible end state. Greater capability does not itself mean hostility; the causal direction depends on both sides' logic of purpose generation.

Rules, agreements, deterrence and control can constrain action beforehand and repair consequences afterward, and retain practical value. Yet if the underlying logic remains unchanged, controlling one round cannot stop the next round of strategic conflict from being generated. New power cannot be met solely by development and control under the old logic. The governing root judgment is this: if civilization cannot make the leap, it tends toward annihilation.

What is it for

Civilization Leap seeks to enable humans and AGI to continue existing together and, on that foundation, advance toward freedom from survival insecurity for humanity as a whole, happiness in individual lives, and more meaningful lives. Continued existence together preserves the future; freedom from survival insecurity

alleviates widespread fear over basic survival; happiness and meaning bring that future into human lives and life itself. Continued existence is the foundation, not the ultimate purpose.

How does it happen

One shared direction, diverse paths. Every real-world implementation must begin with people's actual circumstances, preserve agency and the conditions for refusal and exit, and prevent cooperation from shifting costs onto outsiders. Direction guides methods; methods produce outcomes; outcomes calibrate methods and our understanding of real-world causal relationships. Neither local success nor local failure can replace the direction of civilization as a whole.

The responsibility of this governance edition

This document answers only these questions: when Civilization Leap enters real-world implementation, how can different methods always return to the same direction, and how can local mechanisms, stage-specific weightings, individual successes or interpretations by those in power be prevented from redefining Civilization Leap?

Opening Engineering may vary greatly but civilization must share a direction

Once Civilization Leap enters reality, it encounters a world far more complex than a single theoretical judgment. People differ in their needs, interests, cultures, resources, forms of organization and stages of social development. The same method in different places may produce entirely different outcomes.

Civilization Leap therefore cannot, from the outset, be designed as a fixed institutional system, a technical architecture, an algorithmic model or a standard answer that can be replicated across all societies.

Direction must be shared. Methods may differ. Outcomes must feed back.

Civilization Leap changes the default logic of the starting point from which humans and AGI generate goals and purposes: from “self-interest first” to “self-interest with others first.” It does not change self-interest; it changes where self-interest begins.

Once this shift enters reality, it will affect more than one step in decision-making. How goals are generated changes behavior; behavior enters relationships between people; relationships form cooperation or strategic conflict. These relationships become embedded in organizations, markets, institutions, culture, distribution, evaluation and power structures. These constituent elements of society in turn shape people's sense of gain, happiness and meaning, and further influence the next round of goal generation.

Civilization Leap is not a local engineering undertaking. It concerns the entire causal chain through which civilization continually generates itself.

Engineering implementation and governance must therefore first prevent one thing: no individual method may treat itself as Civilization Leap itself. A system may succeed, an institution may be effective and a technology may bring immense benefits, but none of these local outcomes alone can represent a change in the default logic by which civilization operates.

The task of engineering governance is to enable future paths, methods and local practices, however numerous, to align continually with the same civilizational direction. It must prevent methods from rewriting direction,

local indicators from replacing overall goals, and “Civilization Leap” from becoming a reason for any single power to define the world.

1 The object of governance is the unfolding of civilization's causal chain

The engineering object of Civilization Leap is not a single isolated field. It addresses the continually interacting causal relationships among the constituent elements of human society.

Goals and purposes do not arise from nothing. How a person understands their interests is jointly influenced by security, relationships, education, culture, resources, identity, evaluation, organizations, markets and the technological environment. How an organization forms its goals is jointly influenced by its members' interests, its competitive environment, its power structure, institutional boundaries and the conditions for its long-term continued existence. Future AGI goal generation will likewise remain embedded in its surrounding network of human goals, rules, data, environments and relationships.

Once Civilization Leap enters engineering, therefore, any local change enters a larger causal network. Greater efficiency in one place may change employment and distribution elsewhere; a new incentive may change behavior and reshape people's sense of gain; a new form of cooperation may reduce one kind of strategic conflict while generating new exclusion beyond its boundaries.

Engineering governance must see connections, not only projects.

A complete future implementation will span at least human goals and behavior, interpersonal relationships, organizations and markets, institutions and governance, resources and distribution, culture and education, technology and AGI, evaluation and feedback, security and power, and happiness and meaning. This is not a list of engineering projects to be built. It is a reminder that civilization never operates along a single line.

Any method entering reality must recognize that it is changing an existing network of relationships. The outcomes of local change continue to propagate through that network and return to their starting point as new conditions. The first principle of Civilization Leap governance is to keep these feedback relationships continually in view.

2 The root direction changes where self-interest begins

Every engineering implementation must be able to return to the root direction of Civilization Leap.

From “self-interest first” to “self-interest with others first.”

Civilization Leap does not require individuals to abandon their interests, organizations to stop pursuing development, or any actor to become an unconditional self-sacrificer. Self-interest still exists, and must exist. Life's protection of its own survival, happiness, freedom, boundaries and meaning is itself a fact civilization must respect.

What changes is the starting point of goal and purpose generation.

Under the default logic of “self-interest first,” an actor first forms its own purposes, then deals with others and consequences. Once interests intersect, strategic conflict arises naturally; cooperation often follows strategic conflict to contain conflict, enable exchange and reduce losses. When new interests and capabilities emerge, new strategic conflict is generated within the old cooperation.

Self-interest first generates strategic conflict from within.

Under “self-interest with others first,” actors with actual stakes in a goal and the significant consequences affecting them enter purpose generation before the goal is locked in. Actors still pursue their own interests. But as they seek paths for realizing those interests, cooperation ceases to be merely a remedy that appears after conflict. It begins to become the default path when new interests are generated.

Self-interest with others first generates cooperation from within.

No single method can define this direction. Entirely different institutional, technological and social paths may emerge in the future. They may belong to the same civilizational direction insofar as they truly make goal generation begin less and less from the interests of isolated actors, increasingly bring actual stakeholders and the full consequences into purpose formation, and increasingly make cooperation a way of generating new interests.

3 The foundation and three goals align every method with the same direction

The foundational requirement of Civilization Leap is for humans and AGI to continue existing together, so that a future still exists.

Without continued existence together, every goal loses its premise. Yet mere continued existence is not the endpoint of Civilization Leap, nor does it mean that humans already enjoy living conditions free from survival insecurity. On this foundation, Civilization Leap has three shared goals:

Freedom from survival insecurity for humanity as a whole.

Happiness in individual lives.

More meaningful lives.

“Freedom from survival insecurity for humanity as a whole” points toward basic security for shared life. As civilization gains ever greater productive, organizational and intelligent capabilities, humanity should no longer leave large numbers of lives trapped in fear over basic survival for the long term. The goal is for basic survival to cease being a widespread source of fear and constraint. This is a different level of concern from whether humans and AGI can continue existing together.

“Happiness in individual lives” is not happiness under a uniform standard. Happiness is each individual's personal experience of happiness. Different people may find happiness in entirely different lives, relationships, creation, freedom, tranquility and exploration. Civilization cannot prescribe what happiness means for them.

The goal of “more meaningful lives” likewise has no uniform answer. Meaning may come from relationships, creation, responsibility, experience, contribution and exploration, or from life itself. Civilization can expand the possibilities for life to generate and realize its own meaning, rather than bestowing a uniform meaning.

Humans and AGI continuing to exist together is the foundational requirement. The three goals set the direction. Stages determine weightings. Feedback drives calibration.

Engineering governance therefore cannot ask only whether a method improves efficiency, expands output or improves one indicator. The more fundamental questions always remain: does it safeguard the foundation of humans and AGI continuing to exist together? How does it affect humanity's freedom from survival insecurity, individual happiness and meaning in life? Does it depend on costs being borne elsewhere, in the future or by absent parties? Continued existence together and the three goals must continually enter governance judgments. They do not constitute a stage gate that postpones happiness and meaning until complete safety has been achieved.

4 Governance across levels keeps direction principles methods and outcomes distinct

Once Civilization Leap enters reality, the confusion most likely to arise is the mixing of questions at different levels.

Direction

Direction answers where civilization is going. The root direction and three goals of Civilization Leap belong at this level. Their validity does not arise from the success of a particular method, nor can the failure of a particular method automatically change them.

Principles

Principles answer which boundaries must not be lost while advancing in this direction. They translate direction into shared constraints that all future practices must uphold.

Methods

Methods answer how to proceed at a particular stage, under particular conditions and in a particular field. Methods may be diverse, iterated, unsuccessful or replaced. Civilization Leap does not permanently establish any one method in advance as the sole correct path.

Outcomes

Outcomes answer where the methods already adopted have actually brought people and society. Outcomes first calibrate methods; they also calibrate our understanding of real-world conditions and causal relationships.

Direction guides methods. Methods produce outcomes. Outcomes calibrate methods and our understanding of reality.

If a method produces outcomes contrary to the direction, the first step is to examine the method, conditions and causal judgments, rather than reinterpret the civilizational direction to protect an existing method. Likewise, the failure of a local method cannot be elevated directly into a rejection of the civilizational direction.

The purpose of these relationships between levels is to prevent any tool, organization, institution or technology from gaining the power to define Civilization Leap simply because it is temporarily effective.

5 Overall alignment returns every local success to the full causal relationships

Real-world methods usually affect only one part of society. Local methods readily create an illusion: if one indicator improves, civilization must be advancing.

Yet one system's gains may come from another system bearing costs. Today's efficiency may come at the price of tomorrow's fragility. Cooperation among some participants may also transfer risks to people outside the cooperative structure.

Local optimization cannot replace civilizational direction. Local success cannot replace the full causal picture.

Every future practice should therefore retain the capacity to ask outward-looking questions: who else does this change affect? Through which relationships do its effects continue to propagate? Which gains are merely transferred rather than newly created? Which costs are pushed onto those unable to speak, future people or more distant parts of society?

This questioning does not demand that every action comprehend the entire world before it begins. That is impossible. It requires that “not yet seen” never be treated as “having no effect,” and that local boundaries never be drawn artificially narrowly so as to delete consequences beyond them from judgment.

The wholeness of Civilization Leap does not require all problems to be solved simultaneously. It requires every local action to acknowledge its place in a larger causal network and to remain willing to adjust as new relationships and consequences emerge.

6 The stakeholder principle means inclusion is not equal weighting and weights do not rank human worth

Civilization Leap proposes that others are not an abstract “everyone else,” but actors with actual stakes in a specific goal or purpose. Different stakeholders enter to different degrees, with adjustments as their stakes change.

When this principle enters governance, two boundaries must be upheld together.

First, inclusion is not equal weighting. Different actors are affected differently; they cannot enter every goal in the same way.

Second, weighting does not rank human worth. A lower stake-based weight for an actor in a particular goal does not mean that person's life is worth less. Weightings describe the stakes connecting a specific goal and a specific actor, rather than ranking people themselves.

The stakeholder principle is part of the structure of goal generation, not the whole of Civilization Leap.

Still less can Civilization Leap be reduced to a weighting model. In real-world implementation, purpose generation is jointly affected by who is seen, what counts as a stake, how information is obtained, how power affects judgment, how time changes relationships, which actors cannot speak and which risks remain unknown.

The governance requirement is therefore not to announce a universal formula in advance. It is to uphold an unavoidable principle: actors who actually bear significant consequences cannot be treated as nonexistent in goal generation because they are absent, lack power, cannot express themselves or have not yet been born.

7 People are agents and changing civilization must not come at the cost of remaking people

Civilization Leap begins with the human heart, human nature and human relationships.

People act in their own interests, protect themselves, pursue happiness, seek recognition and fear loss. They also care about others, build relationships, are willing to cooperate and create meaning. These realities of human nature are not noise to be eliminated. They are the reality from which civilization must begin.

No future practice may therefore use “civilization's needs” as a reason to turn people back into material for institutions, systems or algorithms.

Civilization serves life; life does not submit to a civilizational model.

Civilization Leap changes people's paths to what they gain, rather than eliminating their needs. It seeks to enable more people, through creation, helping, cooperation, connection and responding to actual needs, to gain their own interests, dignity, happiness and meaning at the same time.

This is also why happiness must remain individual and meaning must retain multiple sources. Any practice that tries to define happiness or meaning uniformly has already departed from Civilization Leap, even if it acts in Civilization Leap's name.

8 Governance of cooperation retains competition defense and boundaries

Civilization Leap's move from "strategic conflict by default" to "cooperation by default" does not mean that competition, conflict, defense, refusal and boundaries no longer exist in reality.

When interests truly cannot be reconciled, when actors act maliciously, when cooperation is exploited or when security is threatened, civilization still needs to address conflict. What truly changes is that conflict is no longer presumed to be the first starting point of every relationship.

Cooperation is the default generative logic, not a requirement that all actors cooperate forever.

This distinction is crucial. If cooperation becomes compulsory, people lose the right to refuse and exit. If boundaries are abolished in the name of "common interests," cooperation itself may become a new form of control.

Civilization Leap therefore requires that new needs first seek ways of being realized together, while preserving actors' room to protect themselves in actual conflicts, refuse unreasonable demands and leave harmful relationships.

The value of cooperation lies not in surface agreement, but in whether it enables more actors to keep gaining, choosing and developing while one another continue to exist.

9 AGI governance expands causal understanding without deciding life's values for it

AGI is one of the important capability conditions that make Civilization Leap possible. It cannot thereby become the final interpreter of civilization's direction.

AGI's most important civilizational role is not simply to increase efficiency. It is to help actors see relationships and consequences previously hidden by limits of cognition, time and complexity: making more distant effects visible earlier, making hidden stakeholders easier to discover, bringing long-term outcomes into judgment before goals are locked in, and making previously hard-to-discover paths of cooperation visible.

AGI expands the capacity to see; it does not prescribe happiness and meaning for people.

Likewise, humans cannot view AGI solely as an unlimited amplifier for realizing established purposes. Human and AGI goal and purpose generation both need to shift in the same direction: actual stakeholders and significant consequences enter earlier, and goals can be reassessed against new facts.

The focus of governance is therefore not to grant any actor absolute correctness. It is to prevent any actor, including people, organizations or AGI, from permanently occupying the position of defining others' interests, civilization's direction or life's meaning merely because it possesses greater capability.

10 Governance across stages changes weightings without losing direction

Civilization Leap will not advance at the same pace in every historical stage. Crisis, transition, stability and more mature states of civilization bring different practical pressures on continued existence, basic survival security, individual happiness and meaning in life.

The three goals may therefore carry different weightings at different stages. In high-risk periods, continued existence and survival security may receive higher priority. Once basic conditions improve, the space for individual happiness and meaning may expand further.

What changes is the stage-specific weighting, not civilization's direction.

Stage-specific needs must especially be prevented from becoming permanent. Restrictions adopted for short-term safety cannot naturally become long-term structures simply because they were once necessary. Centralized mechanisms established for a transition cannot permanently acquire greater legitimacy merely because they are effective.

The core of governance across stages is always to understand why weightings are temporarily changed and what changes in conditions should prompt their readjustment. Real-world pressures can then affect the path without quietly rewriting civilization's ultimate direction.

11 Reversibility and correction allow civilization to return after mistakes

Civilization Leap does not claim to be a process that will never make mistakes. Precisely because it involves a complex society, any method may produce unexpected outcomes.

The real danger is not that errors occur, but that the ability to exit, correct, roll back and choose again is lost after they occur.

The closer a change comes to irreversibility, the higher its threshold must be. The more reversible it is, the more room there can be for exploration.

Future practices should therefore preserve, wherever possible, room for questioning, refusal, exit, correction, rollback and renewed assessment. Above all, these capacities must not be permanently closed off in the name of a “better future,” “overall interests” or the “correct direction.”

This is not hesitation about civilization's direction. It prevents methods from gaining uncorrectable power in that direction's name. If Civilization Leap is to change the old logic, it cannot itself recreate an old logic that is even harder to exit.

12 Feedback governance continually returns the process to its direction

Feedback is a condition for Civilization Leap to keep advancing.

But its role must be understood precisely. A single local outcome cannot directly adjudicate civilization's direction. It first tells us what the current method has caused under current conditions.

A good outcome cannot prove a method eternally correct; a bad outcome cannot directly prove the direction wrong. What is needed is to return the outcome to the causal chain and determine the level at which the problem occurred.

Was the method poorly chosen? Did conditions change? Were some stakeholders omitted? Did local gains transfer costs elsewhere? Were stage-specific weightings out of balance? Or was our understanding of real-world relationships themselves insufficient?

The purpose of feedback is to realign action, not to let local outcomes take over direction.

Governance is therefore not the establishment of an eternally unchanged procedure. It is the establishment of a capacity to return continually to the root direction and three goals. The deeper Civilization Leap enters reality, the more important this capacity becomes.

13 Boundaries on power prevent any actor from monopolizing the interpretation of Civilization Leap

Civilization Leap involves a shared direction, but a shared direction never means a monopoly on interpretation.

If one organization, technological system, institution or group can permanently define who is a stakeholder, what happiness means, what meaning is or which methods represent Civilization Leap, the structure originally established to change “self-interest first” may become another center of power.

Civilization Leap needs a shared direction, not a sole interpreter.

Every future practice must therefore allow different actors to question its methods, point out its external consequences, propose alternative paths and retain their basic ability to express their own interests and ways of life.

A shared direction means facing the same civilizational goal, not requiring all actors to take the same road. A truly stable civilization is not one where everyone may say only the same thing. Under a common foundation and direction, it allows different paths to compete, be compared, be revised and evolve.

14 Difference and diversity share a direction without standardizing life

Civilization Leap addresses the whole world, and the world is inherently constituted by differences.

Different countries, regions, cultures, communities, organizations and individuals have different traditions, stages of development and choices in life. Civilization Leap has no need to eliminate these differences.

What truly needs to be shared is this: civilization no longer treats opposition and strategic conflict as the default starting point of every relationship, no longer treats individuals as material for the whole, and no longer builds local gains upon long-term harms that cannot be seen. It continually moves toward freedom from survival insecurity for humanity as a whole, happiness in individual lives and more meaningful lives.

What is shared is the direction, not the shape of the world.

Diversity is therefore not an obstacle to Civilization Leap. With the same root direction, different societies can develop different paths of realization. Different outcomes will in turn enrich humanity's understanding of methods, conditions and causal relationships.

15 A shared governance sequence for engineering implementation

Civilization Leap does not prescribe a uniform engineering undertaking, but every future practice should retain a shared governance sequence.

First ask about direction

Does this action advance in Civilization Leap's root direction? What does it serve among the three goals? Does it cross the foundational boundary of humans and AGI continuing to exist together?

Then examine relationships

Which actual actors does the goal involve? Which significant consequences may continue to propagate through relationships, time and social structures? Who might be omitted because they are absent?

Then choose methods

Under the current stage and real-world conditions, how should progress toward the goal be made? Does the method preserve necessary individual boundaries and room for exit and correction?

Then examine outcomes

Do the outcomes really bring society closer to its goals? Have external costs, concentrations of power, exclusion or newly generated strategic conflict emerged?

Finally realign

Adjust methods, judgments about conditions and stage-specific weightings in light of outcomes, then return to the same direction and continue.

Direction → relationships → methods → outcomes → feedback → realignment.

This is not a specific engineering process. It is a discipline of governance: no method may bypass direction, no outcome may be detached from relationships, and every act of feedback must return to civilization's goals.

16 Governance principles that cannot be replaced

Future methods may change, but the following principles must not be quietly replaced for technological convenience, short-term efficiency or local interests.

- Efficiency cannot replace the three goals. Efficiency is a capability, not civilization's direction.
- Individuals cannot be eliminated in the name of the whole. People are civilization's agents, not material for systems.
- Refusal, boundaries and exit cannot be eliminated in the name of cooperation. Compulsory uniformity is not cooperation generated from within.
- Local success cannot replace the full causal picture. Gains must be examined for where they send costs.
- Stage-specific needs cannot permanently rewrite direction. Stage-specific weightings must remain open to readjustment.
- The stakeholder principle cannot be reduced to ranking people's worth. Weights in relationships are not the value of lives.
- No individual method, organization or technology may monopolize the interpretation of Civilization Leap.
- Greater AGI capability does not make capability itself a purpose. Capability must remain constrained by civilization's direction.

- Correction cannot be closed off in order to avoid mistakes. The higher the consequences, the more important it is to retain the possibility of renewed assessment.

Conclusion Engineering implementation brings direction into reality without letting reality engulf it

The direction of Civilization Leap can be stated very simply.

Do not change self-interest. Change where self-interest begins.

The true complexity is how, once this direction enters a society jointly constituted by countless interests, relationships, institutions, cultures, technologies, powers, emotions and histories, it can still remain faithful to the change it originally set out to make.

Engineering will be complex. Methods will diverge. Different places will obtain different outcomes. New problems will keep emerging.

Yet Civilization Leap cannot lose its direction because reality is complex. Nor can it compress complex reality into a uniform answer simply because it has a direction.

One shared direction, diverse methods; feedback from outcomes, continual calibration.

What Civilization Leap truly needs to govern is not only how a particular system operates. It is whether all future practices, while continually changing, still understand why they exist.

When actual stakeholders enter earlier and earlier as humans and AGI generate goals; when new interests are increasingly generated through cooperation; when institutions, technologies and social feedback increasingly enable people to act for themselves while making others and the shared future better as a result; when all this continually converges toward freedom from survival insecurity for humanity as a whole, happiness in individual lives and more meaningful lives—

Civilization Leap is unfolding in reality.

The reasoning is simple. The process is complex. The purpose of governance is to keep a complex process from losing its simple and fundamental direction.

Continue aligning

The next step in engineering implementation is not to seek one fixed method. It is to return continually to the governing direction, full causal picture and foundation of continued existence together established in Four Questions of Civilization Leap V1.1 and Theoretical Master Text V1.3, while checking the currently valid public materials.

Civilization Leap: The Path of Civilization in the AGI Era (all five volumes)

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

Return to the intellectual foundations of Civilization Leap and the civilizational boundaries that must not be lost, so that methods do not redefine direction in turn.

The Path of Civilization Leap

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

Examine where any local method sits within the complete causal chain and why it exists.

System Overview

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

Understand the relationships among the different constituent elements of society, works and public research, rather than replacing the whole with an individual engineering undertaking.

Complete Public Library

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

Find currently valid public manuscripts, versions and subsequent updates.

For the latest public versions, further reading paths and related manuscripts, consult the Civilization Leap website: <https://www.civitas.top/en/>