OPEN RESEARCH EDITION · ACADEMIC REVISION 1.2 · 2026

CIVILIZATION SCIENCE

FRAMEWORK 1.0

A General Framework for Modeling, Measuring, and Engineering Civilizational Systems

Aurion Hu

Founding Author · Independent Researcher

Civilization Science Society (CSS) · in formation

CivilizationSci.org

PUBLICATION STATUS

An invitation to test a framework

This document presents Civilization Science as a proposed interdisciplinary research program. It does not claim that the field, its equations, indicators, institutions, award, or applications have already achieved scientific consensus. Framework 1.0 is deliberately published as an open research edition so that definitions can be challenged, variables operationalized, models compared, evidence reproduced, and errors corrected. Academic Revision 1.2 adds an explicit dimensional-reduction protocol, a bounded transformation for the stability score, derivative-consistent dynamics, and a continuous-data observation–state–update interface.

EPISTEMIC STATUS The stability equation and related formal expressions are hypotheses and organizing models—not validated laws of nature. Their scientific value depends on measurement validity, out-of-sample performance, transparent uncertainty, and comparison against simpler or competing explanations.

Suggested citation: Hu, A. (2026). Civilization Science Framework 1.0: A General Framework for Modeling, Measuring, and Engineering Civilizational Systems. Open Research Edition, Academic Revision 1.2. Civilization Science Society (in formation).

Document language: English. Chinese title: 《 1.0》.

ABSTRACT

Making civilizational systems scientifically tractable

Civilizations generate knowledge, institutions, infrastructures, identities, and long-duration patterns of cooperation; they also produce conflict, exclusion, environmental overshoot, and systemic fragility. Yet no single discipline treats civilization as a measurable, multilevel, adaptive system whose stability, transitions, and failure modes can be investigated through a shared formal language. Civilization Science is proposed as an interdisciplinary research program for that purpose.

The framework models a civilization as a complex adaptive system composed of interacting agents, institutions, networks, infrastructures, ecosystems, and symbolic orders. It introduces a provisional stability relation, $S = (C \times L_e \times E_n) / E$. In the canonical notation, C denotes effective cooperation, L_e an effective relational trust–legitimacy field, E_n net usable civilizational capacity, E an entropy-pressure index, and S bounded civilizational stability. These are dimensionless normalized constructs in the empirical formulation, not physical quantities with assumed universal units. The relation is not a finished empirical law. It is a compact structural hypothesis intended to discipline definitions, measurement, causal modeling, simulation, historical comparison, and falsification.

The paper specifies levels of analysis, operational definitions, dynamic extensions, six research pillars, a provisional 40-volume theoretical program, data and model requirements, testable hypotheses, and governance safeguards. It situates CCWS, CPC, Meaning Economics, AI Agent Economics, EverLifeX, and a proposed research contribution award as applications or research programs subordinate to evidence and ethics. The framework's success should be judged not by conceptual scope but by whether it yields reproducible measurements, useful predictions, better explanations, and interventions that preserve dignity, pluralism, agency, and peaceful correction.

Keywords: civilization; complex adaptive systems; resilience; cooperation; trust; legitimacy; energy; entropy; systemic risk; agent-based modeling; early warning; open science.

CONTENTS

Framework architecture

CONTENTS · CONTINUED

How to read this document

Readers evaluating the scientific core should begin with Sections 3–10 and 13–16. Readers concerned with institutional and ethical legitimacy should focus on Sections 21–25. Sections 17–20 describe proposed applications and research programs; they do not independently validate the core theory.

01 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

1. Executive Summary

A disciplined research program for studying civilizational stability, transition, risk, and deliberate improvement.

Civilization Science begins from a practical observation: humanity increasingly manages tightly coupled planetary systems without an integrated science of the civilizational systems doing the managing. Climate, finance, public health, information networks, artificial intelligence, supply chains, and political legitimacy interact across scales. Failures cascade. Local optimization can produce global fragility. Existing disciplines offer indispensable partial explanations, but their units, data, and causal assumptions are rarely integrated.

The proposed field therefore asks a restricted scientific question: under what observable conditions do large-scale human systems preserve viable cooperation, learning, legitimacy, material capacity, ecological continuity, and peaceful adaptability over time? The goal is not to rank cultures or declare one model of society universally superior. It is to build explicit, revisable models of system performance and failure, with uncertainty and normative choices made visible.

FIVE COMMITMENTS Civilizations are modeled as complex adaptive systems; constructs must be measurable; models must be falsifiable; applications must remain ethically bounded; and the research commons must preserve evidence, versions, criticism, and plural participation.

Framework 1.0 contributes a common vocabulary and research architecture. It defines five core constructs, distinguishes equilibrium from adaptive stability, proposes multilevel, log-linear, and component-dynamic formulations, and identifies an empirical workflow from construct validation through historical backtesting and prospective evaluation. It also separates the core theory from named applications, preventing any application from inheriting validity merely from association with the framework.

The immediate priority is measurement before promotion. The first research cycle should publish a construct dictionary, data provenance standard, benchmark dataset, preregistered model comparisons, and replication protocol. A field earns credibility through cumulative error correction —not through the scale of its founding claim.

02 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

2. Why Civilization Science Is Needed

Civilizational problems are coupled, nonlinear, path-dependent, and only partially visible through disciplinary partitions.

Modern societies can produce more information while losing shared reality; increase connectivity while concentrating systemic risk; expand energy throughput while eroding ecological buffers; and improve short-term efficiency while weakening long-term resilience. These tensions are not adequately described by one-variable accounts of prosperity, state capacity, technology, or culture.

A civilization-scale lens is justified when the object of study crosses institutional sectors and generations. It becomes necessary when feedbacks among material systems, information systems, governance, ecology, and collective meaning alter the causal structure itself. The proposed field is thus defined by a class of problems rather than by an all-encompassing claim to replace economics, sociology, history, ecology, political science, or complexity science.

- Integration: connect heterogeneous evidence without erasing disciplinary expertise.
- Dynamics: analyze feedback, thresholds, delays, path dependence, and regime shifts.
- Comparison: make cross-case claims conditional on measurement equivalence and context.
- Action: evaluate interventions for both effectiveness and ethical legitimacy.

The strongest justification for a new field will be empirical. Civilization Science should survive only if shared constructs and models improve explanation, prediction, or coordinated learning beyond existing approaches.

2.1 The integration gap

The proposed contribution is not the discovery of complexity, resilience, collective action, institutional trust, energy constraints, or systemic risk; extensive literatures already exist in each domain. The claimed gap is an interoperable research architecture that links these domains at civilizational scale while retaining explicit system boundaries, construct definitions, ethical constraints, and model-comparison requirements. This is a claim to be demonstrated, not assumed.

2.2 Criteria for disciplinary value

A distinct research program is warranted only if it produces at least one of four gains: conceptual integration that resolves incompatible definitions; measurements that work across previously disconnected datasets; models with incremental explanatory or predictive performance; or research infrastructure that enables cumulative cross-domain testing. Failure to deliver these gains should lead to narrowing the program rather than defending disciplinary novelty rhetorically.

03 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

3. Definition and Research Boundaries

A field with an expansive object must have unusually explicit limits.

Civilization Science is the interdisciplinary study of the formation, functioning, stability, transformation, and long-term continuity of large-scale human systems as complex adaptive systems. Its objects include interactions among populations, institutions, infrastructures, knowledge, technologies, ecosystems, and symbolic orders across multiple spatial and temporal scales.

The field is not a universal philosophy of history, a deterministic theory of rise and fall, a civilizational ranking system, or a mandate for technocratic control. It does not infer moral worth from stability, productivity, territory, power, or longevity. Stable oppression is not a desirable outcome; rapid democratic correction may be a sign of health rather than disorder.

Inside the research boundary	Outside the boundary unless separately justified
Operational constructs and observable proxies	Metaphysical claims presented as empirical facts
Conditional causal models with uncertainty	Single-cause inevitability narratives
Comparative and historical testing	Uncontextualized ranking of peoples or cultures
Ethically reviewed decision support	Automated social control or coercive optimization
Open criticism and competing models	Authority based on founder status or branding

04 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

4. Civilization as a Complex Adaptive System

Civilizations persist through distributed adaptation, not through a single center of control.

A complex adaptive system consists of heterogeneous agents whose interactions produce emergent patterns, feedback loops, learning, and nonlinear change. Civilizational outcomes arise from households, organizations, states, firms, communities, infrastructures, ecosystems, and machine agents acting under incomplete information and unequal power.

These categories define the framework's multilevel ontology; they are not a requirement that every category enter one empirical model as a separate variable. Framework 1.0 retains the full actor set as a conceptual map while making no claim that all categories are simultaneously measurable, identifiable, or estimable within a single study.

Each empirical model must therefore declare a dimensional-reduction protocol: bound the system and level of analysis; aggregate micro-entities into theoretically justified meso-level states; select a minimal sufficient set of latent factors, network statistics, or summary variables; preserve distributional and power asymmetries that aggregation could erase; and compare the reduced model with simpler baselines and higher-dimensional alternatives. Factor models, principal components, network coarse-graining, clustering, sufficient-statistic methods, or interpretable representation learning may be used, but the reduction must be validated, uncertainty-aware, and traceable to source observations. The retained state vector is determined by the research question and identifiability constraints—not by the full ontology.

This framing has four implications. First, macro-level patterns cannot be reduced to representative individuals. Second, intervention effects depend on network structure and timing. Third, resilience may involve reorganization rather than return to a prior equilibrium. Fourth, prediction should often be probabilistic and scenario-based, especially near critical transitions.

The system boundary must be declared for each study. A civilization may be treated as a cultural-historical formation, an interconnected regional system, a global techno-economic system, or a nested set of social-ecological networks. None is automatically privileged; the appropriate boundary follows the research question and available evidence.

MODELING PRINCIPLE Prefer the smallest model capable of answering the question. Civilizational scale should not become an excuse for unfalsifiable complexity.

05 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

5. Ontological Foundations

The framework adopts layered, relational, process-oriented realism while keeping normative commitments explicit.

The ontology distinguishes entities, relations, processes, fields, and emergent properties. Agents and institutions are entities; cooperation and exchange are relations; learning and decay are processes; trust-legitimacy is modeled as a distributed field; stability is an emergent, scale-dependent property. This vocabulary does not settle philosophical debates, but it prevents variables from drifting between metaphor and measurement.

Civilizational reality is simultaneously material, informational, institutional, ecological, and symbolic. No layer is treated as epiphenomenal. Material resources constrain action; information changes expectations; institutions allocate authority; ecosystems define biophysical limits; meanings motivate sacrifice, belonging, and future orientation.

Normative concepts—including dignity, justice, agency, pluralism, and continuity—cannot be derived from descriptive equations. They enter as explicit constraints and evaluation criteria. The framework therefore rejects the inference that whatever increases measured stability is necessarily good.

06 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

6. Levels and Basic Units

The same construct can behave differently at individual, network, institutional, societal, and planetary levels.

Level	Illustrative units	Typical mechanisms	Candidate observations
Micro	persons, households, AI agents	learning, identity, trust, choice	surveys, behavior, transactions
Meso	organizations, cities, networks	coordination, norms, diffusion	network and administrative data
Macro	states, economies, civilizational systems	legitimacy, distribution, capacity	institutional and system indicators
Planetary	biosphere, global infrastructures	overshoot, cascades, commons	earth-system and transboundary data

The basic analytical unit is not fixed. Depending on the hypothesis, it may be an agent, relationship, institution, flow, network, event, territory, narrative, or regime. Each study should specify unit, level, boundary, observation interval, and aggregation rule.

Cross-level inference is a central hazard. Individual trust does not automatically aggregate to institutional legitimacy; national energy capacity does not imply equitable access; a dense network can improve coordination or accelerate contagion. Multilevel models are preferred when measurements span nested units.

07 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

7. The Civilization Stability Equation

A canonical structural hypothesis with separate conceptual, estimable, and dynamic representations.

The canonical conceptual relation is:

$$S = (C \times L_e \times E_n) / E$$

Here S represents bounded civilizational stability; C effective cooperation; L_e an effective relational trust–legitimacy field; E_n net usable civilizational capacity; and E an entropy-pressure index. Multiplication expresses the hypothesized complementarity of enabling conditions: severe weakness in one factor may constrain the joint system. Division expresses the hypothesized burden imposed by fragmentation, destructive conflict, coordination loss, and dissipative pressure.

CANONICAL NOTATION The symbols preserve the original Civilization Science formulation. For empirical work, all components must be transformed into dimensionless, bounded indices or modeled as latent variables. E is not thermodynamic entropy, and E_n is not physical energy unless a study explicitly defines a defensible physical mapping.

7.1 A testable indexed form

A positive-valued indexed form is:

$$\tilde{S}_{i,t} = [C_{i,t}^\alpha \cdot L_{ei,t}^\beta \cdot E_{ni,t}^\gamma] / (E_{i,t} + \varepsilon)^\delta$$

Indices identify system i and time t; ε is a declared regularization constant; exponents are estimated rather than assumed. This expression requires non-negative, comparably scaled inputs. Results must be reported across plausible ε values because the denominator can otherwise dominate estimates near zero. Because the fractional form can become arbitrarily large as E approaches zero, $\tilde{S}_{i,t}$ is an unbounded raw index and cannot itself satisfy the theoretical requirement that S represent a bounded capacity.

$$S_{i,t} = \sigma(a + b \ln \tilde{S}_{i,t}) = 1 / \{1 + \exp[-(a + b \ln \tilde{S}_{i,t})]\}, \quad 0 < S_{i,t} < 1$$

The reported score must therefore be mapped through a monotone squashing function such as the logistic transformation above. A probit or another declared bounded link may be used when empirically justified. The link parameters, regularization constant, scale, and boundary behavior must be calibrated and reported; both the raw index and bounded score should be retained for audit and sensitivity analysis.

7.2 Log-linear estimation

With a logistic link, the bounded multiplicative hypothesis can be estimated in a transparent logit-linear form:

$$\mathrm{logit}(S_{i,t}) = a + \alpha \ln C_{i,t} + \beta \ln L_{ei,t} + \gamma \ln E_{ni,t} - \delta \ln(E_{i,t} + \varepsilon) + u_{i,t}$$

The coefficients describe conditional effects on the latent log-odds scale rather than universal constants. Fixed effects, random effects, lag structures, nonlinear terms, and measurement error may be added when justified. A causal interpretation requires an identification strategy; regression fit alone is insufficient. Alternative links must be compared by calibration, out-of-sample performance, and sensitivity of substantive conclusions.

7.3 Competing models and decision rule

The canonical relation must be tested against an additive index, interaction regression, generalized additive model, latent-variable model, domain-specific baseline, and appropriately regularized machine-learning benchmark. Evaluation should include calibration, predictive error, temporal and geographic transfer, interpretability, and sensitivity to operationalization. If the canonical model does not provide reproducible incremental value, it should be revised, narrowed, or rejected.

INTERPRETATION CONSTRAINT Stability means the capacity to maintain life-supporting function, legitimate cooperation, learning, and peaceful adaptation under disturbance. It does not mean immobility, regime preservation, or suppression of dissent.

08 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

8. Operational Definitions of C, L_e, E_n, E, and S

Every construct requires a measurement model, uncertainty interval, and documented failure modes.

Construct	Operational meaning	Illustrative indicators	Primary risk
C	effective, inclusive coordination toward shared functions	collective-action success; network reciprocity; service reliability	confusing coercion with cooperation
L_e	effective relational trust, legitimacy, and expected fair reciprocity	institutional trust; procedural fairness; reliable reciprocity	survey, translation, and cultural bias
E_n	net material, human, informational, institutional, and ecological capacity available for adaptation	energy reliability; fiscal space; health; skills; infrastructure and ecological slack	equating throughput or wealth with usable capacity
E	dimensionless pressure from fragmentation, destructive conflict, uncertainty, and coordination loss	violence; corruption; information disorder; network fragmentation	thermodynamic overclaim and double counting
S	bounded capacity to preserve function, dignity, correction, and adaptation	recovery; continuity; peaceful transfer; adaptive performance	rewarding repressive order

Construct validity should be tested through convergent, discriminant, predictive, and cross-cultural evidence. Indicators must be normalized within declared populations and time windows. Composite scores require transparent weighting, sensitivity tests, missing-data rules, and uncertainty propagation.

The subscript e in L_e denotes an effective relational field. “Love Element” may be retained as the historical or motivational name of the originating idea, but the operational scientific construct in this framework is effective relational trust–legitimacy; it is not a physical particle or fundamental force. The subscript n in E_n denotes net usable capacity after essential maintenance, access constraints, and losses. The symbols are research notation and should not obscure plain-language definitions.

8.1 Measurement-model requirements

Each construct requires a reflective, formative, or network-based measurement model. Researchers must declare which model is assumed because indicator interpretation changes accordingly. Measurement invariance should be evaluated before cross-cultural score comparison. Where invariance fails, within-context models or partially pooled estimates are preferable to a universal ranking.

8.2 Distribution and rights constraints

Aggregate capacity or order cannot establish desirable stability if benefits and burdens are radically unequal. Distribution-sensitive indicators, protected rights, meaningful agency, and peaceful correction therefore operate as explicit constraints or parallel outcome dimensions. They should not be hidden inside a single aggregate score.

09 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

9. Civilizational Dynamics

Dynamic analysis should model the evolution of components before treating stability as an outcome trajectory.

A static measurement equation does not by itself define a law of motion. Framework 1.0 therefore distinguishes a measurement map, $S_t = G(x_t)$, from a transition model, $x_{t+1} = F(x_t, z_t, a_t, \eta_t)$. Any expression written as dS/dt must be derived from both the declared measurement map and the dynamics of its components. The earlier production-minus-loss expression is withdrawn as a literal derivative of the Section 7 equation.

9.1 Component state-space formulation

A more defensible dynamic program models the core components as jointly evolving states:

$$x_{t+1} = F(x_t, z_t, a_t, \eta_t), \quad x_t = [C_t, L_{et}, E_{nt}, E_t]^T$$

Here z_t represents external conditions and shocks, a_t interventions or collective actions, and η_t stochastic disturbance. Stability is estimated through the bounded measurement function $S_t = G(x_t)$, using the logistic, probit, or another declared link. This state-space separation is the primary dynamic specification and prevents a measurement identity from being confused with a transition law.

9.2 A derivative consistent with the bounded measurement map

For continuous positive components, define q(t) as the latent log-index and $S(t) = \sigma(q(t))$ as the bounded score:

$$q(t) = a + \alpha \ln C(t) + \beta \ln L_e(t) + \gamma \ln E_n(t) - \delta \ln[E(t) + \varepsilon], \quad S(t) = \sigma(q(t))$$

$$dS/dt = S(1 - S)[\alpha \dot{C}/C + \beta \dot{L}_e/L_e + \gamma \dot{E}_n/E_n - \delta \dot{E}/(E + \varepsilon)]$$

This chain-rule derivative is mathematically consistent with Section 7. It shows that change in bounded stability depends on component growth rates and is damped as S approaches its bounds. It does not establish causality; the component derivatives still require identified transition equations and empirical estimation.

9.3 Exploratory discrete-time transition hypothesis

If researchers wish to retain the production-minus-loss intuition, it must be expressed as an independent discrete-time transition hypothesis rather than as the derivative of the static ratio:

$$\Delta h_{t+1} = \alpha C_t L_{et} E_{nt} - \beta E_t - \rho R_t + \kappa A_t$$

$$S_{t+1} = \sigma[\mathrm{logit}(S_t) + \Delta h_{t+1}]$$

Here R denotes shock exposure and A adaptive capacity. This is a separate, falsifiable transition model whose parameters may vary across systems and time. It must be compared with the component state-space model, autoregressive baselines, and simpler null models; failure to improve calibration or out-of-sample prediction is evidence against retaining it.

Feedback may be positive—for example, effective cooperation increasing calibrated trust—or negative, as when concentrated capacity reduces legitimacy and eventually cooperation. Causal loops, time delays, and distributional mechanisms should be represented explicitly rather than absorbed into coefficients.

Near transitions, variance, autocorrelation, network fragmentation, and recovery time may change. Early-warning indicators are useful only if their false-positive rate, detection lead time, domain of validity, and decision consequences are explicitly evaluated.

10 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

10. Mechanisms of Cooperation, Trust, Energy, and Entropy

Variables become scientific through mechanisms linking causes, observations, and outcomes.

Cooperation converts dispersed agency into collective capacity. It depends on incentives, identity, communication, enforcement, norms, and perceived fairness. Cooperation generated primarily through fear may be brittle and should be measured separately from voluntary or legitimate coordination.

Trust reduces transaction and verification costs, but indiscriminate trust can enable capture. The relevant construct is calibrated trust embedded in accountable institutions. Legitimacy matters because people may comply with costly rules when procedures and authorities are perceived as rightful.

Usable capacity includes more than physical energy. It encompasses knowledge, health, time, infrastructure, ecological services, fiscal room, and organizational slack available for adaptive work. Entropy is used analogically and operationally to denote disorder pressure and dissipative loss; it must not be conflated with thermodynamic entropy without a defensible mapping.

The core empirical task is to identify the causal pathways and interaction terms linking these mechanisms. Mediation, moderation, network diffusion, and feedback should be tested rather than assumed from the equation's visual simplicity.

11 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

11. Six Core Research Pillars

A coherent field requires connected programs that can still be evaluated independently.

Pillar	Core questions and methods
I. Foundations and Epistemology	definitions, ontology, measurement theory, falsification, model comparison
II. Civilizational Physics and Dynamics	flows, networks, thresholds, phase transitions, resilience, collapse
III. Cooperation, Trust, and Institutions	collective action, legitimacy, governance, conflict, repair
IV. Meaning, Information, and Intelligence	narratives, knowledge systems, media, AI agents, sense-making
V. Risk, Continuity, and Early Warning	compound risk, CCWS, scenarios, stress tests, recovery
VI. Civilization Engineering and Open Collaboration	interventions, ethics, standards, CPC, distributed research

The pillars are intentionally porous. A CCWS model may combine network science, institutional trust, ecological risk, and AI-assisted analysis. Cross-pillar work should specify which theory, data, and validation standards it uses.

12 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

12. The 40-Volume Core Theory Architecture

A provisional research map—not a claim that forty validated books already exist.

Cluster	Volume	Status
A · Foundations	Foundations of Civilization Science	Foundation work formed
	Ontology of Civilizational Systems	Open research volume
	Epistemology and Falsifiability	Open research volume
	Measurement Theory	Open research volume
	Comparative Method	Open research volume
B · Dynamics	Civilizational Physics	Foundation work formed
	Stability and Resilience	Open research volume
	Phase Transitions	Open research volume
	Collapse and Recovery	Open research volume
	Long-Duration Dynamics	Open research volume
C · Cooperation	Cooperation Attractor Theory	Open research volume
	Trust and Legitimacy	Open research volume
	Institutions and Commons	Open research volume
	Conflict and Repair	Open research volume
	Governance Evolution	Open research volume
D · Meaning & Intelligence	Meaning Economics	Foundation work formed
	Knowledge Systems	Open research volume
	Information Ecology	Open research volume
	AI Agent Economics	Foundation work formed
	Collective Intelligence	Open research volume
E · Capacity & Ecology	Energy and Civilizational Capacity	Open research volume
	Infrastructure and Networks	Open research volume

Cluster	Volume	Status
	Ecological Boundaries	Open research volume
	Urban and Regional Systems	Open research volume
	Planetary Continuity	Open research volume
F · Risk & Foresight	Systemic Risk	Open research volume
	CCWS Theory	Foundation work formed
	Risk Indicators	Open research volume
	Scenario and Stress Testing	Open research volume
	Civilizational Foresight	Open research volume
G · Engineering	Civilization Engineering	Open research volume
	Policy and Institutional Design	Open research volume
	CPC and Contribution Systems	Foundation work formed
	Digital Public Infrastructure	Open research volume
	Evaluation and Learning	Open research volume
H · Continuity & Practice	Life-Value Continuity	Foundation work formed
	EverLifeX Research Program	Open research volume
	Education and Cultural Transmission	Open research volume
	Open Science Governance	Open research volume
	Civilizational Futures	Open research volume

Seven foundational books or manuscripts have been reported as formed by the founding research program; the remaining thirty-three volumes constitute an open distributed research agenda. “Foundation work formed” does not mean that the corresponding volume or theory has been independently validated. Titles, sequence, authorship, publication form, and evidence status must remain versioned. Companion papers, datasets, standards, software, replications, and case studies should be catalogued separately rather than counted as core volumes.

13 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

13. Measurement and Data Framework

The credibility of the field will depend more on data provenance than on equation elegance.

A Civilization Science data model should connect entities, relations, events, indicators, sources, geographic units, time intervals, and uncertainty. Every observation should carry provenance, method, licensing, revision history, and known bias. Derived indices should be reproducible from source data.

Data and metadata should follow FAIR principles where lawful and ethically appropriate: findable, accessible under declared conditions, interoperable, and reusable. FAIR does not mean that sensitive data must be open. Access controls, privacy-preserving computation, synthetic data, secure research environments, or disclosure limitation may be required.

Measurement proceeds in five layers: construct definition; indicator selection; harmonization; model estimation; and validation. Qualitative evidence—including archives, expert judgment, oral history, and institutional analysis—should be represented with explicit coding protocols rather than forced into false numerical precision.

- Minimum metadata: source, collector, date, geography, population, method, unit, transformations, license, uncertainty.
- Fairness checks: coverage gaps, language bias, surveillance risk, subgroup error, historical asymmetry.
- Robustness checks: alternative weights, proxy substitution, missingness, temporal windows, boundary definitions.

DATA RESTRAINT Not all observable data should be collected. Privacy, consent, representational harm, dual-use risk, and disproportionate monitoring of vulnerable groups can outweigh predictive benefit.

14 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

14. Mathematical Modeling and Multi-Agent Simulation

Models should clarify mechanisms, expose assumptions, earn complexity through performance, and update against traceable observations.

The framework supports statistical, dynamical, network, causal, and agent-based approaches. No method is canonical. Model choice follows the question: causal inference for interventions, network models for cascades, dynamical systems for transitions, Bayesian models for uncertainty, and agent-based models for heterogeneous adaptation.

A multi-agent model should declare agent types, states, decision rules, information access, network topology, institutions, resources, shocks, learning, and outcome measures. Calibration and validation must be separated. Pattern matching to historical outcomes is insufficient if many parameter sets produce the same result.

Recommended practice includes preregistered benchmark tasks, ablation studies, sensitivity analysis, ensemble runs, synthetic-data tests, and out-of-sample evaluation. Simulations are laboratories for conditional reasoning, not substitutes for evidence.

14.1 Continuous-data interaction and online state estimation

To interact with real-world data streams, a computational model should implement an observation–state–update loop rather than rely only on one-time batch fitting. Let y_t denote timestamped observations from heterogeneous sources, x_t the latent civilizational state, and ν_t and η_t observation and process noise:

$$y_t = H_t(x_t) + \nu_t, \quad x_t = F_t(x_{t-1}, z_t, a_t) + \eta_t, \quad S_t = G(x_t)$$

Incoming observations may be continuous, event-driven, delayed, revised, or irregularly sampled. Before they update the latent state, the system must validate provenance, align time and geography, harmonize units, represent missingness and uncertainty, reconcile conflicting sources, and flag data-quality changes. Depending on assumptions, state estimation may use Bayesian filtering, Kalman or particle filters, dynamic latent-variable models, online learning, or another explicitly validated method.

- Ingestion layer: preserve the source, collection time, event time, transformation history, license, uncertainty, and revision status of every observation.
- State-estimation layer: update x_t with a declared observation model, propagate uncertainty, and retain the prior state so that revisions are reproducible.
- Drift-and-governance layer: monitor source drift, concept drift, calibration decay, anomalous updates, and subgroup error; trigger review rather than silently changing the production model.

Online updating does not authorize unconstrained self-modification or automatic policy action. Data snapshots, code, parameters, model cards, and decision thresholds must be versioned; material changes require validation and human approval. Every output should identify the data cutoff, model version, uncertainty range, and whether the underlying observations are provisional, revised, or incomplete.

Model family	Best used for	Required caution
Causal/statistical	effect estimation and forecasting	identification assumptions and drift
Network	contagion, coordination, fragmentation	boundary and missing-edge bias
Dynamical systems	feedback and thresholds	parameter identifiability
Agent-based	heterogeneity and emergence	calibration and equifinality
Machine learning	high-dimensional prediction	explanation, shift, and accountability

15 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

15. Testable Hypotheses and Falsifiability

A framework becomes scientific when it specifies what evidence would count against it.

ID	Claim	Hypothesis	Test
H1	Interaction	The multiplicative $C \times L_e \times E_n$ term predicts stability better than independent additive effects.	Compare preregistered models out of sample.
H2	Trust threshold	Below a context-specific L_e threshold, added capacity yields diminishing stability returns.	Estimate nonlinear threshold models.
H3	Entropy burden	Rising E predicts longer recovery after comparable shocks.	Matched-event and survival analysis.
H4	Distribution	Unequally distributed E_n produces lower durable S than equal aggregate capacity with broader access.	Multilevel distribution-sensitive models.
H5	Correction	Systems with protected dissent and peaceful correction recover better than equally ordered closed systems.	Institutional comparison and event studies.
H6	Network modularity	Moderate modularity reduces cascading failure without eliminating coordination.	Network simulation and infrastructure cases.
H7	Early warning	A defined CCWS ensemble improves calibrated warning over domain-specific baselines.	Prospective blind evaluation.
H8	Intervention	Trust-building interventions improve C only when perceived procedural fairness also rises.	Field or natural experiments.

Falsification criteria include failure of construct validity, instability across reasonable operationalizations, absence of incremental predictive value, inability to replicate, and systematic ethical harms. Negative results should be published and linked to the relevant claim.

16 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

16. Historical Backtesting and Cross-Civilization Comparison

Comparison must preserve context while allowing disciplined inference.

Historical testing can reveal whether indicators lead, coincide with, or merely narrate known outcomes. To limit hindsight bias, researchers should freeze information sets at historical cut-off dates, preregister outcome definitions, and compare against naive and domain-specific baselines.

Case selection should include successful adaptation, near misses, peaceful transformation, recovery, and collapse. Only studying famous failures would bias the model toward dramatic narratives. Cross-civilization comparison requires measurement invariance, translation review, boundary sensitivity, and explicit treatment of colonial and archival asymmetries.

Recommended designs include structured-focused comparison, synthetic controls where applicable, sequence analysis, event history, Bayesian historical inference, and process tracing. Quantitative scores should link back to inspectable historical evidence.

17 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

17. CCWS: Civilizational Collapse Warning System

A proposed risk-intelligence program for calibrated, reviewable, and non-coercive early warning.

CCWS is conceived as an applied research program that integrates signals of cooperation failure, legitimacy decay, capacity stress, information disorder, ecological pressure, conflict, and cascading infrastructure risk. It should produce conditional risk assessments, scenarios, confidence intervals, and explicitly calibrated abstentions—not deterministic collapse dates.

The system architecture may include a global data layer, risk knowledge graph, stability models, AI-assisted analysis, a warning engine, and decision-support outputs. Human review, provenance, uncertainty, and appeal mechanisms are mandatory for consequential use.

Stage	Output	Validation requirement
Signal detection	anomaly with source trace	precision, recall, drift monitoring
Risk synthesis	scenario and probability range	calibration and baseline comparison
Interpretation	mechanism narrative	expert review and counter-evidence
Decision support	options and trade-offs	rights impact and reversibility
Learning	post-event evaluation	public error log and model update

PROHIBITED USE CCWS should not be used to label populations as threats, automate repression, justify collective punishment, or conceal political judgments behind a technical score.

Generic early-warning indicators such as rising variance, autocorrelation, or recovery time can be informative near some critical transitions, but they are neither universal nor sufficient. CCWS must evaluate base rates, lead time, false alarms, missed events, concept drift, and decision utility prospectively. A warning system that cannot abstain or state uncertainty is not ready for consequential use.

18 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

18. CPC: Civilizational Proof of Contribution

A proposed framework for recognizing verifiable public-value contributions without reducing human worth to a score.

CPC explores how contributions to knowledge, trust, systems, resilience, and long-term continuity might be documented, attributed, and recognized. Its purpose is evidentiary: to make contributions inspectable and portable across collaborative research and public-interest projects.

A provisional representation is $CPC = f(I, K, T, S_\gamma, R, L)$, where I denotes impact, K knowledge contribution, T trustworthiness, S_γ systems contribution, R resilience contribution, and L legacy or long-term value. Weights must be domain-specific and contestable.

CPC must never become a universal social-credit score. Participation should be voluntary; evidence should be challengeable; sensitive data minimized; contexts preserved; and human rights independent of contribution metrics. Recognition is not moral ranking.

19 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

19. Meaning Economics and AI Agent Economics

Two research programs examining value formation when meaning and machine agency become economically consequential.

Meaning Economics studies how purpose, identity, trust, belonging, narrative, and contribution affect value creation and allocation. It does not assume that meaning can be fully priced. Instead, it asks where standard economic measures omit motivational, relational, cultural, and intergenerational value.

AI Agent Economics studies economies in which machine agents search, negotiate, produce, coordinate, and transact. Key questions include agency boundaries, identity, liability, alignment, market power, verification, machine-to-machine contracting, and the distribution of productivity gains.

Both programs connect to the core framework through cooperation, trust, usable capacity, and entropy. Empirical work should distinguish descriptive market behavior from normative claims about desirable institutions.

20 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

20. Life-Value Continuity and the EverLifeX Research Program

Continuity concerns the transmission of value, memory, knowledge, care, and responsibility—not literal immortality.

The life-value continuity principle proposes that human value can persist through relationships, works, knowledge, institutions, stewardship, and intergenerational transmission. It reframes legacy as an active process of preserving useful meaning and responsibility across time.

EverLifeX is presented here as a practical research and design program exploring archives, digital identity, family and community memory, contribution records, educational transmission, and AI-mediated continuity. Claims about consciousness, personhood, or survival after death are outside the empirical scope unless independently defined and tested.

Safeguards include consent, posthumous privacy, family conflict resolution, authenticity labeling, data portability, deletion rights, model limitations, and protection against manipulative simulations of deceased persons.

21 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

21. Civilization Engineering and Governance Applications

Engineering means iterative, accountable institutional design—not centralized control of society.

Civilization engineering applies tested knowledge to improve system resilience, cooperation, learning, and continuity. The term is intentionally constrained: interventions should be participatory, reversible where possible, monitored for distributional effects, and open to independent evaluation.

Applications may include institutional stress tests, public-information integrity, infrastructure resilience, commons governance, conflict prevention, AI governance, educational systems, and long-term policy evaluation. Every intervention should specify beneficiaries, affected groups, mechanism, evidence, uncertainty, exit conditions, and redress.

A responsible intervention cycle is: diagnose; deliberate; model; pilot; monitor; evaluate; revise or stop. Optimization targets should include dignity, agency, fairness, ecological limits, and peaceful correction alongside performance.

22 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

22. Research Ethics and Limits of Application

A science of civilization carries unusually high dual-use and legitimacy risks.

Because the framework concerns populations, institutions, risk, and coordination, it could be misused for surveillance, manipulation, exclusion, or authoritarian optimization. Ethical governance is therefore part of the research design rather than an appendix.

- Human dignity and rights are constraints, not variables to be traded away for stability.
- No civilizational ranking by ethnicity, religion, nationality, or cultural worth.
- No covert behavioral manipulation or automated high-impact decisions.
- Minimum necessary data, meaningful consent, security, and deletion mechanisms.
- Independent review, conflict-of-interest disclosure, community participation, and appeal.
- Dual-use assessment before releasing sensitive models, targets, or vulnerabilities.

Engineering claims should be proportional to evidence. In high-uncertainty settings, the default should favor reversible experiments, plural options, and institutional learning over irreversible optimization.

23 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

23. Open Science and Distributed Collaboration

The research infrastructure should make claims traceable, criticism durable, and participation globally accessible.

CivilizationSci.org is envisioned first as an authoritative international academic portal, then as an open research and civilization-engineering collaboration platform. The public layer should expose definitions, papers, data documentation, model cards, version histories, critiques, replications, and open research tasks.

The collaboration model should align with the UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science: access, reuse, inclusive participation, open infrastructures, dialogue with diverse knowledge systems, and equitable international cooperation. Openness remains bounded by privacy, community rights, security, lawful restrictions, and dual-use assessment.

A global epistemic observatory can connect claims to sources through a knowledge graph. Each claim should have an identifier, status, supporting and opposing evidence, authorship, version, method, and review record. AI-readability should serve transparency rather than search-engine performance alone.

Distributed work packages should define question, data, method, deliverable, acceptance criteria, license, ethics requirements, and maintainers. Governance should prevent both founder capture and anonymous irresponsibility through transparent roles, conflict disclosure, and documented decisions.

24 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

24. Civilization Science Research Contribution Award

A proposed recognition mechanism for rigorous, open, and socially valuable research.

The Civilization Science Research Contribution Award may be established after the field has credible governance, independent selection, stable funding, and a sufficient body of research to evaluate. It should not imitate the prestige of older prizes by declaration; legitimacy must be earned through transparent process.

Possible categories include foundational theory, empirical discovery, methods and data, replication and correction, open collaboration, and civilizational public value. Criteria should emphasize originality, rigor, evidence, reproducibility, ethical integrity, and durable contribution.

The award must disclose nominations, conflicts, eligibility, selection rules, funding, and revocation procedures. Founders, donors, and affiliated commercial entities should not control outcomes. Recognizing high-quality correction and replication would signal that the field values truth maintenance, not only grand theory.

25 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

25. Three-Year Research Roadmap

Credibility should be built in ordered stages: definitions, data, tests, replication, and only then scaled application.

Phase	Priority work	Exit criterion
Year 1 · Foundations	construct dictionary; governance charter; ethics protocol; benchmark cases; data standard; open peer commentary	operational definitions and reproducible baseline
Year 2 · Validation	multilingual measurement studies; historical backtests; model comparisons; agent-based benchmark; CCWS pilot evaluation	published positive and negative results
Year 3 · Prospective research	blind forecasts; cross-regional replication; intervention pilots; independent audit; revised Framework 2.0	evidence-based decision on field claims

The roadmap should be governed by research gates. A project advances only when definitions, data, methods, ethics, and evaluation meet published criteria. Failure should trigger revision, narrowing, or discontinuation—not rhetorical escalation.

26 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

26. Conclusion

Civilization Science should be judged by the quality of its questions, tests, corrections, and public value.

Humanity faces problems whose causes and consequences cross scales, institutions, and generations. A shared science of civilizational systems could help integrate evidence, expose feedbacks, compare risks, and evaluate interventions. But the breadth of the ambition creates an equal obligation toward restraint.

Framework 1.0 offers an explicit starting point: civilization as a complex adaptive system; five provisional core constructs; a stability hypothesis; dynamic and multilevel extensions; six research pillars; a 40-volume program; empirical, computational, historical, and ethical methods; and an open collaboration architecture.

The framework is successful only if researchers can measure its constructs, disconfirm its claims, reproduce its analyses, improve its models, and use its applications without compromising rights or pluralism. Its future therefore depends less on defending Version 1.0 than on building institutions capable of correcting it.

OPEN INVITATION Researchers, institutions, communities, and critics are invited to test definitions, propose competing models, contribute data, replicate findings, document failures, and help create a scientifically credible and ethically legitimate field.

27 · FRAMEWORK COMPONENT

27. Glossary, Symbols, and References

A common language for criticism, replication, and cumulative research.

27.1 Core glossary

Term	Working definition
Adaptive capacity	Ability to adjust, learn, reorganize, and preserve valued function under change.
Civilization	A large-scale, long-duration configuration of populations, institutions, infrastructures, knowledge, ecosystems, and symbolic orders.
Civilizational entropy	Operational label for fragmentation, uncertainty, destructive conflict, coordination loss, and dissipative pressure; not automatically thermodynamic entropy.
Civilizational stability	Bounded capacity to preserve life-supporting function, legitimate cooperation, correction, and adaptation under disturbance.
Complex adaptive system	A system of heterogeneous interacting agents that learns, adapts, and produces emergent patterns.
Cooperation	Effective, inclusive coordination among interdependent actors toward shared or compatible functions.
Legitimacy	Perceived rightfulness and procedural acceptability of institutions, rules, and authority.
Resilience	Capacity to absorb disturbance, reorganize, and retain or transform valued functions.
Trust field	Distributed expectations of reliability, fairness, reciprocity, and institutional legitimacy.
Usable capacity	Material, informational, institutional, ecological, and human resources available for adaptive work after essential costs.

27.2 Symbol table

Symbol	Meaning	Status
S	bounded civilizational stability	latent or composite outcome
C	effective cooperation	latent construct with multiple proxies
L_e	effective trust-legitimacy field	relational and institutional construct
E_n	net usable capacity	multidimensional enabling capacity
E	civilizational entropy/disorder pressure	operational analogy; domain-specific
R	shock exposure	exogenous or endogenous stressor
A	adaptive capacity	learning, slack, diversity, and correction
$\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$	estimated elasticities or interaction weights	not universal constants
ε	small regularization term	modeling convenience

27.3 Selected references

Arthur, W. B. (1994). Increasing Returns and Path Dependence in the Economy. University of Michigan Press.

Axelrod, R. (1984). The Evolution of Cooperation. Basic Books.

Barabási, A.-L. (2016). Network Science. Cambridge University Press.

Epstein, J. M., & Axtell, R. (1996). Growing Artificial Societies. Brookings Institution Press / MIT Press.

Gao, J., Barzel, B., & Barabási, A.-L. (2016). Universal resilience patterns in complex networks. Nature, 530, 307–312. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature16948

Holling, C. S. (1973). Resilience and stability of ecological systems. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics, 4, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.04.110173.000245

IPCC. (2022). Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Cambridge University Press.

Meadows, D. H. (2008). Thinking in Systems: A Primer. Chelsea Green.

North, D. C. (1990). Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance. Cambridge University Press.

Ostrom, E. (1990). Governing the Commons. Cambridge University Press.

Ostrom, E. (2009). A general framework for analyzing sustainability of social-ecological systems. Science, 325(5939), 419–422. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1172133

Rockström, J., et al. (2009). A safe operating space for humanity. Nature, 461, 472–475. https://doi.org/10.1038/461472a

Scheffer, M. (2009). Critical Transitions in Nature and Society. Princeton University Press.

Scheffer, M., Bascompte, J., Brock, W. A., et al. (2009). Early-warning signals for critical transitions. Nature, 461, 53–59. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature08227

Sen, A. (1999). Development as Freedom. Alfred A. Knopf.

Simon, H. A. (1962). The architecture of complexity. Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, 106(6), 467–482.

Tainter, J. A. (1988). The Collapse of Complex Societies. Cambridge University Press.

Taleb, N. N. (2012). Antifragile: Things That Gain from Disorder. Random House.

United Nations. (2015). Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

UNESCO. (2021). UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science. UNESCO.

Walker, B., Holling, C. S., Carpenter, S. R., & Kinzig, A. (2004). Resilience, adaptability and transformability in social–ecological systems. Ecology and Society, 9(2), 5.

Wilkinson, M. D., Dumontier, M., Aalbersberg, I. J., et al. (2016). The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship. Scientific Data, 3, 160018. https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.18

World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). Our Common Future. Oxford University Press.

27.4 Research questions for Framework 1.1

- Which operationalizations of cooperation, trust-legitimacy, usable capacity, entropy pressure, and stability demonstrate cross-context validity?
- Does the proposed multiplicative relation provide incremental explanatory or predictive value?
- Which components are scale-dependent, and where does aggregation fail?
- What indicators provide useful lead time without unacceptable false alarms?
- How should normative constraints be represented without disguising them as empirical outputs?
- What governance structure best protects independence, pluralism, correction, and global participation?

APPENDIX A · MINIMUM EMPIRICAL PROTOCOL

From a framework claim to a reproducible study

1. Register the claim State the population, system boundary, time window, causal or predictive target, and evidence that would count against the claim.

2. Specify the construct model Define each construct in plain language; list indicators, exclusions, aggregation rules, and expected sources of measurement error.

3. Freeze the analysis plan Declare preprocessing, missing-data treatment, model families, baselines, validation splits, and primary metrics before examining target outcomes.

4. Audit data and ethics Document provenance, consent, representation gaps, potential group harms, security, and dual-use risk.

5. Compare models Test the proposed equation against simpler additive, domain-specific, and nonparametric baselines. Report calibration as well as discrimination.

6. Stress-test conclusions Vary boundaries, proxies, weights, lag structures, and case selection. Publish robustness failures, not only favorable specifications.

7. Release a reproducibility package Provide data where lawful, code, environment, model cards, decision logs, and a persistent version identifier.

8. Invite independent replication Separate original authors from at least one replication or audit team before upgrading a claim's status.

ACCEPTANCE GATE A result should not be promoted as framework evidence unless the research question, data, model, uncertainty, ethics, and falsification criteria are inspectable by an independent team.

APPENDIX B · CLAIM-STATUS SYSTEM

A visible ladder of epistemic maturity

Status	Meaning	Minimum evidence
C0 · Proposal	Defined idea with scope and ownership	Public specification
C1 · Operationalized	Constructs linked to observable measures	Measurement model and pilot data
C2 · Internally tested	Analysis completed on development cases	Code, diagnostics, uncertainty
C3 · Externally replicated	Independent team reproduces or challenges result	Replication report
C4 · Prospectively validated	Performance demonstrated on unseen future data	Preregistered prospective evaluation
C5 · Practice-qualified	Benefits and harms evaluated in real use	Independent impact and ethics audit

Claims may move downward when evidence fails, data are revised, or domain limits become apparent. Status applies to a specific claim and version—not to the entire field, an author, organization, or brand.

The proposed stability equation begins at C0. Individual operationalizations may progress independently. CCWS, CPC, EverLifeX, and the contribution award require their own claim-status records and cannot inherit validity from the framework name.

APPENDIX C · EXTERNAL REVIEW

Questions for reviewers and collaborating institutions

Review dimension	Primary question
Conceptual clarity	Which construct remains ambiguous, conflated, or unnecessary?
Prior literature	Which established fields or findings already address the claimed gap?
Measurement	Which indicators are invalid, biased, non-comparable, or ethically unacceptable?
Mathematics	Is the functional form identifiable, interpretable, and superior to simpler alternatives?
History	Which cases would most strongly challenge the proposed mechanisms?
Prediction	What prospective benchmark would constitute a fair test?
Ethics	Which uses create unacceptable rights, surveillance, manipulation, or dual-use risks?
Governance	What structure would make criticism and correction institutionally durable?

Reviewers are encouraged to distinguish fatal objections, correctable weaknesses, competing hypotheses, missing evidence, and editorial suggestions. Substantive criticism should be preserved with versioned responses. Consensus is not required; traceable disagreement is itself research infrastructure.

ABOUT THIS EDITION

Authorship, stewardship, and review

Aurion Hu is the founding author and systems architect of the Civilization Science research program. This edition intentionally places the framework, evidence, and open research process ahead of individual authority. Future versions should recognize substantive contributors, reviewers, dataset creators, replication teams, translators, and institutional partners through transparent contribution statements.

Civilization Science Society (CSS) is in formation. Until formal establishment, references to CSS describe the proposed academic steward and do not imply current legal status, accreditation, prize authority, or institutional endorsement.

Editorial note: This manuscript is a formal framework paper and research prospectus. It requires external peer review, domain-specific expert critique, empirical validation, legal review of licensing and institutional claims, and revision before journal submission or representation as consensus science.

VERSION RECORD Framework 1.0 · Open Research Edition · Academic Revision 1.2 · 3 August 2026. This revision adds dimensional-reduction requirements for the multilevel ontology, distinguishes the raw stability index from bounded S, replaces the ambiguous heuristic derivative with derivative-consistent and discrete-time formulations, and defines a continuous-data observation–state–update protocol. Core architecture remains 27 sections, six research pillars, and a 40-volume research program. Corrections and structured critiques should be versioned and publicly attributable.