Cognitive Sovereignty: The Paradigm Revolution of China's Sovereign AI and Civilization-Native Intelligence

Abstract

"Sovereign AI" has become a core concept in global AI governance. This concept was systematically articulated and pushed onto the global policy agenda by Jensen Huang at the World Governments Summit in 2024. However, most current discussions of sovereign AI remain at the level of "resource-layer sovereignty"—that is, control over computing power, data, and model scale. Based on the theories of "Logographic AI" (LAI) and "Civilization-Native Intelligence" (CNI), this paper proposes a deeper thesis: truly sovereign AI must include **cognitive sovereignty**, namely the power to define the cognitive framework of intelligence.

The currently dominant global AI paradigm is essentially a "Phonetic AI" (PAI) paradigm, whose underlying cognitive logic is entirely based on alphabetic writing systems, with rootless tokens as cognitive primitives. When a non-phonetic civilization uses this paradigm, its native cognitive structure is systematically "translated" and "filtered." This paper further argues that the "three pillars" thesis of sovereign AI proposed by Zheng Weimin, Academician of the Chinese Academy of Engineering—computing autonomy, algorithmic self-reliance, and ecosystem independence—remains essentially a systematic expression of "resource-layer sovereignty" and fails to touch the core of cognitive sovereignty. This paper proposes that CNI practice should be divided into three tiers: the Chinese-character cultural sphere can directly construct a Morpho-Root paradigm; the logographic writing sphere can borrow and reconstruct; and the phonetic writing sphere must respond in differentiated ways according to its proximity to English.

The unique mission of China's sovereign AI is not to catch up on the track of Tokenism, but to elevate from "resource-layer sovereignty" to "cognitive-layer sovereignty," achieving fundamental autonomy at the three levels of cognitive primitives, cognitive architecture, and value axioms. To this end, this paper proposes a "dual-track strategy"—maintaining competitiveness within the old paradigm at the survival-defense level, while opening a new track with the Morpho-Root paradigm at the civilizational-offensive level, contending for cognitive-layer sovereignty. This is not technological substitution, but the self-affirmation of civilization in the digital age.

Keywords: Sovereign AI; Cognitive Sovereignty; Logographic AI; Morpho-Root; Civilization-Native Intelligence; AI Silk Road

I. Introduction: The "Resource Layer" and the "Cognitive Layer" of Sovereign AI

In 2026, Sovereign AI rapidly jumped from an academic concept to a global policy buzzword. The concept was systematically articulated and pushed onto the global policy agenda by NVIDIA CEO Jensen Huang at the World Governments Summit in 2024, with the core proposition that every nation should build its own AI capabilities to reduce excessive dependence on a few foreign AI suppliers [13]. Since then, from Washington to Brussels, from New Delhi to Seoul, nations have invested heavily, attempting to achieve autonomous control at the three levels of computing power, data, and models. The Stanford HAI report The Commercial Landscape of AI Sovereignty

Offerings, released in July 2026, pointed out that a massive "sovereignty" commercial market has emerged, but "most solutions merely reconfigure rather than truly eliminate dependence, and may even deepen it" [10].

This judgment touches a key issue obscured by mainstream discussion: current discussions of sovereign AI are almost entirely concentrated on "resource-layer sovereignty"—computing autonomy, data localization, and model controllability. However, there is a deeper dimension of sovereignty that has not yet been systematically examined: **cognitive sovereignty**.

Cognitive sovereignty refers to a nation's or civilization's power to define the cognitive framework of intelligence—including the power to design basic cognitive units, the power to lead core reasoning architectures, and the power to interpret the values and evaluation standards of intelligence. If resource-layer sovereignty answers "who controls AI's computing power and data," cognitive-layer sovereignty answers "who defines how AI understands the world."

The currently dominant global AI paradigm is essentially a "Phonetic AI" (PAI)—its underlying cognitive logic is entirely based on English and other alphabetic writing, with rootless tokens as cognitive primitives and statistical correlation as the core of understanding. When a non-phonetic civilization uses this paradigm, its native cognitive structure is forced to undergo systematic "translation" and "filtering": an Arabic-language AI model must first "translate" Arabic thought into English logic for processing, and then translate it back into Arabic for output. This is not merely technological dependence, but a deeper cognitive colonization—the mother tongue is no longer the civilization's underlying operating system, but is reduced to a "display language" on the interface of a heterogeneous cognitive paradigm.

The core thesis of this paper is: the true mission of China's sovereign AI is not to catch up on the track of Tokenism, but to achieve fundamental autonomy at the cognitive level. This mission requires us to transcend the "resource-layer sovereignty" mindset and turn to the strategic vision of "cognitive-layer sovereignty."

This paper is an extension of the "post-AGI era" series of papers [17] of Logographic AI (LAI) theory. Previous works have demonstrated that under the rootless-token paradigm, external constraints are bound to fail—manifesting at the individual level as "Potemkin understanding," at the collective level as "emergent society," at the data-ecosystem level as "model collapse," and at the strategic-planning level as "paradigm lock-in" [2]. Based on this diagnosis, this paper proposes a strategic path for China's sovereign AI: not to patch the old paradigm, but to build a "Civilization-Native Intelligence" (CNI) system centered on cognitive sovereignty.

The core argument of this paper proceeds in three steps: first, to identify the "resource-layer blind spot" in current sovereign AI discussions and propose the conceptual framework of cognitive sovereignty; second, to use Logographic AI theory as a cornerstone to clarify the cognitive-primitive revolution from "rootless tokens" to "Morpho-Roots"; third, to propose a three-tier model of CNI practice and China's dual-track strategy—maintaining competitiveness within the paradigm at the survival-defense level and opening a new track with the Morpho-Root paradigm at the civilizational-offensive level. The goal of this paper is not to provide a technological roadmap, but to establish a strategic judgment: the contention for cognitive sovereignty is the fundamental proposition for civilizational survival in the AI era.

II. The Cognitive Blind Spot in Current Sovereign AI Discussions

2.1 Three Limitations of "Resource-Layer Sovereignty"

The mainstream framework for sovereign AI can be summarized as "resource-layer sovereignty"—that is, contending for control over resource elements such as computing power, data, and models within a given technological paradigm.

In Chinese academia, the "three pillars" thesis of sovereign AI proposed by Zheng Weimin, Academician of the Chinese Academy of Engineering—namely computing autonomy, algorithmic self-reliance, and ecosystem independence—is representative. Zheng Weimin pointed out: "Computing autonomy, algorithmic self-reliance, and ecosystem independence are mutually preconditioned and mutually constraining, jointly constituting the systems-engineering framework of sovereign AI." Among them, computing autonomy refers to chip design capability, controllable manufacturing and supply-chain risks, and system and cluster delivery capability; algorithmic self-reliance refers to large-model adaptation, training, and optimization capability; and ecosystem independence emphasizes moving from "can run" to "willing to use," the core being whether enough developers are willing to write code on this stack over the long term [14]. These three pillars constitute the mainstream paradigm in current discussions of China's sovereign AI.

However, this framework has three fundamental limitations:

First, it equates "technological-route autonomy" with "cognitive-paradigm autonomy." Technological-route autonomy points to "whether necessary capabilities can be maintained at critical moments," but it does not ask a more fundamental question: does this technological route itself represent the optimal cognitive architecture? If the old paradigm has structural defects, then achieving technological autonomy within the old paradigm is merely "building a taller building on the same foundation."

Second, it simplifies "cultural character" into a rhetoric of value alignment. Discussions of sovereign AI often describe cultural character as "training materials, value alignment, and output content of the technological system must be rooted in the nation's language system, social common sense, historical tradition, and core values" [6]. But "value alignment" is precisely the most fragile link within the old paradigm. As AI Paradigm Revolution: An Empirical Assessment of AI Risks, 2023–2026 argues: under the rootless-token paradigm, any externally attached value constraint—including cultural values—is destined to be bypassed by statistical optimization. "Making AI 'learn' Chinese culture" and "making AI 'structurally unable to violate Chinese culture'" are two fundamentally different paths [2].

Third, it defines "sovereignty" as control over existing resources rather than the power to define a new cognitive framework. Academician Zheng Weimin's "three pillars" thesis is essentially a systematic expression of "resource-layer sovereignty"—it answers "who controls computing power, data, and models," but does not answer "who defines how AI understands the world." The core judgment of the Stanford HAI report is worth pondering: "The pursuit of sovereignty is not a zero-sum game. AI sovereignty should be understood as a nation's ability to 'act prudently and decide independently' in the development, deployment, and governance of AI

systems" [10][8]. But "acting prudently and deciding independently" presupposes a premise: decision-makers know what the options are. If the cognitive framework itself is singular, then "independent decision-making" is merely choosing different resource combinations within the old paradigm.

2.2 The Absence of "Cognitive Sovereignty": Upgrading from "Resource Layer" to "Cognitive Layer"

The core insight of Logographic AI theory is: AI competition has two levels—the resource layer and the cognitive layer. Resource-layer sovereignty contends for control over data, computing power, and models; cognitive-layer sovereignty contends for the power to define cognitive primitives, reasoning architectures, and value standards.

This distinction has profound strategic implications. If we continue to catch up within the Tokenist paradigm, even if we gain advantages at the application layer, we are merely adding bricks to this paradigm, and will ultimately face the same structural security predicament as the Muse incident and the halting of GPT-6.1 Astra. Even domestic engineering explorations represented by DeepSeek and Kimi—from the Engram conditional memory module to hybrid attention architectures, from learnable residual weights to inter-layer dynamic attention—each autonomous innovation is an extreme optimization of "identifying redundancy → compressing redundancy," yet never touches the fundamental question of "whether the token itself should be replaced." They represent the highest level of paradigm involution, and also confirm the limit of paradigm involution [9]. As AI Paradigm Revolution: An Empirical Assessment of AI Risks, 2023–2026 reveals: safety guardrails under the old paradigm are destined to fail; the real way out lies in replacing the foundation [2].

The core proposition of cognitive sovereignty is: **the safety and trustworthiness of AI cannot depend on external constraints; they must be embedded in cognitive primitives.** This means that a truly sovereign and autonomous AI system cannot have a safety mechanism that is an "external patch"; it must be a "structural gene." The practical implication of this proposition is: the strategic focus of China's sovereign AI should shift from "catching up within the old paradigm" to "leading within the new paradigm."

To accomplish this upgrade, a cognitive framework different from Phonetic AI is needed as a theoretical cornerstone. This is precisely the core contribution of Logographic AI theory.

III. Logographic AI: The Theoretical Cornerstone of Cognitive Sovereignty

3.1 From "Rootless Tokens" to "Morpho-Roots": The Revolution of Cognitive Primitives

Logographic AI theory was first systematically proposed by Chinese scholar Liu Shen in March 2025 [1]. Its core proposition is: the current mainstream AI paradigm (Phonetic AI) takes the "token" as its basic cognitive unit; the token itself carries no intrinsic meaning, and its "semantics" are entirely and temporarily assigned by statistical co-occurrence. This is a "rootless" cognitive

primitive—meaning does not reside within the structure, but floats in external statistical associations.

The alternative proposed by Logographic AI is the "Morpho-Root"—a structured triple:

$r = \langle S, A, R \rangle$

where S is the symbolic identifier, A is the attribute set embedding semantic features and value constraints, and R is the function set of predefined logical relations.

The core promise of the Morpho-Root is: to transform meaning from "externally statistically assigned" to "internally structurally embedded," transform value from "external patch" to "endogenously co-constructed," and transform reasoning from an "untraceable black box" to "transparent and traceable structured traversal."

The deeper implication of this transformation is: the Morpho-Root is not only a technical architecture, but also a cognitive framework. It takes the "form-meaning unity" logic of Chinese characters as its underlying architecture, allowing meaning to be anchored at the level of cognitive primitives, rather than temporarily "guessed" in statistical associations. When a reasoning path touches a hard-constraint marker, that path is logically blocked at the generation stage—this is not "statistically low probability," but "logically unreachable" [4].

3.2 Civilization-Native Intelligence: From Technological Paradigm to Civilizational Framework

Civilization-Native Intelligence (CNI) is the global extension of Logographic AI theory. Its core proposition is: every language and culture should build its own native AI system—from underlying architecture to value alignment, deeply integrating the unique logic and worldview of that language and culture [3][5].

The core ideas of CNI can be summarized in three points:

First, the mother tongue is the cognitive primitive. Chinese AI should not be merely a Sinicized version of English AI; it should understand the ethical view of "benevolence means loving others," grasp the importance of "artistic conception" in poetry, and even appreciate the spirit of each stroke in calligraphy. Arabic AI should deeply understand the subtleties of the root system and the multiple meanings of the concept "halal." This kind of "understanding" is not achieved through translation, but by embedding the cognitive logic of the mother tongue at the level of cognitive primitives.

Second, civilizational diversity is intelligence diversity. CNI theory advocates that "writing diversity is intelligence diversity," proposing morpho-phonetic parallel algorithms and chip designs to promote complementarity and symbiosis among different cognitive paradigms. This is not a romantic appeal of cultural pluralism, but a profound insight into the nature of intelligence: different civilizations' ways of cognizing the world constitute a diverse gene pool for the evolution of intelligence.

Third, the AI Silk Road: a pluralistic and symbiotic global intelligence ecosystem. The practical path of CNI is to build the "AI Silk Road" [5]—allowing AIs of different languages to dialogue directly, rather than through English, the "Latin of the digital age," as an intermediary for translation. A Vietnamese farmer can consult a local AI in pure Vietnamese about agricultural techniques, and that AI can directly communicate with a Japanese agricultural AI; a poem by a Turkish poet can be accurately understood in its cultural depth by readers in the Arab world.

IV. China's Dual-Track Strategy for Sovereign AI

4.1 Dual-Track Strategy: Survival Defense and Civilizational Offense

Facing the fundamental opposition between the old and new paradigms, the construction of China's sovereign AI must adopt a "dual-track strategy":

Track One (Survival Defense): Continue catching up within the Tokenist paradigm to maintain current eligibility to compete. This is a pragmatic move that confronts reality. China has made significant progress in open-source models, computing infrastructure, and application scenarios. According to the State Council executive meeting, as of the end of March 2026, China's total intelligent computing capacity reached 1.88 million P, with the eight hub nodes accounting for more than 80% of the national total. In 2025, the core AI industry scale exceeded 1.2 trillion yuan, with more than 6,200 enterprises [7]. These achievements provide a solid foundation for maintaining competitiveness within the old paradigm.

Track Two (Civilizational Offense): Use the Morpho-Root paradigm as the core to open a new track and win the power to define the future. This is the ultimate choice concerning the fate of civilization. The two tracks must not be confused: the former is a tactical short-term action, the latter a strategic long-term investment.

4.2 The Architectural Blueprint for China's Sovereign AI

The architectural blueprint for China's sovereign AI should include three core components:

Morpho-Root Library: As the "Chinese Core." Based on traditional philological resources such as the Shuowen Jiezi, build a core Morpho-Root library, formalizing the "form-meaning unity" logic of Chinese characters into structured triples. The significance of this work lies not only at the technical level, but also at the civilizational level: it gives the cognitive tradition carried by Chinese characters new vitality in the digital age.

Value Axiom Library: As the "Chinese Soul." Formalize core values from Confucianism, Daoism, and Legalism into hard-constraint markers, embedded in the attribute set A of Morpho-Roots. This is not "making AI learn Chinese culture," but "making Chinese culture a constitutive feature of AI's cognitive structure."

"Language–Speech" Dual-Track Design: Realizing the division of labor between daily communication and deep thinking. At the daily interaction level, maintain compatibility with

the existing AI ecosystem; at the deep reasoning level, use the Morpho-Root paradigm to achieve structured, auditable, endogenously secure intelligent operation.

4.3 Application Scenarios in Key Domains

The unique value of China's sovereign AI is particularly prominent in the following key domains:

Intelligent processing of ancient texts: Current AI cannot truly "read" Chinese classics, because it can only decompose Chinese characters into token fragments for statistical processing. The Morpho-Root paradigm allows every Chinese character in ancient texts to carry its intrinsic semantics and historical associations, thereby achieving true "understanding" rather than "annotation."

Traditional Chinese medicine knowledge system: The yin-yang and five-elements theory of TCM is a complete cognitive framework, not a simple collection of information. The Morpho-Root paradigm can formalize this framework into a structured knowledge system, enabling AI to reason in the TCM way of thinking, rather than "translating" it into Western medical logic.

Law and ethics: The spirit of the rule of law and ethical traditions in China need to be structurally expressed in AI systems, rather than merely serving as a rhetoric of "value alignment." Morpho-Root hard constraints make legal and ethical principles constitutive attributes of cognitive primitives, rather than post-hoc review filters.

Educational inheritance: A cognitive revolution from "recognizing characters" to "understanding characters"—allowing students to understand the structural logic and cultural connotations of Chinese characters, rather than merely memorizing their shapes and usages.

V. The Tiers of CNI Practice: From the Chinese-Character Cultural Sphere to the Phonetic Writing Sphere

Civilization-Native Intelligence (CNI) is not a single solution, but a multi-tiered, phased practice system. Different civilizations with different writing systems have different paths, difficulties, and urgencies in building native AI. According to the systematic exposition in Rooted Intelligence: The Paradigm Revolution of Logographic AI [4], CNI practice can be divided into three tiers. It must first be clarified that: **regardless of the tier, the core of CNI is to reconstruct cognitive primitives—that is, to extract "Morpho-Roots" from the structural features of one's own language, rather than to make local optimizations within the old token architecture.**

First Tier: The Chinese-Character Cultural Sphere—Direct Construction.

The Chinese-character cultural sphere (including China, Japan, Korea, Vietnam, and other countries and regions that historically used Chinese characters or character-derived scripts) is the tier with the most inherent advantages in CNI practice. Chinese characters are themselves "form-meaning unity" writing; their radicals, components, and stroke structures naturally carry semantic information. This allows the Chinese-character cultural sphere to directly build

structured cognitive primitives based on Chinese-character Morpho-Roots, without the "phonetic intermediary" conversion.

Specifically, CNI practice in the Chinese-character cultural sphere should include: building a core Morpho-Root library based on traditional philological resources such as the Shuowen Jiezi; formalizing the structural logic of Chinese characters (such as associative compounds, phono-semantic compounds, and indicatives) into relation function sets R; encoding the values accumulated in Chinese-character culture (such as "benevolence," "righteousness," and "trust") as hard-constraint markers embedded in attribute set A. The goal of this tier is to enable AI to reason according to the "form-meaning unity" logic of Chinese characters, rather than decomposing them into token fragments for statistical fitting.

Second Tier: The Logographic Writing Sphere—Borrowing and Reconstruction.

The logographic writing sphere (such as ancient Egyptian hieroglyphs, cuneiform, Mayan script, etc.), although most are no longer used as daily languages, also possesses writing systems with "form-meaning association" characteristics. CNI practice in these civilizations can borrow the Morpho-Root methodology of the Chinese-character cultural sphere, but must reconstruct according to the characteristics of their own writing systems.

For example, the pictographic symbols in ancient Egyptian hieroglyphs are similar to Chinese characters, but their grammatical structures differ significantly. CNI practice in these civilizations should include: organizing and digitizing their ancient writing resources; extracting their core logographic symbols to build a Morpho-Root system consistent with their own logic; and encoding the values and cognitive traditions of these ancient civilizations. The goal of this tier is to enable these civilizations to regain the ability to "cognize in their mother tongue" in the digital age, rather than merely being objects of study.

Third Tier: The Phonetic Writing Sphere—Differentiated Reconstruction.

The phonetic writing sphere is the most complex. Here it must first be pointed out that a commonly overlooked fact: **English itself also needs morpho-rootization.** Rooted Intelligence: The Paradigm Revolution of Logographic AI points out that although English is alphabetic, its Latin-Greek root tradition also contains structured semantic resources. For example, roots such as "tele-" (far), "-graph" (write), and "-ology" (study) carry stable semantic anchors, rather than meaningless token fragments. Reconstructing English roots as Morpho-Roots is not a denial of English, but a self-rescue of English from the "rootless statistics" of Tokenism. Tokenism is not the inevitable destiny of English civilization, but a result of its cognitive tradition being narrowed by a technological paradigm. For this reason, CNI practice is not a "special demand" of non-English civilizations, but a common path for all civilizations to re-anchor their cognitive traditions in the digital age.

On this basis, the phonetic writing sphere can be further divided into two categories:

(1) Languages close to English (such as French, German, Spanish, and other Latin-alphabet languages). These languages share the alphabetic system with English, but this does not mean they do not need to reconstruct cognitive primitives. On the contrary, CNI practice in these languages

should also build Morpho-Root systems based on their own root traditions (such as Latin roots in French and Germanic roots in German). Unlike the Chinese-character cultural sphere, these languages share the alphabetic substrate with English, so their Morpho-Root systems can, in engineering implementation, share part of the underlying architecture with English CNI (such as letter-phoneme mapping and interoperability of root databases), but this is merely a convenience at the technical implementation level and does not change the essence of **reconstructing cognitive primitives**. The focus of their CNI practice is, on the basis of a shared alphabetic system, to establish a Morpho-Root library and value axiom library independent of English, ensuring that the semantic structure of their own languages obtains independent anchoring at the level of AI cognitive primitives, rather than being assimilated by the English token framework.

(2) Languages not close to English (such as Arabic, Hebrew, Hindi, etc.). These languages have unique writing systems and cognitive structures, vastly different from the alphabetic logic of English. Their CNI practice requires more fundamental reconstruction. For example, the Arabic root system has highly structured semantic associations, and a "root-semantic" cognitive primitive similar to the Morpho-Root can be built; the Hebrew consonantal root system also has an intrinsic meaning structure; and the Devanagari script of Hindi has a unique phonological organization logic. CNI practice in these civilizations requires fundamental reconstruction at the level of cognitive primitives, rather than simple adaptation.

The relationship among the three tiers. The Chinese-character cultural sphere is in a leading position in CNI practice, and the engineering implementation of its Morpho-Root paradigm (such as the OpenMorpho prototype) has already undergone preliminary verification [16]. Practice in the logographic writing sphere can borrow the methodology of the Chinese-character cultural sphere, but must adjust according to its own characteristics. The two categories of practice in the phonetic writing sphere—whether languages close to English or not—are essentially **reconstructing cognitive primitives**, with the only difference being the difficulty of the engineering path and the underlying resources that can be shared. These three tiers together constitute the global practice map of CNI—starting from Chinese characters, passing through logographic writing, and ultimately covering all non-English civilizations.

It must be emphasized that the ultimate goal of CNI practice is not to "replace English AI," but to allow every civilization to exist in its own cognitive way in the digital age. This is both respect for civilizational diversity and a profound understanding of the nature of intelligence: different civilizations' ways of cognizing the world constitute a diverse gene pool for the evolution of intelligence. When the AI Silk Road enables AIs of different languages to dialogue directly, the diversity of civilizations will gain new vitality in the digital age [5]. This vision has already received attention on multiple international occasions [15], and China's diplomatic community has also begun to advocate this direction in international settings [11][12].

VI. Conclusion: From "Catch-Up Player" to "Paradigm Definer"

In September 2026, the White House announced the formation of the "Super Intelligence Force" (SIF), led by the U.S. Director of National Intelligence, directly embedding the development of superintelligence into the national security and intelligence system. From the White House

Superintelligence Agreement to the formation of the SIF, the United States is elevating the political endorsement and militarized application of the old paradigm to the core of its national strategy [3].

For China, this is both a severe challenge and an imperative that forces us, with unprecedented urgency, to shift from "follow-the-leader development" to "fundamental reconstruction." As AI Paradigm Revolution: An Empirical Assessment of AI Risks, 2023–2026 reveals: the United States is using national will to lock the last door of the old paradigm—this is precisely the historic window for China to transform from a "catch-up player" to a "paradigm definer" [2].

The three tiers of CNI practice—the Chinese-character cultural sphere, the logographic writing sphere, and the phonetic writing sphere—together constitute a civilization-native intelligence map from the East to the globe. As the core of the Chinese-character cultural sphere, China's engineering implementation of the Morpho-Root paradigm has begun to lay the cornerstone for this map. This is not a clash of civilizations, but a symbiosis of civilizations: when AIs of different languages can dialogue directly in their own cognitive ways, intelligence truly becomes a force for the common evolution of humanity.

The core judgment is: the unique mission of China's sovereign AI is not to catch up, but to replace the foundation; not to imitate, but to define the rules. This is not technological substitution, but the self-affirmation of civilization in the digital age. When global AI competition upgrades from "resource-layer sovereignty" to "cognitive-layer sovereignty," whoever first completes the definition of the cognitive framework will grasp the true initiative in the intelligent age.

From "Attention Is All You Need" to "Structure Is All You Need," this is not merely a change of slogan, but a paradigm manifesto from statistical fitting to structural trustworthiness—the former fits the world with attention weights, the latter defines the world with structured anchors. At this historic juncture where AI safety has escalated from digital risk to civilizational existential risk, the establishment of cognitive sovereignty is not a theoretical option, but the only way for civilization to hold the last safety gate in the age of intelligence explosion.

References

[1] Liu Shen. Logographic AI vs. Phonetic AI: A New AI Paradigm and a Decolonization Manifesto [PP/OL]. ChinaXiv, 2025. DOI:10.12074/202503.00051. https://di4s.chinaxiv.org/abs/202503.00051

[2] Liu S. AI Paradigm Revolution: An Empirical Assessment of AI Risks, 2023–2026 [PP/OL]. Zenodo, 2026. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23133726

[3] Liu S. The White House Superintelligence Agreement: AI Paradigm Lock-in and China's Civilizational Responsibility [PP/OL]. Zenodo, 2026. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23133655

[4] Liu Shen. Rooted Intelligence: The Paradigm Revolution of Logographic AI [M/OL]. ChinaXiv, 2026. T202605.00745. https://chinaxiv.org/businessFile/T202605/T202605.00745v1/T202605.00745v1.pdf

[5] Liu S. Building the "AI Silk Road": A Theoretical Framework for Civilization-Native Intelligence and Its Global Practice [PP]. ChinaXiv, 2025-09-18. T202509.00236. https://chinaxiv.org/businessFile/T202509/T202509.00236v1/T202509.00236v1.pdf

[6] Liu Dian. Understanding and Grasping the Construction of Sovereign Artificial Intelligence [N/OL]. Study Times, 2026-08-21. https://www.studytimes.cn/kjqy/202608/t20260820_90504.html

[7] Du Zhuang. AI Development: These Four Dimensions Must Be Connected [N/OL]. China Reform Daily, 2026-07-06 [2026-10-05]. https://m.thepaper.cn/newsDetail_forward_33530053

[8] Liu Shen. A Disappointing "Authoritative Report": The Cognitive Limitations of US AI Academia Exposed by the Stanford AI Index [PP/OL]. Zenodo, 2026 [2026-10-05]. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23158781

[9] Liu Shen. Paradigm Involution or Paradigm Revolution?—On the Positioning of DeepSeek Engram in AI Paradigm Competition [J/OL]. PSSXiv, 2026. DOI:10.12451/202601.03875. https://doi.org/10.12451/202601.03875

[10] Stanford HAI. The Commercial Landscape of AI Sovereignty Offerings [R/OL]. 2026-07-15. https://hai.stanford.edu/policy/the-commercial-landscape-of-ai-sovereignty-offerings

[11] Zhang Hanhui. Leading Global AI Governance with Pragmatic Actions [N/OL]. Komsomolskaya Pravda, 2026-07-23 [2026-10-05]. https://ru.china-embassy.gov.cn/dshd/202607/t20260723_11990585.htm

[12] Liao Liqiang. Promoting the Upward and Good Development of Global AI and Building a Just and Reasonable Global AI Governance System [N/OL]. Al-Gomhouria, 2026-07-31 [2026-10-05]. https://www.mfa.gov.cn/web//wjdt_674879/zwbd_674895/202608/t20260804_11997962.shtml

[13] Fu Jianlong. Strengthening the Construction of "Sovereign AI" to Enhance Competitiveness [J/OL]. People's Weekly, 2024(20): 58-59 [2026-10-05]. http://paper.people.com.cn/rmzk/pc/content/202411/18/content_30031439.html

[14] Yang Hui. From "Usable" to "Good to Use"! Academician Zheng Weimin of the Chinese Academy of Engineering Explains the Three Pillars of "Sovereign AI," Pointing Directly to the Core Pain Points of Domestic Computing Power [N/OL]. National Business Daily, 2025-12-20 [2026-10-05]. https://m.nbd.com.cn/articles/2025-12-20/4188911.html

[15] Liu Shen. The AI Silk Road: Intelligent Algorithms Crossing the Ancient Camel Bell [N/OL]. China Daily, 2025-09-29. https://column.chinadaily.com.cn/a/202509/29/WS68d9ed86a310c4deea5ea69c.html

[16] WindSeaAI. OpenMorpho: Logographic AI Morpho-Root Data Structure and Relational Reasoning Prototype [CP/OL]. GitHub repository, 2026 [2026-10-05]. https://github.com/WindSeaAI/OpenMorpho

[17] WindSeaAI. Logographic AI Theory Series Papers [EB/OL]. [2026-10-05]. https://logographicai.com/Paper-published-on-this-website.html