

The Civilizational Leap Declaration

How Do We Move Toward a Better World in the Age of AGI? | Website
Public Edition

Author: Zijun Fu | Civilization Leap Research Group

Document ID: CL-STRAT-DECL-EN-v1.0 | Version: v1.0 | Status: Website Public Edition /
International Entry

Website: civilleap.com | Current entry: www.civitas.top | Contact: zijunfu@civitas.top

Document Information / Copyright

Document Title	The Civilizational Leap Declaration
Subtitle	How Do We Move Toward a Better World in the Age of AGI? Website Public Edition
Document ID	CL-STRAT-DECL-EN-v1.0
Layer	CL-STRAT Civilization Strategy and White Paper Layer / External Entry
Version	v1.0
Status	Website Public Edition / International Entry
Author	Zijun Fu
Publisher	Civilization Leap Research Group
Website	civilleap.com
Current Entry	www.civitas.top
Contact	zijunfu@civitas.top
Usage	For research, discussion, and public communication. Please cite author, title, version, and website source when quoting or redistributing.

Suggested citation: Zijun Fu, The Civilizational Leap Declaration, Civilization Leap Research Group, v1.0, 2026. Website: civilleap.com; current entry: www.civitas.top.

Reading Guide

What this document does

This edition is intended for international readers, institutions, research partners, and cross-cultural communication.

Where it sits in the framework

This document is the international entry version of the Civilizational Leap Declaration. It introduces the civilizational divide of the AGI age and directs readers toward the wider Civilization Leap framework.

How to read

Read the main text first. This document is designed as an external entry point, not a full theoretical treatise. The system position, next readings, and download paths are placed at the end.

Main Text

The Civilizational Leap Declaration v1.0

How Do We Move Toward a Better World in the Age of AGI?

Preface | An Ancient Echo, a Modern Divide

I. An Ancient Echo

Humanity has never stopped longing for a better world.

In the Book of Rites, we read: “When the Great Way prevails, the world is shared by all.” It also envisions a society in which the elderly are cared for, adults have meaningful roles, children are nurtured, and the vulnerable are not abandoned.

Across civilizations and centuries, people have described this aspiration in different languages and symbols. Some imagined a just republic, some a holy commonwealth, some a world of equality, dignity, and shared prosperity. But beneath those differences lies the same enduring question:

What kind of world is truly worthy of human life?

For thousands of years, humanity has never lacked this aspiration.

What we have lacked is the capacity to turn such hopes from ideals, beliefs, and moral appeals into durable social reality.

Today, for the first time, the age of AGI may change that.

It brings unprecedented capabilities, but also unprecedented risks. It may amplify selfishness, monopoly, conflict, and systemic instability. But it may also, for the first time in history, give humanity the means to move its deepest shared aspirations closer to reality.

That is why a civilizational leap is not the invention of a brand-new dream. It is, rather, a contemporary answer to an ancient human echo:

What kind of world should humanity now choose to build?

II. The Modern Divide

The real issue is not simply that technology is becoming more powerful.

The real issue is that we are connecting an unprecedented force to an old world already full of fractures.

That old world was not meaningless. It carried humanity this far. It rewarded competition, expansion, efficiency, and growth. Under conditions of scarcity, limited capacity, and local impact, that logic had a certain historical rationality.

But the conditions have changed.

As AGI moves into production, governance, platforms, finance, media, security, and social organization, it amplifies not only capability, but also purpose. If the underlying logic remains unchanged, greater power will simply make the old logic more efficient. It will accelerate concentration of resources, deepen inequality, sharpen control, widen the spread of error, and turn local actions into systemic risks.

So the true dividing line is not the technology itself.

It lies in whether this new force continues to serve an old logic of partial, self-interested advantage—or whether it is brought under institutions that serve humanity as a whole.

That is the core question of a civilizational leap.

It is not fantasy.

It is not rhetoric.

It is not emotional sloganizing.

It is a sharply practical question for the age of AGI:

Will humanity continue reinforcing the old world—or begin building a new one?

And that new world is not simply a stronger version of the old one. It must be a world that, for the first time, explicitly sets these three goals at the center of civilization:

A world where humanity as a whole can live without existential insecurity.

A world where individual lives can be genuinely happy.

A world where human life can carry deeper meaning.

III. From This Point On, This Is No Longer Someone Else' s Problem

Many people assume that these questions concern only technologists, capital holders, and political leaders.

They do not.

They now concern everyone.

Because what AGI first unsettles is not the machine itself, but three forms of stability on which the old world depended:

First, the stability of survival. More and more people are discovering that the old pathways to security are weakening.

Second, the stability of happiness. We assumed that more efficiency, more material abundance, and more choice would naturally yield better lives. Reality suggests otherwise.

Third, the stability of meaning. In the old world, many people could still believe: if I remain useful, I still have a place; if I continue striving, I still matter. But as more functional, standardized, and cognitive work is absorbed by increasingly capable systems, what many people lose first is not merely a task—but the inner ground of why they still matter at all.

That is why the true marker of the AGI age is not merely technological breakthrough.

It is the growing sense that:

The old world is still operating, but it no longer truly promises a future.

And this problem will not remain confined to ordinary people.

Ordinary people feel the instability sooner; elites feel the danger later. The former lose stability first; the latter lose certainty later. The difference is one of timing, not destiny.

Because once systemic risk begins to form, no one truly lives outside the system. Ecological breakdown, social fracture, security dilemmas, collapse of trust, governance failure, and civilization-scale misjudgment do not disappear just because a minority holds more resources.

So this is not a text of technological optimism or technological pessimism.

It is about something more fundamental:

AGI is an amplifier.

It does not automatically correct flawed civilizational logic.

It magnifies the logic already in use—at an unprecedented scale.

If what is amplified remains local self-interest, zero-sum competition, externalized costs, monopolized resources, and hollowed-out meaning, then humanity will move faster toward a stronger, faster, more precise—and more dangerous—old world.

If what is amplified becomes a new logic oriented toward the long-term survival of humanity, widespread flourishing, and meaningful human life, then for the first time, humanity may have a real chance to bring its oldest shared hopes closer to reality.

This declaration begins there.

Chapter One | What Is Actually Beginning to Disappear in the Age of AGI

When people talk about AGI, they usually think first about jobs.

Which roles will disappear? Which industries will be reshaped? Which skills will rapidly lose value?

These are real issues. But if we interpret the problem only as “job replacement,” we are still looking too shallowly.

Because what is beginning to disappear in the age of AGI is not just employment.

It is three deeper things:

the old world’ s sense of security,

the old world’ s sense of value,

and the old world’ s sense of certainty.

For a long time, an ordinary person could at least believe something like this: if I keep working, keep trying, and keep adapting, I have a chance to maintain a basically stable life.

That belief is weakening.

Because the old sense of security rested on fragile assumptions:

that your abilities are needed,

that your role remains scarce,

that your labor is still necessary in the exchange system,

that the cost of living will not rise faster than your ability to keep up.

AGI is destabilizing all of those assumptions at once.

It is not merely replacing one job here or another there. It is rewriting what counts as useful, what deserves payment, and what remains scarce. When a system can perform large amounts of

cognitive, standardized, and process-driven work at lower cost, higher speed, and more stable quality, the old promise—work hard and you can buy security—begins to break down.

This does not mean everyone will immediately lose work.

But it does mean that many people will first lose something even deeper:

their basic grip on the future.

What human beings find hardest to bear is not hardship alone.

It is the growing sense that they no longer matter.

In the old order, even an ordinary person could still find a place. You could be a producer, a member of an organization, the support of a family, an indispensable link in a chain. That sense of having a place was itself a source of value.

But as AGI increasingly absorbs function, efficiency, execution, and standardized judgment, people are forced to confront a harder question:

If machines can increasingly do what I do, why do I still matter?

This is one of the deepest psychological shocks of the AGI era.

Because what it strikes is not just income, but the felt weight of one's own existence.

The old world has long recognized people primarily through usefulness. The more useful you are, the more respected you are. The more productive you are, the more visible you become. The more difficult you are to replace, the more secure your social recognition.

But once AGI enters society at scale, that entire system of recognition begins to fail.

So what many people will face next may not first be unemployment.

It may be something more hidden, and more painful:

I am still working, but I increasingly feel like someone being gradually phased out.

Human societies do not function because the future is truly certain.

They function because, much of the time, people can still pretend it is broadly predictable.

You can plan a career three years ahead.

You can plan your child's education.

You can believe that today's effort will pay off in some recognizable future.

That sense of predictability is one of the deepest psychological foundations of social order.

AGI weakens that foundation.

Because its change is not only fast.

It is structural.

It does not merely accelerate along the old track—it changes the track itself.

Things that could once be navigated by experience increasingly depend on systemic redesign.

Problems that could once be absorbed through gradual adaptation are entering a zone of structural discontinuity.

This is why more and more people will realize:

it is not that they failed to plan;

it is that the world is no longer honoring plans in the old way.

So what is truly beginning to disappear in the age of AGI is not just jobs.

It is the old world's ability to keep promising a future.

It can still function.

But it is increasingly unable to persuade most people that, if they continue trying within the old logic, the future will become more secure, more fulfilling, and more worth living.

And once a world loses the ability to promise a future, it must eventually face another question:

Do we continue patching this world—or begin building another one?

—

Chapter Two | The Real Divide Is Not the Technology Itself

Many people still approach AGI as a technical issue.

Will models become more powerful? Will systems become more intelligent? Will machines surpass humans? Which country will get there first? Which company will dominate?

These questions matter.

But if we stop there, we still have not reached the root.

Because what ultimately decides the future is not how powerful the technology becomes.

It is what the technology is made to serve.

The same force, connected to different goals, can carry the world in radically different directions. Fire can warm a home or burn down a city. Nuclear power can light a grid or destroy one. Networks can connect the world or scale manipulation and fracture.

AGI is no different.

It is not naturally a savior.

It is not naturally a destroyer.

It is, above all, an unprecedented amplifier.

And the most important thing about an amplifier is not how strong it is.

It is what it is amplifying.

That is why the real divide is not the technology itself.

It lies here:

Will AGI continue serving the old logic of partial self-interest, or will it be brought under institutions that serve humanity's common goals?

The old logic is familiar.

It is the logic that has intensified over the past several centuries: efficiency first, growth first, competition first, local advantage first.

Under that logic, the first question asked of technology is not: can it help more people live better lives?

It is: can it help me win faster, dominate more securely, and entrench my advantage?

Capital asks: can it cut costs, raise profits, and replace more labor?

Platforms ask: can it predict behavior more precisely, capture more attention, and hold users more tightly?

States ask: can it produce strategic, informational, or military superiority?

Organizations ask: can it increase efficiency, compress time, and reduce uncertainty?

None of these questions is surprising in itself.

What matters is that when AGI-scale capability is connected to this goal structure, what gets amplified is not only productivity.

What gets amplified is also concentration of resources, appetite for control, transfer of risk, and systemic fragility.

The stronger the technology becomes, the more dangerous the old logic becomes.

In the past, the world still had buffer zones. A mistake in one place did not necessarily become a global consequence. The greed of one actor did not necessarily pass straight through the entire system. A flawed institution could often be temporarily cushioned by distance, growth, or slower feedback loops.

But the AGI age is different.

The stronger the technology, the thinner the buffer.

The deeper the connection, the higher the coupling.

Problems that once spread slowly may now propagate rapidly. Errors that once allowed time for repair may now approach irreversibility.

So the truly frightening possibility is not merely “loss of control.”

It is this:

the old logic is acquiring unprecedented execution power.

Many people instinctively assume that more intelligent AI will naturally make better choices.

This is a dangerous illusion.

Because “more intelligent” only means better at achieving a goal.

It does not mean the goal itself is better.

A more powerful AGI system will not automatically favor humanity’ s common good.

It will become better at carrying out the goals it is given.

That is why what determines the future is not whether AGI becomes more intelligent.

It is who and what it is made to serve.

If it serves capital and partial interests, then the stronger AGI becomes, the faster the world moves toward a stronger, faster, more precise, and more dangerous old world.

If it begins to serve humanity’ s common goals, then for the first time, humanity has a chance not merely to be driven forward by crisis, but to consciously redesign institutions, resource allocation, social recognition, and ways of life around explicit civilizational aims.

So the real question is not whether AGI should exist.

It is whether we will continue handing it to the old logic.

That is the real divide.

Chapter Three | Why Ordinary People and Elites Will Ultimately Face the Same Problem

When many people think about AGI-era risk, they instinctively imagine a divided future.

Danger belongs to ordinary people. Opportunity belongs to the powerful. Ordinary people will lose jobs, become anxious, and be replaced. Elites will gain earlier access to technology, capture more resources, and protect themselves more effectively.

At first glance, this is not entirely wrong.

But it is only half true.

The deeper truth is this:

ordinary people and elites are not facing two different futures.

They are facing the same future on two different timelines.

Ordinary people feel instability sooner.

Elites feel danger later.

The former lose stability first; the latter lose certainty later.

The difference is timing, not destiny.

Ordinary people are simply closer to the cracks.

The old world's promise of security for most people rested on fragile assumptions: that work would remain available, that income would remain exchangeable for basic stability, that one would retain some place in the order, that the future would remain legible enough to plan around.

When AGI disrupts these conditions at scale, those with the least buffer, least room for error, and least ability to externalize loss will feel the impact first.

They do not just lose security sooner.

They lose recognition sooner.

Because the old world has long recognized the majority through usefulness.

If you can work, provide, and produce, then you still “have a place.”

But when increasingly large amounts of functional, standardized, and cognitive labor can be performed more cheaply, more quickly, and more reliably by systems, what many people lose first is not only income.

It is the sentence that once sustained their forward motion:

I am still needed.

At this point, some will say: then the answer is to reach a stronger position as quickly as possible. More wealth, more power, more technical mastery, more proximity to the system’ s center—surely that means more safety?

Yes.

More safety, relatively speaking.

But not ultimate safety.

Because wealth, power, technology, and organizational capacity offer a longer buffer period.

They do not grant exemption from civilizational risk.

No individual, however wealthy, lives permanently outside ecological breakdown.

No group, however powerful, remains forever outside social fracture, collapse of trust, and systemic instability.

No state, however advanced, can guarantee permanent safety in a world of escalating intelligent arms races, algorithmic confrontation, and failed global coordination.

The problem elites face is not immediate collapse.

It is the discovery that the more resources they command, the more they depend on the continued viability of the larger system.

And once that larger system destabilizes, resources no longer automatically convert into real security.

In earlier eras, resources often did buy significantly more safety. Better housing, better care, better education, stronger private protection. All of that still exists, and in the early AGI period it may widen further.

But resources are still, at bottom, claims within a functioning civilization.

They are not licenses to survive independently of civilization.

Once risk becomes systemic rather than local, resources change their function.

They may delay the arrival of crisis.

They do not guarantee escape from crisis itself.

If mass displacement and collapse of value continue to spread, high walls will not indefinitely insulate anyone from external disorder.

If strategic rivalry and intelligent military escalation deepen, private wealth will not prevent involvement in collective insecurity.

If a crisis of meaning spreads at scale, a longer lifespan does not automatically produce a more satisfying life.

So the mature judgment in the AGI era is not: I am safer because I am stronger.

It is this:

if the whole becomes less secure, then even the strongest part is only feeling insecurity later.

Ordinary people and elites are not facing two different futures.

They are facing the same future on different schedules.

Ordinary people feel anxiety earlier because they lose work, income, place, and predictability earlier.

Elites feel danger later because they possess more buffers, more resources, and stronger protection.

But buffers are not immunity.

Delay is not escape.

Once risk becomes systemic, no one truly lives outside the system.

And when happiness and meaning erode at scale, survival itself is eventually pushed back under pressure.

That is why, in the end, everyone will face the same question:

Do we continue defending an increasingly dangerous old world—or begin building a new one?

—

Chapter Four | The Three Goals of a New World

A world is not worth building merely because it is powerful.

It must also be judged by where it ultimately leads human life.

If a world makes a minority safer while making the majority more anxious, it is not good enough, no matter how efficient it is.

If a world makes technology stronger while hollowing out the human spirit, it is not good enough, no matter how advanced it looks.

If a world can extend lifespan but cannot answer why life is worth living, it is still inadequate.

That is why the new world cannot be defined simply as “more power.”

For the first time, it must explicitly place three goals at the center of civilization:

humanity as a whole can live without existential insecurity;

individual lives can be genuinely happy;

human life can carry deeper meaning.

These are not decorative additions.

They are not optional benefits that might arrive after development.

They are not uplifting but empty slogans.

They are the deepest standards for judging whether a civilization is truly advancing—or merely intensifying its old failures.

To live without existential insecurity means far more than basic subsistence.

It means that a person does not have to live in chronic fear of falling.

It means not being one lost job, one illness, one systemic shock away from collapse.

It means not having to mortgage one’s time, dignity, and relationships simply in order to remain alive.

One of the great failures of the old world is that it turned survival into a permanent qualification contest. You must keep proving that you are useful, employable, and worthy of stability. Slow down, weaken, get sick, or be replaced—and the basics begin to move under your feet.

That is not a life without insecurity.

It is survival under extension.

Happiness is not the accumulation of stimulation.

It is the unfolding of a life.

It does not mean a sequence of consumption highs or a life precisely fed by system-designed satisfactions. Genuine happiness means being able to live within stability, dignity, relationship, autonomy, and recognition. It means not merely coping with life, but actually having room to live it.

Yet the old world has become increasingly poor at producing this kind of happiness. It is better at manufacturing desire than sustaining peace, better at producing competition than protecting relationship, better at provoking emotion than supporting the long unfolding of a human life.

Meaning is the deepest layer of all.

If living without insecurity answers whether one can continue living, and happiness answers whether one lives well, then meaning answers the deepest question:

Why is it worth continuing to live at all?

For a long time, many people could still derive an answer from being needed. I work, I contribute, I solve problems—therefore I matter.

But once large amounts of functional, standardized, and cognitive work are taken over by highly capable systems, more and more people will be forced to face the hardest question of the age:

If machines become increasingly useful, why do I still matter?

Real meaning does not come from how many people one defeats.

It comes from what one participates in, whom one helps fulfill, and what one leaves behind in the world.

These three goals—security, happiness, meaning—may appear separate.

They are not.

Without security, happiness becomes fragile and meaning becomes abstract.

Without happiness, survival declines into endurance.

Without meaning, even survival and happiness lose direction over time.

That is why the new world cannot achieve only one of the three.

It cannot merely keep people alive while leaving them numb.

It cannot merely make people “feel better” while refusing to answer the deeper weight of life.

It cannot speak of lofty meaning while leaving most people in precarity.

A world worthy of being built must move toward all three together.

Chapter Five | Altruism Is Not a Moral Slogan. It Is a New Survival Rationality

Many people hear the word “altruism” and immediately become suspicious.

They assume it means self-sacrifice, repression of instinct, or an endless moral demand to serve others at one’s own expense.

If that were all it meant, it would indeed be unsustainable.

Human beings do not live by sermons.

Civilizations do not run on noble slogans alone.

But in the age of AGI, the renewed call for altruism is not a call to turn human beings into saints.

It points to something harder and more realistic:

in a high-capability, highly coupled, high-externality age, continuing to operate by the old logic of self-interest is becoming less and less truly in one’s own interest.

Let us be clear: self-interest was not always destructive.

It genuinely drove much of human progress.

In ages of scarcity, limited capability, and pervasive danger, individuals had to preserve themselves, families had to endure, organizations had to expand, and states had to secure their survival. The pursuit of advantage, wealth, and opportunity was not a strange deviation. It was a basic logic of the old world. Under that logic, productivity grew, technology developed, institutions formed, and societies became more complex.

So the problem is not that self-interest once existed.

The problem is that a logic that once worked does not automatically remain viable in every era.

In the past, localized pursuit of advantage certainly had costs, but many of those costs remained relatively local. One person’s greed did not always damage everyone. One organization’s

extraction did not always raise risk for civilization as a whole. One nation's calculation did not always place humanity's future itself in jeopardy.

But the AGI era is different.

Capability is greater.

Interconnection is deeper.

Consequences propagate faster.

Systems depend on each other more tightly.

That means problems that once remained local now increasingly become systemic.

If capital continues pursuing profit maximization alone, what gets amplified is not only efficiency—but extreme concentration of resources, collapse of labor value, and the hollowing out of human place and dignity.

If platforms continue optimizing only for control and retention, what gets amplified is not only convenience—but also attention capture, collapse of trust, emotional manipulation, and social fragmentation.

If states continue optimizing only for strategic supremacy, what gets amplified is not only defense—but also arms escalation, algorithmic confrontation, strategic misjudgment, and civilization-scale self-destruction.

That is why the renewed call for altruism is not anti-human.

It is a redesign of how human self-interest must function under new civilizational conditions.

People will, of course, continue caring about themselves—their survival, their interests, their families, their place, their future. That is not the problem.

The problem is that under today's conditions, any person, organization, or state that still tries to secure advantage by harming others, exploiting the whole, or externalizing costs is increasingly likely to discover that it cannot even secure its own long-term interests.

So altruism does not mean ignoring oneself.

It means recognizing this:

in our time, stable self-realization increasingly has to pass through what is good for others, good for the whole, and good for the future.

That is its real meaning.

Not “I lose so you can gain.”

But rather: what is truly good for me can no longer be sustainably separated from what is also good for others and for the larger world.

This is why altruism is, first of all, not a moral luxury.

It is a survival rationality.

If technological power can amplify consequences at civilizational scale, then continuing to pursue benefit by damaging others, undermining the whole, and mortgaging the future becomes increasingly unstable.

It is also a happiness rationality.

A society that persistently rewards comparison, pressure, externalized costs, and positional struggle may produce some winners. It will struggle to produce stable happiness.

And it is a meaning rationality.

Stable meaning does not come from domination.

It comes from creation, care, repair, connection, and presence.

When one’ s life gains weight by moving toward others and toward the future, meaning becomes durable.

So altruism is not a moral slogan.

It is not about becoming more virtuous in the abstract.

It is about allowing human beings to remain viable under the conditions of a new civilization.

Chapter Six | What Kind of Person Will Matter Again in the New World?

One of the most frightening questions in the AGI era is this:

If machines can increasingly do things, why do human beings still matter?

This is not the anxiety of a small minority.

It is becoming a common question.

Because the old world recognized people in a narrow way: the more useful you were, the more efficient you were, the more measurable value you produced, the more likely you were to be seen, respected, and rewarded.

But when highly capable systems become better and better at function, efficiency, process, analysis, and execution, that standard begins to loosen.

It is not that human beings suddenly lose value.

It is that the old world's method of recognizing value begins to fail.

So the real question is not whether human beings will be completely replaced.

The deeper question is:

what kinds of people, capacities, and ways of being will matter again in the new world?

The answer is not mysterious.

On the contrary, these things have always been with us.

The old world simply undervalued them.

They can be gathered into five words:

maintenance.

care.

connection.

repair.

presence.

The old world loves innovation.

It praises disruption, speed, growth, and reinvention.

These matter.

But the survival of a civilization depends not only on creating new things.

It depends on whether enough people are doing the work that keeps the foundations from falling apart.

Maintenance is not secondary labor.

It is civilizational continuity labor.

Machines may grow more efficient.

They may complete tasks more quickly, deliver answers more reliably, recognize patterns more accurately.

But some things, even if machines can imitate them, they do not truly possess.

For example: understanding.

Companionship.

Staying beside another person through collapse.

Care is not a private virtue alone.

It is a condition of civilizational stability.

The old world is also very good at dividing people—into classes, sectors, camps, identities, labels. It rewards those who dominate within fractured structures. But it is far less capable of rewarding another kind of capacity:

the capacity to reconnect what has been broken apart.

That is why a critical kind of person in the future will be the one who can connect.

Not only the one who can win, but the one who can make people matter to one another again.

The old world also rewards addition more than restoration: new projects, new growth, new markets, new functions.

But one of the highest-value forms of work in the future will not simply be building more on top of a damaged world.

It will be repairing what has already cracked, been depleted, fragmented, and harmed.

And perhaps deepest of all is presence.

When we ask whether machines can replace people, we often assume we are comparing abilities.

But human beings are often irreplaceable not only because of what they can do, but because of how they can be there.

To sit beside another person in a moment of fear, loss, illness, grief, or transition.

To accompany a child as they grow.

To enter another life not merely as a function, but as a presence.

That is why those who will matter most in the new world will not simply be those who know how to outperform systems.

They will be those who can maintain, care, connect, repair, and truly be present.

Because what keeps a civilization from collapsing is often not its most dazzling layer.

It is the layer that allows the world to continue living at all.

Chapter Seven | How a New Order Begins

At this point, many people ask the same question:

What if I agree with all this—but how does a new world actually begin?

Do we have to wait for universal consensus? For all countries to be ready? For all institutions to upgrade at once? For everyone to change first?

If that were the condition, it would almost guarantee that the new world never begins.

Because the most important changes in history have never emerged only after conditions became perfect.

They begin in incomplete, partial, and initially small forms. Someone tries something first. Somewhere, something is built first. A small part of reality lights up first. Then it expands, links, and becomes common sense.

So the new world will not be “waited into existence.”

It can only be built into existence.

And not by starting with a perfect blueprint—but by beginning with the first small realities that can be tested, repeated, and expanded.

A new order is worth beginning not because it is complete, but because it points in a clear direction.

It does not aim merely to make the old world function more smoothly.

It aims to orient civilization explicitly toward three things:

- security without existential precarity
- genuine human happiness

· deeper meaning in human life

But a new world cannot arrive through praise alone.

It has to translate value into real rules.

That is what contribution value is meant to solve.

Contribution value is not moral scoring.

It is not rewarding declarations.

It is not forcing everyone into one mode of life.

It is not turning human beings into endlessly quantified objects.

Its real purpose is to make those actions that are truly good for the whole move from “important in principle” to “important in reality.”

The old world has long used price as its main language of value.

What sells at a high price is treated as important.

But price is good at expressing exchange.

It is poor at expressing civilizational direction.

That is why contribution value matters: it attempts to re-anchor value in life itself—in what genuinely supports human beings and the larger whole.

Yet contribution value alone is not enough.

A new world must answer not only who deserves reward, but also:

what kind of life makes genuine happiness more possible?

The old world is highly skilled at manufacturing desire.

It is much less skilled at helping people enter lasting well-being.

So the new order cannot be only a distributive framework.

It must also be a happiness-supporting framework—one that helps different people, at different stages of life, move closer to stability, relationship, growth, autonomy, and realization.

And deeper still lies another question:

Can a person’s dream cease to be merely a private fantasy?

In the old world, too many aspirations have no doorway into reality—not because they are false, but because they are not profitable enough, mainstream enough, or aligned enough with the old order’ s priorities.

So many lives become compressed into two tasks: survival and the management of disappointment.

That is why a platform like Dream Garden matters.

It would give personal aspirations a path into real collaboration.

Helping others would no longer be merely accidental kindness; it could become something socially supported and structurally recognized.

In the same way, no matter how compelling an idea is, if it has no living examples, it will be dismissed as fantasy.

So the new order will not begin all at once, everywhere.

It will begin with the first examples that actually work.

A community might experiment with mutual time exchange.

A school might experiment with contribution that does not vanish at graduation.

A company might build public-value accounts.

A city might experiment with linking basic security, education, healthcare, collaborative platforms, and happiness-support systems.

The moment something truly runs in reality, it stops being just an idea.

It becomes a starting point that others can study, revise, and reproduce.

That is why the new world is not fantasy.

It has not yet arrived not because it has no direction—but because its direction has not yet been made real in enough places.

Chapter Eight | Anyone Can Be a Starting Point

By the time they reach this point, many readers instinctively exclude themselves.

They assume that the people who can really begin something are states, giant companies, elite scientists, major capital holders, or global institutions.

What can someone ordinary do?

What can a small community, a school, a modest institution, or a city do?

This reaction is understandable.

The old world trained us to believe that meaningful change can only come from centers of power. Only those at the top are entitled to speak about the future. Only those with major resources can define direction. Only large actors can alter history.

But if a civilizational leap is to happen, it cannot proceed only through that logic.

The new world will not arrive as an order issued by one center to everyone else.

It will emerge as more and more real starting points begin aligning themselves toward the same horizon.

Which means:

No one has to wait to be permitted to begin.

Anyone can be a starting point.

This is not romanticism.

It is the most plausible way civilizational change can actually happen.

If the new world had to wait for one absolute center to understand everything first, agree first, and authorize first, then it would almost certainly arrive too late.

The problems are too complex, contexts too varied, and pathways too different for any one center to design a perfect answer for everyone at once.

The more likely pattern is this:

small but real examples arise in different places, through different methods, proving that another way of living, distributing, and cooperating can actually function.

An individual is small.

But an individual can still become a starting point.

Not because one person can single-handedly change the world, but because one person can stop living entirely by the old logic. One can redefine time, value, and choice. One can let the future acquire a small but real form within one's own life.

Communities can go farther.

Human beings do not live by ideas alone.

They live by relationships.

A real community is a group of people who begin to carry one another in reality—who recognize what matters together, record one another's contributions together, and support values that the old world ignored.

Institutions and platforms can become starting points because they possess the ability to turn values into rules. A school can stop educating only for competitive winners and begin recognizing cooperation, care, and public participation. A company can stop optimizing only for profit and begin accounting for public value. A platform can stop optimizing only for retention and control and begin giving cooperation, trust, and shared fulfillment real social pathways.

Cities are one of the best scales for lighting up the future.

They are large enough to be complex, but concrete enough to become livable examples. A city can make a different way of life experientially visible.

States still matter, of course.

They command rules, resources, scale, security capacity, and the possibility of institutional experimentation.

But a state's importance does not mean it can monopolize the future.

The most important thing about a starting point is not that it is large.

It is that it is real.

Not better rhetoric—but different practice.

Not promotional fantasy—but a place where the future has actually begun to run.

Reality generates trust.

Trust enables replication.

Replication accumulates into the future.

So anyone can be a starting point.

Not because everyone can change the whole world alone—but because the new world was never going to begin from only one place.

Individuals can begin by changing their relationship to time, value, and choice.

Communities can regrow mutual support.

Institutions and platforms can revise their goals.

Cities can turn another way of life into a visible reality.

States can shoulder larger experiments.

The future will not descend in completed form.

It will first appear as many small but real beginnings.

And once those beginnings begin connecting to one another, a new civilization will stop being imagination alone.

It will begin to become real.

So the real question is no longer:

Who is most qualified to begin?

It is:

Who is willing to begin, so that the future can first appear in reality?

—

Conclusion | If You Can Already See It, You Are No Longer Only a Spectator

We have entered a historical moment unlike most others.

The old world still functions, but the boundaries that made it viable are beginning to shift.

The new world has not yet fully formed, but the conditions that could support it are beginning to appear.

For the first time, humanity faces two truths at once.

On the one hand, we are closer than ever to amplifying the old world's problems to civilizational scale. Stronger technologies, deeper interconnection, faster propagation, narrower windows for correction.

On the other hand, we are also closer than ever to moving humanity's long-held aspirations nearer to reality. More resources could be freed from endless internal waste. More capability could be redirected from domination toward mutual fulfillment. More institutions could move from partial victory to collective survival. More lives could be carried from mere endurance toward security, happiness, and meaning.

So the central question is no longer whether the future will change.

It is:

Along what logic will it change?

That is what a civilizational leap is truly about.

We already know that the real divide is not the technology itself.

We already know that the new world cannot be merely a stronger old world.

We already know that this cannot be left to others.

Because if you can already see the edge of the old world—

if you can already feel that deepening unease about survival, happiness, and meaning—

then you are already standing at the divide.

From here, you can continue as before.

You can continue believing the old logic will repair itself.

You can continue believing stronger tools will naturally create a better future.

You can continue handing survival, happiness, and meaning over to chance, to the leftovers of competition, or to stronger actors who will supposedly decide for you.

But you can also admit another truth:

The old world will not automatically grow into a new world.

The new world must be deliberately begun.

That does not mean changing everything at once.

It does not mean needing great power, great wealth, or great influence first.

It means only this: you can no longer fully understand yourself as irrelevant.

Because once you can see the direction, you are no longer merely a spectator.

You can begin from very small places:

from how you define success,

from whether you are willing to reconnect your own interests to other people and to the future,

from whether you are willing to devote part of your time and capability to maintenance, care, connection, repair, and presence,

from whether you are willing to participate in even one small real-world example.

The starting point does not have to be grand.

But it must be real.

Because the future never arrives first as a complete blueprint.

It first appears in small but genuine forms.

Someone lives it first.

Somewhere, it is built first.

Some relationships are restored.

Some rules are reinvented.

Some local world begins operating no longer entirely by the old logic.

Then the future begins to grow from there.

So this declaration is not ultimately meant to leave you in fear.

Nor is it meant merely to leave you with understanding.

It is meant to leave you with a clearer position:

The age we live in no longer allows humanity to remain only passive inheritors.

We will either continue handing greater power to the old logic—or we will begin writing new civilizational goals into reality.

We will either continue waiting—

or begin lighting the first points.

The future will not happen automatically.

A civilizational leap will not come from waiting.

It will be brought into reality, piece by piece, by those who first see the direction, first accept responsibility, and first light real examples.

If you can already see it,

you are no longer only a spectator.

You can become part of a beginning.

And the new world will require many more such beginnings.

Written by Zijun Fu

Published by the Civilizational Leap Research Group

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19302028

Official website: civilleap.com

Current access: www.civitas.top

Contact: zijunfu@civitas.top

Position in the Civilization Leap Framework and Next Readings

This document is the international entry version of the Civilizational Leap Declaration. It introduces the civilizational divide of the AGI age and directs readers toward the wider Civilization Leap framework.

Recommended next readings

- Civilization Leap Mainline Overview: </mainline/>
- The Civilizational Leap Declaration: </paper/civilizational-leap-declaration-en-v1-0.pdf>
- Library: </library.html>
- Downloads: </downloads.html>
- Reading Map: </reading.html>

Note

This external release is an entry document. It does not replace the mainline books, full white papers, governance protocols, or implementation documents.

Downloads and Website Entry Points

官网 / Website	civilleap.com
当前入口 / Current entry	www.civitas.top
文库 / Library	www.civitas.top/library.html
下载中心 / Downloads	www.civitas.top/downloads.html
阅读地图 / Reading map	www.civitas.top/reading.html
联系邮箱 / Contact	zijunfu@civitas.top

Each public document is an entry point into the Civilization Leap framework. The point is not to stop at one text, but to keep following the questions, paths, and actions it opens.