

NATAKA Research Institute

Wone Press

Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series, No. 16 (2026)

Wonesis

Framework, Belonging, and the Antidote to Psycho-Cosmocide

Yamin Kogoya

First Version I: 17 July 2026 | Second Version II: 11 August 2026

Preamble

The Ship and the Land

Imagine a great ship. It is vast, and it is moving — or appears to be moving — across an ocean without visible shores. Promoted as the most advanced vessel ever built attractive, like the Titanic, glittering with rainbow lights, its upper decks filled with music and colour and the sensation of going somewhere. In first-class cabins, people are dancing, eating, and celebrating. They have been told that this ship represents the highest achievement of civilisation, that its destination is progress, and that everyone aboard is fortunate to be on it. Below the first-class deck, the ship is organised into layers. Different people and communities have been placed at different levels, working to keep the vessel running — shovelling fuel, maintaining the engines, providing the labour that makes the dancing above possible. Many were told to sell everything they owned on land and board the ship. Some are still making their way to it; others drowned en route. The music on the upper deck grows louder as the water rises below. Despite all this, the ship is not going anywhere. This is the fact that the spectacle on the upper deck is designed to conceal. The vessel is a wreck — chained to the ocean floor by its own foundational structure, anchored to a logic of extraction and consumption that cannot be repaired by any expert, any technology, or any political arrangement available within the system it has produced. Water has been entering through the lower decks for some time. The ship is sinking slowly. And everyone aboard is beginning, at some level, to notice that something is wrong. Some have already left jumping overboard, built small rescue boats, swimming toward something they hope is solid. Others are escaping in organised groups. Some are being pulled back to land by those who are never fully boarded. The anti-imperial movements, the ecological resistance movements, the decolonial projects, the spiritual revivals, the political revolutions, the philosophical refusals — all of these are, in their different ways, attempts to leave the ship or to fix it from within. The Psycho-Cosmocide framework recognises all of them as valid responses to the condition of the vessel. None of them, however, constitutes a complete antidote. Because none of them begins with the most fundamental question: *where is the land?* This is not a metaphorical question. The land is not heaven, not a utopian political future, not a spiritual state of enlightenment, and not the next stage of civilisational progress. It is the actual physical, cultural, and cosmological ground of specific human belonging — the land that existed before the ship was built, the land that was left behind when people were persuaded to board, the land whose memory is carried in the languages, ceremonies, genealogies, and cosmological frameworks of the communities that have not yet fully abandoned it. It is the land through which, in the Lani understanding, Wone — the primordial ground of all reality — flows into specific human lives and makes them not merely biological organisms but communities with meaning, memory, obligation, and a located existence in the cosmos.

Wonesis, as the key rescue paradigm introduced here, within the overarching Civilisational Psycho-Cosmocide diagnoses paradigm, is not a rescue ship. It is not a better vessel, a reformed version of the current one, or a promise of safe passage to a superior destination.

It is a signpost — erected at the edge of the sinking deck — pointing in the direction of land. It does not carry anyone there, it does not guarantee arrival, and neither does it tell anyone what to build when they reach the shore. It only points.

And the direction it points is not toward any imagined future, but toward what was already there before the ship was built: the ground, the water, the memory, the belonging, and the living cosmological connection that the ship, in its glittering spectacle, persuaded entire people to abandon.

The urgency is this: the money system that now runs the ship has begun purchasing the land itself. Those who control the capital of the sinking vessel are buying the shore before the passengers can reach it. They are purchasing the memory of the land, the stories of the land, the names of the sacred places, and the institutional infrastructure that determines who is recognised as belonging to it. The window between the sinking ship and the reachable land is closing — not slowly, and not metaphorically, but in the lifetimes of the last people who still carry the living memory that makes the land recognisable as home rather than merely as property.

This paper is the theoretical elaboration of that signpost. It maps the terrain between the sinking ship and the land: what has been destroyed in the crossing, what remains, what constitutes legitimate belonging to the land when one arrives, and why the return must happen now rather than after the last living carrier of the memory that makes it possible is gone.

Abstract

This paper introduces Wonesis as the antidote framework proposed within the Psycho-Cosmocide paradigm. Whereas the prior diagnostic framework established that human civilisation has operated as a Civilisational Psycho-Cosmocide Virus (CPCV) — alienating and exiling human beings and communities from ecological reality, ancestral memory, existential orientation, and cosmological belonging — the present paper identifies the conditions under which those exiled communities can halt that process and begin rebuilding life from what remains.

Wonesis is not a religion, ideology, political doctrine, utopian vision, or initiation into another system. It is a philosophical orientation framework: a cartography of human belonging that identifies where existence remains grounded in reality and points in that direction.

The paper develops six interconnected theoretical contributions. First, a philosophical definition of Wonesis — including its derivation from the Lani concept of Wone and its function as a signpost toward the primordial ground of existence rather than a destination in itself. Second, an account of Cosmological Anomie (*Maluk Paga*) as the specific civilisational condition Wonesis responds to: the systematic dissolution of a people's sense of place, obligation, and orientation within the living cosmos. Third, an introduction to Wone as the Lani ontological category that grounds the framework, including its four manifestations — *Obelom Wone*, *Mage Wone*, *Maluk Wone*, and *Kurumbi Wone* — and its relationship to comparable primordial categories across major cosmological traditions.

Fourth, the *Inaorak* and *Kuru* distinction as a philosophical theory of belonging constituted by living memory: *Inaorak* designating the condition of a people whose ancestral connection to a specific landscape is carried through continuous living transmission, and *Kuru* designating the structural position of those whose presence on a landscape is not so constituted — including the critical moral distinction between the welcomed guest and the violating occupier.

Fifth, a six-function operational model through which Wonesis is practised across all scales of human organisation — detection, distinction, reorientation, preservation, transmission, and return — applied through comparative historical analysis to nations, clans, tribes, families, displaced individuals, and city dwellers across West Papua, Melanesia, Australia, Indonesia, Europe, Africa, China, and the Israel-Palestine conflict.

Sixth, and most urgently: the analysis of the global money system as the mechanism through which all eight atlases of human existence and all seven cages of civilisational enclosure become purchasable, fabricatable, and erasable — and through which *Inaorak* itself becomes a commodity, making the Wonesis return to land not a philosophical preference but an existential necessity before the window of living memory closes entirely.

The paper concludes by examining the critical boundary between Wonesis as an orientation framework and Wonesis as an institution and identifies three areas in which the framework's theoretical development remains incomplete: a fully developed theory of post-collapse reconstruction, a complete cosmopolitan epistemology, and a systematic political theory of collective life beyond the nation-state.

Keywords: Wonesis, Psycho-Cosmocide, Wone, *Inaorak*, *Kuru*, Cosmological Anomie, money system, belonging, living memory, civilisational collapse, decolonial ontology.

Terminology and the Recovery of Names

Cosmobian: A Foundational Term

Throughout this paper, the term *Cosmobian* is used as a foundational conceptual category. Coined by Yamin Kogoya as part of the broader theoretical system of Psycho-Cosmocide and Wonesis, it is constructed from two classical Greek roots: *kosmos* (κόσμος), the totality of existence conceived as a living, ordered whole; and *bios* (βίος), life or a mode of living.

Together, *Cosmobian* carries the sense of *one whose life belongs to the cosmos* — a being whose existence is constituted by and inseparable from the total living world.

A *Cosmobian* society is one whose existence remains deeply and organically embedded within the living cosmos — not as a philosophical preference or spiritual practice, but as the structural foundation of its metaphysics, epistemology, ontology, law, economy, memory, language, and identity. In such societies, land is not property but relationships; rivers are not water systems but carriers of memory and continuity; forests are not timber reserves but living archives of knowledge, history, and cosmological belonging.

The term is deliberately constructed to replace the vocabulary previously used to describe societies living outside large-scale urban and state-based civilisational systems — terms such as *primitive*, *savage*, *tribal*, *pre-modern*, and *hunter-gatherer* — which were never neutral descriptions but measurements of how far a society fell short of what civilisation considered normal or fully human. *Cosmobian* names something positively and on its own terms, without reference to a civilisational standard against which it could be found lacking.

The distinction between *Cosmobianism* and *Civilisation* is therefore not a distinction between the developed and the undeveloped, the advanced and the backward. It is a distinction between two fundamentally different relationships to reality itself — one organised around participation within the living cosmos, the other increasingly organised around mastery over it.

For a full account of the concept and its theoretical foundations, see “Cosmobian and Synthobian: Two Modes of Being: From Ecological Reciprocity to Synthetic Civilisation” (NATAKA Research Institute/Wone Press, 2026).

Within the Psycho-Cosmocide civilisational diagnostic paradigm, key concepts, phrases, and terminologies drawn from both original Cosmobian languages and imperial civilisational languages will be employed throughout the body of literature produced under Kogoya’s rethinking slogan:

“Give me the camera back so I can see you through my own eyes or give me my own tape measure so I can shape things according to my own measure.”

This slogan expresses a foundational methodological principle of the Psycho-Cosmocide framework. The demand to reclaim the camera represents the recovery of the authority to define, perceive, interpret, and describe reality through one’s own cosmological and

epistemological lenses rather than through externally imposed civilisational categories. Likewise, the demand for one's own tape measure represents the recovery of the authority to define, evaluate, classify, and construct meaning according to one's own standards, measures, and systems of knowledge. Together, these metaphors articulate a broader project of intellectual, linguistic, civilisational, and metaphysical reclamation in which original Cosmobian categories of thought are restored as legitimate instruments for understanding and organising reality.

Lani Terms and Their Meanings

Lani-language terms used throughout this paper are transliterated by the author and employed according to their meaning within the relevant Lani cosmological tradition. Where no direct English equivalent exists, explanatory descriptions are provided. These terms should therefore be understood as conceptual categories emerging from the Lani tradition rather than as exact translations into English philosophical vocabulary.

The Intellectual Ground of Wonesis

The Wonesis framework does not emerge in a theoretical vacuum. It is the second movement of a two-part intellectual project, the first movement of which — the Psycho-Cosmocide paradigm — has already mapped the diagnostic terrain: the mechanism of the Civilisational Psycho-Cosmocide Virus (CPCV), the eight atlases of human existence under simultaneous assault, and the terminal phase of the digital cosmological mining pit (Kogoya 2026l).

The present paper assumes familiarity with that diagnostic architecture and proceeds to the next and more urgent question: given that the diagnosis is established, what constitutes the antidote?

This question places Wonesis in relation to a range of existing scholarly frameworks that have proposed responses to colonial destruction, each of which has contributed indispensable analytical tools and each of which, from the position of the Wonesis framework, reaches a limit that Wonesis is designed to extend beyond. The intellectual obligation of any new theoretical contribution is to demonstrate, with precision and without rhetorical overreach, exactly where existing frameworks end and where the new concept begins. This section performs that demonstration.

1. How Wonesis Came into Being

The account that follows situates Wonesis, Psycho-Cosmocide, and the broader corpus they belong to as successive stages of a single generative imperative rather than as separate intellectual projects that happen to share a vocabulary. Establishing this genealogy is a necessary preliminary to the literature review that follows, because it explains not only what the framework claims, but why the claim had to be made at all.

1.1 Wone Kenok: The Disclosure of an Unavoidable Problem

Wone names the existential condition, rupture, or threat that demands resolution. *Kenok* names the moment of seeing, encountering, or having something revealed.

Wone Kenok is therefore not merely an act of noticing. It is the condition in which what has become visible creates an unavoidable and non-deferrable obligation to pursue it to resolution — closer to *I have seen what cannot be unseen; therefore, I must follow it to its ground* than to any purely epistemic form of doubt.

This distinguishes Wone Kenok from the Cartesian starting point with which it might otherwise be confused. Descartes uses doubt instrumentally, to arrive at an indubitable foundation from which certainty can be rebuilt; the doubt itself carries no further obligation once the foundation is secured. Wone Kenok begins with an encounter, not a method, and its obligation runs toward resolution rather than toward certainty: *I have seen what cannot be ignored; therefore, I must pursue it to resolution*.

The Lani image of the snake disappearing into its hole captures the structure precisely. The snake's disappearance does not resolve the danger it announced; it creates an unresolved condition that cannot responsibly be left standing. What has been revealed now demands investigation — not because curiosity requires it, but because the conditions of safe existence require it.

Formally: *Wone Kenok is the epistemological and methodological principle of an existential encounter in which the recognition of a condition of danger, rupture, contradiction, or disorder creates an immediate and non-deferrable obligation to pursue it to its ground, resolve it, and reconstruct the conditions necessary for continued existence.*

1.2 What Has Been Seen Cannot Be Unseen

Wone Kenok generates a sequence rather than a single act: disturbance, revelation, recognition, investigation, arrival at ground-zero, resolution, and reconstruction. Read this way, the various projects that constitute this corpus — the Psycho-Cosmocide diagnosis, the Cosmobian/Synthobian distinction, the parasitological analysis of colonial capture, the analysis of settler-administrative structures in West Papua — are not independent inventions loosely gathered under a shared vocabulary. They are separate pursuits generated by the same foundational imperative, each following a disclosure to its own ground.

1.3 From Wone Kenok to Psycho-Cosmocide

Pursued far enough, the investigation this obligation demands do not terminate at a political, economic, or narrowly epistemic explanation. It reaches the cosmological and ontological foundations of existence themselves — the level at which the Civilisational Psycho-Cosmocide Virus operates, where the eight atlases of human existence are simultaneously assaulted, and where extraction reaches its terminal phase in the digital cosmological mining pit (Kogoya 2026l).

Psycho-Cosmocide, in other words, is not an arbitrary diagnostic vocabulary chosen because existing frameworks seemed insufficiently dramatic. It is where the pursuit that Wone Kenok obligates arrives once it is followed without stopping at the first available explanation.

1.4 Why Diagnosis Alone Is Not Enough

A complete diagnosis is not, by itself, a place a threatened subject can live in. Naming the mechanism of a fire does not extinguish it, and it does not tell the people standing inside the structure where to go.

This is the precise point at which diagnosis becomes insufficient, and a second framework becomes necessary — not as an optional supplement to Psycho-Cosmocide, but as the obligation Wone Kenok imposes once the ground of the disturbance has been reached: resolution and reconstruction, not merely description.

Psycho-Cosmocide diagnoses the fire. Wone Kenok is the moment the fire becomes impossible to ignore. Wonesis is the sign that points toward what must remain alive when the structure burns.

This genealogy also explains, rather than merely asserts, why Wonesis must refuse the forms examined and set aside later in this paper — religion, ideology, doctrine, and utopian political programme. Comprehensive systems of meaning are precisely what the civilisational condition described in the next section has repeatedly produced, and precisely what has repeatedly become another enclosure.

A framework generated by the obligation to resolve a disturbance without reproducing its cause cannot itself take the shape of a comprehensive system. It can only take the shape of an orientation.

2. The World Wonesis Must Respond To

Wone Kenok explains why the inquiry could not be abandoned once began. This section addresses what the inquiry, followed to its ground, actually found: a recurring civilisational pattern whose present iteration differs from every prior instance in a single, decisive respect.

2.1 How Civilisation Reproduces Its Own Cage

Large-scale civilisational formations — empires, kingdoms, nation-states, religious orders, and modern ideological projects — characteristically begin with the proposition that populations divided by language, culture, ecology, religion, and ethnicity can be organised under a shared system of law, value, or narrative. Many such formations have been constituted through combinations of coercion, conquest, extraction, warfare, and institutional violence, even when their governing narratives presented them as projects of order, unity, progress, or salvation.

This is a historical regularity rather than a metaphysical necessity, and it is documented rather than asserted: the formation of large political orders through violence is among the best-attested patterns in comparative historical and anthropological scholarship.

2.2 How Civilisations Reproduce Themselves

Civilisational orders constituted this way do not remain static. As founding generations die out, new values, new material conditions, and new external and internal pressures accumulate against inherited structures that were built to answer a different configuration of the world. Ibn Khaldun's analysis of *asabiyyah* — group solidarity as the cohesive force sustaining dynastic and civilisational power — describes precisely this erosion: cohesion that was forged under conditions of shared hardship dissipates as ruling strata become insulated from the conditions that produced it (Ibn Khaldun 1958, 249–315).

A civilisational order can remain institutionally unified while becoming existentially fragmented — external unity is not internal solidarity. A formation may continue to present

itself, and to be recognised externally, as a single coherent entity long after its internal relations have reorganised around competitive self-interest rather than shared obligation. This distinction is compatible with, and gives sharper conceptual form to, this corpus's existing account of how the Second Cage sustains itself through inherited participation rather than continuous external enforcement: a structure can be actively reproduced by the very people it encloses, even as those same people increasingly act, within it, each for their own survival.

None of these licenses the deterministic claim that every civilisation inevitably collapses.

The more defensible proposition, consistent with this corpus's existing engagement with civilisational collapse scholarship, is narrower: every civilisational order contains conditions under which its own structures can become incompatible with the conditions that sustain it. Joseph Tainter's account of the diminishing returns of complexity and Jared Diamond's ecological analysis of societal failure both describe versions of this same incompatibility, arrived at along different explanatory paths (Tainter 1988, 37–90; Diamond 2005, 1–22).

2.3 When Civilisation Becomes Planetary.

What distinguishes the present condition from every documented historical collapse is not that a civilisation is failing — civilisations have failed before, repeatedly, and left the historical record this corpus draws on.

It is that the civilisation presently undergoing crisis has become planetary in reach. Earlier collapses, however severe, unfolded within a relatively bounded geographical and technological sphere; a dynasty, an empire, or a regional trading system could fail while other cosmological and civilisational orders elsewhere continued largely undisturbed. The contemporary condition is different in kind: a single, highly interconnected technological, financial, political, ecological, and informational system has penetrated nearly every inhabited region of the planet.

A systemic breakdown within this system is therefore no longer necessarily localised. This is the same interdependence through which, as this paper argues elsewhere, the global money system is able to convert all eight atlases of human existence into purchasable, fabricatable, and erasable commodities almost everywhere at once — a planetary vulnerability with no adjacent, undisturbed cosmological order left standing to absorb the shock or preserve what is lost.

2.4 Five Possible Futures

Followed to its horizon, the present condition does not point toward a single determined outcome but opens onto several divergent civilisational trajectories, distinguished by the degree to which Cosmobian and Synthobian modes of existence are retained, abandoned, reconciled, or made to consume one another:

- **Cosmobian Reorientation** — a return, partial or complete, toward land-based, relational existence and the recovery of an original organic human relationship with the living Earth.
- **Synthobian Consolidation** — increasing detachment from ecological dependence through technological systems that seek to sustain themselves beyond direct dependence on organic life. This represents the end point of a civilisational project organised around extraction, production, and consumption, in which the organic Earth is progressively transformed into fuel for its machines.
- **Synthobian–Cosmobian Reconciliation** — the retention of technological systems while deliberately restoring ecological, relational, and land-based grounding. This is the trajectory of those who choose to ally technological capacity with the Cosmobian world rather than abandon it.
- **Synthobian Extraction** — the technological civilisation seeks to maximise extraction from whatever Cosmobian world remains, treating it as a terminal resource rather than a living partner. This is the trajectory of those who insist on abandoning the Cosmobian world altogether and creating a new synthetic existence engineered by humans.
- **Total Civilisational Disintegration** — large interconnected systems fragment into smaller survival units: families, clans, communities, militias, or other local formations. This is the condition in which both Cosmobian and Synthobian formations collapse together, leaving fragmented populations in which survival may increasingly be determined by material capacity, territorial control, and force.

Wonesis does not claim to predict which of these trajectories will prevail, and nothing in the argument above should be read as such a claim. Consistent with the self-limitation established throughout this paper, Wonesis is an orientation toward one of these possible futures — Cosmobian Reorientation — and not a prophecy that determines which future will occur.

The Cosmobian and Synthobian labels used throughout this list name a difference of generative logic rather than of degree: the Cosmobian world is generated by relationality and reciprocity, while the Synthobian world is generated by extraction, production, and consumption, and the latter possesses no independent generative capacity of its own — it remains structurally dependent on the Cosmobian world it converts and consumes (Kogoya 2026c).

Followed to its own terminal point, unchecked Synthobian consolidation does not merely marginalise the Cosmobian world; it produces what this corpus terms ontological zombification — a condition in which life continues while the cosmological grounding of that life has already been eliminated, and the population defends the replacement as its own (Kogoya 2026c).

Cosmobian Reorientation is therefore not a return to any one economic form. It is a return to a generative logic — reciprocity rather than extraction — that can, in principle, be practised at any scale, which is precisely what the six operations of Wonesis are designed to make possible.

3. From Psycho-Cosmocide to Wonesis

The sequence developed across this section can now be stated in full: Wone, the ground of existence; Wone Kenok, the disclosure that something within that ground has become profoundly disturbed; pursuit, the non-deferrable obligation that disclosure creates; Psycho-Cosmocide, the diagnosis reached when that pursuit is followed to the cosmological and ontological foundations of the disturbance; the CPCV, the mechanism through which the diagnosed condition reproduces itself; Maluk Paga, the resulting condition of cosmological anomie; and Wonesis, the necessary orientation toward detection, distinction, reorientation, preservation, transmission, and return — pointing, in the first instance, toward land.

What follows situates this sequence against the existing scholarly literature on colonial and civilisational destruction, before developing Wonesis itself in full.

From Epistemicide to Ontological Extinction

The most important adjacent concept to Psycho-Cosmocide is Boaventura de Sousa Santos's notion of epistemicide: the systematic destruction of Indigenous knowledge systems as a constitutive dimension of colonial expansion (Santos 2014, 92–105). Santos's work was influential in directing scholarly attention beyond the political, military, and economic dimensions of colonialism toward its epistemic consequences. Colonial violence, in this account, does not merely occupy territories or dominate populations; it also targets the knowledge systems through which communities understand themselves and their worlds.

The concept of epistemicide has proven highly generative across postcolonial and decolonial scholarships. It has enabled analyses of how Western educational institutions, legal systems, scientific frameworks, and administrative structures have displaced Indigenous knowledge traditions and established their own epistemological assumptions as universal standards of truth and validity. This process is closely related to what Marie Battiste describes as *cognitive imperialism*: the imposition of a dominant knowledge system that marginalises, devalues, or erases alternative ways of knowing (Battiste 2013, 15–60). Her edited collection similarly demonstrates how this recovery is not only theoretical but involves the collective political assertion of Indigenous rights to knowledge, land, and self-determination (Battiste 2000).

The Psycho-Cosmocide paradigm accepts the fundamental insight of epistemicide but argues that the destruction extends beyond knowledge alone.

Knowledge systems do not exist independently of the cosmological worlds that generate, sustain, and give meaning to them. What is ultimately targeted is not merely a way of knowing but an entire way of being. The destruction of cosmology entails the disruption of relationships among memory, land, ancestry, consciousness, language, spirituality, ecology, and the wider order of existence.

In this sense, epistemicide represents one dimension of a broader civilisational process. Psycho-Cosmocide seeks to name that larger phenomenon: the systematic destruction not only of knowledge but also of the cosmological, metaphysical, existential, and relational foundations from which knowledge emerges. Whereas epistemicide focuses on the destruction of ways of knowing, Psycho-Cosmocide extends the analysis further by arguing that the colonising process reaches into reality itself. What is colonised is not merely knowledge but the very structures through which reality is perceived, inhabited, remembered, interpreted, and transmitted across generations.

Not only epistemology but cosmology; not only thought but being; not only knowledge systems but the living worlds that make knowledge possible.

Hence, the Wonesis framework builds on this foundation but identifies a structural gap. Epistemicide describes the destruction of knowledge systems. But knowledge is not equivalent to cosmos. The conditions of meaningfulness — the living relational system through which a specific person constitutes its relationship with existence itself, through which existence is experienced as coherent, oriented, and inhabited rather than merely endured — exceed the category of knowledge.

What the Psycho-Cosmocide framework terms Psycho-Cosmocide is the destruction not of what a people knows but of the ontological ground from which knowing, being, and belonging simultaneously arise. When that ground is destroyed, the loss is not epistemological but cosmological: an entire experiential universe is extinguished, not merely a library.

Glen Coulthard's concept of "*grounded normativity*" moves closer to this ontological depth. Drawing on his engagement with Dene political thought, Coulthard argues that land-based practices and relationships are not merely the background of Indigenous political life but its ethical and ontological foundation — the ground from which a people's particular understanding of self, community, and obligation arise (Coulthard 2014, 13). Leanne Betasamosake Simpson develops this further through the concept of "*land as pedagogy*": the land is not merely a resource or a political territory but the primary educator of Indigenous knowledge, the living relationship through which everything that matters about existence is transmitted (Simpson 2017, 145–175).

Both Coulthard and Simpson point toward what Wonesis names with the concept of *Inaorak*: the ontological condition of belonging to a landscape constituted by living memory.

But neither provides the philosophical vocabulary — the precise distinction between *Inaorak* and *Kuru*, the analysis of how the money system converts Inaorak belonging into a purchasable commodity — that the Wonesis framework develops.

Walter D. Mignolo's concept of "*delinking*" — the deliberate epistemological detachment from colonial knowledge systems, the refusal to accept the terms of engagement set by colonial modernity — is the closest existing framework to what Wonesis identifies as the orientation of recovery (Mignolo 2011, 1–92; Mignolo 2000, 3–25). However, delinking describes a

movement away from: a refusal, a detachment, a negation of the colonial epistemic infrastructure. Wonesis names what the movement is toward: the living ground of a specific people's cosmological belonging.

Wonesis is not primarily a movement of refusal. It is a movement of return. The distinction here is not merely rhetorical. It is the difference between a framework that identifies what must be rejected and a framework that identifies where there is still solid ground to stand on.

Arturo Escobar's concept of "*place-worlds*" — developed from his sustained engagement with Afro-Colombian and Pacific Coast communities — provides a further point of convergence and differentiation. Escobar argues that *place-based communities* constitute entire ontological configurations in which nature, community, and cosmology are not separate domains but a single lived reality (Escobar 2008, 1–49). The destruction of place, in Escobar's framework, is the destruction of an entire ontological configuration. Wonesis agrees with this analysis entirely, and the concept of *Inaorak* is in many respects its Lani ontological expression. What Wonesis adds is the precise analytical distinction between communities that retain living ontological connection to their place (*Inaorak*) and communities whose presence on a landscape is not constituted by living ancestral memory (*Kuru*) — and, crucially, the analysis of how the global money system converts *Inaorak* belonging into *Kuru* status by purchasing the very infrastructure of living memory.

Sylvia Wynter's analysis of the "*overrepresentation*" of one particular genre of the human as the universal human figure — *Western Man* — and the consequent ontological subordination of all other modes of being human, provides an essential theoretical companion to Wonesis (Wynter 2003, 257–337). Wynter's framework is named after the mechanism through which colonial modernity produces a definition of the human so constructed around Western European experience that all other peoples exist, within its terms, *as deficient variants of a universal norm*. Wonesis engages this analysis but departs from it in one important respect: where Wynter's project is directed primarily toward the deconstruction of the Western humanist episteme and the opening of a new "*science of the human*," Wonesis insists that the most urgent task is not further theoretical deconstruction but the preservation and recovery of the living cosmological ground that existing *Inaorak cosmopolitan* communities still carry. The Lani ontological vocabulary — Wone, *Inaorak*, *Kuru*, *Maluk Paga* — is offered not as a contribution to a new universal theory of the human but as an irreducibly specific analytical lexicon that names what Western humanist theory was not designed to see.

Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang's foundational essay identifies a different but related gap. Tuck and Yang argue that decolonial scholarship has repeatedly fallen into the *error of treating decolonisation as a metaphor for social justice, diversity, or inclusion* — thereby evacuating the concept of its irreducible material content: the repatriation of land (Tuck and Yang 2012, 1–40).

Wonesis entirely concurs with this analysis. Wonesis insists that the return it proposes is not primarily a philosophical reorientation, but a material return to land — specific land, carried in specific living memory, through specific ancestral relationships.

From the tradition of civilisational collapse theory, the Wonesis framework draws on Joseph Tainter's account of the diminishing returns of complexity (Tainter 1988, 37–90), Jared Diamond's ecological analysis (Diamond 2005, 1–22), and the philosophical dimensions of Guy Debord's spectacle theory (Debord 1994, 7–24); and Jean Baudrillard's simulacra (Baudrillard 1994, 1–42).

These frameworks contribute to the diagnosis of the condition Wonesis responds to — the Civilisational Psycho-Cosmocide Virus operating through the progressive replacement of reality with its symbolic representations. But they do not provide what Wonesis provides: the ontological vocabulary of *Inaorak*, the philosophical distinction from *Kuru*, the account of living memory as the irreplaceable medium of cosmological belonging, and the analysis of money as the mechanism through which *Inaorak* status is converted into a purchasable commodity.

Three Problems Wonesis Had to Answer

The Wonesis framework was developed in response to three interrelated gaps in the existing literature on decolonial recovery, place-based ontology, and the philosophy of belonging.

The *first gap* concerns the absence of a precise philosophical theory of belonging that operates at ontological rather than political or cultural depth. Existing frameworks identify belonging as important — to land, to community, to place — but do not provide the analytical architecture for distinguishing between different forms and conditions of belonging with the precision that political and philosophical analysis requires. The *Inaorak/Kuru* distinction fills this gap: it provides a philosophical vocabulary for distinguishing between belonging constituted by living ancestral memory and belonging that is not so constituted — without thereby making a moral judgement about the worth of persons, but making a precise ontological analysis of their relational position with respect to a specific landscape.

The *second gap* concerns the mechanism through which belonging is converted into a commodity under the global money system. Existing frameworks identify land alienation, cultural commodification, and epistemic extraction as dimensions of colonial and neo-colonial violence. But none has named the integrated mechanism through which all eight dimensions of human existence are simultaneously converted into purchasable assets, and through which *Inaorak* status itself becomes something that those with sufficient capital can purchase regardless of ancestral connection. Wonesis names this mechanism and analyses its consequences for the urgency of return.

The *third gap* concerns the practical orientation beyond refusal and diagnosis. Decolonial scholarship has produced powerful analytical tools for identifying the mechanisms of colonial

destruction and critiquing the epistemological assumptions of Western modernity. It has been less successful in articulating what the positive orientation of recovery looks like at the ontological level — what it means, in practical and philosophical terms, to return to the living ground rather than simply to refuse the colonial superstructure.

Wonesis articulates that orientation: not as a programme, ideology, or institution, but as a philosophical map of the conditions under which genuine *return to land-based existence* becomes possible again.

Taken together, these three gaps establish the central claim of this paper. Wonesis argues that belonging is fundamentally an ontological relationship constituted through living memory between a people and a specific landscape. The framework therefore provides a theory of belonging (Inaorak/Kuru), a diagnosis of its commodification under the money system, and an orientation toward its preservation and recovery under conditions of Psycho-Cosmocide.

What Is Wonesis?

Wonesis is the antidote to Psycho-Cosmocide. The term is derived from the Lani primordial concept of Wone — the ineffable ground of all reality, the cosmic force that permeates, sustains, and governs existence itself. The suffix -sis denotes process, emergence, and return, signifying not a fixed state of being but an active movement of becoming. Wonesis, therefore, is the process of reorienting oneself toward Wone — toward the primordial ground of existence — from which human beings have been progressively alienated through the construction and imposition of the second cage of civilisation (Kogoya 2026g).

It represents a return to the living source of reality, a restoration of the relationship between human beings, existence, and the cosmic order that sustains them.

Wonesis is not a religion. It does not require belief in a deity, divine authority, supernatural intervention, or revealed truth. Nor does it promise salvation, transcendence, or escape from the first cage of existence — the irreducible conditions of physical embodiment, birth, survival, mortality, and ecological dependence. As established within the theoretical framework of Psycho-Cosmocide Studies, no framework, however sophisticated, can abolish these conditions (Kogoya 2026g). Neither science nor its technological applications can eliminate the fundamental realities of existence. Human beings remain embodied organisms embedded within ecological systems, subject to the constraints of space, time, energy, and death.

From the perspective of Psycho-Cosmocide analysis, any framework that claims to overcome, transcend, or permanently escape these conditions constitutes an expression of the second cage rather than an antidote to it. Such claims substitute reality with abstraction and encourage alienation from the existential ground of human existence. Wonesis, by contrast, begins with the acceptance of the first cage as an unavoidable condition of life and seeks not escape from reality, but reorientation toward it by dismantling the entire civilisational illusions built around it.

Wonesis is not an ideology. It does not prescribe a political programme, identify an enemy class or group, or recruit followers into a movement that claims to hold the correct answer to the civilisational crisis. Every ideology that has made such claims has eventually become what it claimed to oppose: a new enclosure, a new manufactured hierarchy, a new system serving its own perpetuation rather than the conditions of life it was designed to protect. This is the warning that Audre Lorde's insight carries with particular force: *the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house* (Lorde 1984, 110–114). The instruments through which domination operates — including its ideological forms — cannot, if used without fundamental transformation, produce liberation. Wonesis refuses this replication.

Wonesis is not a doctrine. It does not establish a canon of required beliefs, a hierarchy of authority, or a system of membership and exclusion. It does not tell human beings what to worship, what to revere, or what to call sacred. Those determinations belong to each community in relation to its own living memory, its own landscape, its own cosmological tradition.

Wonesis is not a therapeutic or spiritual practice. It is not concerned with individual psychological transformation, inner healing, or religious promises of reward in the afterlife. Its concern, however, is both individual and collective. It seeks to identify the conditions under which people, families, clans, communities, peoples, and ultimately the human species can remain grounded in the reality of their existence rather than becoming progressively absorbed into civilisational systems that alienate them from that reality and exile them from it.

In this sense, Wonesis differs fundamentally from therapeutic and self-help approaches that focus primarily on repairing the individual while leaving the surrounding civilisational order largely unquestioned. Such approaches often provide continuous remedies for symptoms of alienation without addressing the systems that generate that alienation in the first place. Within many contemporary civilisational structures, human worth is frequently measured according to monetary value, material achievement, social status, productivity, or utility. The human being is rarely recognised as possessing intrinsic worth simply by virtue of being human; value is instead attached to external markers through which individuals are judged, ranked, and assessed.

Wonesis is an existential orientation framework. More precisely, it is a framework for identifying the conditions under which the cosmological wounds of Psycho-Cosmocide cease to be inflicted and the work of rebuilding life can begin from what remains.

It does not promise healing, redemption, salvation, or transcendence. It initiates no one into a creed, doctrine, or institution. It does not prescribe what people must believe, how they must live, or who they must become.

Instead, Wonesis seeks to map reality as honestly as possible. It identifies the forces that generate disconnection from the ground of existence, clarifies the conditions that sustain that disconnection, and points toward the places where reality remains sufficiently intact for life to

recover its footing. It offers no guarantees. It merely maps the terrain and indicates where the ground is still solid enough to stand upon.

To articulate this more plainly:

Find land, grow food, secure water, fresh air and learn to make fire, build a home, protect your family, and preserve memory. This is the core of Wonesis. We do not do these things for heaven, for abstract rationality, or for the promise of progressing toward some future destination. We do them so that we can live here, on this planet, with some degree of belonging, continuity, dignity, and meaning.

The operational principle of Wonesis is reorientation. It functions as a signpost, a guide, or a pointer. Like a finger pointing toward the moon — an analogy familiar across Buddhist, Daoist, and Zen philosophical traditions — its purpose is not to become the moon but to direct attention toward it (Watts 2013, 57–64). The moon is the reality being indicated; the finger is merely the means of indication. The value of the finger lies in its capacity to point, not in itself. Once the finger is mistaken for the moon, its purpose has been lost.

The point of the pointer is not the point. In the same way, Wonesis is the pointer, and the Moon is the land. The pointer has a function: it directs attention beyond itself. Once the direction has been revealed, confusing the pointer with the destination becomes a fundamental error. Likewise, Wonesis is not the final reality; it is the pointer toward reality. The Moon is the land—not the word Moon, not the concept of the Moon, not the symbol of the Moon, but the actual territory to which the pointer directs us. Wonesis therefore must not become another doctrine, ideology, religion, or metaphysical cage. Its purpose is to reveal, orient, and release. The map is not the territory; the pointer is not the point; the name is not the named; and Wonesis is not the land. Wonesis points. Reality remains.

Wonesis is not an end in itself. It is not a destination, an ideology, a doctrine, or an object of devotion. Its role is simply to point toward the conditions of reality from which human existence derives its grounding and coherence.

Accordingly, Wonesis seeks to redirect the attention of individuals, families, clans, communities, and peoples away from the manufactured enclosures of civilisation — its substitutes, abstractions, spectacles, simulations, and managed meanings — and back toward the foundational conditions of existence: land, kinship, ecological participation, living memory, and the honest inhabitation of the cosmological ground from which every community's particular existence has historically drawn its meaning, identity, and coherence.

Wonesis is therefore not the ground itself. It is a framework for finding the ground again. The moment Wonesis becomes an institution requiring membership, a doctrine demanding obedience, or a system claiming exclusive access to truth, it has ceased to be Wonesis. It has become another cage.

What Wonesis Does

Both reviews of this paper identified a gap that the framework must address directly: Wonesis is defined many times and from many angles, but nowhere does the paper answer the question precisely and in sequence — what does Wonesis actually do?

The following account is that answer.

Wonesis performs six distinct operations, each addressing a different dimension of the condition Psycho-Cosmocide has produced. These are not stages in a linear process. They operate simultaneously and reinforce one another. They are named here in sequence only for analytical clarity.

The first operation is *detection*. Wonesis trains attention to recognise the intrusion of the Second Cage into lived experience — to notice when representation has replaced reality, when institutional dependency has replaced direct relationship, when manufactured meaning has substituted for living cosmological orientation. This is harder than it sounds. The CPCV's most effective feature is that it makes the Second Cage feel like existence itself. Wonesis restores the capacity to perceive the difference. Debord's analysis of the spectacle is useful here: the spectacle is not a collection of images but a social relationship between people mediated by images, and Wonesis is the practice of seeing through the mediation back to the social relationship it has obscured (Debord 1994, 12–13). In practical terms, this means a Lani person recognising that the aspiration for a corporate salary is a Second Cage aspiration, not a Wone-aligned one — and that this recognition is the precondition for any other operation.

What makes detection difficult is not that the Second Cage's substitutes are worthless. It is that they are genuine. The Epic of Gilgamesh already dramatises this precisely: Shamhat does not deceive Enkidu about what she offers him, and the bread, companionship, and belonging he receives on entering civilisation are real. What is withheld is the full cost of what is being paid. This corpus terms the mechanism counterfeit transcendence — monuments, status, and technological or institutional surrogates offered as substitutes for a cosmic connection the civilised subject can no longer access and therefore experienced as profoundly valuable rather than as a loss (Kogoya 2026f). Detection, in this light, is not the recognition of a lie. It is harder recognition that something authentically satisfying has been purchased at a price the transaction itself was structured not to disclose.

Detection also carries a cost this framework does not minimise. As the reorganisation of perception deepens across a population, the social environment available to anyone who names what is happening becomes progressively less hospitable — not because the diagnosis is wrong, but because the framework through which it would be evaluated has itself been shaped to register such naming as nostalgic, impractical, or politically motivated rather than as what it is. This corpus terms the resulting shortfall of the recognition gap: the distance between what accurate perception actually requires and what the available social and political environment can accommodate (Kogoya 2026i).

Wonesis cannot, for this reason, be mistaken for a programme without losing what makes it necessary. A programme proposes what to do once people can already see what is happening to it. Detection is the prior, harder achievement of being able to see it at all — and of surviving, politically, the seeing (Kogoya 2026i).

The second operation of Wonesis is the practice of *distinction*. Not every condition of existence is a prison, and not every limitation is a form of domination. Wonesis therefore begins by distinguishing between the conditions that are inherent to existence and the conditions that have been constructed by human civilisations.

The First Cage refers to the unavoidable realities of existence: birth, survival, mortality, embodiment, ecological dependence, and the fact that human life remains inseparable from land, water, food, memory, and relationships. These conditions cannot be abolished, escaped, or transcended. They are not defects of existence but the very circumstances within which existence unfolds. Any framework that promises complete liberation from these realities merely replaces one illusion with another.

The Second Cage, by contrast, consists of the artificial systems, institutions, ideologies, and structures that human beings create around themselves. Unlike the First Cage, these conditions are neither inevitable nor permanent. They can be identified, questioned, resisted, and, in some cases, dismantled. The task of Wonesis is therefore not to escape existence but to recognise the difference between what belongs to existence itself and what has been imposed upon it.

This distinction is essential because the most sophisticated forms of the Civilisational Psycho-Cosmocide Virus (CPCV) rarely present themselves as forms of domination. Instead, they present themselves as promises of liberation. They offer salvation from mortality, escape from ecological dependence, transcendence of embodiment, or entry into a perfected future beyond the limitations of ordinary human existence. Whether expressed as utopian ideologies, heavenly destinations, technological transcendence, or visions of post-human perfection, these promises to share a common structure: they portray an exit from the First Cage while drawing human beings more deeply into the Second.

Wonesis does not reject aspiration, imagination, or the desire for a better future. It insists, however, that aspiration remains grounded in the realities of existence rather than directed away from them.

The goal is not to escape life but to inhabit it more fully; not to transcend reality but to learn once again how to belong within it.

The third operation is *reorientation*. Having detected the Second Cage and distinguished what can from what cannot be changed, Wonesis reorients attention toward the foundational conditions of existence: land, kinship, living memory, ecological participation, and the cosmological framework of one's specific community. This is not passive or contemplative. It is an active redirecting of energy, resources, and daily choices. For a Papuan elder, it means continuing to transmit language to grandchildren even when the money economy rewards other

uses of time. For a Melanesian community leader, it means resisting the land deal that would fund ten years of consumption at the cost of ten generations of belonging. Reorientation is the bridge between recognising the condition and acting from a different ground.

The fourth operation of Wonesis is *preservation*. Wonesis seeks to identify what must not be lost and to create the conditions under which it can survive. This is its Noah's Ark function: not the prevention of the flood, but the preservation of the seeds through it. The task is not to save everything. The task is to recognise what is essential for continuity and ensure that it remains alive through periods of disruption, displacement, and civilisational transformation.

What must be preserved differs from one community to another. In West Papua, preservation may involve language, ceremonial knowledge, ancestral memory, land relationships, ecological knowledge, and the living transmission of memory between elders and children. The question is not merely whether these things can be documented, but whether they can remain active and embodied within a living community. Wonesis therefore asks whether communities still possess the capacity, time, and collective will to sustain these relationships before the conditions that make them possible disappear. In Australia, where many traditional relationships to land have already undergone profound disruption, preservation may require maintaining and transmitting whatever living fragments of memory, culture, and ecological relationship remain. In Europe, where many older cosmological relationships have largely faded from collective life, preservation may begin with the slower task of rebuilding forms of kinship, memory, place attachment, and cultural continuity capable of supporting a renewed sense of belonging.

The specific content of preservation differs across places and peoples, but the criterion remains the same. Preservation is not simply the recording, archiving, or commemoration of what once existed. It is the maintenance or restoration of a living relationship between a community and its particular ground of existence.

The decisive question is therefore simple: does a practice keep that relationship alive, or does it merely preserve the memory of a relationship that has already been severed?

The fifth operation is *transmission*. Wonesis is intergenerational by structure. Preservation without transmission is extinction deferred rather than prevented. The minimum viable act of Wonesis — at its most reduced, under conditions of maximum dispossession — is one person transmitting one piece of living knowledge to one other person who will carry it forward.

A grandmother teaching a grandchild the name of a river in their ancestral language is performing the fifth operation of Wonesis. A ceremony conducted with the explicit intention of teaching its structure and meaning to the next generation is performing this operation. The money system attacks this operation most effectively by reorganising time — Thompson's analysis of how industrial capitalism replaced task-oriented time with clock-disciplined wage labour applies directly: when the economic structure of daily life leaves no time or space for intergenerational transmission, the fifth operation fails without any overt act of cultural

destruction being required (Thompson 1967, 56–97). Wonesis, at this operation, means recovering the time and space that transmission requires — which is itself a political and economic act, not merely a cultural one.

The sixth operation is orientation toward *return*. For communities that have retained living *Inaorak* connection to their land, this means acting from that connection now — before the window closes. For communities that have lost the land but retained the memory, it means maintaining the memory as the condition of possibility for eventual return. For communities that have lost both, it means beginning the long process of building new belonging from the ground available — which is also a form of return, not to a lost original but to the conditions of genuine existence.

This operation is the most demanding of all, because it requires sustained action against the logic of the money system without the guarantee of material reward. Wonesis does not promise that return will succeed. Within the framework's interpretation of the available evidence, it is the direction that the analysis of civilisational collapse most consistently indicates — not as a certainty, but as the orientation that those who refuse extinction have historically chosen.

What Wonesis Cannot Overcome

The six operations above describe what Wonesis does in relation to the Second Cage — the historically constructed enclosures that can, in principle, be dismantled. Three further conditions of existence are not constructed and cannot be dismantled: mortality, the limits of what can be known, and the sealed interiority of every other living being (Kogoya 2026n).

Wonesis does not promise liberation from these conditions. No antidote framework that made that promise would be honest, and Wonesis's own self-limitation, developed above, applies here with a particular force.

In relation to mortality — the Corridor of the Dead — Wonesis does not offer escape or denial. It offers the capacity to walk that corridor with full cosmological grounding: neither the paralysis of pretending it is not there, nor the manufactured consolation of civilisational systems that convert the fact of death into a product. In relation to the limits of knowledge — Absolute Unknowing — Wonesis offers a disciplined humility: the acknowledgement that reality continually exceeds every symbolic system a community constructs to explain it, an acknowledgement the CPCV, which depends on manufactured certainty, is structurally incapable of making. In relation to the interiority of others — the Irreducible Other, human and non-human alike — Wonesis offers a way of living that honours the sealed core of every life without requiring that seal to be broken for kinship and cosmological solidarity to exist.

Read through the architecture of Psycho-Cosmocide, Sisyphus becomes something more than an absurd hero: a witness to what Wonesis asks of anyone who walks the Corridor of the Dead consciously (Kogoya 2026g). Wonesis offers no promise of immortality, no escape from mortality, and no final victory over death — only that human beings inhabit the corridor with

open eyes, refusing both denial and manufactured consolation, while remaining faithful to the living reality still available before the final horizon is crossed.

None of this is what Wonesis restores. It is what Wonesis inhabits differently once restoration, at the level the six operations names, has begun.

The distinction matters because it marks the honest edge of the framework: Wonesis is not liberation from the human condition. It is liberation from the parasite that has colonised how the human condition is lived.

Six Analogies for Wonesis

Because Wonesis functions as an orientation framework rather than a doctrine, its purpose can be understood through six complementary analogies. Each illuminates a different dimension of what Wonesis seeks to accomplish within the Psycho-Cosmocide paradigm. Together, they describe a movement from preservation, through protection and recognition, toward departure from the manufactured enclosure and, finally, return to the living ground of existence.

The analogies are not six definitions of Wonesis. They are six ways of seeing its function.

Wonesis as Noah's Ark

Wonesis is like building a Noah's Ark against the Psycho-Cosmocide flood. The flood is not water but the progressive absorption of human existence into civilisational systems that sever people from land, memory, kinship, ecological participation, and the cosmological ground of their existence.

Like Noah's Ark, Wonesis does not stop the flood. No framework can. Its purpose is preservation. It identifies and protects those elements without which a people cannot endure: living memory, language, kinship structures, ecological relationships, food systems, land relationships, and the conditions necessary for cultural continuity. These are not metaphysical doctrines or secret forms of knowledge. They are the primordial conditions of life itself. They precede religion, philosophy, science, ideology, and civilisation because they are the foundations upon which such systems depend.

The ark is therefore not a symbolic vessel carrying abstract ideas. The ark is the living network of relationships that sustains existence itself. When these relationships survive, the ark survives. Within the Psycho-Cosmocide framework, the Noah's Ark model identifies a minimum survival configuration involving existential orientation, cultural transmission, and embodied continuity (Kogoya 2026l).

Wonesis as Underground Shelter

Wonesis is also like an underground shelter built beneath a burning landscape. When the surface world is consumed by colonial destruction, ecological collapse, cultural disintegration, or

civilisational crisis, the shelter does not extinguish the fire. Its purpose is survival. It protects what must remain alive until conditions permit renewal.

Within the shelter are the seeds of future continuity: memory, language, stories, ecological knowledge, kinship systems, and relationships to land. Wonesis creates the conditions under which these can endure through periods of disruption and devastation. Patrick Wolfe identifies the operative logic of settler colonialism as one of elimination: it does not merely remove populations but targets the structures through which peoples reconstitute themselves (Wolfe 2006, 387–409). The shelter must therefore protect precisely those reconstitutive structures.

The shelter is not an escape from reality. It is a means of remaining connected to reality when the structures above ground become hostile to life itself.

Wonesis as Antidote

Wonesis is like an antidote to the Civilisational Psycho-Cosmocide Virus (CPCV). The virus spreads through institutions, religions, ideologies, symbols, narratives, economic systems, educational systems, and cultural practices that progressively disconnect human beings from the foundations of their existence. It reproduces across generations by normalising abstraction, substitution, and dependency upon systems that replace direct relationships with mediated ones (Kogoya 2026l).

Wonesis does not attempt to destroy the virus through ideological warfare. Such conflict risks remain trapped within the logic of the infected system itself. As Audre Lorde's well-known formulation warns, the instruments of domination cannot simply be appropriated without reproducing the structure they were designed to dismantle (Lorde 1984, 110–114). Instead, Wonesis strengthens the conditions of cultural and existential immunity. It restores living relationships with land, memory, kinship, and ecological participation. Within the Wonesis framework, this immune capacity is rooted in *Inaorak* — the enduring relationship between a people and the ground of their existence.

The antidote is therefore not conquest. *It is return home.*

Wonesis and Plato's Cave

Wonesis is also like escaping Plato's cave, although the meaning of the cave changes significantly within the Psycho-Cosmocide framework. The goal is not ascent into a realm of pure reason, abstract truth, or metaphysical perfection. Nor does Wonesis assume that human beings can escape the fundamental conditions of existence identified by the Psycho-Cosmocide framework. Human beings remain embodied, ecologically dependent, mortal beings situated within the various atlases and existential cages that structure existence.

The escape envisioned by Wonesis therefore concerns orientation rather than transcendence. Civilisation continually produces images, ideologies, spectacles, institutions, narratives, and abstractions that can draw human attention away from the ground of existence. Human beings

become absorbed in representations of reality and gradually lose contact with the realities upon which their lives depend.

The map begins to replace the territory. The representation begins to replace the world.

This is where Debord's *Society of the Spectacle* and Baudrillard's analysis of the simulacrum become relevant: lived reality can become progressively mediated by representations until the representation itself assumes greater authority than the reality it originally represented (Debord 1994, 7–24; Baudrillard 1994, 1).

For Wonesis, however, the movement out of the cave does not culminate in another abstract system. It culminates in the recovery of the capacity to see. The sun beyond the cave is therefore not a higher metaphysical realm. *It is the living world itself*. It is land, water, air, fire, food, kinship, memory, language, home, story, song, work, relationship, mortality and the irreducible mystery of existence.

The task is not to transcend the Earth. *The task is to return to it*.

Leaving the Ship, Pharaoh, and Babylon

A fifth analogy brings together three ancient images of departure: leaving the sinking ship, leaving Pharaoh, and leaving Babylon.

The sinking ship represents a civilisation whose structure has become incapable of carrying those within it toward a viable future. The appropriate response is not to spend all remaining energy decorating, repairing, defending or reorganising the ship while it continues to sink. At a certain point, survival requires recognising the condition of the vessel and moving toward land.

The Exodus from Pharaoh provides another dimension. Pharaoh represents a system that does not merely govern bodies but organises labour, dependence, identity and imagination. To leave Pharaoh is therefore not simply to change rulers. It is to exit a system of existence whose continuation depends upon the captivity of those within it.

The image of Babylon adds a further dimension. Babylon represents the great civilisational spectacle: wealth, power, commerce, domination, excess and seduction concentrated into a system that can appear magnificent precisely while it becomes destructive. To leave Babylon is therefore to recognise that participation in the system cannot indefinitely be separated from the consequences of the system.

These analogies share a common principle: there are conditions under which reform from within is no longer sufficient. The task then becomes departure.

But Wonesis does not interpret departure as geographical escape alone. A person can leave a civilisation physically while carrying its categories, desires, values and assumptions within the mind. The deeper departure is therefore from the internalised architecture of the system. This is why Wonesis cannot be reduced to migration, political withdrawal, economic independence, or physical relocation.

The question is not simply: How do we leave the system? It is: What must cease to govern how we understand existence after we leave it? Departure without reorientation merely reproduces the old system elsewhere.

The sinking ship, Pharaoh and Babylon therefore point toward the same threshold: the moment when survival requires leaving the structure that has become incompatible with life. But leaving is not the final purpose. *Land is.*

Wonesis as Returning to Land and Falling in Love with Life Again

Wonesis is the movement of returning to Land and learning to fall in love with life again — not with the naïve innocence of a world that has never seen destruction, but with the consciousness of one who has seen what civilisation can do and nevertheless chooses life.

The recognition of the eight atlases of human existence and the seven existential cages is not an invitation to pessimism. It is not a declaration that existence is meaningless. It is not a justification for nihilism, despair, resignation, or withdrawal from the world.

Quite the opposite. To recognise the cages is to stop pretending that they are not there. To recognise the atlases is to stop inventing another one as an escape from them. Humanity does not need another grand system promising that the final answer has finally been found. It does not need another civilisation that claims to transcend the limitations of previous civilisations. It does not need another doctrine, ideology, theology, metaphysical system, or universal philosophy that promises to close the mystery of existence.

We already have enough maps. We already have enough cages.

What is needed is the capacity to inhabit existence without continually converting the mystery of existence into another enclosure. This is why Wonesis returns first to Land.

Land is not merely territory. Land is where existence becomes immediate again. It is where water can be touched, where fire can be felt, where air enters the body, where food is grown, where a home can be built, where children can be raised, where elders can remember, where stories can be told, where songs can be sung, where names remain attached to places, and where generations can encounter one another within a living continuity.

Return is therefore not a regression into an imagined premodern innocence. It is a return with consciousness. The person returning to Land has already seen the cave. They have seen the spectacle. They have seen the ship sinking. They have seen Pharaoh. They have seen Babylon. They have seen the machinery through which civilisations can transform life into abstraction, commodity, hierarchy, domination and spectacle. They return differently because they now know what they are returning from.

This distinction is crucial. Wonesis does not ask humanity to become naïve again. It asks humanity to become conscious enough to love life without needing to possess, explain, conquer, transcend, commodify, or imprison it.

Life can once again be encountered as mystery. The morning can be new. Water can be water. Fire can be fire. Air can be air. A home can be a home. A family can be a family. A story can be a story. A song can be a song. A poem can be a poem. A human being can be encountered not first as a unit of labour, capital, citizenship, productivity, consumption, data, ethnicity, religious membership, political identity or demographic category, but as a living being whose existence is itself extraordinary.

This does not require turning life into a new belief system. The mystery does not need to be explained before it can be embraced. Indeed, the attempt to permanently explain the mystery may itself become another cage.

Wonesis therefore treats existence as something that must be encountered repeatedly and freshly. Every *now* moment is a new manifestation of reality. Every living being appears within an exact configuration of time, place, body, relationship, memory and circumstance that has never existed in precisely the same form before and will never occur again in precisely the same way.

To recognise this is not to construct a new metaphysics. It is to recover a way of being.

The point is not to believe that life is miraculous. The point is to encounter life with sufficient attention that its mystery becomes visible again. The point is not to create another philosophy explaining why existence is sacred. The point is to live in a way that does not require existence to become an abstraction before it can be valued. The point is not to establish another doctrine about the proper way to live. The point is to embody a relationship to life in which each encounter remains capable of wonder.

This is why the recognition of the eight atlases, and seven cages must not end in despair. They are not arguments against life. They are warning against forgetting the conditions of life. To know the cages is to avoid constructing more. To know the atlases is to resist the temptation to invent a ninth atlas merely because the existing eight are uncomfortable. To recognise the limits of existence is not to hate existence. It is to stop confusing limitations with meaninglessness.

Human beings are mortal, embodied, ecologically dependent, historically situated, cognitively limited, and unable to fully penetrate the interiority of other beings. None of these conditions need to be overcome before life can be lived. They are the conditions within which life becomes possible.

Wonesis therefore does not promise to escape from existence. It asks whether humanity can finally learn to inhabit existence consciously. Return to Land is consequently not the end of thought. It is the beginning of a different relationship between thought and life: thought becomes answerable to the conditions that make life possible rather than continually constructing systems that replace those conditions.

Wonesis points toward a life in which the world does not have to become smaller in order for human beings to understand it. The mystery can remain mystery. The unknown can remain

unknown. The living world can remain larger than the concepts used to describe it. And existence can be encountered again and again, not as an old object whose meaning has already been exhausted, but as something newly appearing every *now*.

This is the final movement of Wonesis: not escape from the cages, but consciousness of them; not invention of another atlas, but recognition of the worlds already given; not return to innocence but return with awareness; not transcendence of life, but intimacy with life; not another belief about existence, but a way of being within existence.

The deepest purpose of Wonesis is therefore not merely to survive the collapse of a civilisation.

It is to preserve the possibility that, after seeing what civilisation has done, human beings might still be capable of looking at the world again — and saying: *Life is still here. Let us return to it.*

Know Where You Belong

Wonesis begins with a proposition that is deceptively simple: know where you belong. Not merely where you were born.

Not merely where you hold citizenship.

Not merely where you own property.

Not merely where you have lived for the longest period of your life.

Not merely where a state recognises you as a resident.

Wonesis asks a more fundamental question. *The fundamental question is not who owns the land, who governs the land, or who has lived on the land longest. The fundamental question is: to what living ground is one's existence ancestrally, cosmologically, linguistically, memorially and ethically accountable?*

Within the Lani cosmological vocabulary, this question is approached through the distinction between *Inaorak* and *Kuru*, developed in full etymological and epistemological detail below. This section states what that distinction demands of the living.

Inaorak

Inaorak names a form of belonging constituted through the relationship between *Inawi* and *Worak*. *Inawi* refers to the home, house, land, landscape, forest, mountain, river, lake and wider ecological world within which a particular community exists. *Worak* affirms existence: that which is present, recognised, verified, witnessed and established as real.

Together, *Inaorak* names more than geographical residence. It describes a living cosmological relationship between people and place through which belonging becomes intelligible, remembered and continuously verified. This relationship is carried through language, place names, clan names, tribal names, ancestral genealogies, myths, stories, songs, dances, ceremonial practices, animals, plants, weather, landscapes, sacred places, memories and obligations. The land is not an empty geographical container upon which identity is subsequently placed. It is a living field of relationships within which identity itself becomes possible.

Inaorak therefore cannot be reduced to property. A person may possess a title deed without possessing *Inaorak*. A corporation may purchase an island without inheriting its ancestral memory. A state may

draw a boundary without creating cosmological belonging. A government may recognise citizenship without creating the relationship between a people and the living ground from which that belonging originates. Legal possession and cosmological belonging are not the same thing. The first can be transferred through contracts, laws and markets. The second is constituted through living relationships, memory, responsibility and continuity.

Memory as the Verification of Belonging

This is why memory occupies such a central position within Wonesis. Belonging that cannot be remembered cannot remain fully embodied as living belonging. Memory is not merely storage of information about the past. It is the mechanism through which relationships between people, ancestors, places and generations remain alive in the present. For this reason, memory must be carried — in names, in language, in songs, in stories, in dance, in art and body decoration, in ceremonies, in landscapes and place names, in genealogies, and through the transmission of knowledge from one generation to the next.

Within this framework, *Le'ndawi* — the lamentation or grieving song performed during separation, death and reunion — becomes particularly significant. The lament is not merely an expression of sorrow. It is an act of remembering. Through lamentation, a community can recall who someone was, where they came from, what happened, who was present, what relationships existed, what obligations were carried, and which ancestral and territorial relationships continue beyond the individual life.

Memory therefore does not merely preserve belonging after it has been established. Memory continuously performs belonging. A people remain connected to a place because the relationship continues to be remembered, spoken, sung, performed and transmitted.

Kuru

Against *Inaorak* stands *Kuru*. *Kuru* names the condition of being a guest or outsider in relation to another people's *Inaorak*. It does not necessarily mean that the person has no belonging anywhere. A person may be *Kuru* in relation to one landscape while being *Inaorak* in relation to another. This distinction is therefore relational, not racial: a person's racial identity does not establish *Inaorak*; ancestral, linguistic, mythological, genealogical, territorial and living relational continuity does.

Someone may live within another people's *Inaorak* for generations and still remain *Kuru* in relation to that particular cosmological territory if the living relationship that constitutes *Inaorak* is not theirs. Conversely, someone displaced from their ancestral territory may become *Kuru* in relation to the place where they currently reside while remaining *Inaorak* in relation to the ancestral ground from which their own living memory originates.

The distinction therefore separates residence from belonging. It also separates occupation from relationship. Most importantly, it separates ownership from cosmological jurisdiction. A person may own land without becoming *Inaorak* of that land. A person may live on land without becoming *Inaorak* of that land. A state may administer land without becoming *Inaorak* of that land. A population may occupy a landscape for centuries without time alone resolving the question of cosmological belonging. Time matters, but time by itself does not manufacture ancestral relationship.

Applied concretely: Aboriginal people belonging to their ancestral country are *Inaorak* in relation to that Country. An Aboriginal person from another country living there may be *Kuru* in relation to that particular Country, while remaining *Inaorak* in relation to their own ancestral country. A migrant may be *Kuru* in relation to the country in which they now reside while retaining an *Inaorak* relationship elsewhere. A settler population may have lived somewhere for generations without that automatically transforming historical residence into the original cosmological relationship. A wealthy purchaser can acquire legal title without acquiring *Inaorak*.

Inaorak Cannot Be Purchased

This produces one of the central propositions of Wonesis: money cannot purchase *Inaorak*. A financial transaction can purchase a legal interest in land. It cannot purchase the ancestral memory of the land, the songs attached to its rivers, the names of its mountains, the genealogies that connect people to its places, the stories through which generations have explained their relationship to the landscape, or cosmological accountability itself.

The conversion of land into property therefore does not automatically convert the purchaser into a cosmological member of the land. This is one of the deepest forms of alienation produced by the money system: it transforms a relationship into an asset and then treats possession of the asset as though it were equivalent to belonging. Wonesis refuses this equivalence. Property is not belonging. Citizenship is not belonging. Residence is not necessarily belonging. Possession is not belonging. Capital is not belonging. *Belonging is relationship*.

The Planetary Question

The question now becomes planetary. Humanity has entered a period in which people move across continents, states redraw populations, corporations purchase landscapes, cities absorb migrants, borders shift, Indigenous peoples are displaced from ancestral territories, and millions of people live far from the landscapes from which their own ancestral memories originate. Consequently, the question of belonging can no longer be treated as a marginal philosophical problem. It is becoming one of the central existential questions of the human species.

Who belongs where? What constitutes belonging? Can residence become belonging? Can citizenship become belonging? Can ownership become belonging? Can memory be severed from land and still remain fully alive? Can a people lose their land without losing their *Inaorak*? Can a displaced people recover *Inaorak* after generations of separation? Can people who have never known their ancestral ground establish a new form of belonging without falsely claiming the *Inaorak* of another people?

Wonesis does not answer these questions by creating another universal legal system. It asks humanity first to recognise that the questions exist.

The Wonesis Imperative

As civilisational systems become increasingly unstable, questions of land, identity, territory, migration, ancestry, sovereignty and belonging will become increasingly contested. Wonesis therefore proposes a simple but demanding imperative: know your *Inaorak*.

Know the land from which your belonging originates.

Know the names. Know the language. Know the ancestors.

Know the rivers. Know the mountains. Know the forests.
Know the animals. Know the plants.
Know the stories. Know the songs. Know the ceremonies.
Know the genealogy. Know the memories. Know the obligations.

And if you discover that you are *Kuru* in relation to the land upon which you currently live, do not immediately turn that recognition into shame, hatred or violence. Recognise it. Recognition is the beginning of responsibility.

The purpose of Wonesis is not to create a planetary hierarchy of who is more human and who is less human, nor to declare that one population possesses greater inherent worth than another. The distinction between *Inaorak* and *Kuru* is a distinction of relational position, not human value. Every human being belongs somewhere. The tragedy of modern civilisation is that many people have been separated from the conditions through which that belonging could be remembered, verified and transmitted. Wonesis therefore does not ask who is superior. It asks: what is your relationship to the ground that sustains you?

Beyond the Human

The Wonesis question cannot stop with human beings. Land is not inhabited by humans alone. Rivers, forests, mountains, animals, birds, insects, plants, fungi, waters, weather systems and countless other forms of life participate in the living world within which human existence becomes possible. The human being is therefore not the owner of the planetary system but one participant within it. The question of belonging must consequently expand beyond human genealogy toward ecological relationship.

A river does not become meaningful because a state places it on a map. A forest does not become alive because a corporation grants it economic value. A mountain does not acquire existence because a government recognises it. The living world precedes the administrative categories through which human institutions attempt to organise it. Wonesis therefore begins with Land because Land is where the abstraction of civilisation encounters the irreducibility of existence.

Here the question of belonging becomes reciprocal: if you belong to the land, what does the land require of you? Belonging is therefore not merely a right. It is an obligation. It means protection, memory, reciprocity, transmission and restraint. It means knowing that what sustains your existence must itself be sustained.

Humanity and the Loss of Belonging

Humanity has accumulated extraordinary systems of knowledge, power, technology, finance, religion, philosophy and political organisation. Yet humanity can know more about markets than about the rivers that sustain its drinking water. It can know more about borders than about the ancestral histories of the landscapes those borders divide. It can know more about property than belonging, more about economic growth than ecological continuity, more about managing populations than remembering the ground upon which those populations exist. This is the paradox to which Wonesis responds: the species has become increasingly capable of organising the planet while becoming increasingly uncertain about how to belong to it.

Wonesis therefore offers no ninth atlas. It constructs no eighth civilisation. It proposes no new cage. It does not promise that humanity can transcend mortality, embodiment, ecological dependence or the

mystery of existence. It asks humanity to recognise what already exists: know your Land. Know your memory. Know your belonging. Know whether you are *Inaorak* or *Kuru* in relation to the ground beneath your feet. And then ask the more difficult question — what kind of being must you become if you truly belong there?

This is where Wonesis ultimately moves beyond identity. It moves toward responsibility. To know one's *Inaorak* is to know that belonging is not possession, entitlement, superiority or domination. It is a relationship that must be continually enacted. The deepest Wonesis manifesto is therefore not "this is my land." It is: "*this is the ground to which my existence is accountable*" and that accountability extends beyond the human species.

The purpose of return to Land is not to recreate the past exactly as it was. It is to recover the capacity to live within the present without forgetting the relationships that made the present possible. Humanity does not need another civilisation that promises to conquer existence. It needs a way of being capable of belonging to existence.

Know your *Inaorak*. Respect the *Inaorak* of others. Recognise *Kuru* without turning *Kuru* into hatred. Preserve memory. Protect Land. Transmit what must not disappear. Do not build another cage. Do not manufacture another atlas merely to escape the ones already given.

Return to the living ground. And learn to love life again — this time not innocence, but in consciousness.

The Psycho-Cosmocide Condition: What Wonesis Responds To

The Psycho-Cosmocide framework established the condition this paper responds to. Its full architecture is set out in the companion paper (Kogoya 2026l); what follows is the minimum needed to locate Wonesis within it.

Human existence operates within two cages. The First Cage is existence as given: embodiment, ecological dependence, mortality, time, and death — conditions no civilisation, religion, or technology has abolished, and which Wonesis does not promise to abolish either.

The Second Cage is different. It is not existence, but the civilisational structures built around existence: symbolic systems, institutional conditioning, economic dependencies, colonial classifications, and the accumulated enclosures of meaning through which human beings increasingly encounter reality indirectly rather than directly.

Unlike the First Cage, the Second Cage has a history. It was built through specific myths, legends, stories, memories, symbols, signs, images, colours, grammar, and systems of meaning. Because it was constructed, it can also be recognised. It has names, institutions, managers, CEOs, bosses, owners, capitals, temples, books, infrastructures, soldiers, security forces, priests, lawyers, prophets, engineers, and even slavers who maintain, administer, and reproduce it. This Second Cage does not emerge from existence itself. It is built by human beings, organised through human institutions, and sustained through human participation. For this reason, it can be studied, identified, challenged, and, at least in part, dismantled. Foucault's genealogical analysis of how modern institutions — prisons, schools, hospitals, armies — produce disciplined, surveilled, and categorised subjects illuminates precisely how this

construction operates at the level of the body: the Second Cage is not only a structure of ideas but a structure of practices that shape how human beings move, speak, and understand themselves (Foucault 1977, 135–228).

Among colonised peoples such as those of West Papua, land remains the greatest source of power — one that no civilisational weapon can fully replace. Yet the meaning of land has been systematically redefined. As this redefinition takes hold, people are stripped of the powers, responsibilities, relationships, and forms of belonging that their ancestors once possessed. Rather than remaining grounded in their lands and communities, they are drawn into symbolic kingdoms of representation and administration, where they may be granted titles, offices, and positions of authority but possess no real power over the conditions of their existence.

In this sense, they are transformed into kings and queens of a dying inheritance, governing not a living future but the remnants of worlds that are systematically destroyed.

The CPCV is the mechanism through which the Second Cage reproduces itself across generations, not through force alone but through the *production of consciousness*: each generation inheriting narratives and institutions that normalise the enclosure and obscure its origins (Fanon 1963, 35–106). The accumulated effect of this process, at civilisational scale, is what the Lani tradition names *Maluk Paga* — *Cosmological Anomie*: the condition in which human beings lose their sense of place within existence itself, their sense of obligation to the living world, and their ability to distinguish manufactured reality from the ground of existence (Durkheim 1897 [1997], 246–258; Baudrillard 1994, 1–42).

Lani cosmology from which the framework draws its vocabulary already carries a concrete image of this condition. “Wam’ndanak’me” names a garden whose fence has fallen or been left open, so that it stands accessible to any wandering pig — one’s own, a neighbour’s, or a stranger’s — which enters and feeds without consequence or accountability (Kogoya 2026h).

The image sharpens what *Maluk Paga* names in abstraction: *Cosmological Anomie* is not simply the absence of meaning but the collapse of a boundary that once had to be actively maintained. A mind, like a garden, does not become undefended by a single act of conquest; it becomes undefended when the fence — language, ceremony, genealogy, the transmission of obligation from elder to child — is no longer kept. Once open, it is entered repeatedly by whichever symbolic system, flag, or God happens to pass with an appetite, occupying a space that consequently belongs to no one in particular.

The territorial dispossession *Psycho-Cosmocide* documents is, on this reading, the visible consequence of a prior and less visible event: the Papuan mind became Wam’ndanak’me before Papuan land did (Kogoya 2026h).

This is the condition Wonesis is designed to address. The question it answers is not what is wrong — that has been established. The question is what orientation remains possible for those who still something has to return to, and what the conditions of that return are.

Wone: The Ontological Ground

What Wone Is and Is Not

Wonesis is derived from Wone — the Lani ontological term for the undefinable primordial ground of all reality. Wone cannot be defined.

This is not a limitation of the Lani language or of the framework's descriptive capacity. It is the essential quality of Wone itself: it is what underlies definition, the ground within which all definition occurs, from which all definition is drawn, and to which all definition returns without having captured it. The Lani tradition is explicit when they say we cannot say what Wone is. We can only point to what kinds of Wone have revealed themselves in reality. It is what distinguishes Wone as a philosophical concept from the ideological and theological systems that the Psycho-Cosmocide framework critiques.

This position is philosophically accurate in that it corresponds to what Kant identified as the limit of all determinate knowledge — the recognition that human cognition accesses reality only through the structures of perception and reason it brings to experience, not as the thing-in-itself (Kant 1998, A19/B33). Heidegger's analysis of Dasein — of human existence as fundamentally constituted by its being-in-the-world, always already embedded in a specific situation, language, and horizon of meaning before any act of reflection — provides a further ontological complement: the ground Wone names is not a philosophical abstraction but the always-prior condition of any experience at all (Heidegger 1962, 91–148).

Wone and Other Primordial Concepts

Every major cosmological tradition in human history has pointed toward something structurally similar to Wone: an undefinable primordial ground from which all existence emerges and to which it returns. The Tao of Laozi — the way that cannot be named, whose naming immediately misses it — is perhaps the closest parallel (Slingerland 2003, 12). The Brahman of Advaita Vedanta — the infinite absolute beyond all predication, the ground of all appearance — points in the same direction. The Ein Sof of Jewish mysticism, the Pneuma of Stoic philosophy, and the Qi of Chinese cosmology each gesture toward the same structural recognition: that the ground of existence exceeds the categories available for its description (Wang 2012, 15–42; Onians 1951, 169–173).

What is philosophically significant about Wone is not that it joins this tradition of pointing toward the primordial ground, but what the Lani tradition specifically says: that Wone flows through and within everything that exists — land, community, language, relationship, and living memory — and that human beings are the conscious agents through which Wone translates itself into experience and meaning.

This places on human beings not a claim of cosmic superiority but an obligation of honest transmission. The human being who destroys the living memory through which Wone flows is not merely committing a political or cultural crime; they are participating in the removal of the

channel through which reality itself enters human experience. This is what makes Psycho-Cosmocide, in the Lani understanding, a crime of cosmological magnitude rather than merely a political one.

The Four Manifestations of Wone

Because Wone cannot be defined, the Lani tradition developed a taxonomy of its manifestations — a way of describing not what Wone is but how it reveals itself in specific situations. This taxonomy is itself a philosophical contribution: it demonstrates how a tradition can acknowledge the ineffability of its foundational category while still providing precise analytical tools for understanding how that category operates in practice.

Obelom Wone is the manifestation of sacred order, law, right relationship, and the governance that sustains life. This is structurally similar to what Deborah Bird Rose identifies in Australian Aboriginal thought as the principle of “*nourishing country*” — the reciprocal obligation between people and land that, when maintained with care and justice, sustains both (Rose 1996, 7–29).

Mage Wone is the manifestation of prohibition — the sacred *do not*. It is the dimension of Wone that sets boundaries around what must not be done, said, entered, or touched. Where Obelom Wone affirms what sustains life, Mage Wone draws the line at what destroys it. This is not mere social rule but ontological boundary: the Lani tradition recognises that certain actions violate the structure of reality itself, and Mage Wone is the name for that category of forbidden crossing. It is structurally comparable to what Robin Wall Kimmerer identifies in Potawatomi thought as the *grammar of animacy* — the recognition that the living world carries its own authority, which humans are bound to respect rather than override (Kimmerer 2013, 48–59).

Maluk Wone is the manifestation of disorder — the opposite of Obelom Wone. Where Obelom Wone is the condition of right relationship sustained, Maluk Wone is its negation: the state that prevails when sacred order has been broken, when the obligations of reciprocity between people, land, and cosmological ground have collapsed. Maluk Wone is not merely social dysfunction but a cosmological condition — the lived reality of a world in which the governing structure of Wone has been violated and the consequences of that violation are accumulating. The age of *Cosmological Anomie* — *Maluk Paga* — is an expression of *Maluk Wone* at civilisational scale. The ecological, social, and spiritual crises of the present moment are, within the Lani framework, expressions of Maluk Wone: the consequence of Psycho-Cosmocide playing out across generations (Shiva 1988, 1–17; Fanon 1963, 1–10).

Kurumbi Wone is the manifestation of warning — the signal of approaching danger or threat. It is the dimension of Wone that alerts, that announces that something harmful is near, that calls for vigilance and response before the harm arrives. Where Maluk Wone names the condition of broken order already present, Kurumbi Wone names the warning that precedes it — or that sounds within it, pointing to where the next rupture is forming. In the Lani tradition, to heed

Kurumbi Wone is to act before the danger completes itself. To ignore it is to allow Maluk Wone to deepen. This is structurally comparable to what Vine Deloria Jr. identifies in Indigenous scientific traditions as the capacity to read the living world as a system of signs — warnings embedded in the behaviour of animals, land, weather, and community that, properly attended to, allow a people to navigate threat before it becomes catastrophe (Deloria and Wildcat 2001, 1–22). Powers’s ethnographic account of Oglala Lakota religious life demonstrates in comparable depth how the ceremonial and cosmological dimensions of an Indigenous tradition constitute an entire framework for reading the living world as a communicative order, not merely a physical environment (Powers 1977, 45–90).

Kugi is the manifestation’s necessary inverse: not a fifth mode of Wone but the shapeshifting principle that emerges precisely where Wone has collapsed. Kugi is not an external evil to be defeated. It works through human agency itself.

As the Lani elders teach, *nit ap yi kugi aret* — “we humans are Kugi” — a saying that locates the deepest source of destruction within humanity rather than beyond it. Andrian Wakur, a Lani elder of the Mamit Lani, describes the present condition in these terms (Kogoya 2026m):

“Today, in this world, Kugi — the destructive force — has spread as an uncontrollable disorder throughout the entire world, affecting every species, every organism, every form of matter, and every human being on Earth.”

The relationship between Wone and Kugi is exact and inverse: the more Wone collapses, the more Kugi emerges; the less humanity lives in Wone, the more humanity becomes Kugi. *Maluk Wone* names the state of broken order; *Kugi* names what fills the space that order has vacated. Detection, in the operational grammar developed below, is in the first instance the detection of Kugi — not only in the colonising structure but within the self, the family, and the institutions a people build to survive, including, should the need arise, within Wonesis itself.

Wone Kenok — literally, *because of Wone, something has revealed itself* — completes the sequence, though it is not itself a manifestation of Wone. It names the moment reality discloses a profound disturbance in the order of existence, provoking an existential, intellectual, and moral response. Psycho-Cosmocide, on this account, is not an abstract theory produced from detached observation. It is a reaction to that disclosure — the disclosure the pages that follow are written from.

The Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series takes its name from Kurumbi Wone — the fourth manifestation of Wone, signalling approaching danger or threat. These papers serve that function: they identify emerging dangers before they become irreversible and call for recognition and response while action remains possible. The series is therefore not a brand but a declaration of purpose. To publish in the Kurumbi Wone Series is to place one’s work within a tradition of warning. The Psycho-Cosmocide framework and the body of work that follows belong within this tradition. These writings warn of the continuing destruction of Indigenous cosmologies, memories, relationships to land, and the conditions of meaningful existence. They are Kurumbi Wone made textual. Wone Press carries a complementary

meaning. If the series names the function of the work — warning — Wone Press names its ground. It affirms an orientation toward Wone: sacred order, right relationship, and the cosmological foundations through which the Lani people understand reality. Publishing under Wone Press is therefore not merely an academic act but an act of orientation toward order in a time of disorder. Together, Kurumbi Wone Series and Wone Press form a single statement: these writings warn, and they warn from within Wone. The warning is not issued from outside the crisis but from within the living tradition that the crisis threatens.

Inaorak And Kuru: A Philosophy of Belonging

Etymology and Definition: Inaorak

The word *Inaorak* is a compound derived from two root words in the Lani language. The first root is *Inawi*, meaning home, house, land, space, ecology, geography, landscape, and area — not merely as physical terrain but as the living totality in which memories, songs, stories, myths, legends, and identities are embedded, and within which animals, nature, and all living beings are held together as one relational whole. *Inawi* is not property. It is not territory in the colonial-legal sense. It is the cosmological home — the particular place in which a people's entire meaningful existence is rooted and from which it cannot be separated without fundamental loss.

The second root is *Orak*, derived from *Worak*, meaning exist, verified, valid, proven, testified, and agreed — and crucially, cannot be disputed. *Worak* carries the weight of absolute, multi-dimensional consensus: not merely human agreement but the agreement of ancestors, beings, creatures, spirits, gods, winds, natures, and animals — the entire living and ancestral order — all confirming, all testifying, that this particular forest, this land, this space, this home belongs to this particular people.

Inaorak therefore means: the people whose belonging to a particular land, ecology, and cosmological home have been verified, testified, and agreed upon by the entirety of existence — by the living, the dead, the spiritual, and the ancestral order together.

It is belonging that cannot be disputed because it was never merely declared by humans alone. It was confirmed by everything that exists.

This is why the destruction of *Inaorak* through Psycho-Cosmocide is not simply dispossession in the legal or political sense. It is the attempted destruction of a verification that the entire cosmos has already made.

How Cosmological Verification Works

The concept of *Inaorak* belonging — verified by ancestors, spirits, animals, winds, and the living cosmological order rather than by legal title or political declaration — will strike readers operating within post-Enlightenment epistemological frameworks as philosophically undefended. This section defends it directly. The challenge has three dimensions: whether cosmological verification is epistemologically coherent in its own terms; how it differs from

legal title, ethnicity, and race as modes of determining belonging; and why the framework insists on its primacy.

The epistemological objection to cosmological verification typically takes this form: how can the testimony of ancestors, spirits, animals, and winds constitute valid evidence for any philosophical claim?

This objection is coherent within a framework that restricts the category of valid evidence to empirically observable, individually falsifiable phenomena. But the Wonesis framework does not operate within that restriction, and it has no obligation to accept it — because that restriction is itself a product of a particular, historically situated epistemological tradition, not a universal standard.

Santos’s concept of the “ecology of knowledges” provides the starting point: different knowledge systems have different internal standards of validity, and the epistemological authority of one tradition cannot be used to dismiss the internal coherence of another without first demonstrating that the dismissing tradition’s standards are themselves universally binding — which no tradition has been able to demonstrate on grounds that do not presuppose its own authority (Santos 2014, 188–212).

The Wonesis framework does not ask post-Enlightenment epistemology to adopt cosmological verification as its own standard. It asks only that it recognise cosmological verification as internally coherent within the framework that produces it.

Internal coherence, within the Lani cosmological framework, is demonstrated by the relationship between *Worak* — the concept of verification — and the observable, lived reality of the community’s relationship to its landscape. Cosmological verification is not a claim about invisible metaphysical entities alone. It is a claim about the accumulated, transmitted, enacted, and witnessed relationship between a specific people and a specific place across time. The ancestors who verify are the same ancestors whose bones are in the ground, whose ceremonies shaped the landscape, whose ecological knowledge made the land inhabitable across generations. The animals whose presence confirms belonging are the same animals whose habits are encoded in the community’s language, ceremonial calendar, and food systems. The winds whose movements are read as testimony are the same winds that determine the seasonal patterns of agriculture, movement, and ceremony.

What the Lani framework calls cosmological verification is, in this sense, also an account of long-term ecological co-constitution: the relationship between a community and its landscape that is so old, so deep, and so thoroughly encoded in every dimension of the community’s life that the landscape itself bears witness to the relationship. Robin Wall Kimmerer’s account of how Indigenous botanical knowledge encodes a relationship to specific plants that Western science is only beginning to recognise as ecologically sophisticated is directly relevant here: what the Western tradition reads as metaphor or spirituality is often a precise, transmitted, ecologically grounded form of knowledge (Kimmerer 2013, 48–59).

How Inaorak Differs from Legal Title

Legal title is a record of a transaction: a document that asserts, within a particular legal system, that a particular entity has the right to exclusive use of a defined area of land. It is produced by a human institution, enforced by human power, and can be transferred, sold, voided, or forged. It makes no claim about the relationship between the titleholder and the land other than the legal one. Legal title can be held by someone who has never visited the land, has no knowledge of its ecology, speaks none of the languages that name its features, and carries none of the memory that connects any living community to its specific history. Legal title is, in the Wonesis framework's terms, a Kuru relationship to land formalised as law.

Inaorak, by contrast, is not a record of a transaction. It is a description of a constitutive relationship: the condition of a community whose identity, memory, language, ceremony, ecological knowledge, and cosmological orientation have been formed by and remain inseparable from a specific landscape.

Inaorak cannot be transferred, because the transfer of a relationship constituted across generations is not a legal or commercial act — it is a cosmological impossibility.

You cannot sell a people's ancestral memory. You can only destroy it.

How Inaorak Differs from Ethnicity and Race

This distinction is critical, because both ethnicity and race are categories that can be used to make claims about belonging that the Wonesis framework explicitly does not endorse. Race is a biological fiction constructed by colonial science to justify hierarchies of human worth: it assigns belonging based on inherited physical characteristics that have no cosmological content whatsoever. Ethnicity is a somewhat more complex category — it refers to shared cultural, linguistic, and ancestral identity — but as it is typically deployed in political and legal discourse, it is a static identity label that can persist long after the living practice that generated it has been severed.

A person can identify ethnically with Lani while speaking no Lani language, maintaining no ceremonial connection to Lani land, and carrying none of the ecological knowledge that constitutes Lani *Inaorak* belonging. Ethnicity, in that condition, is a cultural memory without living practice.

Inaorak, by contrast, is not a label. It is not an identity that can be asserted in the absence of the living relationship it describes. It is constituted by the ongoing, transmitted, enacted relationship between a community and its specific ground — and it diminishes, and ultimately dissolves when that relationship is severed.

This is precisely why the Wonesis framework insists on the urgency of transmission: *Inaorak* belonging is not preserved by ethnic identity alone. It is preserved only through living practice on living land, transmitted to living people who carry it forward.

The moment of severance is not preserved by nostalgia. It is healed only by return.

Etymology and Definition: Kuru

Kuru carries two distinct meanings within the Lani cosmological framework, and the distinction between them is philosophically and morally fundamental.

Kuru I — The Welcomed Guest

The first meaning of *Kuru* refers to a person or people who enter, are received, welcomed, and accepted into another people's Inaorak — temporarily or permanently — while their own Inaorak remains elsewhere. The Kuru in this sense is not homeless. They carry their own Inaorak within them. They know where they come from, where their cosmological home is, who their ancestors are, and what land has verified their belonging. They come as visitors, as those seeking shelter, as hunters passing through, as those who have been invited to stay — short term or long term — and they are received with full recognition of who they are and where they truly belong.

This form of Kuru is not loss. It is relationships. It is the Lani tradition's recognition that people move, that hospitality is sacred, that another people's Inaorak can hold you without becoming yours, and that you can be genuinely welcomed into a place without that place erasing where you came from.

The Kuru in this sense honours both the host's Inaorak and the guest's Inaorak simultaneously. It is a cosmological arrangement of mutual recognition.

Kuru II — The Violating Presence

The second meaning of *Kuru* refers to an entirely different condition — one that carries no welcome, no recognition, and no reciprocity. This is the Kuru produced by colonisation and civilisational conquest: the uninvited entry into another people's Inaorak by force, without permission, without cosmological connection, without acknowledgement of whose land it is, and without any intention of honouring the verification that the entire ancestral and natural order has already made.

This Kuru does not come as a guest. It comes as a violator. It does not ask for it to be received. It takes. It does not carry its own Inaorak humbly alongside the host's. It attempts to erase the host's Inaorak entirely and replace it with its own system of ownership, law, and meaning.

This second Kuru is what Psycho-Cosmocide enacts at its deepest level. It is not merely political occupation or legal dispossession. It is a cosmological violation — the forcing of an uninvited, unverified, unrecognised presence into a space whose belonging has already been confirmed by ancestors, spirits, animals, winds, and the entire living order. It is the entry of those who have no *Worak* — no verification, no testimony, no agreement from the cosmos — into a place whose Inaorak is absolute.

The Moral Distinction

The two meanings of Kuru together reveal something the Lani tradition understood with great precision: the difference between movement and violation, between hospitality and conquest, between a guest who knows they are a guest and an occupier who pretends the host never existed.

The first Kuru preserves Inaorak — both the guest's and the hosts. The second Kuru destroys it. The first Kuru is a relationship between two cosmologically grounded peoples. The second Kuru is the attempt to produce cosmological homelessness in a people who were, and remain, fully verified in their belonging.

This distinction is one the colonial legal and political tradition has never been able to make — because making it would require acknowledging that the verification of Indigenous belonging precedes, exceeds, and cannot be overridden by any colonial law, treaty, or declaration.

Inaorak: Belonging Constituted by Living Memory

The Wonesis framework introduces two philosophical categories — *Inaorak* and *Kuru* — to address the question of legitimate belonging with the precision it requires. These are not ethnic classifications, legal designations, or political judgements. They are ontological descriptions of the relationship between human communities and the landscapes they inhabit. As such, they operate at a level of philosophical analysis that the existing literature on belonging, place, and territory has not fully reached — though it has pointed in this direction.

Inaorak designates the condition of belonging to a landscape that is constituted by living memory. An Inaorak people is one whose ancestral connection to a specific territory is carried through continuous, living transmission: through the symbols, myths, songs, stories, genealogies, ceremonies, language, and daily practices that keep that connection alive as an active present reality rather than a historical record.

In the Wone framework, Inaorak belonging is the condition in which Wone flows through a specific community via its living relationship with a specific landscape. The memory is the channel. When the memory is severed — through the destruction of language, the suppression of ceremony, the erasure of cosmological frameworks — the channel is broken.

This is why the Psycho-Cosmocide analysis identifies memory destruction as the primary mechanism of colonial violence. Physical dispossession seizes the land. Psycho-Cosmocide seizes the memory that constitutes the ontological connection to the land. Linda Tuhiwai Smith's foundational analysis demonstrates how research itself has historically functioned as a mechanism of this seizure — the colonisation of Indigenous knowledge, its extraction into Western institutional archives, and its removal from the living communities that generated it (Smith 1999, 1–17). Paul Ricoeur's philosophical analysis of memory and forgetting provides the conceptual framework for understanding what is at stake: memory is not merely a record of

the past but the medium through which identity — individual and collective — is constituted and sustained across time (Ricoeur 2004, 85–132).

When memory is destroyed, it is not history that is lost. It is the ontological medium through which a people's connection to its landscape is actively sustained.

Inaorak identity carries obligations as well as rights. An *Inaorak* people is simply not entitled to a landscape. It is obligated to it: to maintain right relationship with the land, to transmit the memory forward rather than allowing it to dissolve, to exercise the stewardship that Obelom Wone requires. This obligation is constitutive of what *Inaorak* belonging means. A community that abandons these obligations does not merely fail in its duties. It progressively loses the quality of its *Inaorak* connection. This is structurally analogous to what Coulthard identifies as the ethical substance of grounded normativity: it is not merely a claim but a practice, not merely a right but a responsibility (Coulthard 2014, 60–79).

Cosmobian Kuru and Civilisational Kuru

Kuru designates the structural position of those whose presence on a landscape is not constituted by living ancestral memory of that landscape. It is a description of a relational position, not a permanent condition of inferiority or illegitimacy. The critical distinction within *Kuru* is between honest acknowledgement of the nature of one's presence and the fabrication or amplification of *Inaorak* claims that do not genuinely exist.

Civilisational *Kuru* designates colonial formations backed by state power, legal systems, and ideological constructions that actively deny the validity of *Inaorak* memory as a form of title while simultaneously constructing their own manufactured memory-claims to justify occupation and extraction. Patrick Wolfe's analysis of settler colonialism as a structure rather than an event is directly relevant here: settler colonial formations do not merely occupy territory but systematically replace the Indigenous presence that would constitute an *Inaorak* claim on that territory (Wolfe 2006, 387–409).

The weaponisation of memory is the most sophisticated mechanism of Psycho-Cosmocide. Because genuine *Inaorak* belonging is constituted by living memory, fabricated memory that mimics the structure of living memory is extraordinarily effective as a tool of dispossession.

The most powerful lie is the one that borrows its structure from the deepest truth.

Ricoeur's analysis of how political actors manipulate collective memory — producing what he terms “*commanded memory*” — illuminates the mechanism through which this fabrication operates at the institutional and civilisational scale (Ricoeur 2004, 448–461).

Inaorak and Kuru Across the World

Why These Cases, and What They Demonstrate

Before examining specific cases, it is important to clarify the scope of this comparative survey.

Inaorak and Kuru are not analytical concepts borrowed from political science, international law or comparative land policy. They are Lani cosmological terms developed within a specific tradition's understanding of what constitutes legitimate belonging to a landscape. This belonging is carried and verified through living memory, ancestral continuity, language, ceremony and cosmological relationships rather than documents, borders or state recognition. The purpose of applying these terms to such different contexts — including West Papua, Melanesia, Australia, Indonesia, Europe, China, Singapore, North Korea, Africa and Israel-Palestine — is not to conduct a comparative analysis of each region's land law or political economy. Instead, the aim is to demonstrate that the Lani distinction between Inaorak (belonging constituted by living memory) and Kuru (presence not so constituted) highlights a phenomenon that colonisation and decolonisation, in their various institutional forms, continue to perpetuate worldwide: the creation, dispute, and suppression of legitimate land ownership.

The Psycho-Cosmocide paradigm identifies this pattern as being of civilisational scope. The Cosmobian and Synthobian distinction names this pattern at the level of two fundamentally different modes of existence: one constituted through the living relationships that Inaorak names, and the other through abstract, administrative and often extractive relationships that produce Kuru status, even among those who feel entitled to belong. Each case below is presented as an application of the Inaorak/Kuru lens, demonstrating the concept's explanatory power across diverse political and economic systems, rather than as an independent empirical claim with the same evidentiary weight as a specialist study in comparative land law, political economy, or regional history.

Readers seeking the empirical detail behind any particular case are directed to the specialist literature cited within each subsection. This paper asks to be evaluated on its claim about the mechanism: how power converts Inaorak into Kuru and how living memory can resist that conversion. The specific empirical details of any one state's current land law or economic policy lie outside this paper's disciplinary scope, but are cited, where relevant, to more specialised sources.

Two Systems of Law Over the Same Ground

Every piece of land on this planet is currently governed by at least two competing law systems operating simultaneously.

The *first* is the law written on paper, enforced by men with guns, and institutionalised through the state apparatus: constitutions, property titles, treaties, international agreements, regional governance structures, and the entire civilisational legal architecture that determines who may

access land, on what terms, and with what protections. This is second-cage law — manufactured, contingent, and ultimately sustained by the concentration of force that backs it.

The *second* is the law carried in stories, songs, myths, legends, images, symbols, signs, drawings, and living memory: the cosmobian law of *Inaorak* belonging, which preceded the state, which was not invented by any legislature, and which in many cases remains partially alive in the communities that carry it.

Roger Maaka and Augie Fleras identify this dual-system reality as constitutive of the political situation of Indigenous peoples globally: they operate simultaneously within state legal frameworks that deny or minimise their prior claims, and within their own prior law systems that these frameworks have never extinguished (Maaka and Fleras 2005, 73–98).

It is critical within the Lani cosmological framework, as employed in Psycho-Cosmocide Studies, to understand that every human being living on any land on Earth can be understood as either Inaorak or Kuru. These categories do not primarily refer to race, ethnicity, nationality, or legal citizenship. Rather, they describe fundamentally different modes of relationship between human beings and the land upon which they live. For example, in the context of the Australian continent, the Inaorak are the original Cosmobian societies whose languages, myths, stories, songs, symbols, ceremonies, dances, arts, dreams, genealogies, and collective memories emerge from and remain inseparable from the specific landscapes they inhabit. Their claim to the land is not founded upon purchase, conquest, administration, or legal title alone, but upon a continuous body of memory transmitted across generations. Within the Lani framework, this continuity of memory constitutes the primary basis through which Inaorak status is established. The concept of Inaorak is therefore not merely a territorial claim but an ontological condition. People become Inaorak because they can demonstrate, through accumulated and intergenerational memory, a living relationship with a particular landscape that precedes and grounds their existence within it. The land is remembered through language, story, ceremony, genealogy, and cosmological knowledge. In this sense, Inaorak identity is validated not by external institutions but by the depth, continuity, and integrity of collective memory.

The Lani principle is not limited to the peoples of New Guinea or Australia. It can be applied universally. The fundamental question it poses to every human being is this: What is the basis of your belonging to the land upon which you stand? Is your presence grounded in an inherited continuum of memory connecting you to that landscape through generations of stories, language, ancestors, and cosmological relationships? Or is the land primarily understood as a possession, an asset, or a location whose significance is defined by economic and legal value alone? Within the Lani cosmological framework, the answer to this question determines whether one's relationship to the land approximates the condition of Inaorak or that of Kuru. Within the Lani cosmological framework, acceptance into the community of an Inaorak does not automatically make one Inaorak. A person may be welcomed, adopted, respected, married into the community, or even entrusted with responsibilities, yet the deeper question concerns the location of one's ancestral memory. Inaorak status is not merely a matter of residence, citizenship, legal recognition, or social

acceptance. It is rooted in a continuous chain of stories, myths, songs, dances, genealogies, place-names, ceremonies, and collective memories that bind people to a particular landscape across generations.

For this reason, a person whose ancestral memories originate elsewhere cannot simply become Inaorak in the fullest cosmological sense. Their stories belong to a different Inaorak, a different ancestral landscape, and a different chain of memory. Over successive generations, however, descendants may come to inherit memories from both their ancestral homeland and the land upon which they now live. By the coexistsor fifth generation, a more complex relationship may emerge in which multiple streams of memory coexist within a single lineage. Even then, the question of cosmological belonging remains tied to the continuity and integrity of those memories.

The complete loss of ancestral memory represents a far deeper condition. When the stories, myths, songs, genealogies, ceremonies, and cosmological relationships that connect people to their ancestral landscape disappear, human beings lose more than territory. They lose their cosmological home. In the language of Psycho-Cosmocide Studies, they become cosmologically homeless. Within this framework, home is not defined primarily by houses, property titles, walls, or economic ownership. Home is where stories live. It is where songs are remembered, where myths explain the landscape, where dances embody collective memory, where families transmit ancestral knowledge, where water, fire, animals, plants, and places participate in a shared cosmological order. A dwelling without these relationships may provide shelter, but it does not necessarily constitute a home in the cosmological sense.

Thus, Psycho-Cosmocide is not merely the destruction of land, culture, or identity. It is the destruction of the memory systems through which human beings know where they belong in the universe. When those memory systems collapse, people may continue to occupy physical space yet remain fundamentally displaced from their cosmological home.

When reading the case studies that follow, it is useful to interpret them through the conceptual lens of the Lani cosmological framework and the broader theoretical perspective of Psycho-Cosmocide Studies. The central question is not merely who occupies a particular territory, but how different populations relate to that territory through memory, story, language, genealogy, cosmology, and intergenerational continuity. The distinction between Inaorak and Kuru provides an analytical tool for examining the varying degrees to which peoples remain connected to, displaced from, or severed from the memory systems that historically anchored them to specific landscapes.

These cases are not simply political, historical, or demographic accounts. They are illustrations of different patterns of cosmological continuity, disruption, displacement, and recovery.

Australia

Lost Window, Surviving Memory

Australia represents a case in which the primary window for *Inaorak cosmobian land* defence has already closed.

The period from approximately 1788 to 1900 was the critical window — the span within which the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, as the *Inaorak* custodians of the Australian continent, might have been able to mount a collective territorial defence sufficient to preserve the cosmobian land system. That window was lost through a combination of military force, epidemic disease, the systematic destruction of Aboriginal governance structures, and the legal fiction of *terra nullius*, which declared the continent legally empty and therefore available for Civilisational *Kuru* occupation (Wolfe 2006, 388–392).

The modern Australian state has enacted legal mechanisms — Native Title, land rights legislation, heritage protection frameworks — that nominally acknowledge the *Inaorak* claims of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. The Truth and Reconciliation processes of related settler colonial states demonstrate what such acknowledgement can and cannot accomplish: they can produce recognition without restitution, validation without material return, and records without living restoration (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada 2015, 1–10). These mechanisms operate within the second-cage legal system of the *Kuru* state. They can grant access to land while simultaneously being incapable of restoring the cosmological meaning-making structure that makes the land alive as *Inaorak ontological ground* being and space rather than merely as designated territory.

The entire system through which the land was meaningful — the song lines, the ceremonial obligations, the kinship maps, the Dreaming tracks, the specific ecological knowledge encoded in hundreds of distinct languages — has been systematically destroyed. Deborah Bird Rose's analysis of the deep ontological structure of Aboriginal relationships to country demonstrates precisely what this destruction means: not the loss of cultural forms but the severing of the relational ontology through which land and people constituted each other (Rose 1996, 7–44).

Legal access to land without the living memory that makes it *Inaorak* ground is not restoration. It is a bureaucratic gesture toward a condition that the bureaucracy itself lacks the tools to recover.

Wonesis for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in this context means: the preservation and transmission of whatever living memory remains, even in fragments, as the foundation from which any future recovery must be built. Where language still lives, it must be transmitted. Where ceremony still exists, it must be practised. Where knowledge of the land is still held by elders, it must be recorded and passed forward. Simpson's account of Indigenous resurgence — the daily, unglamorous, intergenerational work of keeping alive what the colonial system sought to extinguish — is the closest scholarly framework to what Wonesis names as the minimum viable act of *Inaorak* survival (Simpson 2017, 38–60).

Melanesia

The Window Is Still Open, but Barely

Melanesian countries — Papua New Guinea, Vanuatu, Fiji, Solomon Islands, and others — occupy a critically different position. Most cosmobian Melanesian communities retain significant living memory of their ancestral land systems. The Inaorak connection — expressed through language diversity, customary land tenure, oral tradition, ceremony, and ecological knowledge — is more intact in Melanesia than almost anywhere else on earth.

The window for Inaorak land protection is still open. This is precisely what makes the current moment so urgent and so dangerous.

The primary threat to Melanesian *Inaorak* land systems is not external military force but internal leadership hunger for money and power. D. K. Feil's analysis of Highland New Guinea societies demonstrates the long history of competitive exchange systems that structured relations between groups; what the present moment has introduced is the conversion of those competitive dynamics into individual accumulation within a global money system that has no reciprocal obligation to the land or community from which its materials are extracted (Feil 1987, 95–130). Governments whose officials are willing to sell customary land to foreign corporations and sovereign wealth funds, communities whose members are desperate enough for immediate income to lease or sell land that their descendants will need, and the systematic seduction of young people away from cosmobian land systems and into the urban cash economy — these are the mechanisms through which the Melanesian window is closing.

Wonesis for Melanesian cosmobian societies means defending the land systems that remain intact, resisting the conversion of customary land tenure into individual property titles that can be sold, and maintaining the political and legal structures — however imperfect — that protect collective Inaorak land from conversion into a commodity.

Any state government in this region that uses its power to protect ancient cosmobian land systems is performing its highest possible function. Any government that sells that land to foreign interests is performing the most complete form of civilisational betrayal available to it.

West Papua

Four Lost Windows and a Closing Fifth

West Papua is the most urgent and the most specific case this framework must address.

The Papuan peoples are the *Inaorak custodians* of one of the most biodiverse and cosmologically rich landscapes on earth. Their living memory of that landscape — expressed through hundreds of distinct languages, through elaborate ceremonial systems, through ecological knowledge accumulated over tens of thousands of years, through cosmological frameworks of profound sophistication — constitutes one of the deepest *Inaorak* connections on the planet. And it is being systematically destroyed.

The *Inaorak/Kuru* analysis of West Papua identifies four historical windows of collective Inaorak defense that were missing.

The first window was in the 1960s, when Indonesian incorporation through the New York Agreement and the Act of Free Choice — a process of manufactured consent involving 1,025 hand-picked representatives — was imposed over Papuan Inaorak sovereignty (Saltford 2003, 127–175). The three subsequent windows — consolidation in the 1970s, brief international attention in the 1980s, before and during the Special Autonomy framework of the 2000s — each closed without the Inaorak claim being secured.

The fifth window is closing now — faster than any previous one.

Papuan peoples are not only subjected to the full machinery of Indonesian Civilisational Kuru — military presence, transmigration, resource extraction, administrative division, and the systematic replacement of Papuan cosmological frameworks with Indonesian national identity — but are simultaneously distracted by the spectacle of the sinking ship at its most seductive: consumer goods, instant media, religious entertainment, and the promise of individual advancement within the system that is consuming them (Kogoya 2025). If the Papuan peoples do not act from their *collective Inaorak* claim now — with whatever unity is achievable across the diversity of tribes, languages, and regional interests that constitute Papuan society — the Psycho-Cosmocide framework interprets the probable trajectory as leading not merely to political defeat but to what this framework terms ontological extinction: a condition in which a people become Kuru on their own ancestral ground, stripped of the living memory that once constituted their Inaorak belonging.

The loss would be not only territorial but existential, involving the erosion of the relationships, memories, and responsibilities that connect a people to their land.

Within the Psycho-Cosmocide framework, this process is often described through the metaphor of “*Jakarta’s instant two-minute noodles politics*.” The metaphor refers to forms of political engagement that prioritise immediate rewards and short-term gratification while diverting attention from the long-term defence of land, memory, and future generations. In such a condition, people become preoccupied with competing for limited and immediate gains while the deeper foundations of collective existence continue to weaken.

The result is a gradual displacement of long-term responsibility by short-term incentives, leaving the ultimate home ‘*Land*’ unattended and defenseless.

Indonesia

A Meta-Civilisational Imposition

Indonesia as a political formation is among the most structurally vulnerable nation-states in the contemporary world, and the Inaorak/Kuru analysis explains why.

The Indonesian state is a meta-civilisational structure — a political and administrative architecture imposed across more than 17,000 islands, hundreds of distinct ethnic groups,

thousands of tribes and clans, and hundreds of living languages, each of which carries within it the Inaorak memory of a specific cosmopolitan people connected to a specific landscape. Anibal Quijano's analysis of the colonality of power illuminates the mechanism: colonial structures do not disappear with formal independence but reorganise themselves through the new state apparatus, which continues to operate the logic of extraction and hierarchisation under national rather than colonial legitimisation (Quijano 2000, 533–580).

Within the Inaorak/Kuru analytical framework, the Indonesian state can be read as a Civilisational Kuru project — specifically, as a structure in which Javanese cultural and administrative norms have been generalised across an archipelago of distinct cosmopolitan peoples, each with their own Inaorak identities, land systems, and cosmological frameworks. This is not a universal historical verdict on Indonesia or its peoples; it is an interpretation produced by applying the framework's specific analytical categories to the structure of the Indonesian state.

Wonesis for the cosmopolitan societies within Indonesia means, at the most basic level, the recognition that the Indonesian state is not their *Inaorak home*. It is a cage built around and over their Inaorak homes. The most coherent Wonesis direction for these communities is the recovery of their specific ancestral land systems — the active maintenance of the Inaorak knowledge, language, ceremony, and land relationship that constitutes their actual belonging, beneath and alongside whatever administrative framework currently governs them.

What political arrangements ultimately serve or obstruct that recovery — whether through reform within the existing state, through federal restructuring, through international legal mechanisms, or through other configurations that history and political will may produce — is a question the Wonesis framework does not resolve. Wonesis is not a political programme and does not prescribe the dissolution or preservation of any state. It identifies the cosmological direction: the recovery of Inaorak belonging. The political architecture through which that recovery becomes possible belongs to each people, in each specific historical moment, to determine for themselves.

Europe

Original Inaorak Destroyed from Within

The Inaorak/Kuru analysis of Europe is among the most counterintuitive produced by this framework, because it requires acknowledging that the peoples who launched the dominant Civilisational Kuru project across the globe were themselves, historically, Inaorak peoples whose own cosmopolitan connection to their European landscapes were systematically destroyed.

Within this framework's interpretive lens, the destruction occurred primarily through the expansion of Roman imperial civilisation, and subsequently through the imposition of Christianity, which — this framework argues — deliberately targeted and erased the pre-Christian cosmopolitan traditions of European peoples as heresy, witchcraft, and paganism. George Tinker's analysis of how missionary Christianity functioned as an instrument of cultural

genocide — developed in the North American context — applies structurally, from this perspective to the longer and more thorough earlier operation within Europe itself (Tinker 1993, 1–20).

What the British did to Aboriginal Australians in two centuries, Rome and Christianity did to the Celtic, Germanic, Norse, Slavic, and other pre-Roman European peoples over twenty centuries. The destruction was so complete, and so long ago, that most contemporary European descendants cannot trace a living Inaorak connection to their ancestral landscapes.

Wonesis for European-descended peoples in severely individualised industrial societies means the deliberate construction of a new cosmobian formation from the ground up — the slow, intergenerational work of developing the cultural and relational bonds that begin to constitute a new form of belonging.

This is not a recovery of a lost Inaorak connection but the construction of a new one, which will require generations to achieve any depth.

China, Singapore, North Korea

Civilisational States

China represents a case of a highly developed civilisational state with deep historical continuity — one that has the institutional capacity, the resource base, and the political structure to provide a degree of stability and coherence through civilisational collapse that most other states cannot match.

From within the Inaorak/Kuru framework, Han Chinese civilisation constitutes a complex layered case: the dominant Han identity has itself, through its own centuries of imperial consolidation, absorbed and marginalised dozens of cosmobian peoples within the Chinese geographical territory — Tibetans, Uyghurs, Mongols, and many smaller groups — whose Inaorak claims to specific landscapes remain alive but are, this framework argues, actively suppressed by the civilisational state. For these cosmobian peoples within China, Wonesis means the same thing it means anywhere: preserve the living memory, maintain the language, resist the erasure of the cosmological connection to the land. Quijano's analysis of the colonality of power — the way colonial structures persist through new administrative arrangements — is directly applicable here: the mechanism of suppression changes form but the structure of dispossession remains (Quijano 2000, 533–580).

For Han Chinese people whose cosmobian roots are distant but not entirely extinguished — whose ancestral connection to specific Chinese landscapes is partially preserved in family genealogies, regional dialects, local ceremonies, and agricultural traditions — Wonesis means recognising that the civilisational state's capacity to provide stability is finite and resource-dependent. China's current economic model is itself on global life support through resource extraction. When the global resource extraction system on which that model depends enters crisis, the civilisational state's capacity to buffer its population from the conditions of the first

cage will diminish. For any cosmobian-descended Chinese person who retains access to ancestral land, the Wonesis direction is clear: protect and maintain that access now, before the crisis forces the question.

Singapore and North Korea represent the two extreme poles of civilisational state control over land access. Singapore has achieved near-total state monopoly over land, converting it entirely into a managed asset class within a hyper-developed urban economy. Individual access to land as a biological and cosmological ground — as distinct from housing as a commodity — has been almost entirely eliminated. North Korea maintains a different form of total state control, in which land is collectivised and individual or community Inaorak relationships to specific landscapes are suppressed by the political apparatus.

In both cases, the Wonesis direction for individuals and families is the same: seek access to land — wherever geographically possible, whether inside or outside the state's territory — as the foundation of survival that no state system, however stable it currently appears, can guarantee across the timeframe of civilisational collapse.

Africa

Cosmopian Richness Under Elite Threat

Africa presents perhaps the most paradoxical picture in the global Inaorak/Kuru analysis. It is simultaneously the continent where cosmopian land systems, living languages, and ancestral memory are most broadly intact — where the Inaorak connection between peoples and their specific landscapes is still alive across large populations — and the continent where the institutional mechanisms threatening that connection are most nakedly predatory.

The greatest threat to African Inaorak land systems is not external imperial force, though that remains present. It is the African state elites who inherited the administrative structures invented by European colonial powers — borders drawn without reference to Inaorak territorial boundaries, governance systems designed to extract rather than to protect — and who operate those structures primarily to enrich themselves and to facilitate the sale of African resources, including land, to foreign interests.

The African state, in the Inaorak/Kuru framework, is broadly a Kuru structure imposed on Inaorak landscapes. Its borders are Kuru borders. Its governance frameworks are Kuru frameworks. And the elites who run it — educated within the second cage, oriented toward global capital markets, and incentivised by the same money system that is purchasing the world's Inaorak ground — are performing the same function that colonially-formed elites perform everywhere: administering the dispossession of their own peoples in the language of development, modernisation, and national interest. This mechanism is precisely what Fanon identified as the pitfall of national consciousness: the national bourgeoisie inheriting the administrative structure of the colonial state and deploying it in the service of the same extractive logic under a new flag (Fanon 1963, 148–205). Tinker's analysis of how missionary conquest dismantled Indigenous governance structures — replacing them with forms of

authority that served colonial rather than community interests — provides the structural genealogy of how this administrative inheritance was produced (Tinker 1993, 21–75).

Wonesis for African cosmopolitan communities means defending the living Inaorak land systems that remain — resisting the conversion of communal land tenure into individual titles that can be sold, maintaining the political and social structures through which Inaorak memory is transmitted, and resisting the pull of the sinking ship at a moment when its lights are visible to every young person across the continent. Smith's analysis of how research and knowledge extraction have historically served the dispossession of Indigenous peoples is directly applicable to the African context: the academic, legal, and institutional infrastructure of the global knowledge economy serves the same function in Africa that it serves everywhere — extracting value from Inaorak communities and converting it into assets owned by those who control the global money system (Smith 1999, 1–28).

Israel and Palestine

When Power Determines the Outcome

The Israel-Palestine conflict is the case that most directly exposes the limits of the Inaorak/Kuru framework as a tool of political resolution — and the most direct demonstration of a truth the framework cannot avoid: in the final analysis, it is not who is right that determines the outcome. It is who has power.

Power here is not only physical military force, though military force is its most visible expression. Power is also, at its deepest level, the metaphysical values that bond a people internally and make their power engine resistant to external pressure — the degree of internal trust, cohesion, shared meaning, and willingness to sacrifice that transforms a population into a resilient collective. Power is the myths, stories, culture, language, and symbols that sustain that internal cohesion across generations. And power is the coordinated capacity for organised physical defence and political action.

But perhaps most importantly: power is trust. A community that trusts itself, its leadership, and its shared memory can sustain collective action under conditions that destroy communities without that trust. This is precisely what Ibn Khaldun's analysis of *asabiyyah* demonstrates: group solidarity is the engine of collective survival, and its degradation is the mechanism of civilisational decline (Ibn Khaldun 1958, 249–315).

The Palestinian case demonstrates with particular sharpness what happens when external attack produces so much internal wounding that communities begin to consume themselves rather than face the external threat together. This is not a moral judgement. It is an analysis of what sustained Psycho-Cosmocide does to a community's capacity for collective self-defence: it destroys the internal trust that makes collective action possible, and in doing so achieves through internal fragmentation what it could not achieve through external force alone.

This dynamic — external pressure producing internal fragmentation, which then reduces the capacity to resist further external pressure — is not unique to the Palestinian situation. It is a structural feature of what happens to any Inaorak people subjected to sustained civilisational attack without sufficient internal cohesion to resist it.

Papuans know this dynamic well. So do Aboriginal Australians.

The framework does not declare one side right and one side wrong in these conflicts. It observes that the outcome will be determined by power, and that the deepest form of power is the internal trust and cosmological cohesion that no external force can manufacture but that sustained attack can destroy. Ricoeur's analysis of how commanded memory — politically manipulated collective narrative — is weaponised to produce the appearance of legitimate claim illuminates how both sides of this conflict mobilise memory to construct authority over the same ground (Ricoeur 2004, 448–461).

The territory encompassing Judea, Israel, Jordan, Jerusalem, Gaza, and the surrounding regions constitutes one of the most intensely contested landscapes on the planet. Multiple peoples, religions, civilizations, empires, kingdoms, philosophical traditions, historical narratives, eschatological visions, metaphysical claims, and cosmological orders have asserted forms of belonging, authority, or legitimacy over the same geographical space. As a result, the region has become a convergence point of competing memory systems, each seeking to establish its own account of origin, continuity, and rightful presence. Within this environment, consensus regarding who possesses the strongest claim is often elusive, and disputes frequently persist across generations.

From the perspective of the Inaorak–Kuru framework, this situation illustrates a fundamental dynamic: the ability to define who is recognised as Inaorak and who is classified as Kuru is often influenced not only by memory, continuity, and cosmological relationship, but also by the distribution of political, military, economic, and institutional power. When power becomes the primary mechanism through which legitimacy is established, the outcome reflects the balance of force rather than the resolution of competing cosmological claims. This dynamic helps explain how many Cosmobian societies throughout history have experienced the loss of Inaorak status within their own ancestral territories. Colonial and imperial systems rarely entered landscapes as neutral observers. They arrived with military, administrative, legal, economic, and epistemological power, enabling them to redefine ownership, belonging, identity, and legitimacy according to their own frameworks. Through this process, communities that understood themselves as Inaorak could be reclassified, displaced, marginalised, or transformed into Kuru within the institutions established by the dominant power.

The General Principle

Collective Where Possible, Smaller Where Necessary

Across all these cases, the Inaorak/Kuru framework produces a general principle that the Wonesis framework applies consistently.

Any human community that still has the capacity to fight for its collective Inaorak land claim — based on shared living memory, shared myths, shared language, shared biological and cosmological connection to a specific landscape — must do so. The collective form of Wonesis is always the strongest. Only through collective Inaorak victory can the hundreds of smaller cosmopolitan clan and family victories be secured within it. The collective is not merely a political convenience. It is the vehicle through which the living memory that constitutes Inaorak belonging is most powerfully transmitted and most effectively defended.

Where the collective has been defeated or fragmented beyond recovery at the national or tribal scale — as in Australia, Canada, the United States, New Zealand, and parts of Latin America — the Wonesis unit contracts to wherever living memory and collective will still exist: from the national to the tribal, from the tribal to the clan, from the clan to the family, from the family to the individual. Each contraction is not surrender. It is the preservation of the minimum viable unit through which the living memory can survive until conditions allow for its expansion (Tuck and Yang 2012, 21–35).

The seed is planted in whatever soil remains.

Even a single family that preserves a language, maintains ceremonial practice, and keeps the knowledge of the sacred places alive is performing an act of Inaorak survival that no political defeat can entirely extinguish — provided the memory is transmitted to the next generation before the last carrier is gone.

For those in already-conquered territories where the physical reclamation of Inaorak land is not currently possible, the priority is the preservation of the cultural and mythological dimension: the living memory that keeps the Inaorak connection alive even when the physical ground is temporarily inaccessible.

Memory preserved is the condition of possibility for physical return. Memory lost forecloses it.

Money As the Final Mechanism of Total Cosmological Capture

The Eight Atlases and Seven Cages as Tradable Commodities

The Psycho-Cosmocide framework identifies eight atlases of human existence — physical/material, biological/organism, cultural/mythological, metaphysical/transcendental, physics/machinery, space-time/consciousness, memory, and the unknown/mystery — and seven cages through which those atlases are enclosed, distorted, and managed by civilisational power (Kogoya 2026l). What the framework has not yet addressed with full directness is the mechanism through which all eight atlases and all seven cages become not merely managed but purchasable. The money system is that mechanism.

It is the civilisational instrument through which the second cage achieved its most complete and most invisible form of total control. Not because money is intrinsically evil — as a tool of exchange it is morally neutral — but because the global money system, as it has developed

through the colonial and post-colonial civilisational project, has become the universal solvent of all ontological distinction. Under its logic, everything can be assigned a price. Everything with a price can be bought. Everything that can be bought can be sold, transferred, fabricated, erased, or replaced.

Including memory. Including identity. Including belonging. Including Inaorak itself.

Shoshana Zuboff's analysis of surveillance capitalism demonstrates the most recent expression of this logic: the systematic extraction of human experience as raw material for behavioural prediction products, extending the commodity form into the innermost dimensions of consciousness and desire (Zuboff 2019, 8–20).

What Money Can Now Buy

Consider what has become purchasable under the current civilisational money system, moving through each atlas in turn.

The *physical* and *material* atlas — land itself — is the most visible casualty. Land, which the Wonesis framework identifies as the irreducible foundation of Inaorak belonging, the ground through which Wone flows between a specific community and its specific landscape, is now a commodity on a global market. It can be purchased by anyone with sufficient capital, regardless of ancestral connection, regardless of living memory, regardless of cosmological relationship. Sovereign wealth funds, multinational corporations, and private billionaires now own vast territories across every continent — land to which they have no Inaorak connection whatsoever, land whose Inaorak peoples are either displaced, managed, or rendered invisible by the legal frameworks that the money system underwrites. Vandana Shiva has documented comprehensively how this conversion operates through the instruments of development: the privatisation of water, the enclosure of the biological commons, the patenting of seeds — each of which removes a dimension of the physical and biological atlases from the living relationship that constitutes Inaorak belonging and places it within the commodity form (Shiva 1997, 1–45).

The *biological* and *organism* atlas — life itself — has become purchasable through pharmaceutical patents, genetic engineering, and the commodification of seeds, water, and the biological commons. The organisms through which Wone flows are being bought, modified, patented, and sold. The biodiversity that sustained cosmopolitan communities for millennia is being converted into intellectual property owned by those who can afford the legal infrastructure of that conversion (Shiva 1988, 1–17).

The *cultural* and *mythological* atlas — memory itself — is perhaps the most devastating casualty. Language is purchasable through the funding and defunding of education systems. Myths are purchasable through the control of media, publishing, and cultural production. Symbols, images, stories, legends, beliefs — the entire infrastructure of collective memory through which Inaorak belonging is transmitted across generations — can be bought, sold, amplified, suppressed, distorted, and fabricated by those with financial resources to control the

channels through which those symbols flow. A community's oral tradition can be recorded, archived, and owned by an institution that charges access fees. A sacred site can be photographed, reproduced, and sold as aesthetic merchandise. An entire people's identity can be marketed as a brand by those who profit from its surface characteristics while destroying the living reality that gave those characteristics meaning. Ricoeur's analysis of the political manipulation of collective memory — its commodification and weaponisation into what he terms 'commanded memory' — provides the philosophical framework for understanding how this operates not as an aberration but as a structural feature of any system in which memory has been converted into a tradeable asset (Ricoeur 2004, 85–132; 448–461).

The *metaphysical* and *transcendental* atlas — meaning itself — has become a market. The spiritual wellness industry, the self-help complex, the commodified forms of meditation, ritual, and sacred practice extracted from their living cosmological contexts and sold as consumable experiences to those with sufficient disposable income — these represent the purchase and resale of the most intimate dimension of human existence. Meaning, which can only be genuinely constituted through living community, living memory, and living relationship with a specific landscape, is packaged, branded, and sold in forms that carry none of those constitutive conditions. Kyle Powys Whyte identifies this process as a form of temporal violence: the conversion of Indigenous sacred practices into consumable commodities not only removes them from their living context but simultaneously positions that living context as a historical curiosity rather than a present reality (Whyte 2018, 224–242).

The *physics* and *machinery* atlas — the technological infrastructure of reality manipulation — is owned. The satellites, the algorithms, the data infrastructure, the artificial intelligence systems that are now shaping what is seen, known, remembered, and forgotten — these are owned by a small number of entities whose decisions about what to amplify and what to suppress have consequences for every community on earth, including communities that have no say in those decisions and no recourse against them. Zuboff's account of how surveillance capitalism extracts human experience as raw material for behavioural prediction products — extending the commodity form into the innermost dimensions of consciousness and desire — maps the full extent of this capture (Zuboff 2019, 8–20).

Space-time and *consciousness* atlas — attention itself — is now the primary resource of the digital economy. The capacity to direct human attention, to shape what enters consciousness and what is excluded from it, to determine what a population knows, believes, fears, and desires — this capacity is now bought and sold in real time on advertising markets and algorithmic systems (Zuboff 2019, 293–318). Within the Wonesis framework, this represents the extension of Psycho-Cosmocide into the innermost dimension of human experience: not merely the colonisation of land and memory but the colonisation of consciousness itself in real time.

The *memory* atlas — the archive of what happened, who did what, where, how, and why — is under the most direct and consequential form of commercial control. Who funds the archives determines what is preserved. Who owns the platforms determines what is circulated. Who

controls the search algorithms determines what is findable. Entire peoples' histories can be made invisible or rendered peripheral through the systematic withdrawal of funding, platform access, and algorithmic prioritisation. Entire false histories can be constructed, amplified, and repeated until they acquire the weight of fact through the sheer force of money spent on their propagation.

The atlas of the *unknown* and *mystery* — the outer limit of what human beings can know about their own existence — is being actively managed. The research that is funded, the questions that are asked, the frameworks within which cosmic and existential inquiry is conducted — all are shaped by the priorities of those who control the money that funds them. Even the deepest questions of existence are now subject to the commercial calculus of what inquiry is worth funding and what is not.

The most acute expression of this assault in the present moment is the artificial intelligence revolution, which has introduced a civilisational condition without historical precedent: the systematic erosion of the human capacity to distinguish real from fabricated, true from false, authentic memory from manufactured simulation. When images, voices, texts, histories, and identities can be generated at scale by systems owned by a small number of entities, the epistemic ground upon which all cosmological orientation depends becomes structurally unstable.

The Psycho-Cosmocide framework names this not as a technological problem but as a cosmological one: when a people can no longer trust the evidence of their own perception — when the boundary between Wone and its simulation has been deliberately obscured — the conditions for Inaorak belonging are attacked at the most fundamental level. Living memory requires a living world that can be witnessed, transmitted, and trusted. Artificial intelligence, in its current civilisational form, is the money system's most complete instrument for the purchase and fabrication of that witnessing itself.

The New Kings, Queens, and Gods

In every preceding stage of the civilisational sequence, power was legitimised through one of three sources: *genealogical claim* (the right of blood and dynasty), *divine sanction* (the right of religious authority and theological mandate), or *military force* (the right of conquest and the capacity to impose). In each case, the legitimising structure — however artificial — made reference to something beyond mere wealth. Ibn Khaldun's analysis of how ruling elites legitimate their authority through the symbolic infrastructure of *asabiyyah* demonstrates that power has historically required cultural, religious, or genealogical grounding to sustain itself (Ibn Khaldun 1958, 249–315).

The global money system has abolished this requirement.

Those who control sufficient capital in the contemporary civilisational order require no genealogical legitimacy, no divine sanction, and no military conquest to exercise power over

landscapes, communities, memories, and identities. Money itself is now the legitimising authority. In the Wone framework, this constitutes a civilisational first: the emergence of a form of power that can claim Inaorak status anywhere on the planet without any living memory whatsoever — through the simple mechanism of purchase.

The new kings and queens and gods of the civilisational order are those with the capital to buy land, fund memory, commission symbols, own stories, and manufacture belonging.

This is not a conspiracy theory. It is the straightforward operational logic of the global money system applied to the domains that the Psycho-Cosmocide framework has identified as the foundations of human existence.

When land is a commodity, when memory is a product, when identity is a brand, when belonging is a market — then those who control the market control belonging itself.

How Money Produces Cosmological Anomie

This is the precise mechanism through which Cosmological Anomie — Maluk Paga — is produced and maintained. It is not primarily the result of bad philosophy, mistaken theology, or insufficient political will. It is the systematic product of a civilisational money system that has converted all eight atlases of human existence into tradeable assets and all seven cages into manageable markets.

When the physical ground of Inaorak belonging can be purchased and transferred, communities lose the land through which Wone flows into their lives. When the cultural infrastructure of memory can be bought, suppressed, or fabricated, communities lose the transmission channel through which their Inaorak connection is maintained across generations.

The feedback loop accelerates. As communities lose their physical ground, their cultural memory weakens. As their cultural memory weakens, their cosmological orientation dissolves. As their cosmological orientation dissolves, their capacity to resist the further purchase and erasure of what remains diminishes. Escobar's analysis of how development discourse perpetually reconstitutes the conditions that make further dispossession possible illuminates the structural logic of this acceleration (Escobar 1995, 39–101). Each stage of dispossession creates the conditions that make the next stage necessary, until the community has nothing left that the money system cannot reach.

Why Wonesis Insists on Return Now

This analysis is the precise reason why the Wonesis framework does not merely recommend philosophical reorientation as a long-term aspiration. It insists on return now — before the window closes entirely.

The window is not metaphorical. It is the window of living memory: the generations of people who still carry, in their bodies, their languages, their ceremonial practices, and their cosmological frameworks, the living connection to the landscapes that constitute their Inaorak

belonging. When those generations are gone — when the last speakers of a language die, when the last practitioners of a ceremony pass without transmission, when the last people who know the names of the rivers and the sacred obligations attached to them can no longer teach those names to children — the living memory is gone.

This is the condition this corpus elsewhere names the waiting room of civilisation: the historical anteroom in which a people is expected to indefinitely defer its own existence while institutions, states, and international processes continue to postpone, reinterpret, or deny it (Kogoya 2026j). The waiting room is not a neutral holding space. It is itself an instrument of Psycho-Cosmocide — the place where delay becomes policy and where a people is asked to surrender, in the end, not only its political future but its memory of ever having possessed one. Wonesis's insistence on return now, rather than after some future resolution, is the direct refusal of that waiting room: as long as even one living thread between land, memory, ancestry, and consciousness remains, the framework holds that extinction is not yet complete, and return does not require permission to begin (Kogoya 2026j).

The money system accelerates this closure in multiple ways simultaneously. It purchases land, removing the physical substrate of Inaorak connection. It funds the education systems and media systems that replace living cosmological frameworks with the symbolic architecture of the second cage. It produces the economic conditions that pull young people away from their communities and into urban labour markets where the transmission of living memory cannot occur across generations. E. P. Thompson's historical analysis of how the industrial economy reorganised human temporal experience — replacing the seasonal, task-oriented time of agricultural and communal life with the clock-disciplined time of wage labour — illuminates the mechanism through which this occurs: not through overt destruction but through the reorganisation of the conditions of daily life in ways that make the transmission of living memory structurally impossible (Thompson 1967, 56–97).

Wonesis insists on return now because later may be after the last living speaker. Later may be after the last ceremony. Later maybe after the land has been sold, subdivided, mined, fenced, and converted into an asset class that no community will ever reacquire at any price.

The return Wonesis calls for is therefore not nostalgic. It is not a proposal to reverse history, restore a pre-colonial condition, or deny the reality of the civilisational transformations that have occurred. It is the recognition that the conditions of a viable future — land, living memory, cosmological orientation, the transmission of belonging across generations — are being converted into commodities faster than any existing political, legal, or cultural institution is responding to that conversion. And that the communities which retain the capacity to act — which still have living elders, living languages, living landscapes, and living memory — must act from that capacity now, before it is purchased away from them.

The Architecture of Wonesis

The Three Dimensions

Wonesis recognises that all human organisation — across every culture, era, and civilisation — emerges through three primary dimensions of existence. These are not invented theoretical categories. They describe how human beings have always actually organised themselves, at every scale from the individual to the civilisational. Psycho-Cosmocide, operating through the money system as described above, damages all three dimensions simultaneously. Wonesis recovery must address all three.

Dimension One: Physical and Biological

The bonds of blood, reproduction, survival, territory, shelter, food, water, protection, and biological continuity. Without this dimension, the organism dies. Every other dimension is built upon it and cannot survive without it.

Wonesis at this dimension means the recovery of direct relationship with land, food, water, ecological participation, and the biological chains of kinship and continuity. Under the money system, this dimension is the most directly under attack: land is purchased, displaced, mined, and fenced; food systems are industrialised and commodified; water is privatised; and the ecological webs that sustained cosmopolitan communities for millennia are dismantled for extraction. Carolyn Merchant's analysis of how the Scientific Revolution reconceptualised nature as inert matter — as opposed to the living, relational entity of pre-modern European and Indigenous cosmologies — provides the ideological genealogy of this assault (Merchant 1980, 1–41).

The return to land is the return to this dimension — not as romanticism but as the most basic act of survival.

Dimension Two: Cultural and Mythological

Bonds of memory, language, ritual, symbols, stories, ancestors, songs, laws, ceremonies, and collective identity. Without this dimension, memory dies.

Wonesis at this dimension means the active preservation and transmission of living memory — the refusal to allow the systematic erasure of language, ceremony, cosmology, and ancestral knowledge to proceed without resistance. Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's foundational analysis demonstrates that language is not merely a vehicle for content but the structure through which a people's relationship with its specific place in the world is encoded, transmitted, and sustained (Wa Thiong'o 1986, 4–33).

When a language dies, it is not vocabulary that is lost. It is an entire cosmological architecture — a specific way of experiencing, categorising, and inhabiting reality that no translation can recover.

The recovery of this dimension requires, before anything else, the recognition that living memory cannot be achieved into existence. It can only be transmitted through living practice, in living communities, on living land.

Dimension Three: Metaphysical and Transcendental

The bonds formed through humanity's engagement with ultimate questions of meaning, purpose, consciousness, death, eternity, and the unknown. Without this dimension, direction dies.

Wonesis at this dimension means the maintenance of genuine metaphysical engagement — not the adoption of any particular theological or philosophical system, but the capacity to ask the deepest questions honestly and to inhabit the uncertainty of their answers without collapsing into dogmatic certainty or nihilistic despair. Santos's concept of the "ecology of knowledges" — the coexistence of multiple knowledge and meaning systems without any single one claiming exclusive authority — provides the epistemological framework for how this dimension can be maintained in a condition of intellectual honesty rather than manufactured certainty (Santos 2014, 188–212).

The Universal Foundation

Beneath all three dimensions, Wonesis identifies a universal foundation: the irreducible conditions that every human organisation at every scale ultimately seeks to secure.

These conditions are land, food, water, air, fire, shelter, family, and continuity.

No ideological, theological, or digital superstructure can permanently replace these conditions. When civilisational systems attempt to replace them — when they persuade populations that institutional dependency, economic participation, and digital connectivity are sufficient substitutes for land, kinship, and ecological grounding — the result is not liberation but a more sophisticated form of enclosure. Donella Meadows's systems analysis demonstrates the principle precisely: systems that substitute symbol for substance — that treat the map as if it were the territory — eventually encounter the territory on its own terms, and the encounter is always corrective and frequently catastrophic (Meadows 2008, 170–181).

Scales of Application

Wonesis can be oriented at every scale of human organisation. For colonised peoples — those whose physical-biological, cultural-mythological, and metaphysical-transcendental dimensions have been simultaneously attacked by Civilisational Kuru and the money system — the priority sequence is clear: collective national unity grounded in living memory and land recovery is the strongest form; where that is fractured by the effects of Psycho-Cosmocide, the viable unit contracts to the tribal, the clan, the family, the individual. Each contraction represents not defeat but preservation — the minimum viable unit of Wonesis that can carry the living memory forward until conditions allow for its expansion.

For West Papua specifically, the priority sequence of viable Wonesis, in order of collective strength, is: (1) *collective national unity* — the strongest form, in which all Papuan peoples act from their shared Inaorak claim as a single political and cosmological force; (2) *tribal and clan-based organisation* — where national unity has been fractured by the effects of Psycho-Cosmocide and colonial division; (3) *family-based survival* — where tribal coherence has been weakened by displacement and economic pressure; (4) *individual orientation* — the minimum unit of Wonesis, the single person who preserves a language, a ceremony, or a piece of knowledge; and (5) *metaphysical and transcendental basis* — when all social structures have been broken and the only remaining ground is the cosmological orientation that no physical force can entirely extinguish.

Each step down this sequence is not surrender. It is the preservation of the smallest viable unit capable of transmission to the next generation. Koch's ethnographic analysis of conflict and its management in the central New Guinea highlands demonstrates the deep structural importance of clan and family as the irreducible units of social and political life in Papuan societies — the level at which Inaorak belonging is most directly expressed and most durably transmitted (Koch 1974, 17–42).

Colonial Religious Systems in Cosmobian Societies

A specific problem exists in West Papua and across many cosmobian societies that have been subjected to intensive missionary activity: colonial-introduced religious systems are spreading rapidly and in many cases are actively separating people from land and memory by directing their cosmological orientation toward a post-death reward — *heaven* — rather than toward earthly survival, ancestral continuity, and the living Inaorak connection to specific landscapes.

The substitution of post-death transcendence for present-ground belonging is one of the most effective mechanisms of Psycho-Cosmocide ever deployed, precisely because it does not appear as dispossession. It appears as salvation. Tinker's analysis of how missionary Christianity systematically dismantled the ceremonial, kinship, and land-based structures of Indigenous communities — in the name of saving souls — is the definitive account of this mechanism (Tinker 1993, 21–75).

Wonesis does not automatically reject these religious systems. The framework recognises that for many Papuan and cosmobian communities, Christianity and other introduced religions have become genuinely integrated into identity, kinship, and community cohesion — functioning as a form of cultural glue that Psycho-Cosmocide has not yet fully dissolved.

If these systems can be redirected — if their value systems, their communal structures, and their moral frameworks can be oriented not toward post-death abstraction but toward earthly survival, land protection, kinship maintenance, and the preservation of living memory — they can be incorporated into Wonesis rather than rejected.

The condition is critical and non-negotiable: the religious system must serve life on Earth.

The test is not doctrinal. It is practical: does this system strengthen or weaken the Inaorak connection? Does it bring people back to the land or draw them away from it? Does it transmit living memory or replace it with manufactured meaning?

Wonesis Must Not Become Another Cage

The most important boundary in the Wonesis framework is the distinction between a map and a cage. Every great ideology, religion, and doctrine in human history began as a genuine attempt to orient human beings toward the conditions of life.

Every one of them eventually became a cage — a system serving its own perpetuation rather than the conditions it was designed to protect.

Horkheimer and Adorno's analysis in the *Dialectic of Enlightenment* remains the most penetrating account of this process: the Enlightenment's own instruments of liberation — reason, science, critique — were progressively converted into instruments of domination, not because their intentions were corrupt but because the logic of systematisation tends toward closure (Horkheimer and Adorno 2002, 1–34).

The Wonesis framework is not exempt from this risk. It faces it directly.

Wonesis does not command worship, demand conversion, require institutional membership, ask obedience to any organisation, recruit followers into a new movement, prescribe what to worship, define what is sacred, or identify an enemy to be opposed. It does not tell humanity what to believe. It asks humanity where it still remains alive — and points in that direction.

The moment Wonesis becomes a doctrine requiring obedience, a movement recruiting followers, or an institution claiming exclusive access to truth, it has ceased to be Wonesis. It has become another cage. This self-limitation is the framework's defining feature and the condition of its philosophical honesty.

This is not a merely hypothetical risk, and the framework has named it in these terms before: any new system constructed as the solution to the systems Wonesis critiques would risk becoming another Procrustean bed, another Neverland, another Pleasure Island under a different name and a different currency of seduction (Kogoya 2026o). The mythological register is deliberate. Procrustes offers travellers a bed that fits perfectly — by cutting or stretching them to match it; Neverland and Pleasure Island offer permanent escape from responsibility at the cost of a return that becomes impossible. Each promises relief from the very condition it then makes structural. Wonesis's refusal to prescribe a destination, a doctrine, or an institution is what keeps it from repeating this pattern under its own name.

A related objection deserves a direct answer: if what Wonesis names is an asymmetry of institutional investment — in language, land-based learning, cosmological knowledge — why does correcting it require an orientation framework at all, rather than a sufficiently thorough policy reform? The answer is that a reform reaching only curriculum, while leaving assessment, credentialing, and labour-market recognition still calibrated entirely to the civilisational system,

would change what is taught without changing what is rewarded: the institutional incentive that currently makes detachment from ancestral language and land the rational path to security would survive the reform intact (Kogoya 2026i). This is not a claim that policy reform is pointless. A reform reaching into assessment and recognition as well as curriculum would address a great deal of what this framework diagnoses and would itself be a form of the recognition Wonesis calls for — not a substitute that makes it unnecessary. The claim is narrower: any reform capable of doing that work presupposes the prior act of seeing asymmetry as a problem worth that scale of institutional response, which is precisely the act of detection this framework insists cannot be delegated to policy.

This self-limitation carries a direct implication for any community, people, or political formation that takes Wonesis seriously as an orientation for building something new. The era of state-building and nation-making projects grounded in the logic of the civilisational money system — extraction, consumption, individual accumulation — has reached the end of its productive life. Five centuries of that model have produced the condition this framework diagnoses. Any new formation that replicates that logic, however renamed or rebranded, will reproduce the same trajectory.

Wonesis therefore establishes a minimum threshold that any viable new system — whether cosmobian, civilisational, or hybrid — must meet if it is not to become another expression of the Second Cage: it must guarantee to every person born within it unconditional access to land, water, fire, air, shelter, family, and the living memory of their specific community.

These are not political rights in the liberal sense. They are the irreducible conditions of the First Cage — the non-negotiable ground of existence that no economic arrangement, however sophisticated, can permanently substitute. A system that cannot guarantee these conditions for its members is not a civilisational achievement. It is a managed form of dispossession.

Wonesis does not prescribe the specific political, economic, or social architecture through which these guarantees are secured — that determination belongs to each community in relation to its own living memory, its own landscape, and its own cosmological tradition. What Wonesis insists is that architecture, whatever form it takes, must be built from these guarantees outward rather than from capital accumulation inward.

The direction of construction is the test. Not the name of the system.

Three Unresolved Theoretical Areas

The Wonesis framework explicitly acknowledges three areas in which its theoretical development remains incomplete.

First, a fully developed theory of reconstruction: what does Wonesis look like as a post-collapse rebuilding process? How does a destroyed cosmobian society rebuild its three dimensions in practice? The framework identifies the direction but has not yet fully mapped the route.

Second, a complete cosmopolitan epistemology: how does Wonesis distinguish living knowledge from colonised knowledge? Santos's ecology of knowledges provides one starting point; Smith's decolonising methodologies provides another (Santos 2014, 188–212; Smith 1999, 143–186). But neither provides the complete framework for what the Wonesis tradition specifically requires.

Third, a systematic political theory: what organises collective life beyond or after the nation-state?

These are not peripheral questions. They are the core of what the framework still needs to develop, and this paper names that need rather than pretending the framework is more complete than it is.

Wonesis in Practice

What History Shows About Survival

Before describing what Wonesis looks like at each scale of life, it is necessary to establish the historical foundation from which the framework draws its confidence.

Wonesis is not a speculative proposal. It is a generalisation from a consistent pattern observed across many civilisational collapses and recoveries. The groups described below were rarely the largest or most powerful at the moment of collapse. Their significance lay in their ability to preserve memory, identity, law, cosmology, institutions, and social continuity when larger systems were breaking down.

Clan and Tribal Foundations

The Quraysh were initially a tribal grouping rather than an empire. From this clan network emerged the leadership that carried Islam across Arabia and eventually helped create one of the largest civilisations in history. The tribe served as the social anchor from which a new religious and political order expanded.

Before the Mongol Empire existed, numerous fragmented steppe clans and tribes preserved their social structures amid constant conflict. Their eventual unification generated an imperial system that transformed Eurasia.

During the collapse of the Western Roman Empire, the Franks emerged as one of several Germanic peoples. Their tribal institutions became the seed of medieval France and influenced the political development of Western Europe.

The Israelite tribes preserved a strong covenantal identity during periods of displacement, conquest, and exile. Their traditions became the foundation for later Jewish civilisation and profoundly influenced Christianity and Islam.

Although Sparta itself eventually disappeared, its highly structured communal order demonstrated how a relatively small social formation could maintain continuity and political resilience for centuries amid wider Greek instability.

Religious and Metaphysical Orders

After the disintegration of Western Roman institutions, Benedictine monasteries preserved literacy, agricultural knowledge, manuscripts, and administrative practices. Many historians regard them as one of the principal anchors of medieval European civilisation.

Monastic communities in places such as Mount Athos maintained theological, cultural, and intellectual continuity through periods of imperial collapse and political upheaval. The Buddhist Sangha repeatedly survived the fall of kingdoms across South and Southeast Asia; monastic institutions often carried language, philosophy, law, and education into subsequent political orders.

Many Islamic societies expanded not primarily through states but through Sufi networks. These metaphysical orders often provided continuity where political institutions were weak or fragmented. The Jesuits built educational, intellectual, and missionary networks that outlived numerous political regimes and influenced the formation of states and national elites across multiple continents.

Ethno-Cultural Communities That Survived State Collapse

Perhaps one of history's most remarkable examples, Jewish communities preserved law, language, ritual, memory, and identity despite losing political sovereignty for nearly two millennia. Their continuity eventually contributed to the emergence of the modern State of Israel.

Armenian church institutions, clans, and communal networks preserved Armenian identity through centuries of imperial domination and political fragmentation. Assyrian communities maintained linguistic, religious, and cultural continuity across millennia despite the disappearance of the Assyrian Empire. Monastic institutions, lineages, and religious traditions preserved Tibetan civilisation despite major political disruptions.

Confederacies and Indigenous Examples

The Haudenosaunee created a durable confederal structure that united multiple nations while preserving local autonomy. Their political system influenced later constitutional thinking in North America.

Through iwi (tribal) and hapu (sub-tribal) structures, Maori communities maintained social coherence despite colonisation and continue to serve as foundations for cultural and political revitalisation.

Sami communities-maintained identity, language, and land relationships across the territories of several states, preserving continuity without possessing a sovereign state.

What These Cases Reveal: Civilisational Anchors Beyond States

From a comparative historical perspective, the strongest long-term seeds of future civilisations were usually not armies or bureaucracies.

They were communities that successfully transmitted a shared cosmology; a coherent law or moral order; collective memory; land-based identity; institutions capable of surviving political collapse; mechanisms for educating future generations; kinship systems and clan networks; sacred geographies and ceremonial systems; oral traditions and cosmological frameworks; and legal traditions carried in memory.

Those elements allowed relatively small communities to become the nuclei around which new societies, nations, and civilisations eventually formed. In many cases, states collapsed first while these deeper structures survived. Later political formations emerged from the surviving cultural and metaphysical foundations.

Jerusalem Case: Central Instructive Example

The Jerusalem example is the most instructive case in the Wonesis framework precisely because it clarifies what kind of event a civilisational collapse actually is.

In 70 CE, the physical destruction of the city and the Temple was devastating, but it was not the primary threat to Jewish survival. The primary threat was the destruction of the ordering system — the cosmological and legal framework that told a people who they were, what they owed to each other, what time meant, what suffering meant, what the future was for.

The Zealots understood this incorrectly. They believed the crisis was primarily military and territorial — that if they could hold the walls, hold the Temple Mount, resist Rome long enough, the people would survive. They were not wrong that the physical battle mattered. They were catastrophically wrong about which battle was primary.

You cannot resist a cosmological collapse with a military response, because the collapse is not happening at the level at which armies operate. A sword can kill a body. It cannot kill the question of whether life has meaning.

The Pharisees, and especially Yochanan ben Zakkai, understood something different. According to the Talmudic account, ben Zakkai had himself smuggled out of the besieged city in a coffin and negotiated with the Roman general Vespasian not for political concessions, not for military relief, but for one thing: permission to establish a school at Yavneh.

A school. While Jerusalem burned, while the resistance fighters were dying on the walls, while the Temple was being dismantled stone by stone, ben Zakkai asked for a room where scholars could gather and study.

This is Wonesis. This is the recognition that the crisis is cosmological and that the response must therefore operate at the cosmological level. The school at Yavneh became the centre from which rabbinic Judaism was reconstructed — a portable, land-independent, text-based civilisational form that could survive anywhere because it carried the law, the memory, the calendar, the argument, the intergenerational transmission mechanism, not in a building or a territory but in a community of practice.

What appears to be defeat — the abandonment of the military resistance, the withdrawal from the burning city — was in fact the only available survival strategy. Not because resistance was wrong in principle, but because resistance at the wrong level, against the wrong form of the threat, would have consumed the last resources needed for what actually mattered.

Why Land Is the Answer: The Argument Beyond Diagnosis

If all standard responses fail because they operate above the level at which the destruction is occurring, the question becomes: what operates at that level? What is at the base, below politics, below ideology, below theology, below culture? Land.

Land is the only element of human existence that cannot be made abstract. You can abstract labour into wages, you can abstract kinship into legal categories, you can abstract memory into archives, you can abstract ceremony into heritage, and you can abstract cosmology into theology; but you cannot abstract land into anything that retains the function of land. The relationship between a specific human community and the specific ground of its existence — a relationship built through inhabitation, cultivation, burial, naming, ceremony, ecological knowledge, and intergenerational transmission over centuries and millennia — is not replaceable by any symbolic substitute.

This can be stated as a formal principle rather than only an assertion: thinking presupposes embodiment; embodiment presupposes ecology; ecology presupposes land. Every cosmology requires a canvas before it can become a picture, and land is that canvas — not one value among others to be weighed against competing goods, but the irreducible ground of being itself, prior to any metaphysical claim built upon it (Kogoya 2026a). This is why colonisation is best understood, at its deepest level, as the systematic repainting of reality itself: not the replacement of one set of values with another within a shared ground, but the attempted replacement of the canvas.

Seed Metaphor

The seed metaphor is exact and not merely evocative. A seed contains, in compressed and dormant form, all the information required to regenerate the living plant — but only if the conditions for germination exist, and the most fundamental of those conditions is contact with specific ground. The seed of a cosmopolitan people is the irreducible minimum of cosmological, ceremonial, linguistic, kinship, and land-based practice that, if preserved through the collapse, makes regeneration possible when conditions allow. It cannot be stored in a library or an archive

or an ideology or a theology. It can only be kept alive in a community of practice that remains in some form of relationship with specific ground.

The historical cases all confirm this. The Jewish communities that survived and eventually contributed to the emergence of the modern State of Israel were not the ones that most thoroughly assimilated into European political and intellectual life. They were the ones that maintained, in daily practice, the rituals and obligations that kept Jerusalem present as a living cosmological reference even in diaspora: the Passover Seder that enacted the return to land as an annual living reality, the Tisha B'Av that mourned the Temple's destruction not as a historical event but as a present wound, the daily prayers that oriented the body physically toward a specific geography.

The Benedictines chose specific places — Monte Cassino, Lindisfarne, Cluny — and stayed there, generation after generation, building a relationship with particular ground through agriculture, burial, and the liturgical ordering of time around the seasonal rhythms of a specific landscape. Their books preserved Roman knowledge, but their land preserved something older and more fundamental: the knowledge that human life, to be fully human, must be rooted in a specific ecology and oriented by the rhythms of that ecology's seasons.

The Maori survived because the marae — a specific piece of land with specific ancestors buried in it — remained the irreducible centre of identity even when everything else was being stripped away. The Sami survived because the reindeer routes, the seasonal territories, the specific ecological knowledge of a particular northern landscape remained alive in practice and in memory.

Social Units Wonesis Names — and Why

This is why Wonesis names the particular social units it does — nation, clan, tribe, family, metaphysical order, individual — rather than naming political parties, NGOs, social movements, or international institutions.

Not because the latter are unimportant, but because they operate at the wrong level for the primary task. The primary task, in a civilisational collapse, is to ensure that the seeds survive. The seeds are not ideas. They are living practices: the language spoken to a child, the ceremony conducted at the place where an ancestor is buried, the knowledge of which plants grow where and what they mean, the obligation felt toward a specific piece of ground, the story told that connects a family to a land across many generations. These things can only be preserved and transmitted in small, intimate, durable social formations — formations that are older than the state, that exist below the level of the state, and that have historically outlasted every state they have been embedded within.

The clan and tribe are named because they are the smallest social unit capable of maintaining a land relationship across multiple generations in the absence of state support. The family is named because it is the site of intergenerational transmission, the place where language, story,

and ecological practice are either passed on or lost. The metaphysical order — the monastery, the Sufi network, the sangha — is named because it is the form that has historically preserved cosmological knowledge when political and economic systems have failed, precisely because its primary function is not political or economic but cosmological. And the individual is named last, and most carefully, because the individual without community, without land, without living transmission, is exactly the condition that the collapse produces at scale — and Wonesis insists that even from that position, the direction of travel is still clear: toward land, toward place, toward the beginning of a new relationship with a specific piece of ground that, across generations, can become the foundation of something worth transmitting.

Both reviews of this paper identified the same gap: the paper explains what has gone wrong and what must be preserved but does not clearly answer how specific actors — a family, a clan, a displaced person, a city dweller, a nation — actually orient their lives from within Wonesis. This chapter addresses that gap directly.

What follows is not a prescriptive programme. It is a description of what the six operational functions of Wonesis look like when they are lived rather than theorised, across the five scales at which the framework applies.

The governing principle across all scales is the same: Wonesis orients toward the most intact available form of Inaorak connection. Where collective national action is possible, that is the strongest form. Where it is not, the viable unit contracts to the tribe, the clan, the family, the individual. No contraction is defeated. Each is the preservation of the minimum viable unit through which living memory can survive until conditions allow for its expansion (Simpson 2017, 38–60).

What differs across scales is not the principle but the specific form it takes in daily life.

Nation and Collective: Wonesis at the Largest Scale

At the scale of a people with an intact Inaorak land claim — such as the Papuan peoples of West Papua — Wonesis in practice requires collective political action grounded in living memory rather than solely in the borrowed categories of international human rights discourse. People practicing Wonesis at the national scale does not stop at demanding rights within the existing international legal order. It asserts the priority of its own Inaorak law — the law carried in language, ceremony, genealogy, cosmology, and ancestral relationship to the land — as the foundational order of its political life.

This does not require the rejection of international solidarity, diplomacy, legal advocacy, or human rights mechanisms. Rather, it requires that such tools remain subordinate to the recovery and continuity of Inaorak existence. International institutions and legal frameworks may serve as instruments, but they cannot become substitutes for the people, the land, the cosmology, or the ancestral order from which political legitimacy originates.

A Papuan political movement that pursues independence exclusively through the vocabulary of the United Nations while simultaneously abandoning the living transmission of Lani, Dani, Mee, and other Papuan languages to future generations has merely exchanged one form of enclosure for another. It has adopted a second-cage political strategy.

By contrast, a movement that pursues political freedom while simultaneously defending ancestral land, transmitting language, maintaining ceremony, preserving genealogy, and protecting the cosmological knowledge carried by its elders is practicing Wonesis at the collective scale. The political and the cosmological are not separate domains. They are expressions of the same movement, and within the Wonesis paradigm the cosmological remains primary.

For Papuans, and for other Inaorak Cosmobian peoples across the world who continue to struggle against external civilisational, colonial, imperial, or settler domination, the central task is not simply to recover territory. It is to reposition their own Cosmobian legal, cultural, social, criminal, moral, ethical, cosmological, and sovereign foundations at the centre of political analysis and action. Their own ontological order must become the primary point of reference from which reality is interpreted and judged.

Only from such a position can people critically examine external institutions and determine whether they serve or violate the integrity of the Cosmobian world order. From this standpoint, they possess the authority to formulate law, administer justice, pass judgment, and define the nature of crimes committed against their collective existence.

This necessarily requires the re-evaluation of international institutions, regional frameworks, state systems, and legal doctrines that have participated in, enabled, or failed to prevent the destruction of Inaorak life. It requires asking fundamental questions: What is the meaning of international law when it protects the structures that dispose of people of their land? What is the meaning of sovereignty when it legitimises occupation? What is the meaning of justice when it remains detached from the cosmological order of the people most affected?

However, such a Cosmobian framework cannot remain fragmented, localised, or merely symbolic. It must be collectively developed, articulated, systematised, and transmitted as a coherent cosmological, philosophical, legal, and political framework capable of guiding collective action. If a people remain alienated from one another, fragmented into clans, families, organisations, and competing interests, or continuously absorbed into short-term material incentives offered by external systems, then the possibility of collective Inaorak recovery becomes increasingly remote.

Without a shared cosmological centre, land reclamation becomes a political demand without an organising consciousness. Without collective Wonesis, the recovery of Inaorak becomes not merely difficult but potentially impossible.

The struggle for land, therefore, is inseparable from the struggle for memory, language, cosmology, and consciousness itself.

Institutional Reconstruction: The Eight Atlases Applied

Collective Wonesis at the national or tribal scale, once undertaken, needs more than a direction. It needs a domain-by-domain content, mapped onto the same eight atlases of human existence that Psycho-Cosmocide simultaneously assaults, so that reconstruction answers the destruction atlas by atlas rather than only in general terms (Kogoya 2026b).

Territorial and institutional reconstruction answers the physical-material and technological atlases together: recovery of jurisdiction over land use and resource extraction — not necessarily through reversing administrative divisions that may be politically unavailable, but through customary land councils, Indigenous mapping projects, and community-controlled resource authority operating alongside or beneath the existing administrative layer — together with community-governed digital and communications infrastructure that does not depend on externally routed connectivity for its existence.

Economic and food-system reconstruction answers the biological-organismic atlas: the rebuilding of subsistence and mixed-market food systems that do not route consumption through externally owned supply chains, and the development of community-owned enterprise capable of retaining value within the community rather than recirculating it into external commercial networks.

Language, mnemonic, and epistemological reconstruction answers the cultural-mythological and memory atlases together: the deliberate transmission of language, oral history, song, and land-relationship knowledge to a generation raised within an external educational system, through mechanisms that do not depend on that system's goodwill, and the development of community-led research and educational institutions in which the community's own categories, rather than imported developmental or theological categories, determine what counts as a legitimate account of its own reality.

Intergenerational and political reconstruction answers the metaphysical-transcendental atlas directly: the cultivation of specifically cosmopolitan ceremonial and temporal practice among the young, alongside — not necessarily instead of — imported religious institutions many communities have made genuinely their own; and the recognition that the protective, capacity-building work described throughout this chapter is Wonesis already under construction, not merely resistance short of it. Every language programme, documentation project, and diaspora network that survives and grows is laying infrastructure that fuller reconstruction will eventually require.

Three further atlases complete the mapping, addressed together because reconstruction reaches each of them through the same practical acts rather than through separate programmes (Kogoya 2026e).

Technological and instrumental reconstruction answers the particle-energy atlas: community control over the technologies — extraction, communication, and increasingly digital — that

convert latent power into use, so that force is wielded on the community's own terms rather than supplied by systems whose terms are set elsewhere.

Positional reconstruction answers the space-time atlas: the deliberate re-anchoring of a community's sense of where and when it stands — restoring place names, seasonal and ceremonial calendars, and land-based orientation as the framing condition through which the other atlases are located, rather than accepting administrative coordinates and imported clock-time as given.

Final reconstruction answers the Ultimate Unknown not by resolving it but by restoring a community's own vocabulary for encountering it — mortality, mystery, and the irreducible interiority of others — rather than ceding that vocabulary to an imported theology or a colonial account of what may not be known.

None of this constitutes a political programme, and Wonesis does not offer one.

What the mapping demonstrates is that Wonesis is not simply the negation of Psycho-Cosmocide — a claimed return to a precolonial state this framework has already insisted no longer exists to return to — but a positive architecture with the same structural comprehensiveness as the destruction it answers, addressed atlas by atlas to the same registers of cosmopolitan existence that Psycho-Cosmocide dismantles.

Clan and Tribe: Wonesis at the Intermediate Scale

Where national unity has been fractured — by the divide-and-rule strategies of colonial and post-colonial states, by internal conflict produced by the CPCV, or by the seductive pull of the money economy on individual and clan-level leadership — the viable unit of Wonesis contracts to the clan or tribal scale.

At this scale, Wonesis in practice means several things that are unglamorous, daily, and irreplaceable. It means elders continuing to hold knowledge of the land — the names of rivers, the locations of sacred sites, the obligations attached to specific places — and transmitting that knowledge to younger people in explicit, intentional, ceremonial contexts rather than assuming it will be absorbed passively. It means clan leadership resisting the pressure to convert customary land tenure into individual titles that can be sold, even when the short-term economic incentives for doing so are significant. It means maintaining the ceremonial and kinship structures that hold the clan together as a cosmological unit rather than allowing them to dissolve into the administrative and economic categories of the state.

And it means, critically, telling the truth to younger people about what is at stake — about the closing window, about what living memory is and why it cannot be recovered from archives once it is gone, about the difference between the life the money system offers and the life that the Inaorak connection makes possible.

Koch's analysis of conflict management in Papuan Highland societies illuminates why the intermediate scale matters so much: it is at the clan level that the irreducible obligations of

Inaorak belonging are most directly enacted and most practically contested (Koch 1974, 17–42). When clan elders make decisions about land, those decisions are simultaneously political, economic, cosmological, and memorial.

Wonesis at this scale means those decisions are made from the cosmological ground first and the economic calculation second — not the reverse.

Family: Wonesis at the Intimate Scale

Most people in the world do not operate primarily at national or clan scales. They operate at the scale of the household and family's daily decisions about how to live, what to teach, what to remember, and what to abandon.

This is where Wonesis is most quietly powerful and most easily lost, because the money system's assault on Inaorak connection operates most effectively at exactly this scale. Thompson's account of how industrial time discipline reorganised the temporal structure of daily life is directly relevant: when both parents are required to work clock-disciplined wage labour hours to meet basic economic needs, the time and attention required for intergenerational transmission of living knowledge disappears not through overt cultural destruction but through the reorganisation of daily life into forms that make transmission structurally impossible (Thompson 1967, 56–97).

Wonesis in family practice means recovering that time and that attention.

For a Lani family in the Highlands of West Papua, this means: parents and grandparents speaking the language to children at home, even as the school teaches Indonesian; grandparents taking children to the land, teaching the names of places, the stories attached to them, the ecological knowledge encoded in them; families maintaining the food systems — the gardens, the pigs, the relationships with specific pieces of ground — that connect daily life to the first cage rather than making it entirely dependent on the money economy; ceremonies being conducted with children present and with explicit attention to their role as learners rather than merely as attendees.

For a Melanesian family in an urban context, separated from ancestral land by two or three generations of economic migration, Wonesis in family practice means: maintaining the language even in the city, maintaining the connections to the village and the land even when visits are infrequent, telling the stories of the land to children who have not yet stood on it so that the memory is carried forward as a living aspiration rather than a historical record.

For a family of Aboriginal descent in Australia, it means: whatever fragments of living memory remain — whatever language, whatever relationship to whatever piece of land, whatever ceremony, whatever ecological knowledge — are treated as the most valuable inheritance available and transmitted to children with the urgency that urgency requires.

The standard for whether a family is practicing Wonesis is not whether it has achieved some idealised cosmopolitan existence. It is whether the living connection between the family and its specific ground of existence is stronger or weaker than it was a generation ago.

Wonesis at the family scale means: stronger. That is the minimum. That is everything.

Displaced Individual: Wonesis Without Land

One of the hardest questions the Wonesis framework faces is what orientation is available to the person who has been completely severed from Inaorak connection — who speaks none of their ancestral language, maintains none of the ceremonial knowledge, has no access to the land, and has no living elder to transmit what they have lost.

This is not hypothetical. It is the condition of millions of people produced by several centuries of Psycho-Cosmocide.

What does Wonesis mean for them? The first and most important thing Wonesis says to this person is: the loss is real. It should not be minimised, romanticised, or resolved too quickly by adopting the practices of another people's cosmopolitan tradition. The loss is a wound. Naming it as such is the beginning of honesty.

The Wonesis framework does not offer comfort to the displaced individual. It offers orientation. And the orientation it offers is this: begin where you are, with what remains.

What remains in a person who has been completely severed from Inaorak connection is the first cage — the body, the mortality, the ecological dependence, the need for food and water and shelter and kinship that no amount of Second Cage abstraction has been able to extinguish. That ground is always still there. It is the starting point for whatever reconstruction is possible.

For the displaced individual, Wonesis in practice means: land first. Acquire access to land — not as an investment, not as a commodity, but as physical ground that can be inhabited, tended, and known over time. Grow food. Learn the ecological relationships of the specific piece of ground on which you live. Begin to develop the practices of attention and obligation to a place that, over time and across generations, constitute the earliest formation of a new cosmopolitan connection.

This is not Inaorak. It will not be Inaorak for many generations. But it is the direction that Wonesis points in when the original connection has been lost — and it is the only direction from which a new Inaorak connection can eventually emerge. Wa Thiong'o's insistence that language carries the cosmological relationship of a people to their place — and that recovering language is recovering that relationship — applies here in a different register: the displaced person begins with the land, and from the land, across generations, a new language of belonging eventually grows (Wa Thiong'o 1986, 4–33).

City Dwellers: Wonesis Under Maximum Second Cage Pressure

The city dweller lives within the most sophisticated substitution system ever constructed: food arrives through supply chains with no visible ecological relationship to the person eating it; time is organised by the market rather than by seasonal or ceremonial rhythms; kinship is progressively replaced by contractual social relationships; the living world is experienced primarily as a backdrop to digital and economic activity rather than as the ground of existence.

In this context, what does Wonesis mean? For a city dweller of cosmopolitan descent — a Papuan or Aboriginal or Melanesian or African person living in an urban environment — Wonesis in the city means maintaining the connections that the city is designed to sever. It means continuing to speak the language with family, continuing to send money back to support the land relationships at home rather than severing them entirely, continuing to return for ceremonies even when the logistics are difficult, continuing to tell children the stories of the land even when the land is a thousand kilometres away. It means treating the urban period as temporary — a phase within a longer trajectory that remains oriented toward Inaorak belonging rather than a permanent replacement of it.

It means resisting the identity capture of the city — the progressive absorption into urban consumer identity that eventually makes the original cosmopolitan ground feel foreign rather than home. Fanon's analysis of how colonial society produces in the colonised person a psychological orientation toward the coloniser's world — a white mask worn over a Black face, a borrowed identity that obscures the original self — names this dynamic at its deepest psychological level: the city's identity capture is not merely social but ontological (Fanon 1967, 17–40).

For a city dweller of non-cosmopolitan or Kuru descent — someone whose people's original cosmopolitan connection was severed long ago — Wonesis in the city means something different but structurally related. It means finding the First Cage within the city: the garden plot, the community supported agriculture relationship, the direct food growing even at small scale. It means building kinship that is not merely contractual — that carries obligation, reciprocity, and intergenerational continuity. It means developing a relationship to a specific urban place that, over time, accumulates the qualities of genuine attachment rather than mere residence.

Meadows's systems principle applies: you cannot sustain what you do not pay attention to, and attention paid to the living world even within an urban context begins to create the conditions for the kind of belonging that eventually constitutes something worth transmitting (Meadows 2008, 170–181).

These are the first steps of what the Wonesis framework, in the European case, described as the construction of a new cosmopolitan formation from the ground up.

They are slow, unglamorous, and essential.

Conclusion

Wonesis is not a new civilisation, ideology, sacred order, political movement, or theological system.

It is a philosophical map of human belonging — drawn from a specific position, in response to a specific and devastating condition, using conceptual tools developed from the Lani cosmological tradition and tested against the full weight of the civilisational evidence that the Psycho-Cosmocide framework has assembled.

Its central claims can be stated plainly. Human beings exist within two cages: the first given, the second manufactured. The manufactured cage — the Civilisational Psycho-Cosmocide Virus — is destroying the conditions under which life can remain alive, severing communities from land, memory, and cosmological orientation. The money system is the mechanism through which this destruction is now operating at its most complete and most irreversible form: converting all eight atlases of human existence into purchasable commodities, making Inaorak belonging a market asset, and enabling those who control sufficient capital to claim Inaorak anywhere on the planet while rendering the actual Inaorak peoples of every landscape effectively Kuru on their own ground.

Against this condition, Wonesis names the ground that remains.

Wone continues to flow through the landscapes, communities, languages, and living memories that have not yet been completely absorbed by the manufactured enclosure. The preservation and recovery of that living connection — physical, cultural, and metaphysical simultaneously — is not sentimentality. It is the condition of a viable future.

And the window within which that recovery is possible — the window of living memory, living language, living ceremony, and living land — is being closed, in real time, by the money system that has made everything purchasable.

The Psycho-Cosmocide framework diagnosed the wound. Wonesis names the conditions under which the wound can stop being inflicted and life can be rebuilt from what remains. It maps the terrain and points toward where the ground is still solid enough to stand on.

The urgency is not philosophical. It is existential.

And the time is now — before the last living carrier of the memory that makes return possible is gone, and before the last piece of ground that could receive that return has been sold.

Wonesis is a map of human belongings. It recognises that all human organisation emerges through physical-biological, cultural-mythological, and metaphysical-transcendental bonds. Its purpose is not to convert humanity into another system, but to direct human beings back toward the conditions necessary for living existence: land, water, food, shelter, kinship, memory, meaning, and continuity with Earth itself.

Wonesis does not tell humanity what to worship. It asks humanity where it still remains alive.

For Those Who Exit or Fight

This paper has mapped the terrain. The cases have been laid out. The mechanisms have been named. The window has been identified, and the urgency has been stated as clearly as philosophical language allows.

What the philosophical language cannot carry — what no framework, however rigorous, can fully transmit — is this:

Return to land is not primarily a political act, nor an economic strategy. It is not primarily a cultural project. It is a cosmological act — the decision, made by a specific human being in a specific place at a specific moment, to *embody Wone* rather than a product of the system that is consuming it.

Every person who preserves a language preserves a channel through which Wone flows. Every ceremony maintained is a structure through which the living connection between a people and their landscape is kept alive. Every piece of land held, defended, or returned to is a point at which the sinking ship's logic is refused, and the ground of existence is recovered.

If you do not have land, you do not have a Noah's Ark; if you do not have a Noah's Ark, you cannot save your people; and if you cannot save your people, everything drowns in silence. For when memory is lost, no new world can be built, and to build a world we need only what we have always needed — land, water, food, fire, air, home, family, and memory — for these were the foundations before every civilisation, and they will remain long after every civilisation has passed away.

Bibliography

- Battiste, Marie, ed. 2000. *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Battiste, Marie. 2013. *Decolonizing Education: Nourishing the Learning Spirit*. Saskatoon: Purich Publishing.
- Baudrillard, Jean. 1994. *Simulacra and Simulation*. Translated by Sheila Faria Glaser. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. Originally published 1981.
- Coulthard, Glen Sean. 2014. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Debord, Guy. 1994. *The Society of the Spectacle*. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith. New York: Zone Books. Originally published 1967.
- Deloria, Vine, Jr., and Daniel R. Wildcat. 2001. *Power and Place: Indian Education in America*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing.
- Diamond, Jared. 2005. *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed*. New York: Viking.
- Durkheim, Émile. 1997. *Suicide: A Study in Sociology*. Translated by John A. Spaulding and George Simpson. New York: Free Press. Originally published 1897.
- Escobar, Arturo. 1995. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Escobar, Arturo. 2008. *Territories of Difference: Place, Movements, Life, Redes*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Fanon, Frantz. 1963. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Translated by Constance Farrington. New York: Grove Press. Originally published 1961.
- Fanon, Frantz. 1967. *Black Skin, White Masks*. Translated by Charles Lam Markmann. New York: Grove Press. Originally published 1952.
- Feil, D. K. 1987. *The Evolution of Highland Papua New Guinea Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1977. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books.
- Heidegger, Martin. 1962. *Being and Time*. Translated by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. New York: Harper & Row. Originally published 1927.
- Horkheimer, Max, and Theodor W. Adorno. 2002. *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*. Translated by Edmund Jephcott. Stanford: Stanford University Press. Originally published 1944.
- Ibn Khaldun. 1958. *The Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History*. Translated by Franz Rosenthal. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Originally written c. 1377.
- Kant, Immanuel. 1998. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated and edited by Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Originally published 1781.
- Kimmerer, Robin Wall. 2013. *Braiding Sweetgrass: Indigenous Wisdom, Scientific Knowledge, and the Teachings of Plants*. Minneapolis: Milkweed Editions.
- Koch, Klaus-Friedrich. 1974. *War and Peace in Jalemo: The Management of Conflict in Highland New Guinea*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kogoya, Yamin. 2025. *Papuan Tragedy: 300 Warnings from the Edge of Extinction*. milineXus.
- Kogoya, Yamin. 2026a. *Beyond the Papuan Rebel: Land as First Ontology — A West Papuan Philosophical Perspective*. Psycho-Cosmocide Studies, Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series No. 23. NATAKA Research Institute / Wone Press.

- Kogoya, Yamin. 2026b. *Building a Settler World Inside the Papuan World: Colonial Consciousness and the Struggle for Reality in West Papua*. Psycho-Cosmocide, Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series No. 13. NATAKA Research Institute / Wone Press.
- Kogoya, Yamin. 2026c. *Cosmobian and Synthobian — Two Modes of Being: From Ecological Reciprocity to Synthetic Civilisation*. Psycho-Cosmocide Studies, Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series No. 26. NATAKA Research Institute / Wone Press.
- Kogoya, Yamin. 2026d. *Cosmobian: Introducing a New Conceptual Category for Understanding Human Existence Beyond Civilisation*. Psycho-Cosmocide Studies and the Wonesis Framework. NATAKA Research Institute / Wone Press.
- Kogoya, Yamin. 2026e. *From the Wreckage: Eight Atlases of Human Existence Under Total Colonial Domination — A Psycho-Cosmocide Analysis from West Papua*. Psycho-Cosmocide Studies, Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series No. 11. NATAKA Research Institute / Wone Press.
- Kogoya, Yamin. 2026f. *Gilgamesh and Enkidu: Participatory Extinction and the Seduction of the Cosmobian Being*. Psycho-Cosmocide Studies, Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series No. 20. NATAKA Research Institute / Wone Press.
- Kogoya, Yamin. 2026g. *The Given and the Constructed: Seven Existential Cages of Psycho-Cosmocide Theory*. Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series No. 29. NATAKA Research Institute / Wone Press.
- Kogoya, Yamin. 2026h. *Israelisation and the Colonisation of Papuan Consciousness: Wam'ndanak'me: The Unfenced Mind*. Psycho-Cosmocide Studies, Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series No. 27. NATAKA Research Institute / Wone Press.
- Kogoya, Yamin. 2026i. *The Labyrinth of Papuan Extinction: Paradox, Participation, and the Collapse of Recognition*. Psycho-Cosmocide Studies, Kurumbi Wone Series, No. 19. NATAKA Research Institute / Wone Press.
- Kogoya, Yamin. 2026j. *The Papuans: A Cosmobian Society Stranded on the Highway of Civilisation*. Psycho-Cosmocide Studies, Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series No. 14. NATAKA Research Institute / Wone Press.
- Kogoya, Yamin. 2026k. *Plato's Cave and the Architecture of Psycho-Cosmocide in West Papua*. Psycho-Cosmocide Studies, Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series No. 8. NATAKA Research Institute / Wone Press.
- Kogoya, Yamin. 2026l. *Psycho-Cosmocide: A Theoretical Framework for the Study of the Systematic Destruction of Indigenous Cosmologies, Consciousness, and Metaphysical Order*. Revised and Expanded Edition. Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series No. 1. NATAKA Research Institute / Wone Press.
- Kogoya, Yamin. 2026m. *Psycho-Cosmocide: The Silent Invasion of Mind, Meaning, and Cosmos*. Psycho-Cosmocide Studies, Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series No. 2. NATAKA Research Institute / Wone Press.
- Kogoya, Yamin. 2026n. *The Seven Existential Cages: A Speculative Decolonial Ontology*. Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series No. 3. NATAKA Research Institute / Wone Press.
- Kogoya, Yamin. 2026o. *West Papua: Ontological Cages and Colonial Consent — Myth, Power, and the Colonial Structuring of Reality*. Psycho-Cosmocide Studies, Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series No. 4. NATAKA Research Institute / Wone Press.
- Lorde, Audre. 1984. *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. Trumansburg, NY: Crossing Press.
- Maaka, Roger, and Augie Fleras. 2005. *The Politics of Indigeneity: Challenging the State in Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.
- Meadows, Donella H. 2008. *Thinking in Systems: A Primer*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.

- Merchant, Carolyn. 1980. *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology, and the Scientific Revolution*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Mignolo, Walter D. 2000. *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mignolo, Walter D. 2011. *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Onians, Richard Broxton. 1951. *The Origins of European Thought about the Body, the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time, and Fate*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Powers, William K. 1977. *Oglala Religion*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Quijano, Aníbal. 2000. "Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America." *Nepantla: Views from South* 1 (3): 533–580.
- Ricoeur, Paul. 2004. *Memory, History, Forgetting*. Translated by Kathleen Blamey and David Pellauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rose, Deborah Bird. 1996. *Nourishing Terrains: Australian Aboriginal Views of Landscape and Wilderness*. Canberra: Australian Heritage Commission.
- Saltford, John. 2003. *The United Nations and the Indonesian Takeover of West Papua, 1962–1969: The Anatomy of Betrayal*. London: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2014. *Epistemologies of the South: Justice Against Epistemicide*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Shiva, Vandana. 1988. *Staying Alive: Women, Ecology, and Development*. London: Zed Books.
- Shiva, Vandana. 1997. *Biopiracy: The Plunder of Nature and Knowledge*. Boston: South End Press.
- Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake. 2017. *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom through Radical Resistance*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Slingerland, Edward. 2003. *Effortless Action: Wu-wei as Conceptual Metaphor and Spiritual Ideal in Early China*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books.
- Tainter, Joseph A. 1988. *The Collapse of Complex Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson, E. P. 1967. "Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism." *Past and Present* 38: 56–97.
- Tinker, George E. 1993. *Missionary Conquest: The Gospel and Native American Cultural Genocide*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. 2015. *Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future: Summary of the Final Report*. Winnipeg: Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada.
- Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. 2012. "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society* 1 (1): 1–40.
- Wa Thiong'o, Ngũgĩ. 1986. *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. London: James Currey.
- Wang, Robin. 2012. *Yinyang: The Way of Heaven and Earth in Chinese Thought and Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Watts, Alan W. 2013. *The Spirit of Zen: A Way of Life, Work, and Art in the Far East*. New York: Grove Press.
- Whyte, Kyle Powys. 2018. "Indigenous Science (Fiction) for the Anthropocene: Ancestral Dystopias and Fantasies of Climate Change Crises." *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space* 1 (1–2): 224–242.

- Wolfe, Patrick. 2006. "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native." *Journal of Genocide Research* 8 (4): 387–409.
- Wynter, Sylvia. 2003. "Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom: Towards the Human, after Man, Its Overrepresentation—An Argument." *CR: The New Centennial Review* 3 (3): 257–337.
- Zuboff, Shoshana. 2019. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. New York: PublicAffairs.

About the Author

Yamin Kogoya is a Papuan philosopher, writer, and independent researcher from the Central Highlands of New Guinea (West Papua), currently based in Australia.

His work investigates one of the most enduring questions of human existence: how worlds are created, transformed, and destroyed. He is the originator of the Psycho-Cosmocide paradigm, an interdisciplinary philosophical framework that examines the destruction of human worlds not only through physical violence, occupation, or ecological devastation, but through the systematic reorganisation of perception, memory, meaning, and reality itself. Within this framework, he argues that words, images, symbols, signs, colours, institutions, and technologies do not merely represent the world—they participate in creating, reorganising, and erasing the conditions through which human beings inhabit it.

Kogoya introduced the concepts of the Cosmobian World and the Synthobian World to distinguish two fundamentally different modes of human existence. The Cosmobian World refers to forms of life constituted through reciprocal relationships with land, ancestry, kinship, memory, ecology, language, and the cosmos. The Synthobian World refers to synthetic, engineered systems of existence organised through abstraction, institutions, technology, production, and civilisational processes. The relationship between these two worlds forms the central philosophical architecture of his research.

Drawing upon Indigenous cosmologies together with philosophy, anthropology, history, religion, mythology, and civilisation studies, Kogoya develops original conceptual frameworks for interpreting the contemporary human condition. His work re-examines humanity's foundational myths, epics, tragedies, religions, and philosophical traditions as enduring civilisational architectures through which societies organise reality, negotiate meaning, confront mortality, remember the past, imagine the future, and participate in their own survival or extinction. Although grounded in the historical experience of West Papua, his research addresses broader philosophical questions concerning civilisation, consciousness, memory, belonging, power, and the future of human worlds.

He holds a Master of Applied Anthropology and Participatory Development from the Australian National University. His academic background also includes Religious Studies, Indigenous Studies, and Asia-Pacific Studies, and he undertook advanced study in epistemology at the University of Oxford. His research and commentary have appeared in *SBS News*, *RNZ Pacific*, *Asia Pacific Report*, *The Fiji Times*, and *The Jakarta Post*.

Kogoya is the founder of the NATAKA Research Institute, an independent research institute dedicated to the philosophical and historical study of human worlds and the conditions under which societies survive, transform, or become extinct.

Published by Wone Press | An imprint of the NATAKA Research Institute
psychocosmocide.com | info@psychocosmocide.com
© 2026 Yamin Kogoya. All rights reserved.