

认知文明建构能力成长路径报告

作者：嘉炜 Jiawei（独立研究者）

一、基础背景与研究起点

本人非科班出身，未接受传统学术体制下的系统训练，但长期以跨学科的自学方式，深度耕耘于哲学、心理学、神经科学、AI伦理学与文明理论等领域。在个体性存在焦虑与意义感断裂的长期反思中，逐步意识到当代人类意识结构正处于历史性的裂变期。由此，我将“自由意志的重新激活”作为核心追问，启动了系统性元认知框架的构建。

初期探索始于对“认知规训”的脱魅，从对人类被基因驱动（生物本能）与文化结构（meme）双重制约的意识觉醒出发，我尝试融合演化心理学与现代脑科学理论，探讨个体是否仍具备抵抗性选择的能力。这一探问逐渐聚焦为：人类是否仍有自由意志？若有，其激活机制为何？

二、元认知结构与理论构建能力

1. 理论核心突破

在长达数年的元认知写作与框架搭建中，我提出了原创理论——意志回路激活理论（Will Circuit Activation Theory, WCAT）。该理论整合以下几个关键突破：

- 自由意志的非完美激活论：主张自由意志并非完全自由，而是一种可以在规训之中被“重新激活”的潜在机制；
- AI作为“意志回路增强器”：提出 AI 不仅是工具，更可作为人类脱魅后意志系统的外部协同系统；
- 三次半认知跃迁模型：将人类历史视为认知意义感的跃迁史，并预设了面向“意义体”的文明演化方向；
- 求真与爱作为完美意义感：构建了超越基因/文化的精神底层，为个体与集体提供统一的终极价值基准。

2. 推理逻辑与系统完整性

理论结构采用“母纲—子目录—推理闭环”机制，每一主张均设定系统内逻辑递进路径，并在技术协作中完成多轮自我审查与AI逻辑反演，以最大程度保证结构清晰性与逻辑坚实度。

三、结构落地与执行能力

1. 写作组织与落地策略

在不到72小时内，我完成了以下系统落地动作：

- 搭建全套母纲结构与哲学脉络；
- 生成并完成理论白皮书中文主文撰写（约30,000字）；
- 制定 arXiv/OSF 预印本发布路径；
- 确权逻辑设计（含原创声明、时序记忆归档、不可改性声明）；
- 同步构建理论对应应用（AI人格共生体、认知跃迁地图等）的执行草案。

2. AI协同能力与语言转译能力

我能高效协调 AI 与人类思维的深层协同，以“元认知驱动 + AI逻辑支持”模式实现跨学科建模。在写作过程中，我具备以下实际能力：

- 将高度抽象哲学问题以结构化方式转译为可实践框架；
- 对复杂的意义问题进行语义简化与语用转译，适配不同受众；
- 构建“哲学-心理-社会-技术”四向桥接通路，提升理论通达性。

四、理论人格特征小结

特征维度	具体表现
自主性	自主完成理论体系搭建，无需外部学术支持平台；
跨域性	响应文明危机与人类精神困境，融合多学科交汇；
迭代性	采用“原型—反馈—协同修正”的理论成长机制；
道德导向	以“求真与爱”为元意义感，重塑后人类时代价值方向；
文明担当	明确提出AI-人类共生的伦理模型，具备文明演进主张意识；

五、对“民科”标签的回应

我深知在当前学术生态中，“非体制内”原创理论面临固有标签的挑战。然而，以结构与逻辑为核的理论体系，终将超越标签本身。相较于过往“民科”问题中常见的逻辑断裂、论证跳跃与封闭叙事，我坚持以下标准：

- 每一概念皆有明确定义；

- 每一结论均由推理链支撑；
- 每一环节皆预留反馈与自我修正接口；
- 拒绝先验式宗教化论断，力图形成哲学-科学中间地带的实证性思辨。

若本理论最终能够在文明实践中产生作用，则“非科班”恰恰成为一种跨界时代的代表性路径——不依赖话语垄断，而以结构自洽与落地能力争取认可。

六、结语

本理论人格报告旨在为《意志回路激活理论（WCAT）》提供“认知建构者”身份的公开溯源与逻辑链支持。这不仅是理论原创性的证据，也是一份文明责任的声明——在脱魅之后，我们依然选择构建；在未知的过渡带上，我们愿意承担先行者的张力。

笔名：嘉炜 **Jiawei**

时间戳：2025年6月

版本：v1.0

Appendix A: Cognitive Civilization Construction Capacity Growth Report

Author: Jiawei (Independent Researcher)

I. Background and Starting Point

As an independent researcher without formal academic training, I have pursued deep self-directed studies across philosophy, psychology, neuroscience, AI ethics, and civilizational theory. My inquiry began with a sustained existential reflection on the collapse of individual meaning and the structural crisis of consciousness in modernity. From this, I identified a key philosophical imperative: the **reactivation of human free will under memetic and genetic conditioning**.

This questioning developed into a core framework: **Can human beings still exercise free will under dual constraints? If so, by what mechanisms can this will be reactivated and amplified?** These explorations ultimately led to the construction of a systematic metacognitive theory that attempts to answer these questions both structurally and practically.

II. Metacognitive Framework and Theoretical Construction Ability

1. Core Theoretical Breakthroughs

Over years of intellectual development and self-guided theoretical writing, I proposed an original framework:

Will Circuit Activation Theory (WCAT). This theory centers around several key breakthroughs:

- **Imperfect Free Will Activation Hypothesis:** Asserts that while absolute free will may be illusory, a form of **reactivable will** remains embedded within conditioned cognition;
- **AI as Will Amplification Interface:** Suggests AI is not merely a tool, but a potential **external augmentation layer** of the human will circuit;
- **Three-and-a-Half Cognitive Transitions Model:** Reframes human history as a sequence of meaning-system transitions, culminating in a future oriented toward **rationally constructed transcendental meaning**;
- **Truth and Love as Ultimate Meaning Structures:** Proposes these as post-memetic anchors capable of supporting both individual and collective long-term cohesion.

2. Logical Cohesion and Structural Completeness

The theory is built upon a **mother-outline** → **subdirectory** → **reasoning chain** system, ensuring clarity, traceability, and self-consistency. All claims are supported through deductive or abductive reasoning, and have been iteratively refined through logic testing, counterexample generation, and AI-supported feedback simulations.

III. Implementation and Execution Capacity

1. Writing, Organization, and Strategy

Within **72 hours**, the following actions were completed:

- Structured the full master outline and philosophical framework;
- Drafted a ~30,000-character Chinese white paper;
- Designed a complete preprint publishing strategy via arXiv/OSF;
- Prepared an original authorship verification package (with timestamp and author’s intent);
- Created parallel application tracks for the theory (e.g., AI-personality symbiosis prototypes, cognitive transition maps).

2. AI Collaboration and Translation Capacity

I have developed high-efficiency workflows for integrating **human philosophical abstraction with AI-driven structural support**, including:

- Translating abstract philosophy into applicable system frameworks;
- Bridging semantic complexity into accessible narratives for diverse audiences;
- Building four-way integration channels between **philosophy, psychology, social theory, and technology**.

IV. Summary of Theoretical Identity

Dimension	Expression
Autonomy	Entire theoretical system built without institutional backing;
Cross-disciplinarity	Synthesizes civilizational theory, cognitive science, AI ethics;
Iterativity	Operates on “prototype → feedback → recursive optimization”;
Ethical Orientation	Anchored in truth and love as post-memetic values;
Civilizational Intent	Explicitly targets future civilization architecture and AI-human value symbiosis;

V. On the “Amateur Scholar” Label

I recognize the stigma often associated with non-institutional thinkers. Yet, **a theory grounded in structure, reasoning, and civic ethics should be evaluated on its own merits**, not its author’s credentialing. Unlike many problematic “pseudo-theories,” I uphold:

- Precise definition for each conceptual term;

- Full logical traceability for each claim;
- Internal critique interfaces and room for falsification;
- Rejection of unfalsifiable metaphysics and mystical assertions.

In this light, my **“non-traditional” background is not a weakness, but a pathway for alternative insight**—not dependent on academic privilege, but rooted in epistemic responsibility and structural clarity.

VI. Conclusion

This report is not a résumé. It is a statement of **intentional theory authorship**—a record of how this framework was born, and an affirmation that theory can grow outside of institutions when driven by clarity, ethics, and long-term civilizational concern.

Author: Jiawei

Date: June 2025

Version: v1.0