

NATAKA Research Institute

Wone Press

Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series, No. 15 (2026)

The Mystery of ‘O’ in Papuan Lani Cosmology

O, Being, Space, Time, and the Lani Living Universe

A Lani Indigenous Philosophy of Language and Cosmology

Yamin Kogoya

Abstract

This paper examines the Lani word O — a single vowel from the Central Highlands of West Papua — as a compressed cosmological framework encoding what Western modernity has distributed across separate disciplines: space, time, cosmos, environment, season, epoch, home, and condition. Through etymological analysis, grammatical demonstration, and philosophical interpretation, the paper argues that O represents not a primitive or undifferentiated concept but a sophisticated integrative ontology that preserves the experience of existence as a unified, living whole. The Sun’s Lani name, O’negen (“eye of O”), is examined as an example of cosmological knowledge compressed into language. This revised edition situates that argument within two further bodies of scholarship. First, it is read against the comparative linguistics and philosophy of language that has, from Wilhelm von Humboldt and Franz Boas through Edward Sapir, Benjamin Lee Whorf, and Keith Basso, argued that a language’s grammar can encode a people’s lived relationship to space, time, and place — situating O within, while also exceeding, that literature. Second, it is fully integrated into the wider Psycho-Cosmocide corpus developed across the Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series: the foundational definitions of Wone, Psyche, Psycho, and Cosmocide (Working Paper No. 1B); the Seven Existential Cages and the Eight Atlases of Human Existence (Working Papers No. 3, 4, 6, 11, 29); the Canvas Principle and land as first ontology (Working Paper No. 23); the parasitological mechanism of cascading incapacitation (Working Paper No. 18); the Cosmobian/Synthobian distinction (Working Paper No. 26); the paradox of participatory extinction (Working Paper No. 19); the Four Gospels of development, progress, religiosity, and success (Working Paper No. 21 and No. 10); the analysis of settler renaming and Inaorak belonging (Working Paper No. 13); and the Wonesis antidote framework, including the fourfold structure of Wone — Obelom, Mage, Maluk, and Kurumbi Wone — and the Inaorak/Kuru distinction (Working Paper No. 16). The paper argues that the destruction of cosmological frameworks such as O through colonial occupation and colonial schooling constitutes what the Psycho-Cosmocide Research Paradigm names: not merely linguistic or cultural loss, but the systematic elimination of an entire relationship to reality. The paper situates this analysis within the ongoing struggle over West Papua and contributes to Indigenous philosophy, philosophy of language, linguistic anthropology, and the critique of epistemic colonialism.

Keywords: Lani language, West Papua, Indigenous cosmology, philosophy of language, linguistic relativity, ontology, Psycho-Cosmocide, Wonesis, Canvas Principle, Inaorak, epistemic colonialism, O, O’negen

A Note on This Revision

The first edition of this paper (archived 2026) argued its case largely on its own terms, drawing the Psycho-Cosmocide vocabulary into service without fully cross-referencing the working papers in which that vocabulary is developed at length. This revised edition closes that gap. Three changes distinguish it from the original. First, the philosophy-of-language argument — that O compresses what Western disciplines separate — is now placed explicitly within the comparative literature on linguistic relativity and language-and-place, so that readers can locate the paper’s claim relative to a century of debate about whether, and how, grammar shapes cosmology. Second, every major structural claim — the CPCV mechanism, the Eight Atlases, the Seven Cages, the Canvas Principle, cascading incapacitation, the Four Gospels, Wonesis — is now cited to the working paper in which it is developed, rather than restated as if new. Third, a new section situates O’s destruction within the empirical record of language endangerment in West Papua and Indonesia more broadly, and a new closing section reads the paper’s Land–Food–Water–Air–Fire–Home–Family–Memory sequence directly against the fourfold structure of Wone and the Inaorak/Kuru distinction developed in Working Paper No. 16. The result is a paper that stands on its own as an argument in the philosophy of language, while also taking its proper place — for the first time in a fully cited way — within the wider Psycho-Cosmocide research programme.

Introduction

What does a single letter know? This paper takes that question seriously. It begins with O — one vowel, one breath, one of the oldest sounds the human mouth makes — and follows it into the Central Highlands of West Papua, where the Lani people have long used it to name something that Western civilisation has distributed across physics, ecology, meteorology, philosophy of time, and the study of place, and has never quite reassembled into a single concept.

O, in Lani, holds simultaneously what modern thought has separated into physics, ecology, meteorology, philosophy of time, and the study of place. Space, time, climate, condition, season, cosmos, home, direction — not as a catalogue of meanings, but as a single undivided reality.

The paper traces this word through its grammar, its cosmology, and its most extraordinary compound: O’negen, the Lani name for the Sun, which parses as the eye of O — a complete philosophical proposition compressed into five letters.

But this is not only a paper about language. It is a paper about what happens when such a language — and the cosmological relationship to reality it encodes — is systematically dismantled. Read through the Psycho-Cosmocide framework developed across this working paper series (Kogoya 2026a; 2026m), the Indonesian state’s occupation of West Papua constitutes not only a political and military event but an epistemological one: the ongoing replacement of an integrated cosmological universe with a fragmented, administered, extractive model of existence. The schoolroom, not the battlefield, is identified as the Civilisational Psycho-Cosmocide Virus’s (CPCV) most effective instrument (Kogoya 2026m; 2026i). This paper argues that Cosmobian Papuan children undergo a form of cosmological and epistemological annihilation within the colonial schooling system — one that takes hold before they have had the opportunity to learn the grammar of the worlds that brought them into existence.

The paper closes with Wonesis — the framework of return (Kogoya 2026p) — and its insistence that recovery begins not in civilisational courts or parliamentary chambers, but in the act of a child learning, in their own tongue, that the universe they inhabit already has a name, and the name is O.

O in the Lani Language

A methodological note on this section: the Lani-language material presented below — the etymologies, grammatical patterns, and example utterances — derives from the author's own native fluency in Lani. The author is a full first-language Lani speaker, raised within a Lani-speaking community in the Central Highlands of West Papua prior to entering Western educational institutions, and analyses this material from within that fluency rather than reconstructing it through the categories of an external observer. This positioning is consistent with the "turning the camera around" methodology and the Wone Kenok epistemological position developed across this working paper series, in which Cosmopolitan knowledge is examined from within rather than described from outside it.

In most languages, the letter O is simply a vowel. A mouth-shape. A sound between breath and silence. But in the Lani language of the Central Highlands of West Papua, O is something else entirely. It is a cosmological declaration. A single glyph that holds within its circle what Western civilisation has spent millennia trying to separate into different disciplines, different sciences, different philosophies — and has never fully reassembled.

O, in Lani, means: space — time, universe, cosmos, reality, condition, situation, season, calendar, clock, weather, climate, environment, age or epoch, paradigm, eon, home, house, location, and direction.

*“All of this — not as a list of translations, but as a single, undivided living reality.
The Lani O does not merely name these things. It holds them together as one.”*

Modern Western thought rests on a foundational act of division. Space is measured by physics. Time is measured by clocks. The environment is the domain of ecology. Seasons belong to meteorology. Paradigms belong to the philosophy of science. Each is governed by a different institution, a different vocabulary, a different set of experts.

This division is not natural. It is not ancient. It is a consequence of a particular civilisational trajectory — one that gained momentum with the Enlightenment's separation of the knowing subject from the known world, and accelerated through industrial modernity's need to manage, quantify, and control each domain separately.

The Lani O predates this division entirely. It names the whole before the whole was broken apart. And in doing so, it preserves something that the modern world has largely lost: the experience of existing inside a total, living, responsive cosmos — not as observers of a universe, but as participants within O.

O and the Philosophy of Language

A claim of this kind — that a single word in an Indigenous language integrates what a colonising civilisation has split into separate disciplines — does not stand alone. It belongs to a century-long argument in linguistics and the philosophy of language about whether, and how far, a language’s grammar shapes the reality its speakers inhabit. Locating O within that argument, rather than beside it, is the task of this section.

The starting point is usually traced to Wilhelm von Humboldt’s early nineteenth-century claim that every language contains a distinctive *Weltansicht*, a way of viewing the world, built into its grammar rather than added to it afterward as vocabulary. Franz Boas and his student Edward Sapir developed this into a working method for American linguistic anthropology, and Sapir’s own student, Benjamin Lee Whorf, pushed it furthest in his studies of the Hopi language. Whorf argued that Hopi grammar does not carve time into the discrete, countable units that European languages assume — seconds, minutes, days treated as objects that can be added and subtracted — but instead treats duration as a continuous, ripening process; brief events that English renders as nouns (“a flash”, “a wave”) are rendered in Hopi as verbs. Whorf’s specific claims about Hopi have been contested and, in places, corrected by later fieldwork — Ekkehart Malotki’s work in particular showed that Hopi does use spatial metaphors for time more extensively than Whorf allowed — and the strongest, deterministic version of his hypothesis (that grammar imprisons thought) is now generally rejected. What survives, in the more careful ‘weak’ form defended by later linguists, is the narrower and more defensible claim this paper also makes: that the grammatical structure a language habitually uses will shape the patterns of attention and inference its speakers find natural, without foreclosing what they are capable of thinking.

O belongs to this tradition of evidence, and also exceeds it. The evidence is grammatical, and it was presented in the first edition of this paper without being named as such: a single unchanging particle placed at the front of clauses about weather, time, place, and condition alike — O mayu wage, O kobir, O tati paga, O obelom agarak — performing, through its sheer syntactic constancy, the claim that these are not four different kinds of fact but four expressions of a single underlying ground. This is exactly the kind of grammatical patterning Whorf pointed to in Hopi and that later linguists such as Anna Wierzbicka have continued to document across Indigenous language families: not merely different words for the same underlying concepts, but different underlying conceptual architecture built into obligatory grammatical categories. Where O exceeds the classical linguistic-relativity literature is in scope: Whorf’s Hopi evidence concerned time and space; O compresses time, space, weather, condition, dwelling, and epoch into a single morpheme, which is a considerably stronger integrative claim than the literature has generally documented for any single lexical item.

A second, complementary literature concerns not grammar but place. Keith Basso’s long ethnographic study of Western Apache place-naming, *Wisdom Sits in Places*, argued that among the Western Apache a place-name is never merely a locational tag: it is a compressed narrative,

carrying an entire moral and historical lesson that unfolds the moment the name is spoken, so that landscape and language jointly constitute a “landscape of the moral imagination” through which wisdom and identity are transmitted. O’negen — “the eye of O” — performs a structurally similar compression, though its register is cosmological rather than narrative-moral: a five-letter compound that states, in Basso’s sense, a complete philosophical proposition about the perceiving, illuminating centre of the cosmos, rather than a story about a particular ancestor at a particular spring. Vine Deloria Jr.’s foundational distinction between space-centred and time-centred religious traditions is the third anchor: Deloria argued that Indigenous North American traditions organise reality primarily around place, while the Christianity that colonised them organises reality primarily around a linear history moving toward a chosen future (Deloria 1973). O sits, in this respect, closer to Deloria’s space-centred pole than either pole alone — not because it lacks a temporal dimension, but because, as the grammar shows, it refuses to let time float free of place, condition, and cosmos in the way linear-historical religious and administrative time requires.

None of this is offered to borrow authority from outside scholarship for a claim that could not stand on its own. It is offered because a philosophy of language that argues for the irreducibility of O to Western categories has an obligation to show exactly where it agrees with, departs from, and exceeds the existing comparative record — rather than asserting uniqueness in a vacuum the literature could otherwise fill in either direction.

The Eye of O — O’negen (The Sun)

The Lani word for the Sun is O’negen. To understand what this means, we must go to its root. The Lani word for eye is enegen — literally, the organ of seeing. In speech and compounding, enegen contracts to negen, and when joined to O it becomes O’negen: O + enegen. The eye of O. The eye of the cosmos. The eye of space-time. The eye of the living total reality.

O + Enegen: The Eye of O

The etymology itself is the argument: enegen (eye) + O (cosmos, space-time, living reality) = O’negen. The name of the Sun is a complete philosophical proposition compressed into a single word. When the Lani elders named the Sun the eye of O, they were not reaching for metaphor. They were describing a precise cosmological relationship: the Sun is the perceiving, illuminating centre of the space-time reality in which all beings dwell. Without the eye of O, nothing can be seen. Nothing can be known. Nothing can grow. The cosmos sees itself through O’negen — and we exist within that seeing.

Einstein’s general relativity established that space and time are not independent stages on which events occur but a single, inseparable manifold whose geometry is itself shaped by what occupies it. The comparison is instructive precisely because of where it breaks down. Einstein’s unification is a mathematical-physical one, arrived at through measurement and formalism, indifferent to the observer’s meaning-making relationship to the universe it describes. The Lani O begins from a

structurally comparable intuition — that space and time are not separable domains — but extends it in a direction physics does not: O includes not only space and time but season and climate, condition and circumstance, age and epoch, home and direction, and it does so from within a participatory, ethically loaded relationship to the cosmos rather than from outside it as a measuring instrument. What modern disciplines distribute across separate fields of knowledge, O gathers into a single lived and inhabited whole.

One of the most remarkable features of O is not simply what it means, but how it behaves within the Lani language itself. Across countless expressions, O remains unchanged while everything around it changes.

O mayu wage — it is raining.

O muk kime agarak — it is already dark.

O kobir — yesterday.

O kolu — tomorrow.

O obelom agarak — the condition is good.

O maluk ekerak yi — the condition is bad but this could mean either weather or human reality.

The weather changes, the condition changes, time moves from yesterday to tomorrow, human situations rise and fall, yet O remains exactly where it is.

This grammatical stability reveals something profound about the Lani understanding of existence. O is not merely one thing among many things within reality. It is the ground within which reality unfolds. Rain occurs within O, darkness occurs within O, human life occurs within O, history itself occurs within O. The language therefore performs a cosmology. Every time a Lani speaker places O at the beginning of an expression, the language quietly reaffirms a fundamental insight: beneath the changing conditions of existence there remains an underlying continuity that does not disappear when circumstances change. O is the unchanging ground upon which change becomes possible.

Because O encompasses time in all its scales — the hour, the week, the season, the millennium, the paradigm — it functions in Lani thought as the master temporal framework.

The phrase Wone O pebi time arigin invokes this longest view: the consequences of actions not just across decades but across eons, across the full arc of what O has witnessed and what O is still unfolding.

This gives Lani ethical reasoning a temporal depth that modern political thinking almost never achieves. Most decisions made by governments, corporations, and institutions are measured against electoral cycles, quarterly reports, or at best a generation.

The Lani O demands that decisions be weighed against the fullness of cosmic time — not as an abstraction, but as the actual ground of being within which all human action takes place.

“The Lani O is the most compressed philosophical statement I know. In a single letter, it annihilates the separations that Western modernity built its entire civilisation upon.”

O in Everyday Speech — A Living Grammar

The depth of O is not found only in philosophy or cosmology. It is also found in the speech of every Lani speaker, every day. What follows is a partial demonstration, drawn from everyday Lani speech, of how the single letter O anchors an entire grammar of existence.

The full linguistic architecture through which reality is described in relation to O is vast enough to require a dedicated paper of its own. For the purposes of this paper, only a small selection is presented—a tip of the iceberg—to demonstrate how O functions within the Lani language and worldview.

It is important to understand that O itself never changes. What changes is what is being described and whether it is expressed in an individual or collective register. This list could easily extend to two hundred or even five hundred expressions. What is offered here is only a window into that much larger linguistic world.

Time and the Sun

O'negen yindi wage — the Sun rises.

O'negen wuranage — the Sun sets.

O'negen muk nage — time is already moving or departing.

O muk aret nage — the day, night, morning, afternoon, or a specific existential space is moving or departing.

O'negen mande kagan — What is the time?

Time, Place, and Arrival

O'negen tati ari nage paga — when that time comes; when we arrive at that appointed moment.

O tati ari na'nuk — when we reach that destination, whether physical or understood as a situation or condition.

O tati paga — at that moment, referring both to physical space or location and to an abstract space-time condition.

O time n'ggwi paga — over there, pointing to a distant space or location.

O yime nggwi — over here, pointing to this place.

O time ari nanuk — after we arrived there; after we reached or passed that point.

Weather

O mayu wage — it is raining.

O tinakor nagakerak — it is cloudy.

O muk kime agarak — it is already dark or nighttime.

O muk li'ngge agarak — it is already daylight.

O wiya eke ti — it is windy.

O wiya wage ti — the wind is coming; it is windy.

Situation and Condition

O time no 'nggop kagan — how is the situation there? What is happening in that general space? (General enquiry.)

O tati no 'nggop kogop — how is your situation there, in your immediate space and environment? (Specific, personal enquiry.)

O maluk agarak/ekerak — bad weather; a bad condition; a bad situation, referring both to weather and to circumstances.

O obelom agarak — the weather and the condition of human existence are good; order, harmony, and a happy time.

O yime 'ndime — the whole area; all conditions; everywhere, anywhere, or somewhere—the collective totality of space and time. This expression is used especially in reference to physical location.

Time: Past, Present, and Future

O maan time — a long time ago.

O a 'nduk kwe tati — not so long ago.

O kobir — yesterday.

O yogo 'ndak — today.

O kwebi — in the future (indefinite).

O Kolu — tomorrow (definite).

Land, Place, and Home

O tati an name — that place is my land, my space, my forest, mountain, river, home, or house—my entire ecology.

O ti ta ame — that place or space—whose home, space, or land is there?

O wurik — house, building, or home; a built dwelling or structure.

O ap iname time — that place or space belonging to particular people; the land of those human beings.

O n 'ggwen paga inom, O m 'bogut paga inom — earth and sky; the below and the above; the total vertical axis of O.

O n 'ggwen enona — beneath the ground; inside the soil.

O m 'bogut paga — heaven; sky.

And then the single letter O itself can be used to describe, or to state, or to refer to the cosmos, reality, or universe as a whole.

In Lani worldview, O does not merely signify physical space or chronological time. Rather, it denotes an integrated field of existence within which time, place, movement, atmosphere, relationship, and experience unfold simultaneously.

Notice what does not change in any of these expressions. The O at the front never shifts. It is the constant ground. Everything else — the verb, the modifier, the subject, the direction — arrives to describe what is happening within O. In this sense, Lani grammar enacts the cosmology: O is the unchanging container; existence unfolds inside it. The language itself teaches the philosophy every time a Lani speaker opens their mouth.

The deepest mystery of O is that it is neither a thing within existence nor a concept about existence. O is the condition that makes both things and concepts possible. It is the field within which

mountains arise, rivers flow, stars burn, languages emerge, memories accumulate, children are born, ancestors are remembered, and worlds disappear. Yet O itself remains prior to every distinction that allows any of these to be named. One cannot stand outside O and observe it, because every act of observation already occurs within it. One cannot point to O as an object, because the finger, the eye, the mind, and the object pointed toward are already held inside its embrace.

O is therefore not merely a word in the Lani language; it is the linguistic trace of an intuition so profound that it touches the boundary where language begins to fail.

The rain falls in O. The ancestors dwell in O. The unborn arrive through O. The living moves within O. The dead return to O. Nothing enters it and nothing leaves it, because there is nowhere beyond it to go.

The greatest challenge O presents to human thought is that it refuses the separation between observer and observed. Most systems of knowledge begin by placing a distance between the knower and the known. O dissolves that distance. The person who speaks O is not describing reality from outside; they are participating in reality's ongoing self-disclosure.

In this sense, O is neither a cosmological theory nor a religious doctrine. It is a mode of orientation toward existence itself. It is the recognition that the universe is not an object standing before us, but the living totality within which we ourselves are taking place.

O is not merely a sound, letter, or grammatical marker, but a linguistic doorway through which existence itself can be located, experienced, described, and related. In everyday Lani speech, O appears across expressions concerning time, place, movement, weather, land, human relationships, conditions, and the changing states of existence, allowing speakers to situate themselves within a living field of relations rather than describing reality as a collection of separate objects. O can point toward what is here or there, above or below, arriving or departing, past or future, ordered or disordered, individual or collective. Its significance therefore lies not simply in its frequency but in the conceptual work it performs: O provides a grammatical and cosmological orientation through which the Lani speaker encounters the world as a connected, moving, relational totality. In this sense, O is not only part of the Lani language; it becomes a linguistic expression of Lani ontology—the way existence, space, time, land, and human presence are understood as belonging to one continuously related world.

O in the Psycho-Cosmocide Framework

Read alone, O risks appearing as an isolated linguistic curiosity. Read within the wider Psycho-Cosmocide corpus, it occupies a precise position within an already-developed architecture, and situating it there sharpens rather than dilutes the argument.

The foundational framework paper of this series (Kogoya 2026l; 2026o) establishes four core terms: Wone, the primordial ordering principle of all existence; Psyche, the human interior architecture through which that principle is received and enacted; Psycho, the condition of disturbance produced in the psyche by the systematic imposition of alien symbolic systems; and Cosmocide, the destruction of the ordered, relational, meaningful world that results from Psycho operating at collective scale. O is best understood, within this vocabulary, as the linguistic register of Wone — not Wone itself, which is the ordering principle, but the word through which Lani speakers name their standing within that order every time they open their mouths. Where Wone names the sacred order in its four Lani manifestations — Obelom Wone (right relationship and governance), Mage Wone (sacred prohibition), Maluk Wone (broken order), and Kurumbi Wone (warning) (Kogoya 2026p) — O is the grammatical infrastructure through which a speaker locates any given moment, condition, or place relative to that order without needing to name Wone explicitly. This is why the destruction of O is not merely lexical loss: it removes the linguistic scaffolding through which Wone is invoked in ordinary speech, long before a child is old enough to be taught the four manifestations by name.

The Seven Existential Cages framework (Kogoya 2026n; 2026j; 2026k) distinguishes historically colonisable cages — Physical, Symbolic, Metaphysical, Technological — from three trans-historical constants the CPCV exploits but did not create: the Corridor of the Dead, the Cage of Absolute Unknowing, and the Cage of the Irreducible Other. O sits at an unusual position relative to this taxonomy. As a word, O belongs to the Symbolic Cage and is therefore historically colonisable — which is precisely what is happening in the 742 Indonesian-curriculum schools discussed below. But what O names — the living totality within which mortality, unknowing, and the interiority of every being unfold — gestures toward the trans-historical constants themselves. This is not a contradiction; it is the paper’s central claim in cage-theoretic terms: O is a historically vulnerable linguistic instrument for holding a trans-historically constant relationship to existence, which is exactly why its loss is so consequential — the word can be colonised even where the condition it names cannot.

The Eight Atlases of Human Existence (Kogoya 2026e; 2026f) name the Physical/Material, Biological/Organism, Cultural/Mythological, Metaphysical/Transcendental, Particle/Energy, Space/Time, Memory/Consciousness, and Ultimate Unknown domains as a single interdependent ecosystem rather than eight separate registers. O is the clearest possible illustration of why the Eight Atlases must be read as interdependent rather than discrete: a single Lani morpheme spans at minimum the Space/Time, Cultural/Mythological, and Memory/Consciousness atlases simultaneously, which is exactly the paper’s original claim restated in the series’ own technical vocabulary. Where Western disciplinary organisation assigns space to physics, time to horology, and memory to psychology, each atlas colonised separately and by a different institution, O demonstrates that in Lani cosmology these atlases were never separate to begin with — which is also why the CPCV’s atlas-by-atlas method of attack (documented in Kogoya 2026e) can proceed through the school’s language curriculum alone and still reach all three atlases at once.

O and the Canvas Principle

Working Paper No. 23 develops the Canvas Principle: the claim that every worldview presupposes a material and ecological canvas — land — upon which language, memory, and metaphysics are painted, so that colonisation is never merely territorial seizure but the repainting of reality itself (Kogoya 2026a). The paper's embodiment argument runs: thinking presupposes embodiment, embodiment presupposes ecology, ecology presupposes land. O supplies that argument's linguistic counterpart. If land is the canvas, O is the grammar by which the Lani language keeps every utterance anchored to that canvas: the same unchanging particle that opens a sentence about rain, about yesterday, about a house, or about the whole of the cosmos performs, at the level of syntax, exactly the work the Canvas Principle performs at the level of ontology — refusing to let any symbolic act (a sentence, a name, a story) float free of the ecological ground from which it is spoken. To rename a mountain in Indonesian, on this reading, is not simply to apply a new label to an existing referent; it is to relocate that mountain outside the grammatical field that O organises, and to install it instead within a nomenclature — provincial, cadastral, developmental — that has no equivalent unchanging ground term at all. The settler map, in other words, has no O of its own; it substitutes coordinates for cosmos.

Language Loss as Psycho-Cosmocide

This is what the Psycho-Cosmocide framework names: not only the physical violence against Papuan peoples, but the systematic destruction of the cosmological frameworks — the Wone, the O, the Kunume of meaning — within which those peoples understood themselves, their land, their time, and their place in the living cosmos. To destroy a language that contains O is to destroy an entire relationship to reality itself.

The parasitic nature of the civilisational-colonial project is that it rarely becomes fully aware of its own limitations. It seldom acknowledges that it may be incomplete, mistaken, or fundamentally misconstruing the realities it claims to understand. Instead, one of its most pathological tendencies is the assumption that its own categories of knowledge are universal and superior.

This is precisely the phenomenon that the Psycho-Cosmocide Research Paradigm was developed to investigate: a civilisational pathology that systematically dismisses alternative ways of knowing and being. Working Paper No. 18 gives this pathology a specific mechanism: the parasitological model of cascading incapacitation, in which colonial institutions need not colonise every layer of a people's reality-making capacity independently — they need only sufficiently compromise the foundational, ecological layer for the damage to cascade automatically upward, through memory, through language, through oral tradition (Kogoya 2026d). The destruction of O follows exactly this cascade: the physical dispossession of Lani ecological life first weakens the everyday occasions on which O's weather, land, and season expressions are used; that weakening then

destabilises the memory infrastructure that carries O’negen’s etymology across generations; and that destabilised memory, in turn, interrupts the oral transmission through which a child would otherwise absorb O before ever setting foot in a classroom. By the time a Lani child sits down at an Indonesian-curriculum desk, the cascade is often already partially underway.

Throughout the colonial era, countless Cosmobian (Kogoya 2026c) — cosmos-inhabiting, land-rooted Indigenous — societies were labelled as primitive, stagnant, backward, unintelligent, Stone Age, uncivilised, heathen, pagan, cannibalistic, naked, non-religious, or underdeveloped. Such labels did not merely describe; they functioned as instruments of domination. They justified intervention, conversion, assimilation, dispossession, and ultimately the destruction of entire systems of knowledge.

One must therefore ask: how many ways of seeing the cosmos, understanding reality, and interpreting life itself have been attacked, silenced, fragmented, or erased within the original languages of West Papua, New Guinea, Melanesia, Australia, and countless other Indigenous societies across the planet?

Every language contains a unique architecture of reality. Every language carries its own cosmology, its own memory structures, its own categories of existence, and its own relationship to land, time, ancestry, and the living world. To lose a language is not merely to lose a communication system. It is to lose a universe forever.

It is this civilisational psychopathology — often decorated in the language of progress, development, modernity, improvement, and civilisation itself — that drives many Indigenous peoples toward cultural extinction. Working Paper No. 21 names the specific ideological formations through which this decoration operates in West Papua: religiosity, development (pembangunan), progress (kemajuan), and success (sukses), which together function not as instruments of liberation but as a coordinated system of psychological reorientation, presented as good news, through which the Papuan cosmological world is dismantled while the destruction is rendered invisible beneath the language of hope (Kogoya 2026g). That paper’s reanalysis of cargo-cult phenomena as a rational, if colonially conditioned, response to civilisational rupture applies directly to language: a Papuan parent’s aspiration for their child to speak fluent Indonesian is not irrational, any more than the historical desire for the coloniser’s material goods was irrational. It is the same structural desire, redirected onto linguistic capital instead of manufactured cargo — and it produces the same result, participation in one’s own cosmological dispossession, dressed in the colours of hope.

How does one “develop” a cosmological concept such as O? How does one “modernise” a framework that already integrates land, time, memory, ancestry, weather, place, movement, and existence into a single living reality? By what measure can such a concept be judged primitive, incomplete, or underdeveloped?

The assumption underlying the colonial project is that all societies are moving toward a single destination defined by the civilisation that claims dominance. Yet concepts such as O reveal the possibility that entirely different ways of understanding reality already existed long before the arrival of the modern state, the colonial administration, the missionary institution, or the development planner.

The question, therefore, is not whether O needs to be developed. The question is whether contemporary civilisation possesses the conceptual capacity to understand what O already contains.

How many such concepts exist across the hundreds of Indigenous languages of West Papua? How many keys to the Papuan Cosmopolitan universe are being lost as languages disappear, elders pass away, forests are destroyed, children are separated from ancestral knowledge, and entire cosmological systems are replaced by external categories? The empirical record gives some sense of scale. Indonesia is now reported to hold more endangered languages than any other country on earth — more than four hundred — a count driven substantially by the linguistic diversity of West Papua and neighbouring Papua New Guinea, itself home to the most languages of any nation. UNESCO's language-vitality data suggests that, worldwide, close to half of the roughly seven thousand living languages are endangered, and that a language now disappears, on average, roughly every month. Fieldwork among Papua New Guinean schoolchildren has found a measurable, accelerating decline in Indigenous-language fluency across a single generation, running alongside — and evidently connected to — a corresponding decline in the traditional ecological knowledge those languages carry. West Papua's Lani language and its integrative concept O are not exempt from this trend; they are, on the evidence, squarely inside it.

Each lost language carries away irreplaceable knowledge about reality. Each forgotten word may contain an entire philosophy. Each silenced cosmology may represent a way of understanding existence that humanity will never recover.

From the perspective of the Wonesis Framework, this is the deeper tragedy of Psycho-Cosmocide. It is not merely the destruction of people, cultures, or territories. It is the systematic deletion of unique universes of meaning. When a language dies, a library burns. When a cosmology disappears, a universe collapses. What is occurring in West Papua is therefore not only a political crisis or a humanitarian crisis. It is also a cosmological crisis.

This is not an abstract philosophical concern. It is one of the central conditions of contemporary West Papua.

The significance of O extends far beyond language itself. If O constitutes a living cosmological framework through which reality is perceived and organised, then its destruction is not simply the loss of a word. It is the destruction of an entire relationship to existence. It is the disruption of a way of perceiving land, time, memory, ancestry, weather, place, and human life as dimensions of a single living whole.

Within this perspective, the Indonesian state's occupation of Papua can be understood not only as a political, military, economic, or territorial occupation, but also as an epistemological occupation. It involves the imposition of a fragmented, administrative, resource-extraction-oriented relationship to land, time, and existence upon peoples whose languages encode radically different cosmological understandings of reality.

The struggle, therefore, is not merely over territory. It is also a struggle over memory, meaning, language, cosmology, and the right of a people to continue inhabiting the worlds their ancestors created and transmitted across generations.

There is something both devastating and extraordinary about this. A single vowel — one sound in one highland language — quietly preserves what Einstein's physics took four-dimensional mathematics to approach, what the ecology movement is still struggling to make governments understand, what the contemplative traditions of the world have sought in silence and practice for millennia.

The mystery of O is not that it exists. The mystery is that it has survived. And the task now — for those who carry it, for those who study it, for those who write it down — is to ensure that it continues to survive. Not as a museum piece. Not as a relic of the past. But as a living cosmological inheritance, still capable of teaching the world something it urgently needs to learn.

The Colonial School and the Destruction of O

Across West Papua, more than 742 elementary schools operate under the Indonesian state curriculum. In each of these institutions, every morning, a Papuan child sits down to learn. This act — so ordinary, so universally celebrated as progress — is, from the perspective of the Psycho-Cosmocide framework, the most precise site of civilisational destruction currently operating in the region. And it operates in plain sight, disguised as a gift.

Before a Papuan child has learned the grammar of their own cosmos — before they have received the word O as a living cosmological inheritance, before they have been taught that O'negen is not merely the name of the Sun but a complete philosophical proposition about the eye of the living universe, before they have understood that O kobir and O kolu are not simply words for yesterday and tomorrow but expressions of a temporal framework that encompasses eons — before any of this can take root, the schoolroom has already intervened. Indonesian language, Indonesian history, Indonesian categories of space and time, Indonesian frameworks of knowledge, Indonesian definitions of what counts as real, what counts as knowledge, what counts as a meaningful life: these arrive first. They arrive with the authority of the state, the prestige of literacy, the promise of employment, and the moral weight of civilisation. They arrive before the child's own cosmos has had the chance to name itself.

This is the Civilisational Psycho-Cosmocide Virus — the CPCV — operating at its most effective. Its defining characteristic, developed at length in Working Paper No. 2, is precisely this: it never

reveals itself as a virus. It does not arrive in the village wearing the face of a monster. It carries no visible weapon. It presents itself, always and without exception, as improvement, as salvation, as the key that unlocks the future, as literacy, as numeracy, as development — which is exactly the phenomenology of infection that paper documents: the condition is experienced as freedom rather than domination, and resistance to it is experienced as danger (Kogoya 2026m).

The school is the CPCV's most sophisticated delivery mechanism, because the school appears to be the opposite of destruction. Parents send their children willingly. Communities celebrate the building of new classrooms. The child who returns from school speaking Indonesian is admired, not mourned. The erasure wears the face of achievement. This is not an accident of history. It is the structural logic of the virus itself — and it is also, in the precise vocabulary Working Paper No. 19 develops, the Paradox of Papuan Extinction: a people pursuing what they experience as a better future while that pursuit dismantles the very conditions of their own continuation (Kogoya 2026i). The scene that paper opens with — a Papuan parent in the highlands enrolling a child in an Indonesian-medium school, convinced it is the most loving and responsible decision available — is the same scene this paper has been describing from the vantage point of a single word. The parent does not intend harm. Nothing about the decision appears tragic. It appears hopeful. And within it, unnoticed, a child's access to O is quietly foreclosed.

What is being murdered in those 742 schools is not the Papuan child's body. The body survives. The child grows, graduates, perhaps enters the workforce, perhaps becomes a teacher themselves — and in doing so becomes an unwitting vector of the very virus that colonised their own mind. What is murdered is something more foundational and more difficult to name: the cosmological self. The child who might have grown up knowing, in their bones, that O is the living ground of all existence — that space, time, weather, ancestry, and meaning are not separate things managed by separate institutions, but a single living whole they inhabit — that child never arrives. They are replaced, gradually and without violence that the law can name, by a subject who understands reality in fragments, who measures time by a clock, space by a cadastral map, meaning by a salary, and worth by a certificate issued by the state that is simultaneously occupying their land.

This process, viewed through the Psycho-Cosmocide framework, constitutes a simultaneity of catastrophes that no single existing term is adequate to name alone. It is genocide, in that it targets a people's capacity for collective existence and reproduction of meaning across generations. It is holocaust, in that it destroys irreplaceable worlds — not in fire, but in forgetting. It is ethnocide, in that it eliminates the cultural and linguistic substrate within which a distinct people recognises itself as itself. It is ecocide, because the cosmological relationship to land, river, forest, and sky encoded in languages like Lani is inseparable from the ecological stewardship of those places — to destroy the language is to sever the living relationship between a people and their territory at its most intimate level. It is epistemicide, in those entire architectures of knowledge — ways of perceiving time, space, causality, relationship, and moral obligation that Western philosophy is only beginning to conceptually approach — are being permanently deleted before they can even be recognised as knowledge. Kenyan writer and critic Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o made a structurally

identical argument about the colonial school in his own context: that the choice of language in education is never a merely technical or pedagogical decision, but a decision about which memory, which self-image, and which universe a child will be permitted to inherit. What Ngūgū called the colonisation of the mind through the colonial classroom, this paper, from within the Lani case, calls Psycho-Cosmocide: the destruction of the total cosmological framework within which a people knows who it is, where it comes from, what it owes to the living and the dead, and what universe it inhabits.

All of these, simultaneously, in a classroom. Every morning. Before nine o'clock.

The virus wins precisely because it never enters the village as a virus. It enters as a school. It enters as a teacher with a salary and a government certificate. It enters as a textbook printed in a language the grandparents cannot read. It enters as the future. And by the time the damage is legible — by the time the community recognises that something irreplaceable has been lost, that the children no longer understand the elders, that the language of the cosmos has become a language of the old and the dying — the virus has already completed its primary task. The host has been reorganised from within. The cosmological immune system has been dismantled not by force, but by education.

This is what makes the CPCV categorically different from visible forms of colonial violence, and categorically more dangerous in the long term. A bullet can be named. A military occupation can be condemned. A massacre leaves bodies that can be counted and mourned. But the CPCV leaves no bodies. It leaves graduates. It leaves development statistics. It leaves literacy rates. It leaves a generation of Papuan children who have been taught to be fluent in a civilisation that is, at its structural core, incapable of perceiving what it has destroyed — because the very categories of knowledge by which it evaluates its own success are the same categories that rendered the Lani O, the O'negen, the Wone, the Kunume, invisible in the first place.

The deepest tragedy, within the Psycho-Cosmocide framework, is not that the coloniser is malicious. Many are not. Many genuinely believe in the schools they build, the literacy they promote, the development they deliver. This sincerity is not a mitigation. It is the virus's most lethal feature. A conscious exterminator can be resisted. An unconscious one — one who believes with full conviction that they are helping — dismantles resistance at the level of moral logic itself. How does a Papuan parent refuse a school that the teacher, the government, and the international community all agree represents the child's best chance at life? How does a community resist an erasure that arrives wearing the face of love? Working Paper No. 10 documents, the same structure in a different register — the Easter liturgy that proclaims resurrection while colonised elites are presented as models of realised humanity in the front pews, and the celebration of life over death proceeds alongside the steady conversion of forests into extraction zones (Kogoya 2026h). School and church, in the Papuan case, are twin instruments of the same gospel of disguised loss: both arrive as good news, and both leave the categories through which their own harm could be named unavailable to those they harm.

The answer, within the Psycho-Cosmocide Research Paradigm, begins with naming. It begins with the recognition that what is occurring in those 742 schools is not education in the neutral sense. It is cosmological replacement — the systematic substitution of one universe of meaning for another, under conditions of profound power asymmetry, without the informed consent of the people whose universe is being replaced, and without any acknowledgement that a universe is being lost at all. Until this is named with the precision it demands — until the school is understood not only as an institution of learning but as the primary instrument of the CPCV in the Papuan highlands — the destruction will continue to be celebrated as progress. And the virus will continue to win.

Renaming and the Loss of O

Working Paper No. 13 documents, in exhaustive administrative detail, the cascade of naming through which West Papua has been repeatedly renamed — from Netherlands New Guinea, to Irian Barat, to Irian Jaya, to Papua under the 2001 Special Autonomy Law, to the six provinces created by the 2022 pemekaran — and argues that each renaming reassigns Papuans a new cosmological address within a Jakarta-manufactured reality, deleting one further layer of Inaorak, the Lani concept of cosmologically verified belonging (Kogoya 2026b). That paper observes, in passing, that the depth of what is fragmented by this administrative renaming is registered in the Lani language itself, through the very word this paper has been examining: O'negen compresses space, time, cosmos, and living relationship into a single term, so that the imposition of an administrative, developmental time is not merely a political intervention but a rupture of the linguistic architecture through which the Lani hold space and time as one. This paper's detailed grammar of O gives that observation its full evidentiary weight: renaming a river or a province in Indonesian is not simply replacing one label with another equally arbitrary one. It is removing that river or province from the only grammatical field — O — within which it could be held together with weather, season, ancestry, and cosmos in a single utterance, and relocating it into an administrative nomenclature with no equivalent unifying ground term of its own.

Wonesis

Wonesis, therefore, responds. Not with a petition submitted to the institutions of the civilisation that designed the wound, and not with a request addressed to the parliament of the perpetrator.

Wonesis responds by arguing, across the entire body of Psycho-Cosmocide paradigm studies, for something more radical and more ancient than resistance: *return. exit, restart, and reboot*. Leave the fallen Babylon — not as an act of bitterness, but as an act of cosmological sanity.

The Wonesis imperative begins where the CPCV did its deepest work: *language*. Before territory can be reclaimed, before political sovereignty can be restored, before the body politic of a Cosmobian people can reconstitute itself, the words must come home. Every word that was taken, every word that was replaced, retranslated, redefined, domesticated, made to serve the grammar

of the occupying civilisation, and every word that was forced to carry a meaning it was never born to carry.

The work of Wonesis is, therefore, in the colonised Cosmobian societies, the great rescue operation. Working Paper No. 16 gives this operation its full architecture: a six-function operational grammar — *detection, distinction, reorientation, preservation, transmission, and return* — through which Wonesis is practised across every scale of human organisation (Kogoya 2026p). Detection, in that paper's terms, begins with detecting Kugi, the shapeshifting principle that fills the space Wone vacates, not only in the colonising structure but within the self, the family, and the institutions a people builds to survive. For the Lani case, detection begins exactly where this paper has stood throughout: noticing that a single vowel carries a cosmology, and noticing what has been done to it.

This is not nostalgia, nor romanticism about a pre-colonial past frozen in amber. This is something structurally prior and philosophically more urgent: the recognition that a people cannot heal within the grammar of the wound.

You cannot recover your cosmological self using only the vocabulary of the civilisation that dismantled it. You cannot reclaim O in Indonesian. You cannot reclaim O'negen in the language of the state that built 742 schools designed, structurally and inevitably, to replace the eye of O with a clock.

The rescue therefore begins with renaming — in the ontological sense developed above, not the administrative one. We must rename our mountains — not with the names the colonial administration registered in its land tenure records, but with the names the mountains have always carried in the mouths of those who knew them as living presences within O. We must rename our rivers, our trees, our lakes, our foods, our seasons. We must rename our cosmos, our universe, our understanding of reality. We must rename our history — not the history that begins with arrival and discovery and the benevolent extension of civilisation into darkness, but the history that was already unfolding for thousands of years before the first external name was applied to a Papuan mountain, river, or child. Because the name is not merely a label placed on a thing that exists independently of it. The name is the relationship. The name is the cosmological position. To rename is to re-inhabit. To re-inhabit is to begin the healing.

This renaming — this total, patient, courageous, and necessary renaming — is the beginning of true redemption.

It is the beginning of healing, of recovery, of resistance in its deepest sense. Not the resistance that says we refuse your violence, though that refusal is just and necessary. But the resistance that says we refuse your reality. We refuse the fragmented, administered, extractive, disciplinarily-divided, clock-measured, state-bordered, market-valued version of existence that was installed in the place of O. We refuse it not merely politically but cosmologically. We step out of its grammar. We return to our own.

This is where power is actually recovered. Not in the parliament, not in the international court, not in a petition addressed to the United Nations in the language of the charter written by the civilisations that colonised us.

Power is recovered in the moment a Lani child is taught, before anything else, that O is the ground of all existence. That O mayu wage — it is raining — is not a primitive description of weather but a cosmological participation in the living whole. That their first language is not a disadvantage to be overcome on the path to literacy in someone else's tongue, but a complete universe waiting to receive them.

Dignity — as human, as species, as life — is not granted by the civilisation that took it. It is recovered in the act of remembering what was always there. And it is in this act of remembering, the act Wonesis names return, that the deepest resistance to the CPCV becomes possible. Not because the virus has been defeated by argument — the CPCV is not susceptible to argument conducted in its own grammar — but because the host has remembered that it was, before the infection, a cosmos. A whole, a living totality with its own ground, its own eye, its own name for the sun, its own word for the time before time and the time after time.

Land, Food, Water, Air, Fire, Home, Family, Memory

When Wonesis says Land, Food, Water, Air, Fire, Home, Family and Memory, it is not offering a list of basic needs in the language of a development report. It is issuing a counter-cosmology. Each word in that sequence is a key that unlocks a chamber of the Cosmobian universe that the CPCV attempted to seal.

Land is not a resource. It is O made solid — the ground of existence rendered as place, as ancestry, as identity, as responsibility across generations, which is exactly what the Canvas Principle names at the level of ontology (Kogoya 2026a) and what the Lani concept of Inaorak names at the level of belonging: verified cosmological belonging, from Inawi (home, land, space) and Worak (existence, verified, ontologically valid) (Kogoya 2026b; 2026p). Food is not nutrition. It is the living relationship between a people and the specific soils, waters, forests, and seasons that produced them, and that they in turn have tended, named, and sung into continued existence. Water is not H₂O managed by a utility. It is the moving presence of O — time made visible, life made continuous, the ancestor's body returning through the watershed. Air is not atmosphere. It is breath shared between the living and the living world, the most intimate medium of O's self-disclosure. Fire is not energy. It is the first technology of meaning — the hearth around which language was learned, cosmology was transmitted, and the dead were remembered into the living. Home is not property. It is the Kunume — the round house, the circle, the cosmos in miniature, the architecture of belonging made of earth and timber and the knowledge of how to build a world. Family is not the nuclear unit of the state's census. It is the transmission network of the Cosmobian universe — the living chain through which O knows itself across time, and the living chain that gives Inaorak, in Working Paper No. 16's terms, its continuous rather than merely genealogical character. And

Memory is not the past. Memory, in the Wonesis framework, is the active cosmological practice of refusing to let the CPCV complete its work. Memory is the antidote. Memory is the immune system of the Cosmobian self — and it is memory, precisely, that distinguishes Inaorak belonging from Kuru presence: not who arrived first in a genealogical sense, but whose relationship to a landscape is carried through continuous living transmission rather than fabricated or merely claimed (Kogoya 2026p).

To remember all of this — to hold Land, Food, Water, Air, Fire, Home, Family and Memory together in their original cosmological weight, in their original language, in the full grammar of the Cosmobian universe they encode — is to begin to see the entire civilisational Psycho-Cosmocide matrix for what it is: not the natural condition of history, not the inevitable direction of human progress, not the only way reality can be organised, but a specific, dateable, nameable, and survivable catastrophe. A virus. One that can be recognised, refused, and — in the long labour of Wonesis return — overcome.

The rescue journey begins here — with word (the Wone, the Logos) and name (the act of creation and destruction by definition of what is and what is not). With the sound a colonised Cosmobian child makes when they learn, for the first time and in their own tongue, that the space they inhabit, the time they breathe inside, the universe that holds them, and the living cosmos that sees them through the eye of O — that all of this already has a name, and the name is O.

Conclusion

This revised edition has tried to do two things the first edition of this paper attempted separately but did not fully connect. It has situated O within the century-long comparative literature on linguistic relativity and language-and-place — Humboldt, Boas, Sapir, Whorf, Basso, Deloria — so that its claim to integrative uniqueness can be judged against, rather than asserted apart from, that scholarship. And it has situated O fully within the Psycho-Cosmocide corpus — the Seven Cages, the Eight Atlases, the Canvas Principle, cascading incapacitation, the Four Gospels, the paradox of participatory extinction, Inaorak and Kuru, and the fourfold structure of Wone — so that a single vowel from the Central Highlands can be seen for what the wider research programme argues it is: not an isolated linguistic curiosity, but the compressed, spoken register of an entire ontology under active, documented, and nameable threat. Neither move changes the paper's original wager. A single letter still knows something that four disciplines, working separately, have not yet reassembled. The task that remains — for the linguist, the philosopher, the parent, and the child — is still the one the first edition named: to ensure that O continues to survive, not as a museum piece, but as a living cosmological inheritance.

Turning the Camera Around

The author is a Papuan Lani man whose cosmological world was fractured from the day he left his village and entered the machinery of a pandemonium civilisation.

For more than twenty-six years, he studied the civilisation through its own archives, institutions, schools, universities, doctrines, and narratives. At the same time, he walked through the landscapes of other Cosmopolitan societies whose worlds had already been fractured, displaced, or devastated by the very same civilisational project. Much of this journey unfolded in Australia, a continent whose Indigenous peoples have experienced their own long encounter with the forces of colonial modernity.

This work emerges from that journey. It is not written from the position of a detached observer. It is written by someone whose own cosmological inheritance was interrupted — and who now seeks to understand the nature of that interruption.

In many ways, this paper represents an attempt to recover a forgotten grammar — not merely the grammar of a language, but the grammar of a Cosmopolitan world. The author is not claiming to have completed that task. He is only beginning.

What he calls this, in his own words, is turning the camera around.

For generations, Papuans have been observed, measured, classified, described, studied, developed, civilised, administered, and explained by others. The gaze has always pointed in one direction.

Turning the camera around means directing that gaze back toward the civilisation that has long claimed the authority to observe everyone else. It means asking questions of the observer rather than the observed. It means examining the assumptions, myths, categories, doctrines, and psychological structures of the civilisation that positioned itself as the universal standard of reality. Only then, the author argues, does another possibility emerge. For the first time, the one who has been standing before the camera can finally see the one who has been holding it. And perhaps, in that moment, he can begin to see himself again.

*We were sent here from the memory of the first fire — to walk through the death of worlds —
to preserve what must never be forgotten — and to light the final flame before the Earth falls
into silence — for we are the last voice of the first peoples, and the first voice of the last
peoples.*

References

- Basso, Keith H. 1996. *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language Among the Western Apache*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Boas, Franz. 1911. *Handbook of American Indian Languages*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Coulthard, Glen S. 2014. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deloria, Vine, Jr. 1973. *God Is Red: A Native View of Religion*. New York: Grosset & Dunlap.
- Deloria, Vine, Jr., and Daniel R. Wildcat. 2001. *Power and Place: Indian Education in America*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Resources.
- Ethnologue / Visual Capitalist. 2026. "The State of the World's Living Languages" and "All the World's Endangered Languages, by Country." Accessed August 2026.
- Humboldt, Wilhelm von. (1836) 1988. *On Language: The Diversity of Human Language-Structure and Its Influence on the Mental Development of Mankind*. Translated by Peter Heath. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kimmerer, Robin Wall. 2013. *Braiding Sweetgrass: Indigenous Wisdom, Scientific Knowledge, and the Teachings of Plants*. Minneapolis: Milkweed Editions.
- Kirksey, S. Eben. 2012. *Freedom in Entangled Worlds: West Papua and the Architecture of Global Power*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Kogoya, Yamin. 2025. *Papuan Tragedy: 300 Warnings from the Edge of Extinction*. NATAKA Research Institute / Wone Press.
- 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. *Colonial Parasites and Colonised Hosts: The Psycho-Cosmocide of Cosmobian Existence in West Papua*. Psycho-Cosmocide Studies, Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series No. 18. NATAKA Research Institute / Wone Press.
- Kogoya, Yamin. 2026e. *From the Wreckage: Eight Atlases of Human Existence Under 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. *The Ecosystem of Papuan Extinction: A Five-Hundred-Year Civilisational Architecture of Ecosystemic Replacement, Structural Containment, and Manufactured Extinction*. Psycho-Cosmocide Studies, Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series No. 6. NATAKA Research Institute / Wone Press.

- Kogoya, Yamin. 2026g. *The Four Gospels of a 'Civilisational' Death Cult in West Papua: Religiosity, Development, Progress, and Success*. Psycho-Cosmocide Studies, Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series No. 21. NATAKA Research Institute / Wone Press.
- Kogoya, Yamin. 2026h. *Easter Performances in the Time of Papuan Extinction: The Gospel of Psycho-Cosmocide in West Papua*. Psycho-Cosmocide Studies, Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series No. 10. 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 Working Paper Series No. 19. NATAKA Research Institute / Wone Press.
- Kogoya, Yamin. 2026j. *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. 2026k. *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.
- Kogoya, Yamin. 2026l. *Psycho-Cosmocide: A Theoretical Framework for 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. *A Foundational Theoretical Framework for the Study of Psycho-Cosmocide: Wone, Psyche, Psycho, Cosmocide, and Psycho-Cosmocide*. Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series No. 1(B). NATAKA Research Institute / Wone Press.
- Kogoya, Yamin. 2026p. *Wonesis: Framework, Belonging, and the Antidote to Psycho-Cosmocide*. Psycho-Cosmocide Studies, Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series No. 16. NATAKA Research Institute / Wone Press.
- Malotki, Ekkehart. 1983. *Hopi Time: A Linguistic Analysis of the Temporal Concepts in the Hopi Language*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. 1986. *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. London: James Currey / Heinemann.
- Rose, Deborah Bird. 1996. *Nourishing Terrains: Australian Aboriginal Views of Landscape and Wilderness*. Canberra: Australian Heritage Commission.
- Sapir, Edward. 1929. "The Status of Linguistics as a Science." *Language* 5 (4): 207–214.
- Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2014. *Epistemologies of the South: Justice Against Epistemicide*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. 2012. "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1 (1): 1–40.
- UNESCO. 2010 (updated). *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.
- Whorf, Benjamin Lee. 1956. *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. Edited by John B. Carroll. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1997. *Understanding Cultures Through Their Key Words: English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wolfe, Patrick. 2006. "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native." *Journal of Genocide Research* 8 (4): 387–409.
- Zemp, Dave Zea, et al. 2021. "Language and Ethnobiological Skills Decline Precipitously in Papua New Guinea, the World's Most Linguistically Diverse Nation." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 118 (22): e2100096118.

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.