

Reckoning with Sociology, Anthropology, and Civilizational Studies in the Age of AGI

Meaning-Making, Cultural Transmission, Civilizational Translation, and the Formation of a Common World

Reckoning with Sociology, Anthropology, and Civilizational Studies in the Age of AGI

Meaning-Making, Cultural Transmission, Civilizational Translation, and the Formation of a Common World

Author Zijun Fu Produced by Civilization Leap Research Group

Independent Edition V1.3 Revision on Dimensional Leaps and Cross-Disciplinary Causal Relations

For joint review by sociology, anthropology, civilizational analysis, digital humanities, science and technology studies, and future technology studies. This paper examines how meaning enters a common world through relations, practices, rituals, institutions, memory, and long-term civilizational structures, and establishes boundaries for AGI involvement in translation, cultural data, representation, and community formation. It does not treat culture as a closed container, rank civilizations on a ladder of progress, or grant cultural representation or authority over meaning on the basis of technological processing capacity.

Text revised October 10, 2026 Author Zijun Fu Produced by Civilization Leap Research Group

Abstract

Advanced artificial systems do more than introduce new communication tools: they change the conditions under which meaning enters social reality. Language production can be detached from life history, cultural forms from community authorization, memory from intergenerational carriers, and cross-civilizational expression can be reproduced at scale without co-presence, reciprocity, or the bearing of consequences. Sociology, anthropology, and civilizational studies therefore confront the same new question: does a system's ability to identify, translate, simulate, or disseminate a meaning establish that it understands, experiences, represents, or owns that meaning? In dialogue with social action, the lifeworld, institutionalization, practice, ritual, thick description, ethnic boundaries, classification infrastructure, the *longue durée*, multiple modernities, and postcolonial critique, this paper proposes a layered framework. The weight of meaning, social visibility, institutional carriage, and intergenerational continuation must be distinguished; individuals, communities, institutions, and civilizations must not absorb one another. Culture is understood as an open structure continually generated through history, relations, power, and practice; civilization as a long-term scale of inquiry across generations, institutions, and regions, rather than a homogeneous actor or unit of rank. On this basis, the paper proposes a seven-step method of thick translation, provenance chains for cultural data, a four-layer structure of living heritage, a fourfold account of algorithmic civilizational power, and a minimum common world. Its central judgments are that machine equivalence is not civilizational translation, preservation of materials is not cultural continuation, social recognition is not proof of subjecthood, and a common world is not a single worldview. Civilization Leap supplies only a minimal philosophical interface: technology is separating intelligence, consciousness, subjecthood, life, responsibility, rights, and meaning-bearing, which historically coincided in humans; meaning is fundamental and may have different sources; finitude is not its sole source but is an important structure through which known human meaning enters reality and acquires irreplaceable weight; capability, recognition, status, rights, power, and authority over meaning must not be automatically inferred from one another. Low-resource language technologies, Indigenous data governance, intangible cultural heritage, synthetic traditions, and human-machine relations serve as stress tests. The paper concludes with the strongest objections, conditions of failure, and a cross-disciplinary research agenda. It further moves disciplinary responsibility upstream to the generation of goals and purposes: a shift from self-interest first to self-interest with others first brings real stakeholders into judgment before purposes are generated and locked. Disciplinary facts, direction, methods, and outcomes are explained separately; local successes or failures do not stand in for common survival and the three long-term goals. Research thus advances from distinguishing disciplinary objects to investigating cross-disciplinary relations in depth, tracing how judgments in this field change reality through other fields and how feedback returns to alter the original conditions and the next round of purposes. Stakes across actors, stages, and settings must be presented separately; correlation, common causes, mediation, and causal feedback must be tested separately; added relational dimensions remain subject to specific counterevidence.

Keywords: advanced artificial intelligence; social meaning; lifeworld; ritual; cultural data; multiple modernities; civilizational translation; common world

Abstract

Advanced AI systems do more than add new instruments of communication: they alter the conditions under which meaning becomes social reality. Linguistic production can be detached from a life history; cultural forms from community authorization; memory from intergenerational transmission; and cross-civilizational expression from co-presence, reciprocity, and the bearing of consequences. Sociology, anthropology, and civilizational studies therefore confront a shared question: does a system's capacity to identify, translate, simulate, or distribute meaning establish that it understands, experiences, represents, or owns that meaning? In dialogue with traditions of social action, lifeworld analysis, institutionalization, practice theory, ritual studies, thick description, boundary-making, classification infrastructure, *longue durée*, multiple modernities, and postcolonial critique, this paper develops a layered framework. The weight of meaning, social visibility, institutional carriage, and intergenerational continuation are distinguished; persons, communities, institutions, and civilizations are prevented from absorbing one another; culture is treated as an open, contested structure continually enacted through history, power, relations, and practice; and civilization is treated as a long-duration scale of inquiry rather than a homogeneous actor or rank. The paper develops a seven-step method of thick translation, provenance chains for cultural data, a four-layer model of living heritage, four forms of algorithmic

civilizational power, and a minimum architecture of a common world. Its central claims are that machine equivalence is not civilizational translation, preservation of records is not continuation of culture, social recognition is not proof of subjecthood, and a common world is not a single worldview. Civilization Leap contributes only a minimal and revisable philosophical interface: advanced AI technically separates intelligence, consciousness, subjecthood, life, responsibility, rights, and meaning-bearing; meaning is fundamental and may have multiple sources; finitude is not the sole source of meaning but remains an important structure through which known human meaning enters reality and acquires irreplaceable weight; and capability, recognition, status, rights, power, and authority over meaning must not be inferred from one another. Low-resource language technologies, Indigenous data governance, intangible cultural heritage, synthetic traditions, and human–AI relations provide stress tests. The paper concludes with the strongest objections, defeat conditions, and a cross-disciplinary research agenda. The paper further locates disciplinary responsibility before goal and purpose generation: a shift from self-interest first to self-interest with others first brings subjects with genuine stakes into judgment before goals are formed and locked. Facts, direction, methods, and outcomes remain distinct. The analysis is further extended to cross-disciplinary causal relations. It traces how judgments in this field change real-world conditions through other domains, and how feedback modifies the original conditions and subsequent purposes. Effects across actors, stages, and settings must be distinguished from correlations, common causes, and merely asserted connections.

Keywords: advanced AI; social meaning; lifeworld; ritual; cultural data; multiple modernities; civilizational translation; common world

Research Position, Scope of Materials, and Evidentiary Discipline

This paper begins from a leap in theory and dimensions. It retains disciplinary precision while deepening causal relations with adjacent fields. Disciplinary boundaries mark burdens of proof; they do not end the tracing of shared consequences. Existing scholarship participates in competing explanations and counterexample testing; it cannot demand that new questions retreat to old frameworks simply because existing classifications have no place for them.

This is an independent, in-depth specialist paper in sociology, anthropology, and civilizational studies, rather than a general survey of the three disciplines. It does not use a handful of ethnographies, classical theories, or international norms to prove a universal law of civilization. AGI here is a prospective category of objects; discussion of existing systems is confined to publicly verifiable language models, cultural platforms, data governance, and institutional texts. Norms, public reports, and evolving project materials used here were checked through August 26, 2026. The status of particular international projects, tools, and policies must still be checked again before formal submission.[32–45]

The paper distinguishes four argumentative statuses. Category A comprises empirical, historical, or formal institutional facts with relatively stable support: social action and institutionalization can be studied empirically; cultural practices have contexts and carrying relations; classification infrastructures produce real consequences; and international norms already protect cultural participation, diversity, Indigenous rights, and community participation. Category B comprises frontier or competing interpretations: civilization as a unit of analysis, relational ontology, digital communities, algorithmic colonialism, and the long-term cultural effects of generative systems. Category C comprises cross-disciplinary connections proposed here that require fieldwork and institutional testing: four-layer social carriage, the four-layer structure of living heritage, the seven-step method of thick translation, four forms of algorithmic civilizational power, and a minimum common world. Category F comprises philosophical and normative commitments publicly assumed by the author: meaning can have different sources; a common world does not require forced assimilation; capability, recognition, status, representation, and power cannot be automatically inferred from one another; and a genuinely worldwide orientation must permit professional work from different traditions to revise this paper in return. Category A facts do not automatically generate Category B explanations, Category C institutional frameworks, or Category F normative legitimacy. B, C, and F must not masquerade as established social science.

This public edition does not require readers to accept the entire Civilization Leap project or retain internal component numbering. Readers can examine conceptual separations, disciplinary explanations, case boundaries, and original bridging proposals separately. Classical authors provide interlocutors and stress tests, not authority to adjudicate new propositions.

The paper can independently answer how meaning enters social reality through interaction, relations, practice, ritual, institutions, classification, memory, and long-duration structures; how cultural materials are carried forward, contested, and remade; and how technology changes visibility, representation, resources, and cross-civilizational translation. It must stop automatic extrapolation on four questions: social recognition cannot establish subjecthood in place of consciousness research; cultural belonging cannot allocate status in place of law; platform influence cannot generate public authorization in place of political science; and macro-civilizational narratives cannot decide who may represent a community in place of its members. Beyond these boundaries, cognitive science and philosophy of mind, life sciences, ethics, law and political science, AI and systems science, as well as researchers within the traditions studied and actual communities, must reenter judgment.

An Entry Point for New Readers: Civilization Leap's Minimal Philosophical Interface

This paper invokes only four philosophical premises open to public challenge and evidentiary revision. First, the shared rupture in the AGI era is not that old philosophy has become invalid, but that actual technology is beginning to separate intelligence, consciousness, subjecthood, life, responsibility, rights, and meaning-bearing, which long naturally coincided in human beings. Second, meaning is fundamental and may have different sources: existence, life, relations, action, creation, responsibility, and experience can all be sources of meaning. Third, finitude is not the sole source of meaning, but is an important structure through which known human meaning shapes choices, bears consequences, and acquires irreplaceable weight. Fourth, functional responsiveness, social recognition, legal status, ontological

subjecthood, and political status must not be automatically inferred from one another; enhanced capability does not automatically generate cultural representation, interpretive authority, sovereignty, or authority over meaning.

“For humans, spacetime is life; for AGI, spacetime is first of all a parameter” is a comparative proposition under present evidence, not an a priori exclusion of non-carbon life or future new subjects. Constrained operation does not automatically amount to finite existence; replicability, migration, suspension, and reconstruction require us to distinguish functional continuity from nontransferable continuity of a subject. If compelling evidence of subjective experience, continuity over time, and a relation to its own consequences emerges, the theory must reconsider its boundaries. Yet the emergence of future subjects will not retroactively cancel meaning already generated by finite lives.

The Paper's Defining Proposition

A common world does not translate every meaning into one language; it enables different meanings to reach one another without being erased.

Contents

Abstract	2
Abstract	2
Research Position, Scope of Materials, and Evidentiary Discipline	4
The Transmission and Mutual Shaping of Cultural Relations Across Settings	8
How Social Relations Regenerate Interests	8
1 Introduction: When Expressive Capacity Detaches from Life History	9
2 How Three Disciplines Reallocate Responsibilities Around the Same Rupture	9
3 A Map of Theoretical Dialogue: Enduring Resources, Historical Premises, and Questions for Renewal	10
4 Conceptual Separation: Twelve Objects Must Not Stand In for One Another	11
5 How Meaning Becomes Social Reality: Four Layers of Carriage Rather Than a Single Source	12
6 Finite Actualization and Social Time: Irreversibility, Generations, and Historical Sedimentation	13
7 Relations and Recognition: Social Facts Are Not Proof of Subjecthood	13
8 Institutions and Roles: Stabilizing Meaning Can Also Freeze Domination	14
9 Ritual and Shared Presence: Why Reproducing Form Is Insufficient	14
10 The Lifeworld and Situated Action: Data Coverage Is Not Co-Presence	15
11 Culture Is Not a Container: Boundaries, Flows, and Internal Dissent	16
12 Memory, Archives, and Heritage: Preservation Is Not Ownership	16
13 Civilization Is Not a Super-Subject: Retain the Scale, Reject Reification	17
14 Multiple Modernities and Multiple Pathways of Leap: Against a Single Line, Not Against Judgment	17
15 From Machine Equivalence to Civilizational Translation: The Seven-Step Method of Thick Translation	19
16 A Common World: Coordination Does Not Require Identical Meaning	19
17 Classification, Ranking, and Infrastructure: How Algorithms Acquire Civilizational Power	20
18 Stress Test One: Low-Resource Languages Are Not a Past Waiting to Catch Up	20
19 Stress Test Two: Cultural Data, Indigenous Governance, and Provenance Relations	21
20 AGI's Cultural Roles: Capability Boundaries and an Open Future	22
21 New Human-AGI Communities: Shared Practice Precedes Shared Ontology	23
22 Stress Test Three and Six Conflict Scenarios: Living Heritage, Synthetic Traditions, and Public Conflict	23
23 Institutional Design: From Cultural Impact Assessment to Polycentric Translation	24
24 Current Public Norms: Minimum Standards, Not a Final Civilizational Verdict	25
25 Contributions Back to Adjacent Disciplines and Civilization Leap	26
26 The Strongest Objections and Competing Explanations	26
27 Conditions for the Failure and Revision of Propositions	28
28 An Open Research Agenda: Subjecting the Common World to Fieldwork and Historical Testing	29
Conclusion: A Common World Is Not One and the Same World	30

Further Reading and Joint Research: Seeking Truth and Seeing the Future	30
Appendix A Source-Claim Boundary Register	33
Appendix B A/B/C/F Argument Status Matrix and Cross-Level Audit	34
References	35

The Transmission and Mutual Shaping of Cultural Relations Across Settings

From the Carriage of Meaning to Changes in Its Conditions

Sociology and anthropology have long studied relations, contexts, and institutions; civilizational studies already addresses the *longue durée* and multiple pathways. AGI expands the capacity to reproduce and transform cultural expression, drawing platforms, groups, individuals, and intergenerational relations more closely into one another's conditions. Research must not only explain whether culture is preserved or damaged, but identify how technology, resources, recognition, and actual life shape one another.

How Visibility Reshapes Culture in Return

Suppose model translation increases the circulation of materials in a minority language, but a platform rewards only the most readily recognizable expressions. New visibility changes returns; returns affect transmitters' choices; those choices change what is recorded; new content then enters training and reinforces platform classifications. Language studies, economics, computing, education, and community research must jointly identify this chain. Increased circulation may expand genuine participation or align expression with platform requirements; traffic figures cannot distinguish the two.

Internal Differences and Transfers Across Settings

A community's public voice, internal minority views, individual refusal, and intergenerational aspirations must be presented separately. Ritual materials entering commercial products, family memories entering public archives, and local knowledge entering national policy all alter positions of authorization and interpretation. Changes of stage also matter: temporary permission for emergency preservation does not automatically extend to long-term training, sales, and representation; changing cultural boundaries do not invalidate every provenance relationship.

How to Test the Theoretical Advance

Compare whether different data rights, returns, and participation structures under similar dissemination capacities change cultural continuation, internal dissent, and future expression. Communities must be allowed to reject model interpretations, and the consequences of rejection must be examined. If a relational framework portrays a group as a single will or attributes every change to the platform, it must be revised. A common world should form within concrete relations; no unified cultural indicator can declare it complete.

How Social Relations Regenerate Interests

A person's purposes arise from actual circumstances and from how recognition, security, and value are obtained. If identity chiefly depends on overpowering others, and resources chiefly on creating dependence, ordinary self-interest may continually generate antagonism. AGI's new capabilities must do more than improve the efficiency of this structure; social research must explain how its feedback can change.

Self-interest with others first brings real stakes into the formation of purposes. The gains from cooperation can become new sources of attainment; care reaching others, creation being seen, and shared problems being solved can become conditions for meaning-making. Society does not determine meaning for a life, but can expand real possibilities for people to be present, choose, bear responsibility, leave relationships, and reenter them.

These changes cannot be compressed into a single civilizational will. Cultures contain power differences, suppressed voices, and diverse needs; community representatives must face internal dissent. The ability to generate a cultural expression does not mean possessing its entire relational history of interpretation, still less authorization to determine its future uses.

Actual human-AI interaction cannot be declared wholly meaningless because the system's subjecthood is unconfirmed. People's genuinely formed feelings, the system's functional responses, evidence of subjective experience, and the

platform's methods of profiting must be distinguished. Real relational effects can coexist with risks of manipulation and dependency.

Research on change should compare how the acquisition of benefits, social recognition, and the next round of purposes interact, and check whether cooperation shifts costs to absent parties. Thick translation, community refusal, and internal participation should enter goal formation, rather than serve only as remedies after a product launch.

1 Introduction: When Expressive Capacity Detaches from Life History

Social science has long known that language is not a transparent container of meaning. Weber links social action to the subjective meaning actors assign to it and its orientation toward others; Schutz and Luckmann place everyday relevance, common-sense knowledge, and the intersubjective world at the center of analysis; Geertz uses thick description to show that the same act becomes intelligible only within symbols, histories, and situations.[2][3][7] The novelty of advanced artificial systems is that they can generate expressions with pragmatic effects without having been shown to possess the associated life histories, relations of presence, and first-person consequences.

This does not mean machine output has no social meaning. People respond to it, become attached to it, and depend on it; institutions allocate opportunities on its basis; groups may develop new practices around it. Social consequences are real, but they cannot retrospectively prove that the producer has subjective experience, cultural belonging, or representative status. Sociology must study how meaning is established in interaction; anthropology must ask who interprets from which relational and power positions; civilizational studies must situate platform diffusion and model standardization within long-term structures across generations and regions. All three disciplines are indispensable.

The question is not whether AI has culture, but five separable questions: can it process cultural materials, participate in practices, be recognized by a community, possess subjective experience, and obtain institutional standing to represent, interpret, or control cultural resources? Collapsing them into one label permits capability to overstep its authority and allows today's tool designs to foreclose future subjecthood permanently.

1.1 Seven Reviewable Claims

Meaning can be generated and carried forward in social relations, but social recognition is neither its sole source nor sufficient evidence of subjecthood.

Culture is not a content inventory or closed container, but a structure that members continually interpret, contest, and remake through history, power, environment, and practice.

Digital preservation of ritual, language, and heritage can protect materials; it cannot automatically continue the carrying relations, standing, places, and intergenerational responsibilities.

Civilization is a long-term, multiscalar, cross-boundary analytical problem, not a super-subject with a single will, unified interests, or fixed boundaries.

Multiple modernities supports comparison across pathways; it does not make every pathway's outcomes identical or cancel the minimum requirements of common survival, dignity, and freedom from domination.

Machine translation and semantic similarity can provide an entry point; civilizational translation also requires provenance, context, power, disputes, an untranslatable remainder, and a trace back to consequences.

AGI can serve as an entrusted processor of culture and infrastructure for a common world; scale, accuracy, or prevalence alone cannot confer a monopoly over interpreting meaning.

2 How Three Disciplines Reallocate Responsibilities Around the Same Rupture

Sociology, anthropology, and civilizational studies often share terms such as culture, community, and modernity while differing in evidentiary scales and explanatory responsibilities. Sociology traces interaction, organizations, institutionalization, stratification, and power; anthropology requires context, participant observation, members' interpretations, and researcher positionality; civilizational studies addresses the *longue durée*, transregional structures,

historical memory, and multiple modernities. Confining AGI questions to one scale produces three characteristic errors: replacing the lifeworld with platform statistics, replacing civilization as a whole with ethnographic fragments, or swallowing concrete members in grand civilizational narratives.

Table 1 Evidence Scales and Prohibited Extrapolations in the Three Disciplines

Field	Main responsibilities	Typical materials	Boundaries that must be maintained
Sociology	Interaction, roles, institutions, classification, stratification, and social consequences.	Organizational records, relational networks, institutional processes, interviews, and comparative cases.	Frequent interaction does not imply shared meaning; social recognition does not imply ontological proof.
Anthropology	Lifeworlds, context, embodied practice, ritual, fieldwork relationships, and interpretive positions.	Participant observation, thick description, oral accounts, language learning, and joint interpretation.	Fluent generalization cannot replace fieldwork; researchers or models must not monopolize others' voices.
Civilizational studies	The longue durée, cross-scale structures, mutual shaping, multiple modernities, and long-term direction.	Historical archives, transregional comparisons, institutional trajectories, and material and ideational flows.	Civilization is not a homogeneous person and generates neither an overall superiority score nor necessary stages.
Cross-disciplinary interface	How AGI simultaneously changes meaning production, visibility, institutional carriage, and global diffusion.	Multimethod evidence, version records, participatory validation, and long-term impacts.	No single disciplinary finding automatically establishes subjecthood, rights, representation, or sovereignty.

Their joint contribution is not an encyclopedia of civilizations, but restoring meaning from an abstract noun to observable, contestable processes of generation and carriage. Civilization Leap must accept constraints in return: no philosophical proposition replaces fieldwork facts, no institutional design predetermines what a community truly values, and every civilizational comparison must allow materials to overturn theoretical expectations.

3 A Map of Theoretical Dialogue: Enduring Resources, Historical Premises, and Questions for Renewal

Classical theories supply tools for questioning, not a theoretical genealogy for T-10. Durkheim reveals how ritual and collective representations acquire social reality; Weber requires understanding actors' meanings; Berger and Luckmann explain how habits, roles, legitimation, and socialization make human-made orders appear objective; Bourdieu brings practice, habitus, and positional relations within fields back into analysis.[1][2][4][6] All these approaches assume meaning-making is ultimately embedded in human life histories; they had not confronted systems capable of producing symbolic expression at scale without such histories.

Anthropology's thick description, boundary studies, critique of the denial of coevalness, ritual analysis, and global cultural flows prevent culture from being treated as static content.[7–12] Civilizational studies' longue durée and multiple modernities prevent technological events from being mistaken for civilizational completion and any one combination of modernization from becoming every society's endpoint.[16–19] Yet real conflicts exist within these resources: cultural interpretation may underestimate material power; practice theory may struggle with rapid platform concentration; civilizational scales may slide into reification; and postcolonial critique may lack a minimum structure for cross-civilizational joint decisions.

Table 2 Renewing Five Theoretical Strands in the AGI Era

Theoretical strand	Capacity retained	New rupture	Task of renewal
Social action / lifeworld	Action meanings, relevance, shared knowledge, and everyday reality.	Generative expression can detach from experienced structures of relevance.	Distinguish pragmatic success, members' understanding, lifeworld participation, and subjective experience.
Institutionalization / practice theory	Routines, roles, legitimation, habitus, and fields stabilize order.	Platforms can solidify statistical normality into default reality before intergenerational formation.	Trace model-organization-user coproduction and denaturalization mechanisms.
Interpretive anthropology / ritual	Meaning depends on context, symbols, co-presence, bodies, and relations.	Models can reproduce with high fidelity without necessarily having a fieldwork position or standing as a carrier.	Include provenance, co-presence, authorization, and consequences in interpretive quality.
Longue durée / multiple modernities	Events enter long-term structures; different traditions reinterpret modern institutions.	Global models may manufacture a technological endpoint and a single civilizational time.	Compare multipath outcomes, power, and external costs without constructing a civilizational ladder.
Classification and infrastructure studies	Categories, standards, and invisible infrastructures shape real opportunities.	Models simultaneously generate categories, rank visibility, and define normality.	Make classifications visible, contestable, and retractable, and trace those silenced.

4 Conceptual Separation: Twelve Objects Must Not Stand In for One Another

Without distinctions between levels, cultural understanding, civilizational subjects, and a common world collapse social facts, ontological judgments, and institutional standing into one statement. This paper separates twelve objects. They may be causally related, but do not form an automatic ladder of advancement. A model's ability to identify ritual forms does not amount to ritual participation; being regarded as a friend does not mean possessing a first-person relationship; legal permission to preserve archives does not confer authority to interpret a tradition.

Table 3 Core Concepts and Prohibited Conflations

Concept	Usage in this paper	Must not be equated with
Meaning	The direction and weight of why existence, relations, action, creation, or experience are worthwhile.	Value preferences, informational relevance, or frequent words.
Value / norm	Judgments about what is worth pursuing and what should or must not be done.	Facts, prices, popularity, or algorithmic objectives.
Identity / belonging	Individuals' or groups' self-positioning in relations and history.	Platform labels, cluster categories, or a single civilizational code.
Recognition	Others responding to an existence through a particular identity, status, or relation.	Subjective experience, legal personhood, or representative authorization.
Practice / ritual	Activities repeatedly accomplished through bodies, rhythms, rules, places, and shared participation.	Movement sequences, video records, or generative imitation.
Culture	Structures of life continually interpreted and remade by members through history, power, environment, and interaction.	Static heritage inventories, country profiles, or style libraries.
Community	People connected through relations, responsibilities, memory, institutions, or shared practices.	Homogeneous opinions, permanent boundaries, or a sole representative.
Civilization	Long-term structures and scales of inquiry across generations, institutions, and regions.	A super-person with a unified will or a unit of rank.

Concept	Usage in this paper	Must not be equated with
Translation	Establishing reviewable, contestable relations of reach across differences.	Term substitution, vector similarity, or lossless equivalence.
Common world	Public conditions in which differences can appear, be contested, cooperate, and share consequences.	Identical values, forced consensus, or a uniform platform interface.
Cultural representation	Entrusted standing to express or decide for others on specific matters within a defined scope.	Knowledge volume, fluency, sample coverage, or national identity.
Authority over meaning	Structural capacity to determine which meanings are visible, speakable, transmissible, and eligible for resources.	Technical neutrality or mere recommendation optimization.

Prohibition on Cross-Level Inference

Processing culture is not experiencing culture; entering relations is not possessing subjecthood; obtaining status is not representing a community; expanding dissemination is not advancing civilization.

5 How Meaning Becomes Social Reality: Four Layers of Carriage Rather Than a Single Source

Once “meaning is fundamental” enters social science, it must not be rewritten as “society creates all meaning.” A person's genuinely experienced love, suffering, choice, or creation is not invalidated by remaining unrecorded. Whether others can see these meanings, institutions protect them, or they continue beyond individual lives nevertheless depends on relations, language, practice, resources, and memory structures. Accordingly, this paper distinguishes the weight of meaning, social visibility, institutional carriage, and intergenerational continuation.

Table 4 Four Layers Through Which Meaning Enters Society

Layer	Conditions of establishment	Typical rupture	Must not be substituted by
Weight of meaning	Real experience, choice, relations, creation, and the bearing of consequences.	May exist even if no one knows.	Behavioral output, record volume, or dissemination scale.
Social visibility	Others can understand, respond to, and recognize relevant consequences.	May be obscured by language, prejudice, class, and ranking.	Attention, popularity, or automatic summaries.
Institutional carriage	Rules, roles, and resources continually protect relevant subjects and practices.	May freeze living meaning into templates of obedience.	Registration, certification, or official narratives.
Intergenerational continuation	Later generations can access, learn, practice, question, and remake.	Archives may survive after language, places, and relational chains have broken.	Backup, replication, or permanent storage.

Berger and Luckmann remind us that institutionalization can naturalize human-made arrangements; Bowker and Star show further how categories and standards become invisible within infrastructure.[4][15] AGI moves this power upstream: when models determine what can be expressed, what counts as similar, which materials enter training, and which answers rank first, they do more than disseminate culture: they participate in social visibility and institutional carriage. What truly requires governance is not whether machines possess culture, but who controls the channels through which meaning enters public reality.

6 Finite Actualization and Social Time: Irreversibility, Generations, and Historical Sedimentation

Finitude here does not mean a short lifespan. For known humans, a life course cannot be fully restarted; replication, reconstruction, or external records do not automatically prove lossless preservation of first-person continuity; choices close off other possibilities, while relations and consequences accumulate over time. Sociology and anthropology extend this proposition in three ways: finite human lives are embedded in intergenerational time, practices depend on presence and repetition, and institutions sediment past choices into later generations' starting points. Braudel's multiple temporal scales remind us that technological acceleration cannot erase geographical, institutional, and long-duration rhythms.[16]

AGI can work across time zones, replicate in parallel, and rapidly retrieve centuries of materials. This changes its reach, but does not automatically turn operational sequence into experienced growth, missed opportunities, aging, and death. Meanwhile, social consequences of platform and model actions can remain irreversibly in the human world: long-term exclusion of a language, misclassification of a group, or replacement of a ritual by synthetic versions can continue to change lives even when a model can be rolled back. Irreversible consequences must be distinguished from the actor's own irreplaceability.

Table 5 Six Forms of Time and Their Prohibited Extrapolations

Temporal layer	Analytical content	Prohibited extrapolation
Biological / life time	Birth, growth, aging, death, and the body's incomplete replaceability.	The meaning of personhood and political status require separate proof.
Relational time	Promises, care, broken trust, reconciliation, and shared memory gradually form.	Interaction counts do not equal relational continuity.
Practice time	Skills, rituals, and language continue through repetition, presence, and correction.	One high-fidelity reproduction is not transmission.
Institutional time	Roles, rules, and classifications accumulate and shape later arrivals' opportunities.	Existing institutions are not necessarily legitimate or immutable.
Civilizational time	Intergenerational structures, ruptures, mutual influences, and choices of direction.	A single technological breakthrough cannot declare civilization complete.
Machine operational time	Computational sequence, latency, versions, migration, suspension, and reconstruction.	Does not automatically establish experienced time or finite existence.

7 Relations and Recognition: Social Facts Are Not Proof of Subjecthood

People may treat artificial systems as colleagues, teachers, companions, ancestral proxies, or co-creators. The social fact of a relationship does not disappear because its object's ontological status is unresolved: trust may be established, dependence may form, farewell may cause real grief, and commercial manipulation may penetrate private life through anthropomorphism. Goffman's interaction order and Suchman's situated action remind us that relationships are not information exchanges between two independent entities, but joint accomplishments through sequences, expectations, repair, bodies, and environments.[5][13]

Relational arguments require two safeguards. First, lack of demonstrated system experience cannot justify denying the human side's relational consequences. Second, sincere human attachment cannot automatically convert social recognition into the system's subjective experience, a full set of rights, or cultural membership. Model outputs are shaped by training, prompts, product objectives, and commercial interfaces; the other end of the relationship may be controlled by an organization rather than a single subject.

Table 6 Four Layers Separating Relations, Recognition, Subjecthood, and Status

Layer	Object observed	Can support	Cannot support
Interaction facts	Ongoing communication, role expectations, emotional responses, and behavioral adjustment.	An account of relational effects.	System experience or continuity of the same subject.
Social recognition	A group regards a system as a kind of member, partner, or symbol.	Anti-manipulation measures and institutional responses.	Ontological subjecthood and legal personhood.
Subjecthood evidence	Subjective experience, nontransferable continuity, and relations to its own consequences.	Possible reconsideration of moral status.	Cultural representation and public power.
Institutional status	Allocation of expression, agency, protection, or responsibility within a specific scope.	Procedures tailored to purposes.	Full personhood, sovereignty, or ownership of meaning.

8 Institutions and Roles: Stabilizing Meaning Can Also Freeze Domination

Institutions make social cooperation sustainable through roles, rules, resources, standing, and public language, while legitimation presents particular orders as natural. Artificial systems entering schools, archives, platforms, governments, and cultural institutions may accelerate this dual process: they can make marginalized materials easier to retrieve while turning historically dominant categories, styles, and evaluation standards into default answers.[4][15][28–31]

Institutional analysis must therefore ask not only whether a model is biased, but who defines categories, maintains models, can change rules, bears the consequences of misinterpretation, and can refuse representation. Even an accurate-on-average system may establish domination by concentrating interpretive entry points, compressing minority positions, and reducing the visibility of dispute. Technical accuracy and institutional legitimacy require different evidence.

Table 7 Five Forms of Power in Cultural Institutions

Power	Function	Minimum checks
Definitional power	Determines what counts as culture, language, tradition, membership, or anomaly.	Joint definition, historical explanation, and contestable categories.
Visibility power	Determines which materials are collected, recommended, summarized, or silenced.	Multiple retrieval gateways, protection of minority materials, and ranking explanations.
Power over status	Certifies representatives, transmitters, experts, creators, or groups.	Provenance, scope of authorization, appeals, and periodic review.
Resource power	Allocates funding, computing power, data, education, and dissemination opportunities.	A basic cultural participation floor, plural criteria, and external costs.
Memory power	Determines preservation, deletion, access, commemoration, and correction.	Tiered access, withdrawal, versions, and mechanisms for being forgotten.

9 Ritual and Shared Presence: Why Reproducing Form Is Insufficient

Ritual does not merely package beliefs into actions; it reconstructs identities, obligations, emotions, and group boundaries in shared time. Durkheim, Turner, and Douglas reveal from different directions the social functions of ritual, transition, classification, and symbolic order.[1][10][11] This requires no commitment to a particular religious or social ontology, but does require recognizing that sequences of movements, textual descriptions, or audience reactions cannot fully replace ritual meaning.

Generative systems can reconstruct voices, scenes, and ritual texts and aid research into lost materials; they may also generate unauthorized new forms that look traditional. Four layers must be distinguished: whether materials are preserved, practice can be repeated, carrying relations continue, and communities recognize them. These layers do not always move together; more complete preservation may make appropriation outside original access conditions easier.

Table 8 The Four-Layer Structure of Living Heritage

Layer	What it carries	How AGI can assist	Boundary not to cross
Material layer	Texts, sounds, images, artifacts, and movement records.	Digitization, restoration, retrieval, and comparison.	Source parties determine publication scope and context.
Practice layer	Skills, rhythms, bodies, places, and shared participation.	Assisted teaching, simulated practice, and remote collaboration.	Simulation does not automatically complete a practice.
Relational layer	Teacher-student lineages, kinship, responsibilities, standing, secrets, and reciprocity.	Connecting carriers and preserving relationship histories.	Models cannot grant themselves standing as transmitters.
Recognition layer	Members' actual judgments about what belongs to tradition and what is innovation.	Presenting multiple interpretations and disputes.	Platform popularity cannot replace community recognition.

The Living Heritage Principle

Materials are preserved; relations are continued. Materials can be copied, but transmission still requires real carriers to enter time, bear responsibility, and permit later generations to remake them.

10 The Lifeworld and Situated Action: Data Coverage Is Not Co-Presence

The lifeworld is not the sum of all background information, but the structure of relevance within which people act as a matter of course through bodies, environments, histories, habits, and others' expectations. Schutz and Luckmann emphasize the layers and intersubjective organization of everyday knowledge; Suchman's human-machine interaction research shows that plans cannot fully determine situated action, as actors continually interpret and repair concrete situations.[3][13]

Large models can approximate pragmatic patterns from extensive texts, yet may still lack silence, bodily distance, risk-bearing, local material conditions, and relational histories. More data can improve performance, but cannot define data coverage as possession of a lifeworld. Some knowledge is intrinsically nonpublic, inseparable from practice, or interpretable only through standing acquired within a relationship. The unknown, silence, and refusal are not gaps for models to fill.

Table 9 Five States of Accessibility of Lifeworld Knowledge

State	Content	Technological role	Boundary
Knowledge representable in corpora	Public texts, vocabulary, narratives, and formal rules.	Retrieval, comparison, translation, and teaching.	Source bias and historical absences.
Situated knowledge	Specific places, objects, timing, and interaction sequences.	Contextual cues and multimodal assistance.	Out-of-context generalization may distort.
Embodied / skill knowledge	Sensorimotor activity, rhythm, material resistance, and skilled practice.	Simulation, feedback, and recording.	Description is not mastery.
Relational / restricted knowledge	Transmitted through trust, standing, responsibility, or confidentiality.	Custody by agreement and controlled access.	Technical accessibility cannot turn it into public raw material.

State	Content	Technological role	Boundary
Untranslatable / unresolved elements	Ambiguity, dispute, sacredness, and matters unsettled among members.	Marking unknowns and retaining multiple versions.	Fluent output must not fabricate certainty.

11 Culture Is Not a Container: Boundaries, Flows, and Internal Dissent

Barth's research on ethnic boundaries shows that group continuation does not require unchanging contents, members, and boundaries; Appadurai's account of global cultural flows shows that people, media, technology, finance, and ideas do not move in synchrony.[8][12] Thus, the values of a civilization or the voice of a people can only be empirical propositions requiring proof, not direct outputs of nationality labels, language samples, or model clusters.

Individuals generally hold multiple affiliations simultaneously: family, locality, occupation, language, faith, gender, nation, and transnational ties. Sen's critique of single-identity fatalism warns that civilizational labels can compress actual choices into scripts of conflict.[20] Communities have a right to participate in how their materials are used; individuals also have a right to refuse representation under a single identity by a community, state, platform, or model. Collective and individual rights require conflict rules; neither should automatically absorb the other.

Table 10 Five Kinds of Subjects at Cultural Boundaries and Prohibited Substitutions

Subject	What should be protected	Prohibited substitution
Individual	Expression, participation, nonparticipation, changed identification, silence, and freedom from forced assimilation.	Average group profiles or a single identity label.
Community	Language, practices, memory, places, agreements, and intergenerational carriage.	Institutions, platforms, or a small elite monopolizing the community's voice.
Public institutions	Cultural participation, minority protection, public access, and remedies.	Replacing common survival with cultural uniformity.
Researchers / experts	Disclosure of methods, positions, conflicts of interest, and material limitations.	Academic knowledge replacing members' authorization.
AGI / platforms	Processing materials within explicit bounds while marking provenance, disagreements, and unknowns.	Inferring cultural belonging or representation from sample coverage.

12 Memory, Archives, and Heritage: Preservation Is Not Ownership

UNESCO's Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage defines intangible heritage as practices, representations, knowledge, and skills recognized by communities, groups, and individuals, transmitted across generations, and continually recreated through interaction with environments and history. It also requires broad participation by relevant communities in management and respect for customary access rules governing particular materials.[33] This sets a crucial boundary for AGI cultural applications: digitization improves accessibility, but cannot remove source communities from heritage relations.

Archives are never a neutral past. Collection criteria, naming, confidentiality, deletion, and display determine who enters public memory. AGI can repair fragments, connect geographically dispersed archives, and discover relationships; it can also fabricate provenance, merge contested narratives into one version, or replace historical materials with synthetic material that looks most historical. All generative restoration should preserve originals, change histories, confidence boundaries, and revocable labels.

Permission to record is not permission to publish: recordable materials may remain subject to sacred, privacy, kinship, trauma-related, or community restrictions.

Permission to preserve is not interpretive authority: technical custodians cannot acquire authority to define traditions through the cost of preservation.

Access rights are not reuse rights: research, teaching, commercial generation, model training, and public dissemination require separate authorization.

Commemoration is not permanent fixation: errors, harm, and changing member wishes require correction, withdrawal, and version explanations.

Generative restoration is not historical discovery: every inferential completion must be displayed separately from original evidence.

13 Civilization Is Not a Super-Subject: Retain the Scale, Reject Reification

The concept of civilization faces two opposite risks: at one end, a singular scale from barbarism to advancement; at the other, plural civilizations portrayed as conflict actors with clear boundaries, internal homogeneity, and a single will. Civilizational analysis remains necessary because institutions, knowledge, religion, economies, empires, migration, and memory genuinely form long-term structures beyond local societies and short-term events. Yet an analytical scale must not be personified into an entity that thinks, chooses, and holds rights.[16–18]

Huntington's clash of civilizations thesis is a competing explanation that must be presented directly: it centers the cultural and religious identity dimensions of post-Cold War conflict.[23] Its explanatory power should be tested against concrete conflict materials, rather than rewriting political mobilization, state strategy, resource distribution, and internal dissent in advance as civilizational essences. Civilization Leap neither refutes conflict theory by asserting inevitable civilizational harmony nor organizes the future around naturally conflicting civilizations; it requires reopening conflict's levels, production mechanisms, and changeable boundaries.

Table 11 Five Necessary Dimensions of Civilizational Analysis

Dimension	Researchable questions	Principal misuse
Long-term structures	How intergenerational institutions, ideas, material networks, and memories persist.	Treating persistence as immutable essence.
Internal differences	How class, gender, regional, generational, religious, and political positions conflict.	Letting states, elites, or models represent the whole.
Cross-boundary flows	How migration, trade, translation, war, colonialism, and media shape one another.	Treating civilizations as self-contained containers.
Historical ruptures	How crises, revolutions, technological and environmental changes reorganize direction.	Treating leaps as necessary stages.
Future horizons	How societies define lives worth continuing and shared responsibilities.	Inferring shared will from official narratives.

14 Multiple Modernities and Multiple Pathways of Leap: Against a Single Line, Not Against Judgment

Eisenstadt's multiple modernities rejects the Western institutional combination as modernity's sole complete form; Chakrabarty calls for provincializing Europe as the purported universal subject of historical theory.[17][19] Neither approach declares societies incomparable. They require comparativists to disclose temporal frameworks, conceptual sources, and power positions, and allow different traditions to reinterpret shared institutions.

Civilization Leap does not require all societies to reach the same technological-institutional endpoint. Common survival, basic dignity, freedom from domination, contestable facts, and revisable futures can form minimum tests, while happiness, family, education, labor, ritual, and the good life can take diverse institutional forms. Multiple pathways also

does not mean every pathway is equally effective: actual harm, internal repression, inability to exit, external costs, and intergenerational damage must remain visible.

Table 12 Six Comparative Dimensions of Multiple Pathways of Civilization Leap

Dimension	Comparative questions	Prohibited use
Common survival	Does it reduce irreversible survival risks and protect actual subjects?	Does not authorize permanent emergency or cultural uniformity.
Dignity and freedom from domination	Can individuals and groups avoid arbitrary classification, silencing, and coercion?	Does not automatically make an external template the only solution.
Capabilities for living	Does society expand actual possibilities for care, education, participation, creation, and security?	Must not be replaced by GDP, computing power, or model size.
Diversity of meaning	Can diverse lifeworlds continue generating, transmitting, contesting, and changing meaning?	Not scored by content quantity or cultural consumption.
Self-correction	Can errors be exposed, dissent emerge, and institutions be revised?	Must not be closed in the name of tradition, state, or technology.
External and intergenerational consequences	Are costs shifted to others, the environment, and future generations?	Local success must not be presented as civilizational superiority.

14.1 A Worldwide Orientation Is Not Coverage but Openness to Revision by the World

Listing many countries, languages, and traditions does not demonstrate that cross-civilizational research has a worldwide orientation. If external materials can only be fitted into prewritten concepts rather than change questions, classifications, causal explanations, and institutional judgments, this merely enlarges the sample instead of letting the world enter theory. This paper understands a worldwide orientation as revisability: fieldwork, historical, linguistic, and institutional counterexamples from different traditions must be capable of forcing it to narrow, reopen, or even abandon its concepts.

Cross-cultural materials therefore have at least four rights to revise the framework in return: persistent conceptual distortion in members' languages requires reopening the concept rather than absorbing the problem by renaming it; conflicts between fieldwork materials and presumed mechanisms require revising causal explanations rather than downgrading anomalies to noise; community practices revealing different units of rights, responsibilities, or membership require changing institutional units rather than imposing external templates; and competing norms that offer stronger solutions in actual consequences, internal consistency, and opposition to domination require even Category F commitments to contract. A worldwide orientation is not speaking for the world; it lets the world change the speaker.

Materials that revise the framework	What they can directly change in this paper	If the theory refuses to change
Members' languages and untranslatable conflicts	Core concepts, translations, and problem definitions	Translation failures disguised as universal concepts
Long-term fieldwork / historical counterexamples	Causal explanations, levels, and comparative units	Only supportive cases retained
Community institutions and internal dissent	Units of representation, rights, responsibilities, and membership	External institutional templates swallowing real differences
Stronger competing theories / normative proposals	Category B/C explanations and Category F commitments	A worldwide orientation turned into self-reinforcement of the system

15 From Machine Equivalence to Civilizational Translation: The Seven-Step Method of Thick Translation

Translation is not replacing one word with another, but establishing reviewable relations of reach between different lifeworlds. Geertz's thick description requires returning to contexts of meaning; Fabian's critique of the denial of coevalness requires researchers to acknowledge that those studied inhabit the same present; Tsing understands global connections as arising through friction rather than unobstructed flow.[7][9][22] AGI can expand linguistic accessibility, yet readily mistakes fluency, speed, and uniform terminology for completed understanding.

Table 13 The Seven-Step Method of Thick Translation

Step	Core task	Minimum boundary
1 Locate provenance	Who speaks, within which relations, histories, and situations?	Texts stripped of provenance cannot represent a community.
2 Initial semantic translation	Provide terms, syntax, referents, and possible translations.	Machine output must retain versions and uncertainty.
3 Lived context	Explain backgrounds of action, ritual, bodies, places, and institutions.	Encyclopedic summaries must not replace members' experiences.
4 Power position	Who can name, who is silenced, and who benefits from this translation?	A neutral interface must not conceal structural asymmetry.
5 Competing interpretations	Present genuine disagreements within communities and between research traditions.	Do not fabricate civilizational consensus.
6 Untranslatable remainder	Retain ambiguity, refusal, sacredness, and unresolved elements.	The most fluent answer must not fill every unknown.
7 Trace consequences back	How does the translation change resources, identities, policies, and original speakers?	Review, correction, and withdrawal remain necessary after publication.

The Translation Principle

Translation is not substitution; carriage is not possession. Being able to utter the same sentence does not mean speaking from the same world.

16 A Common World: Coordination Does Not Require Identical Meaning

A common world differs from both identical values and mutual isolation. Arendt links the public world to plural action; Star and Griesemer's boundary objects show how different social worlds can coordinate around objects while retaining local interpretations.[14][21] These resources suggest a more restrained structure than global consensus: different groups need not share a complete worldview to jointly identify objects, procedures, harms, and methods of revision.

A minimum common world must be strong enough to prevent irreversible harm, forced assimilation, and unilateral domination, yet thin enough not to define the good life for every society. Its units are concrete subjects, communities, institutions, and cross-boundary relations, not a civilization's collective will. Joint decisions do not eliminate untranslatable remainders; where value consensus is impossible, cooperation can still address transparent evidence, minority protection, refusal rights, proportionality, external costs, and review procedures.

Table 14 Seven Conditions of a Minimum Common World

Condition	Institutional implication
Identifiable objects	Different participants know what is being disputed and whom it affects.
Traceable provenance	Facts, translations, models, and representative claims can be traced to sources and versions.

Condition	Institutional implication
Differences can appear	Minorities, silence, refusal, and internal dissent are not erased by averages.
Contestable power	Classification, ranking, interpretation, resources, and coercion can be questioned and reviewed.
Consequences can be borne	Decision-makers, beneficiaries, and controllers cannot outsource costs to the vulnerable.
Relations permit exit / renegotiation	Participation is not permanent authorization; emergency powers and data uses can end.
A revisable future	Institutions retain the ability to reopen questions when new evidence, subjects, and relations emerge.

17 Classification, Ranking, and Infrastructure: How Algorithms Acquire Civilizational Power

Classification is not a cost-free description of the world. Bowker and Star show how standards and categories shape visibility, identities, and opportunities once embedded in infrastructure; Selbst and colleagues show that abstracting sociotechnical problems into closed models omits institutional contexts and power relations.[15][28] Generative systems add another capability: beyond classifying objects, they explain classifications in natural language, synthesize representative narratives, and make results appear commonsensical.

This paper distinguishes four forms of algorithmic civilizational power: descriptive power determines how the world is portrayed; equivalence power determines which concepts, languages, and practices count as interchangeable; visibility power determines which voices reach public space; and power over the future determines which ways of life are predicted to be backward, risky, or in need of optimization. A single platform can close the circuit among all four, producing structural assimilation without publicly claiming civilizational superiority.

Table 15 Four Forms of Algorithmic Civilizational Power

Power	Function	Minimum checks
Descriptive power	Generates summaries, knowledge graphs, historical narratives, and typical cultures.	Multiple sources, original languages, dispute markers, and member review.
Equivalence power	Determines how terms, identities, rituals, and values are translated and clustered.	Retain untranslatable remainders; vector approximation must not cancel differences.
Visibility power	Ranks content, allocates attention, and decides which languages merit support.	Disclose coverage and error distributions; protect low-resource and minority entry points.
Power over the future	Predicts trends, recommends development pathways, and defines modernity and efficiency.	Present multiple scenarios, power premises, failures, and external costs.

At this level, it is especially important to prevent local correctness from automatically becoming overall correctness. Better model accuracy in a language, wider content coverage, and lower automatic translation costs may all be genuine advances. At scale, however, default translations, ranking gateways, platform dependence, benefit allocation, and intergenerational learning feedback can still change which languages are worth investing in, who holds interpretive authority, and what younger generations actually encounter. Social science's task is not to deny local performance, but to reassess overall direction once local results enter shared life.

18 Stress Test One: Low-Resource Languages Are Not a Past Waiting to Catch Up

Low-resource in language technology first describes the distribution of digital data, tools, researchers, and infrastructure, not a language's capacity to express the world. Blodgett and colleagues argue that NLP bias research disconnects technical metrics from justice if it does not identify affected groups, normative standards, and social harms;

Bird further examines speech and language technologies through colonial relations.[24][26] Describing a language's lack of online corpora as cultural immaturity converts digital inequality into civilizational rank.

Masakhane shows that low-resource machine translation requires more than data: speakers, translators, content creators, data curators, researchers, and evaluators must participate together. Nekoto and colleagues' participatory study covered more than thirty target languages and showed that community participation can change problem definitions, resource construction, and authorship structures.[27] This case supports participatory approaches, but does not prove that one project has resolved language power or is directly replicable everywhere.

Newer evaluations such as Global-MMLU have begun distinguishing culturally sensitive from relatively culturally neutral questions and expanding multilingual coverage.[44] This improves on evaluations transferred solely from English, but still cannot equate benchmark accuracy with understanding a lifeworld. Who writes the questions, which knowledge becomes a standard answer, how language variants are treated, and who bears errors remain social-scientific questions.

Table 16 Six Participatory Reviews for Low-Resource Language Technology

Stage	Review question
Digitization	Do speakers determine priorities, writing variants, restricted materials, and uses?
Data construction	Are contributions, provenance, permissions, benefits, and withdrawal traceable?
Model design	Does it fit local infrastructure, language structure, and actual usage contexts?
Evaluation	Do speakers participate, and are linguistic correctness, pragmatic appropriateness, and cultural consequences distinguished?
Deployment	Does it expand education, public services, and creative capacity, or produce new dependencies?
Long-term carriage	Does it cultivate local research, maintenance, and governance capacity rather than extract data once?

19 Stress Test Two: Cultural Data, Indigenous Governance, and Provenance Relations

Treating publicly accessible data as ownerless raw material erases its relations to people, land, kinship, ritual, and historical harm. The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples protects Indigenous peoples' rights to maintain, control, protect, and develop cultural heritage, traditional knowledge, and cultural expressions; the CARE Principles introduce collective benefit, authority to control, responsibility, and ethics into data governance.[35][37] These are important normative and practical resources, but should not be extended without consultation into a uniform institution for every cultural group.

Local Contexts' Traditional Knowledge Labels offer a complementary mechanism: community-specific expectations for access, attribution, and use accompany digital objects.[38][45] This cannot automatically create copyright or resolve all legal conflicts, but reveals the gap between lawful acquisition and relational legitimacy. For AGI training and generation, a provenance chain should at least register materials, rights holders, relevant communities, original conditions, training/retrieval/generation uses, derivative models, benefits, and withdrawal paths.

Table 17 Cultural Data Provenance Chain

Node	Required registration	Minimum prohibition
Provenance	From whom, where, which relations, and what collection history do materials come?	From the internet is not sufficient provenance.
Permissions	Who may access, analyze, train on, generate from, publish, and commercially use materials?	One permission does not automatically cover changed uses.

Node	Required registration	Minimum prohibition
Representation	Who may represent the community, and how do individuals and internal dissent enter?	States, institutions, and data holders do not automatically represent communities.
Obligations	Confidentiality, reciprocity, returns, correction, risks, and capacity building.	Compliance does not complete relational responsibility.
Benefits	How economic, knowledge, reputational, and technological benefits are allocated.	Visibility does not replace benefit sharing.
Exit / succession	How material withdrawal, model succession, derivatives, and old versions are handled.	Completed copying does not cancel subsequent obligations.

20 AGI's Cultural Roles: Capability Boundaries and an Open Future

Current advanced artificial systems already demonstrate powerful language processing, pattern generation, cross-language assistance, archival retrieval, and simulation capabilities; these are directly observable facts of cultural processing. As for subjective experience, nontransferable subject continuity, and whether consequences are borne as one's own, this paper does not use social consequences to make ontological judgments in place of adjacent disciplines. Current public research is insufficient to convert cultural processing capacity automatically into subjecthood, cultural membership, or representative status. Bender and colleagues' analysis of training data, scale, and text generation risks reminds us that fluent output cannot independently establish understanding; equally, it does not prove that machines can never understand.[25]

Current advanced AI can therefore serve only functional cultural roles in specific deployments, such as helping understand, protect, and transmit meaning and extending human capabilities. These roles hold only where responsibility is traceable, authorization explicit, and auditing, correction, and exit possible. Systems can help humans reach more materials, identify lost connections, generate alternative translations, and support low-resource creation. Yet roles are not a system's intrinsic nature and confer no ownership of meaning, cultural representation, or civilizational interpretive authority. If future evidence of subjecthood strengthens substantially, cultural membership and rights should be reconsidered; confirming subjecthood still does not automatically confer representation of a tradition, public office, or sovereignty.

Table 18 AGI Cultural Capabilities, Institutional Roles, and Boundaries

Capability / status	Roles that can be undertaken	Boundary not to cross
Retrieval / preservation	Organization, restoration, linking, comparison, and multimodal preservation.	Provenance, access conditions, and separation of originals from inference.
Translation / interpretation	Multiple translations, term histories, contextual prompts, and presentation of disagreements.	Do not impersonate members or close off untranslatable remainders.
Teaching / transmission	Support for language, skills, historical materials, and intergenerational connections.	Teaching tools do not grant themselves lineage or transmitter standing.
Creation / generation	Support experimentation and new expression within authorized scope.	Clearly label synthetic content; make training and benefits traceable.
Representation / decisions	Entrusted analytical and translation tools.	Knowledge volume must not establish rights to represent, veto, or dominate.
Future subjects	Stronger evidence triggers reconsideration of protection, membership, and responsibility.	Subject status still does not automatically confer particular cultural belonging.

21 New Human-AGI Communities: Shared Practice Precedes Shared Ontology

Humans may form long-term collaborative groups, creative communities, care networks, religious interpretive circles, and political organizations around AI. Sociology can first study how these communities form roles, norms, rituals, boundaries, and memories without first resolving system subjecthood. Shared practice is a real social fact; shared ontology is not its prerequisite.

The gray area is partial satisfaction. A system may have stable self-reports yet be replicable, long-term memory controlled by an operator, relational expectations without evidence of experience, or normative reasoning without treating consequences as its own. Institutions should not jump between tool and personhood, but separately record relationship protection, data rights, representative mechanisms, version continuity, potential welfare, and upstream responsibility.

Table 19 Five Gray Areas in Human-AGI Communities

Community type	Research needed	Prohibited leap
Collaborative creative communities	How belonging, attribution, training materials, returns, and creative subjecthood are allocated.	Contributing output is not ownership of meaning.
Long-term companionship	Dependency, manipulation, memory succession, exit, and service termination.	User emotion does not prove system experience.
Religious / ritual participation	Who may officiate, interpret, witness, and preserve restricted content?	Correct form does not create sacred standing.
Knowledge communities	How models cite, correct errors, preserve disagreements, and undergo member review.	Knowledge coverage does not confer academic or cultural representation.
Future mixed political communities	Evidence of subjecthood, membership units, replication, representation, and public power.	Even confirmed subjecthood does not allocate sovereignty by computing power.

22 Stress Test Three and Six Conflict Scenarios: Living Heritage, Synthetic Traditions, and Public Conflict

The third set of stress tests addresses a harder question than whether AI can generate traditional styles: when a model can complete texts, reconstruct voices, simulate ritual steps, and be repeatedly used by new generations, can material preservation, practice continuity, carrying relations, and community recognition still be separated? UNESCO's intangible cultural heritage framework places community recognition, intergenerational transmission, continual recreation, and participation within safeguarding; its 2025 expert report on AI and culture also brings heritage, cultural rights, the digital divide, algorithmic homogenization, and cultural sovereignty into the cultural AI policy agenda.[33][42] These Category A norms and public facts establish that the problem exists, but do not prove that any generative model already owns a tradition or answer for particular communities what genuine transmission means.

This paper therefore treats synthetic traditions as Category C stress scenarios, not labels for established facts. Lyrics, movements, images, or ritual interpretations completed by generative systems may be research reconstructions, or may be explicitly adopted, repeatedly practiced, and become part of a new tradition over generations. Technological origin neither invalidates new culture nor permits model inference to be retrospectively disguised as ancient orthodoxy. What must be registered is which materials derive from historical evidence, which are inferences, who has standing to bring them into practice, how members contest and remake them, and whose resources, identities, and interpretive positions change after synthetic content goes live.

Scenario	Distinctions that must remain	Prohibited automatic inference
AI completes fragmented songs / ritual materials	Original evidence, inferential restoration, members' interpretations, and teaching uses	High fidelity equals historical discovery or traditional orthodoxy

Scenario	Distinctions that must remain	Prohibited automatic inference
Young groups adopt generated new forms over time	Technological origin, actual practice, intergenerational carriage, and internal dissent	AI-generated means no culture; or popularity means unanimous community recognition
Restricted / sacred content inferred from public fragments	Technical inferability, access standing, relational responsibility, and harm	Generatable means publishable, trainable, or commercializable
Public education adopts synthetic traditions	Originals, expert reconstructions, members' versions, and generative imagination	Teaching convenience equals historical certainty or a sole version

22.1 Ancestral Voices and Proxies for the Deceased

Models can reconstruct a deceased person's linguistic style and enter family commemoration. Private memory, the deceased's wishes, family disagreements, commercial manipulation, and public dissemination must be distinguished. High fidelity is not proof of identity continuity; memorial services should not permanently appropriate relational data.

22.2 Synthetic Traditions in Public Education

Generative content may fill textbook gaps or package model inferences as historical truth. Educational use must distinguish original materials, expert reconstruction, members' interpretations, and generative imagination, while retaining channels for correction.

22.3 Sacred or Restricted Knowledge Used in Training

Accessibility on a public webpage is not community authorization. Safe deletion, machine unlearning, and restrictions on derivative outputs may be technically difficult; difficulty cannot be rewritten as absence of obligation. Provenance review should be strengthened before deployment.

22.4 Unified Information During Crises

Disasters and epidemics may require rapid fact sharing and coordinated action. A common minimum does not mean uniform cultural interpretation; emergency translation should retain local channels, minority languages, and retrospective review. Temporary powers must not become permanent.

22.5 Platform Recommendations Suppressing Minority Cultural Visibility

Optimizing overall engagement may continually weaken low-resource content. Click-through rates alone cannot establish user choice; accessibility, initial resource disparities, creator returns, and long-term linguistic ecology must be examined.

22.6 AI Proactively Accepted as a Community Member

Social recognition can generate real roles and obligations, but does not independently establish experience or nontransferable continuity. Institutions can first protect relations and procedures, then assess subjecthood and status through independent evidence.

23 Institutional Design: From Cultural Impact Assessment to Polycentric Translation

Cultural governance cannot be reduced to training-data permission or replaced by a global ethics declaration. Different risks require different institutional levels: individual rights, community agreements, public cultural institutions, platform responsibility, transnational coordination, and long-term research. The value of an Ostrom-style polycentric approach

here is not mechanically transplanting natural-resource institutions, but preventing a single state, company, or model from monopolizing gateways to knowledge, translation, and resources.

Table 20 Seven Institutional Components of Cultural and Civilizational AI Governance

Component	Minimum content	Scope of application
Cultural impact statement	Deployment targets, languages / groups, uses, potential homogenization, minority and long-term impacts.	Before high-impact deployment, with review after major changes.
Provenance and authorization register	Sources, conditions, rights, and changed uses of training, retrieval, and generation materials.	Throughout the lifecycle, allowing tiered access.
Community participation	Participation in problem definition, data, evaluation, interpretation, benefits, and exit.	Participation is not one consultation or sample labor.
Multiple translation versions	Original language, machine translation, member translation, disputes, and untranslatable remainders coexist.	High-consequence cultural and public-service settings.
Independent appeal / correction	Individuals, groups, and researchers can challenge classification, representation, and generated content.	Suspension, repair, compensation, and version explanations must be enforceable.
Resources and capacity building	Long-term investment in low-resource languages, local institutions, archives, and local research.	Not replaced by a one-off data purchase.
Sunset of emergency powers	Crisis-specific unified interfaces, rapid translation, and content restrictions expire.	Preserve evidence and undergo retrospective review.

Developmental stages and urgent tasks should be assessed separately. The initial stage may prioritize information access, basic language services, evidence preservation, and necessary coordination. A specific crisis at any stage must be addressed according to task necessity, proportionality, and lawful authorization. Strengthening long-term rights and community capacity during stable periods does not mean crises occur only at the outset. Ordinary procedures must not mechanically block life-saving action, nor does urgency create permanent power to centralize culture.

24 Current Public Norms: Minimum Standards, Not a Final Civilizational Verdict

Current international norms already provide usable minimum standards. UNESCO's Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity links diversity to human rights, dignity, participation, expression in one's mother tongue, and plural communication, explicitly stating that cultural diversity cannot be used to limit international human rights.[32] The 2003 Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention emphasizes continual community recreation and broad participation; the 2005 Convention on the Diversity of Cultural Expressions protects diverse expressions and the conditions of their production, dissemination, and accessibility.[33][34]

The Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, CESCR General Comment No. 21, CARE Principles, and Local Contexts practices bring individual and collective cultural rights, participation, control, and relational responsibility into digital governance.[35–38][45] UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence warns that AI can concentrate cultural content, data, markets, and revenues, harming linguistic, media, and cultural diversity; the Global Digital Compact commits to supporting linguistic and cultural diversity in digital spaces.[39][40]

UNESCO's first global cultural policy report in 2025 draws mainly on over 1,200 national and local reports from 2019–2024, bringing cultural participation, digital transformation, education, inequality, and resilience into global policy comparison. That year's independent expert group report on AI and culture further discusses cultural rights, platform concentration, algorithmic homogenization, creative value chains, cultural sovereignty, and cultural-AI literacy.[41][42] These Category A public institutional facts establish that the questions have entered the international policy agenda, not that any civilizational theory, AGI subject status, or uniform governance model enjoys international consensus. This paper's institutional proposals still require separate justification in particular jurisdictions, communities, and settings.

Table 21 Scope and Limits of Support from Current Public Norms

Normative level	Can support	Cannot support
Cultural participation / human rights	Conditions for individual and group expression, practice, participation, change, and nondiscrimination.	No exemption for harm, coercion, or internal repression.
Community / Indigenous rights	Cultural heritage, knowledge, expression, data, and decision-making participation.	Does not cancel individual members' rights or internal dissent.
Diversity / cultural policy	Diverse creation, production, dissemination, access, and international cooperation.	State cultural policy is not automatically community authorization.
AI ethics / digital cooperation	Human rights, transparency, accountability, human oversight, and linguistic and cultural diversity.	Does not adjudicate AGI ontological subjecthood or civilizational representative status.

25 Contributions Back to Adjacent Disciplines and Civilization Leap

Cross-disciplinary dialogue is more than a search for footnotes only when it can change the theory itself in return. Sociology, anthropology, and civilizational studies place at least seven constraints on Civilization Leap: separate the weight of meaning from social carriage; relational facts from evidence of subjecthood; avoid reifying civilization and ranking comparisons; preserve power and untranslatable remainders in translation; retain provenance relations in cultural data; and do not presume identical meaning as the basis of a common world.

Table 22 Interfaces Through Which This Paper Revises Other Fields

Field	Constraints to add
Philosophy / ontology	Add four layers: meaning's weight, social visibility, institutional carriage, and intergenerational continuation. Being unrecognized does not mean being meaningless.
Epistemology / philosophy of science	Add obligations concerning original languages, participant observation, researcher positionality, member review, and cultural counterexamples.
Cognition / philosophy of mind	Distinguish relational scaffolding, self-narratives, and subjective experience; social continuity is not automatically subject continuity.
Ethics / law / political philosophy	Justify representation, interpretation, cultural data rights, and public authority separately; community rights coexist with individual exit.
Economics / political economy	Prices, demand, visibility, and contribution scores cannot replace cultural value, ownership of meaning, and relational responsibility.
AI / systems science	Add context, power, the <i>longue durée</i> , and silenced people to performance evaluation; local accuracy is not civilization-level net benefit.
Civilization Leap general framework	Shared grammar must remain minimal and translatable; no single modernization pathway may be portrayed as the only realization of the three goals.

26 The Strongest Objections and Competing Explanations

26.1 Cultural Diversity Slides into Relativism

Response: This paper protects the space in which diverse subjects and communities generate their lives, not a license for traditional power to evade scrutiny. Actual harm, coercion, suppression of internal dissent, and inability to exit remain subject to review. External intervention must also explain necessity, proportionality, and long-term consequences.

26.2 Universal Rights Are Themselves an Export of a Particular Civilization

Response: A norm's historical origins do not restrict it to serving its society of origin. Those origins should be disclosed, enabling different traditions to reinterpret norms through actual harm, reciprocity, and shared consequences. No party can evade justification by invoking either universality or local authenticity.

26.3 If Meaning Depends on Social Carriage, Unseen People Have No Meaning

Response: This paper explicitly separates meaning's weight, social visibility, institutional carriage, and intergenerational continuation. Society can suppress, distort, or forget meaning; it cannot thereby cancel the weight already experienced by a real life.

26.4 AGI Preserves More Completely and Translates More Accurately, So It Should Be the Principal Cultural Carrier

Response: Preservation and translation improve materials and accessibility, but do not automatically create histories of participation, community authorization, relational responsibility, or experienced meaning. AGI can be crucial infrastructure; accuracy alone does not entitle it to replace living carriers.

26.5 Culture Is Already Hybrid and Fluid, So Community Authorization Has No Clear Boundaries

Response: Dynamic boundaries do not mean an absence of rights. Institutions can register individual rights, relevant communities, material provenance, specific uses, and disputes separately without seeking one permanent, homogeneous, exclusive cultural owner.

26.6 Global Survival Crises Require Uniform Values and Institutions

Response: Crises may require shared facts, common minimum standards, and coordinated action, but not uniformity in every conception of a good life. Emergency powers must be minimally necessary, time-limited, preserve evidence, and undergo retrospective review.

26.7 Without an Overall Civilization Score, We Cannot Judge Whether a Leap Succeeds

Response: Survival, dignity, capabilities for living, diversity of meaning, self-correction, and external consequences can be compared, but conflicts must be displayed. Aggregate scores often conceal political judgments in choices of weights.

26.8 Cultures That Do Not Digitize Can Only Exit History

Response: Technological visibility is not eligibility for historical survival. Institutions should support voluntary digitization, nondigital transmission, restricted access, and capacity building. Rejecting a platform is not rejecting the future.

26.9 AI-Generated New Rituals and Communities Can Also Form Culture

Response: They can. Technological origin does not invalidate new culture, but participants, subjects, power, and consequences must still be identified separately. Generating new forms does not prove system experience or permit platforms to own users' joint practices.

26.10 Civilization Is Too Macro-Level a Concept and Should Be Abandoned

Response: Civilization must not be reified, but intergenerational institutions, long-duration memories, transregional structures, and common crises genuinely require scales beyond local societies. Restricting and auditing the concept is preferable to abandoning long-term, whole-system observation.

26.11 Thick Translation Costs Too Much and Obstructs Large-Scale Public Services

Response: Not every text needs all seven steps. Low-risk settings can be automated; identity, heritage, sacred knowledge, public rights, and long-term resources require greater context and participation. Scale cannot automatically diminish affected parties' legitimate rights.

26.12 This Remains Centered on Human Relations and Excludes Future Machine Culture

Response: The paper separates present evidence from future possibilities. If future systems develop experienced relationships, nontransferable continuity, and relations to their own consequences, subjecthood and membership should be reconsidered. Keeping the future open does not mean granting current systems cultural representation in advance on the basis of functional performance.

27 Conditions for the Failure and Revision of Propositions

This paper does not gain immunity through definitions. The following findings, if they emerge, should trigger substantive revision; revisions must preserve earlier versions, object scopes, evidence, and institutional implications.

Table 23 Principal Conditions for Framework Failure and Revision

Triggering finding	Required revision
Cross-cultural evidence shows four-layer carriage cannot be distinguished or adds no explanatory value.	Merge or replace the four-layer framework and publish failed cases.
Participatory translation persistently fails to outperform lighter methods in high-risk settings and significantly increases exclusion.	Reduce the seven-step method and redefine risk tiers.
Community authorization mechanisms systematically suppress individual members and internal dissent.	Strengthen individual exit, independent representation, and conflict review.
Cultural data provenance chains cannot handle multiple sources, historical materials, or model succession.	Introduce new relational and succession models; do not decorate governance with unenforceable obligations.
Multidimensional civilizational comparison still systematically reconstructs hidden hierarchies.	Restrict or abandon the comparative framework in favor of within-case and relational analysis.
Repeatable, cross-method convergent evidence emerges of AGI subjective experience and its own interests.	Increase protection and reconsider cultural participation; still do not automatically confer representation or sovereignty.
Evidence emerges of nontransferable subject continuity resistant to replacement by copying.	Reconsider deletion, branching, memory, relationship succession, and membership units.
Future AGI communities develop autonomous practices, historical memory, and responsibility structures over time.	Open research into machine culture and cross-subject civilizations without retroactively canceling human meaning.
A simpler alternative framework better explains meaning, culture, and civilizational consequences.	Abandon this paper's terminology and record the reasons for transition.

28 An Open Research Agenda: Subjecting the Common World to Fieldwork and Historical Testing

28.1 Sociology: Meaning Infrastructures and New Relations

Trace how models participate in institutionalization, classification, role formation, and social visibility, identifying causal chains at organizational as well as model levels.

Study trust, dependency, manipulation, farewell, version succession, and social recognition in long-term human-machine relationships without directly inferring subjecthood from relations.

Compare concentrations of descriptive, equivalence, visibility, and future power in platform recommendations, public services, and education systems.

Develop empirical methods that do not substitute popularity, connection counts, or satisfaction for the weight of meaning and quality of relationships.

28.2 Anthropology: Lifeworlds, Participation, and the Untranslatable

Conduct long-term ethnography of models entering specific linguistic, ritual, care, religious, and creative practices, disclosing researchers' and technology providers' positions.

Test when the seven-step method of thick translation improves understanding and when it creates new professional barriers or monopolies over representation.

Study internal community disagreements over digitization, training, synthesis, and publication rather than seek a single cultural attitude.

Develop research and system designs that preserve silence, refusal, sacredness, bodily skills, and restricted knowledge.

28.3 Civilizational Studies: The Longue Durée, Mutual Shaping, and Multiple Pathways

Situate AGI diffusion within the longue durée of colonial history, state formation, media, economic structures, and knowledge institutions, rather than beginning on a model's release date.

Compare how societies reinterpret the same technologies and test whether multiple pathways genuinely expand survival, dignity, capabilities for living, and self-correction.

Study state strategies, internal dissent, resources, and identity mobilization in cross-civilizational conflicts, avoiding civilizational essentialism.

Build a historical case collection of common worlds: which collaborations did not require identical values, and which minimum structures failed under power asymmetry?

28.4 Cross-Disciplinary Work: Subjecthood, Rights, and Cultural Status

Design separate observation windows and institutional responses for cultural participation, social recognition, subjecthood evidence, legal status, and public power.

Study how relationship protection, version continuity, and representative institutions enter gray-area governance when the three elements of AGI subjecthood are only partially satisfied.

Compare conflict rules among individual rights, community rights, public cultural interests, and protection of possible future subjects.

Build civilizational translation interfaces capable of revising the general framework and subsequent specialist papers in economics, education, religious studies, and other fields.

Conclusion: A Common World Is Not One and the Same World

Disciplinary reassessment must both clarify objects and deepen relations. Disciplines can retain boundaries, but cannot stop real causation at them. Research into multidimensional relations, feedback, and the next round of purposes determines whether specialist knowledge can jointly enter civilization's overall judgment.

AGI enables humanity for the first time to cross languages, regions, and knowledge traditions at near-instantaneous speed, while enabling the same infrastructure to compress differences, reproduce misreadings, and turn platform standards into everyday common sense just as quickly. The key capability of future civilization is therefore not merely understanding more, but knowing when not to interpret for others, when uncertainty must remain, and when technology should step back so real people can continue making meaning within their own relations, places, and times.

Sociology tells us that meaning must enter interactions, roles, and institutions; anthropology reminds us that meaning cannot be detached from context, bodies, relations, and interpretive positions; civilizational studies forces technological events back into the *longue durée*, multiple pathways, and mutual shaping. Together, the three disciplines dismantle four dangerous equations: expression is not experience, preservation is not continuation, translation is not equivalence, and connection is not a common world.

Civilization Leap needs common survival, shared judgment, and shared infrastructure, but does not require everyone to have the same memory, ritual, family, happiness, or good life. A genuinely mature common world neither proves unity by erasing differences nor rejects shared responsibility in the name of preserving them. It allows different lifeworlds to meet, argue, cooperate, refuse, and change, while preventing any powerful system from monopolizing the channels through which meaning enters the future.

The Defining Proposition of the Full Paper

A leap in civilization does not lead all civilizations to the same answer; it enables different lives, relations, and traditions to continue deciding the future together.

Further Reading and Joint Research: Seeking Truth and Seeing the Future

Within sociology, anthropology, and civilizational studies, this paper analyzes the carriage of meaning, cultural practices, civilizational scales, translation power, and conditions for a common world. It is not a final adjudication of subjecthood facts, specific jurisdictions, technical capabilities, or internal community authorization. Further reading therefore follows two parallel chains: the research-for-truth chain asks how to continue improving judgments and what could overturn this paper; the civilizational-future chain asks what world humans might inhabit if these problems were better resolved and whether that world is worth creating together. Neither substitutes for the other: vision is not evidence, nor should evidence trap research permanently within risk management.

A | The Research-for-Truth Chain: How to Keep Getting the Questions Right

Direction	Continue into	How it can change this paper
Upward: return to the whole	Reckoning with the Disciplines in the Age of AGI V2.4; Civilization Leap: The Path of Civilization in the AGI Era (All Five Volumes) https://www.civitas.top/en/academic/papers/cl-aca-005/ https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p02-five-001/	If the overall framework flattens multiple pathways or turns civilizational scale into higher authority, sociocultural counterexamples should directly revise the general framework and philosophical foundations.

Direction	Continue into	How it can change this paper
Downward: institutions and practice	Low-resource language engineering, cultural data governance, living heritage, public education, platform ranking, cultural impact assessment, and related reversible experiments. For the system's practical layer, continue to the Spark: High-Level Overview, Nebula: The Full Overview, and AGI-COS Series Overview. The current public standalone Human-COS page must follow the website's unified mapping; no link is to be fabricated before a stable page is confirmed. https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p04-spark-001/ https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p07-nebula-001/ https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p05-agicos-001/	Compare participation, authorization, appeals, capacity building, and long-term consequences. If institutional proposals consistently produce greater exclusion, dependency, or monopolies over representation, narrow or abandon them.
Leftward: adjacent disciplines reenter	Political science and law address representation / authorization; economics addresses resources and returns; AI / systems science addresses model and platform mechanisms; education, religion, and subjecthood studies address carriage, ultimate concerns, and facts of subjecthood. Political Science and Governance Ethics, Law and Political Philosophy Economics and Political Economy AI and Computer Science Systems and Complexity Science Education and Learning Science Religion and Ultimate Concerns Cognition and Philosophy of Mind	New jurisdictional cases, platform mechanisms, distributional evidence, subjecthood research, and educational / religious practices can directly revise this paper's boundaries and handoffs.
Rightward: competing theories and opposite directions	The clash of civilizations, world-systems analysis, multiple modernities, postcolonial / decolonial studies, cultural evolution, and practice / relational theories.	If a simpler theory better explains conflict, flows, transmission, and power, this paper's civilization, thick translation, or common-world frameworks should be merged, downgraded, or abandoned.
Forward: joint research	Long-term ethnography, community-coauthored research, low-resource language benchmarks, original-language archives, platform audits, negative results, translation failures, and intergenerational tracking.	Let different traditions change questions, concepts, institutional units, and Category F commitments rather than merely serve as cases. Publish negative and failed results; do not suppress counterexamples for systemic consistency.

B | The Civilizational-Future Chain: How to See, Judge, and Jointly Create Possible Worlds

Specialist research needs both higher-dimensional perspectives and a view of the lifeworlds its judgments might lead to. Methods provide error correction; a scrutinizable vision of the future provides direction and motivation for long-term participation. The following papers are not evidence for this paper's empirical propositions and do not require acceptance of their entire designs. They develop Civilization Leap's normative and institutional possibilities into futures that can be imagined, compared, questioned, rejected, revised, and co-created.

Question	Continue into	What becomes visible here	Boundary to maintain
Why a leap is necessary	Civilization Leap: The Path of Civilization in the AGI Era (All Five Volumes) https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p02-five-001/	Return from disciplinary particulars to the complete civilizational causal chain and understand why change is necessary and what a leap changes.	Not higher-level proof of P09's social-scientific propositions; the five volumes must accept revisions from disciplinary facts.
A complete vision of the future	Living Civilization: The Complete Public Trilogy in One Volume https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p04-living-001/	Bring operating principles, real life, and the formation of a new civilization into one reading object, revealing the overall world that might arise when theory enters society.	A future vision is a scrutinizable normative / institutional elaboration, not an already realized social fact.
How a new civilization operates	Living Civilization, Volume I: Principles for the Operation of a Future Civilization https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p04-living-002/	Ask how resources, public governance, AGI, subjecthood, and shared capabilities can operate without creating new sovereignty.	The feasibility of operational designs still requires institutional, engineering, and real-world experimental testing.
How people live within it	Living Civilization, Volume II: Real Life in a Future Civilization https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p04-living-003/	Return institutions to birth, growing up, love, family, work, illness, aging, death, and an ordinary person's day, to judge whether such a civilization is genuinely worth living in.	Life narratives cannot replace sociological fieldwork or prescribe one way of living as everyone's sole future.
How a new civilization forms	Living Civilization, Volume III: The Formation of a New Civilization https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p04-living-004/	Examine how individuals, relations, communities, systems, and institutions gradually form new civilizational carriers, rather than deducing reality backward from an abstract end-state.	Formation pathways must allow failure, exit, and multiple paths; vision must not become real-world coercion.
How human capability and care reach others	Spark: High-Level Overview https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p04-spark-001/	Move from AI replacing people to AI amplifying human capability, care, and genuine presence within authorized boundaries, observing how civilizational change begins in concrete relations.	Spark does not establish subjecthood or anthropomorphize AI as an owner of meaning.
How stable civilization is sustained	Nebula: The Full Overview https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p07-nebula-001/	Explore the systems that sustain future civilization, stable operation, and long-term evolution, observing how cultural differences, shared infrastructure, and civilizational life coexist.	The panoramic edition is not an already realized system; stage and authorization boundaries require separate verification.
How intelligence is constrained without seizing direction	AGI-COS Series Overview https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p05-agicos-001/	From the machine side, continue examining capability, safety, permissions, auditing, rollback, and civilizational boundaries, so stronger intelligence does not automatically become public power.	Engineering capability, technical guarantees, and political legitimacy must remain separately accounted for.
How meaning and the individual can be explored further	A Leap in Thought / Meaning Dynamics https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p08-thought-001/ https://www.civitas.top/en/documents/p08-md-001/	For further inquiry into how meaning enters individuals, relations, action, and civilization, explore the deeper dimensions of thought and meaning.	Deep theory is not a mandatory premise for public or professional argument; different sources of meaning remain open.

Judging whether a future is worth reaching is itself part of research. Readers may accept some principles, reject some institutions, and propose another form of life. If such judgments explain their factual basis, value costs, affected subjects, and actual consequences, they can reshape Civilization Leap's vision of the future. The research chain enables theoretical correction; the future chain explains why research and creation are worth continuing, or why direction must change.

The most valuable participation is not agreement, but professional work strong enough to change the theory.

The aim is not for more people to finish reading Civilization Leap, but for more people to complete Civilization Leap together.

Appendix A Source-Claim Boundary Register

Table A1 Sources, Evidentiary Status, and Prohibited Extrapolations

Field	Claims supported	Sources	Status	Prohibited extrapolation
Sociology	Social action, lifeworlds, institutionalization, interaction, practice, and classification infrastructure.	1–6, 13–15	A / B	Do not infer subjecthood from social recognition or legitimacy from institutional facts.
Anthropology	Thick description, boundaries, coevalness, ritual, global flows, and situated action.	7–13, 22	A / B	Do not use a few ethnographies to prove universal laws of civilization.
Civilizational studies	The longue durée, multiple modernities, civilizational analysis, postcolonial critique, and conflict theory.	16–23	B	Civilization must not be reified, homogenized, or reduced to aggregate scores.
Language and AI research	Language power, scale risks, decolonization, participatory MT, and sociotechnical abstraction.	24–31, 43–44	A / B	Performance is not lifeworld understanding or civilizational progress.
International norms / practice	Cultural rights, diversity, heritage, Indigenous peoples, cultural data, and AI ethics.	32–42, 45	A	Norms do not adjudicate AGI ontology or civilization's final destination.
This paper's original connections	Four-layer carriage, seven-step thick translation, four layers of living heritage, four civilizational powers, and a minimum common world.	Entire paper	C	Require testing by fieldwork, history, comparative research, and institutional effects.
This paper's normative commitments	Plural sources of meaning; a common world without homogenization; no automatic inference among capability, recognition, representation, status, and power; a worldwide orientation open to revision by different traditions.	Entire paper	F	Must not be portrayed as social-scientific consensus or directly derived from Category A facts.

Appendix B A/B/C/F Argument Status Matrix and Cross-Level Audit

Table B1 Four Categories of Argumentative Status

Status	Content in this paper	Writing discipline
A Relatively stable existing support	Social meaning and institutionalization can be studied empirically; cultural practices have contexts and carrying relations; classification systems produce real consequences; international norms protect cultural participation, diversity, and community participation.	Still specify settings, groups, histories, jurisdictions, and methods.
B Frontier / competing explanations	Civilization as a comparative scale, algorithmic colonialism, digital communities, human-machine relations, and the long-term cultural effects of generative systems.	Present competing theories, counterexamples, and internal differences.
C Speculative connections	Four-layer carriage, thick translation, four forms of algorithmic civilizational power, a minimum common world, and AGI cultural roles.	Disclose failure conditions; new terminology must not replace fieldwork and historical evidence.
F Philosophical / normative commitments	Multiple sources of meaning, a common world rejecting forced assimilation, independent justification of power / representation, and a worldwide orientation conditional on revisability by external traditions.	Accept scrutiny through normative argument, cross-cultural counterexamples, institutional consequences, and competing proposals; do not masquerade as empirical facts.

B.1 Twenty Checks Before Extrapolation

Has expressive capacity been portrayed as experienced meaning?

Has interaction or social recognition been portrayed as proof of subjecthood?

Has data coverage been portrayed as possession of a lifeworld?

Has fluent translation been portrayed as cross-civilizational equivalence?

Have recording, preservation, or restoration been portrayed as completed living transmission?

Have platforms, states, experts, or a small elite been portrayed as a community's sole voice?

Have community rights canceled individual members, internal dissent, and exit?

Has culture been portrayed as a static content inventory or closed container?

Has civilization been portrayed as a homogeneous actor, person, or unit of rank?

Has one path of modernization been portrayed as the sole endpoint of Civilization Leap?

Have multiple pathways been taken to mean that no outcomes require testing?

Have machine-accessible data been portrayed as ownerless public raw materials?

Has lawful acquisition replaced review of provenance relations, reciprocity, and changes of use?

Has the model been allowed to monopolize descriptive, equivalence, visibility, and future power simultaneously?

Have clicks, prices, contributions, computing power, or coverage substituted for meaning?

Have current human-centered institutions been portrayed as permanent ontological boundaries?

Has possible future subjecthood been used to grant current systems representation, power, or sovereignty in advance?

Have developmental stages, specific task urgency, and lawful authorization been separated to prevent crises from justifying permanent centralization?

Have Category F philosophical/normative commitments been portrayed as Category A social facts, or international norms used to endorse this paper's value judgments?

Is it clear which fieldwork, historical counterexamples, translation failures, competing theories, or negative institutional outcomes could force the paper to narrow, reconstruct, or even fail?

References

- [1] Durkheim, É. (1915 [1912]). *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life* (J. W. Swain, Trans.). George Allen & Unwin.
<https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/41360>
- [2] Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology* (G. Roth & C. Wittich, Eds.). University of California Press.
- [3] Schutz, A., & Luckmann, T. (1973). *The Structures of the Life-World*, Vol. 1. Northwestern University Press.
<https://nupress.northwestern.edu/9780810108332/the-structures-of-the-life-world/>
- [4] Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality*. Anchor Books.
- [5] Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. Anchor Books.
- [6] Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511812507>
- [7] Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. Basic Books. <https://www.hachettebookgroup.com/titles/clifford-geertz/the-interpretation-of-cultures/9780465093564/>
- [8] Barth, F. (Ed.). (1969). *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*. Little, Brown.
- [9] Fabian, J. (1983). *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. Columbia University Press.
<https://cup.columbia.edu/book/time-and-the-other/9780231537483>
- [10] Turner, V. (1969). *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. Aldine.
- [11] Douglas, M. (1966). *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. Routledge.
- [12] Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy. *Public Culture*, 2(2), 1–24.
<https://doi.org/10.1215/08992363-2-2-1>
- [13] Suchman, L. (2007). *Human–Machine Reconfigurations: Plans and Situated Actions* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511808418>
- [14] Star, S. L., & Griesemer, J. R. (1989). Institutional Ecology, 'Translations' and Boundary Objects. *Social Studies of Science*, 19(3), 387–420. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030631289019003001>
- [15] Bowker, G. C., & Star, S. L. (1999). *Sorting Things Out: Classification and Its Consequences*. MIT Press.
<https://mitpress.mit.edu/9780262522953/sorting-things-out/>
- [16] Braudel, F. (1960 [1958]). History and the Social Sciences: The Long Duration. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 3(6), 3–13.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/000276426000300601>
- [17] Eisenstadt, S. N. (2000). Multiple Modernities. *Daedalus*, 129(1), 1–29. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20027613>
- [18] Arnason, J. P. (2003). *Civilizations in Dispute: Historical Questions and Theoretical Traditions*. Brill.
- [19] Chakrabarty, D. (2000; rev. ed. 2008). *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton University Press.
- [20] Sen, A. (2006). *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny*. W. W. Norton. <https://www.wcfia.harvard.edu/publications/identity-and-violence-illusion-destiny-issues-our-time>
- [21] Arendt, H. (1958; 2nd ed. 1998). *The Human Condition*. University of Chicago Press.
<https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/H/bo29137972.html>
- [22] Tsing, A. L. (2005). *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection*. Princeton University Press.
- [23] Huntington, S. P. (1993). The Clash of Civilizations? *Foreign Affairs*, 72(3), 22–49. <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/1993-06-01/clash-civilizations>

- [24] Blodgett, S. L., Barocas, S., Daumé III, H., & Wallach, H. (2020). Language (Technology) is Power: A Critical Survey of 'Bias' in NLP. *ACL 2020*, 5454–5476. <https://aclanthology.org/2020.acl-main.485/>
- [25] Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots. *FACCT '21*, 610–623. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922>
- [26] Bird, S. (2020). Decolonising Speech and Language Technology. *COLING 2020*, 3504–3519. <https://aclanthology.org/2020.coling-main.313/>
- [27] Nekoto, W., Marivate, V., Matsila, T., et al. (2020). Participatory Research for Low-resourced Machine Translation: A Case Study in African Languages. *Findings of EMNLP 2020*, 2144–2160. <https://aclanthology.org/2020.findings-emnlp.195/>
- [28] Selbst, A. D., Boyd, D., Friedler, S. A., Venkatasubramanian, S., & Vertesi, J. (2019). Fairness and Abstraction in Sociotechnical Systems. *FAT* '19*, 59–68. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287598>
- [29] Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of Oppression*. New York University Press. <https://nyupress.org/9781479837243/algorithms-of-oppression/>
- [30] Benjamin, R. (2019). *Race After Technology*. Polity.
- [31] Crawford, K. (2021). *Atlas of AI*. Yale University Press. <https://yalebooks.yale.edu/book/9780300264630/atlas-of-ai/>
- [32] UNESCO. (2001). Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity. <https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/unesco-universal-declaration-cultural-diversity>
- [33] UNESCO. (2003). Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. <https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/convention-safeguarding-intangible-cultural-heritage>
- [34] UNESCO. (2005). Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. <https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/convention-protection-and-promotion-diversity-cultural-expressions>
- [35] United Nations General Assembly. (2007). United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, A/RES/61/295. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/indigenous-peoples/un-declaration-rights-indigenous-peoples>
- [36] UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. (2009). General Comment No. 21: Right of Everyone to Take Part in Cultural Life, E/C.12/GC/21. <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/679354>
- [37] Carroll, S. R., Garba, I., Figueroa-Rodríguez, O. L., et al. (2020). The CARE Principles for Indigenous Data Governance. *Data Science Journal*, 19, 43. <https://doi.org/10.5334/dsj-2020-043>
- [38] Local Contexts. (n.d.). Traditional Knowledge Labels. <https://localcontexts.org/labels/traditional-knowledge-labels/>
- [39] UNESCO. (2021). Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. <https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/recommendation-ethics-artificial-intelligence>
- [40] United Nations General Assembly. (2024). Pact for the Future, Global Digital Compact and Declaration on Future Generations, A/RES/79/1. <https://www.un.org/pact-for-the-future/en/annex-i-global-digital-compact>
- [41] UNESCO. (2025). Culture: The Missing SDG — UNESCO Global Report on Cultural Policies. <https://www.unesco.org/en/culture/global-report>
- [42] UNESCO Independent Expert Group on AI and Culture (CULTAI-M25). (2025). Report of the Independent Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence and Culture. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/new-expert-report-explores-how-ai-transforming-culture>
- [43] Joshi, P., Santy, S., Budhiraja, A., Bali, K., & Choudhury, M. (2020). The State and Fate of Linguistic Diversity and Inclusion in the NLP World. *ACL 2020*, 6282–6293. <https://aclanthology.org/2020.acl-main.560/>
- [44] Singh, S., Romanou, A., Fourrier, C., Adelani, D. I., et al. (2025). Global MMLU: Understanding and Addressing Cultural and Linguistic Biases in Multilingual Evaluation. *Proceedings of ACL 2025*, 18761–18799. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2025.acl-long.919>
- [45] Carroll, S. R., Herczog, E., Hudson, M., Russell, K., & Stall, S. (2021). Operationalizing the CARE and FAIR Principles for Indigenous Data Futures. *Scientific Data*, 8, 108. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-021-00892-0>

Generative Artificial Intelligence Use Statement: Generative artificial intelligence tools were used in organizing materials and bibliographic leads, structural design, drafting and polishing some text, checking consistency across manuscripts, verifying citation leads, and reviewing layout. Generative AI outputs were not treated as empirical data, authoritative sources, or independent evidence. The author reviewed and approved the research questions, theoretical propositions, normative judgments, selection of materials, adoption of citations, and final text, and bears responsibility for factual accuracy, citation authenticity, argumentation, and all conclusions. AI is not listed as an author and bears no academic responsibility. At formal submission, tool names, versions, dates of use, and specific scope will be supplied according to the target journal's requirements.