

Journal of Psycho-Cosmocide Studies

NATAKA Research Institute | Wone Press | Kurumbi Wone Series

Psycho-Cosmocide: The Silent Invasion of Mind, Meaning, and Cosmos

Nature → Civilisation → Civi-lie-sation → Evi-lie-sation → Psycho-Cosmocide → Wonesis

Yamin Kogoya

info@psychocosmocide.com | www.psychocosmocide.com

ABSTRACT

This paper advances the concept of Psycho-Cosmocide—first introduced in *Papuan Tragedy* (2025) and subsequently elaborated across a growing body of work—by tracing a developmental spectrum from integrated pre-civilisational existence through successive stages of structural distortion, here designated as Civi-lie-sation and Evi-lie-sation, culminating in the total occupation of perception, identity, and reality-forming capacity. Drawing on analogies from parasitology and ecology, the analysis extends this framework into the domains of civilisational theory and the philosophy of mind, positioning West Papua as a fully developed contemporary instance of the process. The paper further elaborates Wonesis as a counter-movement: a conscious reawakening and existential reconstruction of the self, grounded not in nostalgia but in the deliberate recovery of original language, memory, and meaning, and distinguished from earlier decolonial frameworks by its explicit cosmological grounding. The study operates at the intersection of philosophy of mind, decolonial theory, and critical civilisational studies.

Keywords: psycho-cosmocide, cognitive colonisation, decolonial theory, wonesis, civilisational parasitism, consciousness, land-based epistemologies

A NOTE TO THE READER

A note on the epistemological position from which this paper is written, and on the conditions under which it invites evaluation, is provided in Appendix A: The Epistemological Stakes. Readers who wish to engage the argument on its own terms before encountering that framing may proceed directly to the Introduction.

INTRODUCTION

The Nature of the Civilisational Parasite

The most dangerous forms of domination do not announce themselves. They do not arrive through visible force, leave no obvious wound, or spill blood. By their very nature, they do not present themselves as evil, monstrous, or threatening entities to be feared, resisted, or destroyed. Instead, their power resides in invisibility—in their capacity to penetrate the deepest strata of human existence undetected. Such domination operates not through physical coercion but through perception itself: through image, language, symbol, and colour. It presents itself as illumination—radiant, benevolent, even divine—often accompanied by promises of progress, happiness, and eternity. In this way, it disarms resistance before resistance can even take form. Rather than destroying the host outright, these forces enact a more profound transformation: they reprogram the host to participate in its own dissolution while remaining convinced that it continues to exist as before. This form of domination constitutes what may be described as a higher-order metaphysical colonisation, in which the inner psychic cosmos is restructured—often divided into imposed categories such as “heaven” and “hell.” Within this constructed mental architecture, colonised subjects are confined, even as their ontological existence in lived space-time is subjected to processes of brutal manipulation, control, and annihilation.

What this paper terms the *civilisational parasite* operates through a prolonged process of cultural and ideological conditioning. The host is decoded, recoded, and rewired—gradually guided toward its own negation not through overt coercion, but through internal transformation. Over time, resistance diminishes. The host begins to comply unconsciously, surrendering willingly and moving toward its own annihilation while believing that this trajectory is natural, necessary, and even beneficial.

Domination thus becomes structural: absorbed into the architecture of thought itself, requiring no external enforcement because it is no longer distinguishable from the self.

It is through this mechanism that the religions, languages, symbolic systems, and ideological formations of empire have extended their reach across the globe.

In its most advanced form, this parasitic force does not merely regulate behaviour; it reconfigures worldviews at its core, reshaping perception and desire at their deepest levels. The host comes to celebrate what undermines it, to defend the systems that erase it, and to abandon the very foundations that once sustained its existence. What was once resisted becomes accepted; what was accepted becomes justified; what was justified becomes glorified. Extinction is no longer recognised as a threat—it is reframed as progress, moralised as duty, and embraced as destiny.

The deepest stage of this subversion is reached when the host can no longer distinguish between its own will and the will that has been inscribed within it. This condition is what this paper designates as *Psycho-Cosmocide*: not a biological disease, but a total invasion of the human cognitive and existential system. It operates not through blood or tissue, but through the primary carriers of meaning—language, image, symbol, and colour. Just as a biological parasite enters the bloodstream, the civilisational parasitic code enters through narrative, education, religious doctrine, and media. Over time, these structures do not merely influence perception; they become perception.

The depth of this process is evident in ordinary life. A flag is, materially, nothing more than dyed fabric—yet millions have lived and died for it. A logo is a simple geometric form—yet it commands loyalty, desire, and identity. Words inscribed on a surface define what is accepted as true, moral, legal, and real. In this way, symbols cease to represent reality; they come to constitute it. The parasite requires no overt force. It secures control by embedding itself within meaning itself, allowing the host to internalise and reproduce the parasite's domination.

Biological Analogues of Cognitive Parasitism

This process is not unique to human civilisation. Nature itself demonstrates how control can be achieved not through force but through the rewriting of perception from within. Two well-documented biological phenomena are instructive—though it should be noted that biological analogy, like all analogical method, illuminates structure while abstracting away important distinctions; what follows is a heuristic parallel, not an equivalence.

The protozoan parasite *Toxoplasma gondii* alters the brain chemistry of its rodent host such that the mouse loses its instinctive fear of cats and may even become attracted to their scent (Berdoy et al., 2000; Webster, 2007). The mouse walks directly toward its predator—not because it has been overpowered, but because its capacity to recognise danger has been systematically rewritten from within. The fungus *Ophiocordyceps unilateralis* invades the body of an ant, commandeers its nervous system, and directs it to climb to a precise location before releasing spores through the host's body (Andersen et al., 2009; Hughes et al., 2011). The ant does not resist. Its internal navigational system has been entirely hijacked.

What is most significant in both cases is not death itself but cooperation. The host participates actively in its own destruction because its perception of reality has been fundamentally altered (Dawkins, 1982). The same structural pattern unfolds within human existence at an immeasurably more complex and subtle level: not through biology, but through meaning encoded in language, symbols, images and colours. The civilisational parasite operates through the same logic—not domination by force, but the rewriting of the host’s cognitive and existential orientation from within (Fanon, 1961; Wa Thiong’o, 1986).

THE SPECTRUM OF THE CIVILISATIONAL INFECTION

The progression from integrated human existence to total cognitive colonisation may be understood as a developmental spectrum comprising five distinct stages. Each stage represents a qualitative transformation in the relationship between human beings and the systems of meaning through which they navigate reality (Mignolo, 2011; Quijano, 2000).

Nature: The Integrated State

In the earliest stage of human existence, no separation existed between the human being and the world. Knowledge was lived rather than written; truth was experienced directly rather than imposed through external systems. As Indigenous epistemologies affirm, knowledge emerges through relational being—“not about knowing the things, but about knowing things by being in relationship with them” (Wilson, 2008). Human understanding was therefore enacted, embodied, and inseparable from life itself, where individuals live and enact their knowledge within the world (Cajete, 2000). Mind, body, spirit, and environment formed a single, undivided field of awareness grounded in relational existence, where all beings exist in relationship to each other, the natural world, and the cosmos. Human beings navigated reality through direct perception—embedded within the cosmos rather than observing it from a position of artificial remove. In this state, identity was not confined to land or body but extended across the living totality of existence; as Tongan academic and philosopher Epeli Hau‘ofa expresses, “*we are the ocean... the ocean is in us,*” reflecting a world in which humanity and cosmos are continuous rather than divided (Hau‘ofa, 1994). This cosmology stands in direct opposition to the Cartesian assertion “I think, therefore I am,” in which existence is grounded in isolated cognition. Here, being does not arise from thought but from relationship, participation, and embeddedness within the living cosmos. There was no need for transcendent salvation, no fear of invented punishment, no manufactured alienation. The cosmos was simply home.

Civilisation: The Human-Structured World

With the emergence of civilisation, this integration began to shift. Human beings constructed systems—cities, laws, hierarchies, institutions—to organise collective life (Scott, 2017). Initially, these structures appeared necessary and beneficial, enabling cooperation, stability, and the accumulation of knowledge. Over time, however, they began to replace direct experience. Written language supplanted living memory; laws displaced natural equilibrium; symbols substituted for felt reality (Goody, 1977; Ong, 1982). Reality was no longer simply experienced; it was managed.

Civi-lie-sation: The Engineering of a Fabricated Reality

Within civilisation, a deeper transformation took hold: reality itself became subject to deliberate engineering. Narratives were constructed to justify power, define morality, and shape collective perception at scale (Said, 1978; Foucault, 1972). Histories were written from particular vantage points; myths were institutionalised; educational systems became instruments not only of learning but of conditioning (Althusser, 1971; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977). The result was a condition in which human societies began to inhabit fabricated versions of reality—constructions so thoroughly embedded in everyday life that they ceased to feel constructed at all. What was manufactured came to feel natural; what was imposed came to feel inevitable (Gramsci, 1971).

Evi-lie-sation: The Systemic Corruption of Truth

As this process deepened, civilisation descended into Evi-lie-sation: a stage at which the manipulation of perception became systemic and self-reinforcing. Distortions were no longer occasional deviations but foundational structures (Chomsky & Herman, 1988; Memmi, 1965). Truth and falsehood merged until the distinction between them grew nearly impossible to sustain. What was natural began to appear primitive or inferior; what was artificial was presented as advanced and desirable (Césaire, 1955/2000; Tuhiwai Smith, 2012). Entire communities were persuaded to abandon their languages, identities, and ways of life in the name of progress. Human systems generated suffering at scale while maintaining an appearance of order, development, and civilised achievement (Davis, 2001).

Psycho-Cosmocide: Total Colonisation of Consciousness

In its most complete form, this progression becomes Psycho-Cosmocide—the colonisation of consciousness itself. This is no longer a matter of social or cultural distortion; it reaches into the very structure of how reality is perceived and how meaning is made (Fanon, 1952/1967; Nandy, 1983). Human beings internalise narratives that erase their identity, sever their connection to land and memory, and disconnect them from the living cosmos to which they belong.

The civilisational parasitic code spreads through books, symbols, colours, religious imagery, and every form of culturally produced meaning—all functioning as transmission systems (Hall, 1997; Bhabha, 1994). Through sustained repetition, these elements become indistinguishable from the self. The host becomes a new ecosystem in which the parasite breeds, reproduces, and spreads further. This is why colonised peoples and lands have so consistently become fertile ground: the rupture of original connection creates precisely the conditions in which the civilisational virus takes hold (Wa Thiong'o, 1986; Tuhiwai Smith, 2012).

At this level, reality is engineered in its entirety. Lies support further lies; illusions reinforce other illusions; entire architectures of meaning are constructed to sustain control (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018). Even resistance is absorbed, redirected, and reincorporated as another layer of the system (Spivak, 1988). The parasite becomes self-sustaining because it operates through the host's own thoughts.

Wonesis: The Counter-Movement of Reawakening

No system is absolute. Cracks appear—in moments of doubt, in questions that refuse to be suppressed: What is real? Who defines it? When did this begin, and who benefits from this structure of meaning? These questions mark the beginning of the counter-movement designated here as Wonesis.

Wonesis is not a simple return to the past, nor a wholesale rejection of civilisation's material achievements (Dussel, 1995; Quijano, 2007). It is the reawakening of the original human capacity to perceive, to discern, and to exist without total dependence on imposed systems of meaning. In this respect, it shares structural ground with prior decolonial frameworks: Freire's conscientisation (1970), Fanon's recovery of national consciousness (1961), and Wa Thiong'o's programme of linguistic return (1986). It extends these frameworks by grounding the counter-movement explicitly in cosmological restoration rather than political or cultural recovery alone. Where conscientisation addresses false consciousness and linguistic decolonisation addresses the medium of thought, Wonesis addresses the lived relationship between a people and the cosmos from which colonisation has severed them: land, water, fire, ancestral memory, and the elemental coordinates of existence.

Yet Wonesis parts from these antecedents not merely in emphasis but in scope. Conscientisation awakens the oppressed to the structures that condition them; national consciousness recovers the political will to resist; linguistic return restores the cognitive architecture of a people's thought. Each of these is necessary. None of them, alone or in combination, is sufficient—because none of them addresses the foundational question that Psycho-Cosmocide ultimately raises: on what ground does a people stand once the awakening occurs? The flood, in this framework, is not a future threat. It is a present condition. And a people who have recovered political consciousness but lost their land, lost their water sources, lost their ceremonial territories and the living archives encoded within them, have recovered the capacity to know what is happening to them without recovering the means to survive it.

This is the precise structural gap that Wonesis is designed to address. The ancient figure of Noah's Ark—stripped of its theological overlay and read as structural logic—illuminates the distinction. The Ark was not a protest. It was not a critique of the flood. It was not an appeal to the system that produced the flood to reform itself. It was the construction of a total alternative: a self-sufficient vessel, built from first principles, capable of carrying forward the living archive of a people and a world through conditions of total destruction. The point is not that the Ark was made of wood and nails. The point is what it contained—and on what it rested. For a people under conditions of Psycho-Cosmocide, the Ark is Land: the irreducible foundation from which food, water, air, fire, shelter, memory, teaching, and cosmological orientation all proceed. Without land, there is no ground on which any other recovery stands. With land, everything else—language, story, ceremony, the transmission of ancestral warning to the young—becomes possible again.

Wonesis, then, is not the work of decolonisation—which operates within the terms set by the colonising framework, seeking to undo what has been done within the structures that did it. It is the work of Genesis: beginning again, from the elemental conditions of existence, with full awareness of the catastrophe that preceded the beginning. This is why Wonesis, at its most radical and most precise, points toward the reconstruction not merely of culture or consciousness, but of the foundational instruments through which a people think, orient themselves, and mark their existence in the cosmos—language, symbol, writing system, grammar, number, time, calendar, colour, and the categories of meaning itself. These are not supplementary concerns. They are the primary terrain of the war. It is at the level of language that cognition is structured; at the level of symbol that reality is named; at the level of time-reckoning that a people's relationship to ancestors and descendants is established. Psycho-Cosmocide colonised these systems first and most thoroughly, because it understood—even if its agents did not always consciously articulate it—that whoever controls the instruments of meaning controls the world they make legible.

Wonesis returns to this same terrain: not to repair the colonised instruments, but to forge new ones adequate to the living reality of a people who have survived the flood and must now build again.

Wonesis is not regression. It is transformation: a conscious re-grounding in the elemental foundations of existence, carried forward with full awareness of the systems that once obscured them. It is conscious survival.

WEST PAPUA: A Living Case Study of Psycho-Cosmocide

The theoretical framework of Psycho-Cosmocide is not an abstraction. It is a living condition, observable in real time, in specific geographies, enacted upon specific peoples. West Papua—the western half of the island of New Guinea, incorporated by force into the Indonesian state following the internationally discredited Act of Free Choice in 1969—constitutes one of the most fully developed and least examined instances of civilisational parasitism in the contemporary world (Elmslie, 2002; King, 2004). What has been inflicted upon the Melanesian peoples of West Papua is not merely political occupation or economic extraction. It is the systematic dismantling of an entire cosmological order: the progressive erasure of language, land-based knowledge, ancestral memory, ceremonial life, territorial sovereignty, and the living relationship between a people and the ground from which their identity is inseparable.

The Melanesian peoples of West Papua did not lose land in the way that property is transferred in a transaction. They lost the very ground in which their ancestors are buried, in which their stories are rooted, through which their languages derive meaning, from which their food, water, fire, and cosmological orientation proceed (Kirsch, 2006; Rutherford, 2012). To lose this land is not to lose a resource. It is to lose the operating conditions of existence itself. Songs belong to specific rivers. Myths belong to specific mountains. Sacred sites encode specific histories, moral frameworks, and lines of authority that no document, institution, or substitute system can replicate.

When this ground is alienated—through transmigration programmes, resource extraction, military occupation, and the juridical reclassification of indigenous territories as state property—what is destroyed is not merely the material substrate of life but the entire archive of a civilisation (Hernawan, 2018; Elmslie & Webb-Gannon, 2013).

What distinguishes Psycho-Cosmocide from mere political repression is that its deepest injuries are invisible to its victims. The Indonesian state—alongside the international economic interests that sustain it—has not only occupied West Papuan territory; it has occupied West Papuan consciousness. Through decades of enforced Indonesian-language education, the imposition of national religious frameworks, the rewriting of local histories within Indonesian nationalist narratives, the criminalisation of cultural and political expression, and the steady demographic transformation of the region through transmigration, the conditions have been engineered in which Papuan peoples are made to experience their own erasure as something other than erasure (Giay & Ballard, 2003; Ondawame, 2010). Development is announced where dispossession is occurring. Progress is declared where cultural destruction is accelerating. Modernisation is proclaimed where ancestral life is being extinguished.

THE INVERSION OF EXISTENTIAL PRIORITY

Among the most consequential effects of Psycho-Cosmocide is what may be called the inversion of existential priority: the systematic reprogramming of a colonised people's threat-recognition apparatus such that what is most urgently consequential is perceived as least urgent, while what is peripheral is experienced as central. The colonised mind—operating through cognitive and affective frameworks installed by the colonising system—loses the capacity to correctly perceive the magnitude of what it faces. This is not a failure of intelligence. It is the predictable outcome of a consciousness restructured from within.

Consider what constitutes Priority One—the irreplaceable, the non-negotiable, the existentially foundational—for a people whose identity, knowledge, language, memory, and future are inseparable from a specific piece of living earth. That priority is the land: not as territory in the juridical sense, but as the total repository of everything a people are. The land holds the ancestors in its soil. It holds the language in its rivers and mountain names. It holds the food systems, the water sources, the fire-making knowledge, the ceremonial sites, the songs that encode navigation, the stories that encode law, the myths that encode cosmology. Without this ground, none of the rest—no acquired language, no adopted religion, no accumulated wealth, no granted development—can reconstitute what is lost. Land is not one priority among many. It is the condition under which all other priorities become possible or impossible (Coulthard, 2014; Simpson, 2014; Cajete, 2000).

Yet the colonised mind, under conditions of Psycho-Cosmocide, has been conditioned to rank this Priority One concern at the bottom of its operative hierarchy of attention. In its place, the reprogrammed consciousness elevates secondary concerns—employment, professional prestige, the promises of religious salvation, the appearance of development, the pursuit of modernity, the performance of civility, the accumulation of individual wealth—to positions of felt urgency. These are not inherently false goods. But in the context of an active colonial occupation, they function as substitutions: they fill the psychic and social space that existential threat-recognition would otherwise occupy, while the foundational destruction proceeds unimpeded (Fanon, 1961; Memmi, 1965; Nandy, 1983).

In West Papua, this inversion is observable in precise, documentable forms. Communities fractured by clan rivalries or denominational religious competition invest enormous energy in internal disputes, while the systematic alienation of ancestral territories proceeds through mining concessions, logging permits, and military land-clearances issued at the level of the national state (Elmslie, 2002; Hernawan, 2018). Individuals who have acquired formal education within the Indonesian national system find themselves unable to name, in any politically coherent way, the nature of the threat they face—because the very categories through which they would name it have been replaced by those of the system that perpetuates it. The Papuan graduate, the Papuan civil servant, the Papuan convert speak the language of the occupier, think through the frameworks of the occupier, and assess threats using the value-hierarchies installed by the occupier. In this condition, Priority One—the land, the ancestors, the living archive of a people—does not register as urgent. It registers, if at all, as sentiment: as culture, as tradition, as the nostalgic attachment of the old. The civilisational parasite has achieved its most refined expression: it has made the host guard the very door through which the parasite enters.

THE LOGIC OF COLONIAL MANAGEMENT: ONE ENTITY, ONE FATE

The inversion of existential priority is compounded by a fundamental asymmetry in how the colonial power and the colonised people perceive the situation. The colonised, operating through the fragmented consciousness produced by Psycho-Cosmocide, experience themselves as a multiplicity: as separate clans, tribes, religious denominations, political factions, generational cohorts, educated elites, and rural communities. The colonial power, by contrast, does not see this multiplicity. It has already resolved it. To the logic of colonial management, the colonised population of a given territory is a single administrative entity—a problem to be managed, a resource to be extracted, a territory to be secured—governed by one logic, regardless of internal differentiation (Quijano, 2000; Mignolo, 2011; Fanon, 1961).

This asymmetry is structurally decisive. When Papuan clan A and Papuan clan B dispute ancestral boundaries, or when Papuan Christians and Papuan animists find themselves in theological disagreement, or when educated Papuan professionals distance themselves from highland communities they regard as backward, these internal distinctions consume enormous psychic and social energy. Meanwhile, the extractive apparatus of the Indonesian state and its international corporate partners does not pause to acknowledge the difference between clan A and clan B. The mining concession does not distinguish between the Christian Papuan and the animist Papuan. The transmigration policy does not exempt the compliant from the resistant. The military occupation does not recognise the educated professional as categorically distinct from the forest-dwelling elder. All are exposed to the same structural fate: the loss of the ground that makes any of their distinctions meaningful (King, 2004; Ondawame, 2010).

This is the mechanism by which Psycho-Cosmocide achieves one of its most devastating effects: it keeps the colonised people divided at the level of their internal distinctions while they are being consumed at the level of their shared existential foundation. The fragmented consciousness cannot coordinate a response proportionate to a unified threat, because it does not perceive a unified threat. It perceives clan rivalry, denominational competition, class differentiation, ideological dispute—all of which are real, but none of which is the primary threat. The primary threat operates at the level the colonised have been conditioned not to see (Wa Thiong'o, 1986; Tuhiwai Smith, 2012; Césaire, 1955/2000).

THE WOLVES AND THE RABBITS: A STRUCTURAL PARABLE

The dynamic described above is most clearly illustrated through an analogy whose simplicity is proportionate to the depth of what it illustrates.

Consider a pack of wolves that convenes a formal dinner and offers an invitation to a group of rabbits, requesting their participation in a discussion about what will be served at the table. The invitation speaks of dialogue, partnership, inclusive governance, and shared futures. The rabbits—their instinctive wariness having been systematically eroded through prior conditioning—accept. They arrive at the table, given seats and permitted to speak. They debate among themselves, vigorously and sincerely, about the most appropriate manner of presentation: the correct seasoning, the preferred arrangement, the style of service that would be most dignified. What the rabbits do not perceive—because the very capacity for that perception has been restructured out of them—is that they are not participants in the dinner. They are the dinner. Their presence at the table is not a sign of inclusion. It is the mechanism of their consumption.

This analogue illuminates how colonised peoples are invited into processes: consultations, dialogues, autonomy frameworks, special regional status arrangements, development partnerships, interreligious councils, cultural preservation committees. Each of these processes presents itself as a form of genuine agency. Each of them locates the participant within a structure of meaning defined and controlled by the colonising power. The terms of participation are set by the wolves. The categories of what can be discussed, the language in which discussion must occur, the criteria by which outcomes are evaluated—all of these are predetermined by the party that has already decided the fundamental question (Spivak, 1988; Mignolo & Walsh, 2018; Gramsci, 1971).

The Papuan intellectual who navigates the Indonesian national system most fluently, who attains the highest academic credentials within the coloniser's educational apparatus, who participates most articulately in the language of rights, development, and international law—does not thereby escape the structure. They have simply become its most accomplished internal voice. This is not an accusation of collaboration.

It is an observation about the structural logic of a system that absorbs resistance and redirects the capacities of the colonised back into the maintenance of the apparatus that colonises them (Fanon, 1961; Bhabha, 1994; Spivak, 1988). The recognition of this structure—seeing the table for what it is, the dinner for what it contains, the invitation for what it conceals—is the precise threshold at which Psycho-Cosmocide becomes visible, and at which the possibility of Wonesis begins.

THE ANTIDOTE

Reconstructing the Self from Within

That recognition—of the table for what it is, of the dinner for what it contains—is not the end of the work. It is its beginning. For a colonised land, a conquered people, or a nation whose identity has been externally redefined, the only viable response to Psycho-Cosmocide is not partial reform or superficial resistance, but the total reconstruction of the self from within (Fanon, 1961; Freire, 1970). The damage inflicted does not exist solely in political systems or economic conditions; it resides in memory, identity, language, and the very substance of meaning itself in deep metaphysical realms.

The process begins with return—not as nostalgia, but as recovery (Dussel, 1995). A return to the original languages, where meaning has not yet been distorted by foreign frameworks (Wa Thiong'o, 1986). A return to the original names, where identity emerges from within the people and their land. A return to the original values, lore, codes, and principles that once guided life in alignment with lived reality rather than abstraction (Wilson, 2008; Coulthard, 2014). These are not cultural ornaments; they are the operating system of a people's existence.

Colonisation does not only take land. It replaces memory (Mignolo, 2000). It installs foreign narratives, foreign symbols, foreign definitions of truth, success, morality, and humanity. Over time, these imposed elements become internalised until the colonised begin to think, speak, and perceive the world through the language of the coloniser (Fanon, 1952/1967; Memmi, 1965). To break this condition requires more than preservation—it requires reinstallation. The erased memory must be revitalised, reactivated, and lived

again. Language must not only be spoken but thought in. Names must not only be remembered but carried as identity. Cultural codes must not only be studied but embodied (Cajete, 2000; Simpson, 2014).

Simultaneously, there must be a deliberate process of removal. External impositions—names, logos, symbols, images, languages, beliefs, and historical narratives that were forced upon a people—must be examined, dismantled, and where necessary, consciously rejected (Hall, 1997; Bhabha, 1994). This is not blind destruction but discernment: what has been imposed must not be permitted to define the core of a people's existence.

If this process does not occur, the condition of Psycho-Cosmocide remains intact. A people may appear alive and functioning within modern systems, but internally they operate as carriers of external memory. Their identity is no longer their own; their perception is structured by what was imposed upon them (Nandy, 1983; Césaire, 1955/2000). In this condition, they exist as a form of living death—a body animated by borrowed meaning, a consciousness shaped by foreign code. True survival, therefore, is not simply biological or economic. It is existential: the capacity of a people to define themselves from within their own language, their own memory, and their own apprehension of reality (Freire, 1970; Coulthard, 2014).

ON THE THRESHOLD OF COSMOLOGICAL ANOMIE

A Call to Re-examine Everything

There are moments in the life of a civilisation—rarer still, moments in the life of humanity as a whole—when the frameworks that have organised perception, justified existence, and provided the coordinates of meaning begin to fail simultaneously. Not one framework. Not the collapse of a single worldview that another is waiting to replace. But the cascading failure of the entire constellation of maps through which human beings have navigated their existence on this planet. We are living in such a moment. And it is precisely in this moment that the concept of Psycho-Cosmocide becomes not merely academically useful but existentially necessary.

What is being proposed here is not scepticism for its own sake, nor the nihilist position that all truth is relative and every framework equally bankrupt. It is something more precise and more demanding: the position that everything which has been held as truth—every structure of meaning, every inherited framework of perception, every category through which reality has been organised and transmitted—must now be consciously, deliberately, and courageously placed on the examination table. Not destroyed. Examined. The distinction is not incidental. Examination is what Psycho-Cosmocide denies. Examination is what Wonesis restores.

This is not an unprecedented intellectual posture. It is, in fact, the defining gesture of every major epistemic transformation in recorded human history. When the old cosmological order of medieval Europe began to collapse—under the weight of plague, institutional rupture, and the disorienting accumulation of evidence that the inherited maps no longer corresponded to observed reality—the thinkers of the Renaissance and early modern period did not simply amend the existing framework. Copernicus re-examined the structure of the heavens. Galileo re-examined the evidence of the senses

against the authority of received doctrine. Bruno re-examined the boundaries of the cosmos itself and paid for that examination with his life. Descartes, confronted with a world in which every inherited certainty had become suspect, did not retreat to prior authority. He made doubt itself the foundation of inquiry—not as nihilism, but as rigour: “I will doubt everything that can be doubted,” he argued, “and build only from what survives.” Newton constructed a new physics from first mathematical principles. These figures were not destroyers. They were builders—but builders who understood that building required first clearing the ground on which the new structure would stand.

The call to re-examine everything issued here operates within this same structural tradition—but extends it in two critical ways. First, the previous European epistemic revolutions, for all their radicalism, did not re-examine the civilisational project itself: they reformed its instruments while leaving its foundations intact. Descartes doubted everything except the thinking self. Newton doubted the Aristotelian physics but not the imperial economy that funded his world. The Renaissance enlarged the frame of European self-understanding without questioning the right of that self to organise the world on its own terms. The present moment of cascading cosmological failure requires a more thoroughgoing examination: one that places not only the instruments but the framework that produced them under scrutiny. Second, this examination cannot be conducted using only the tools of the tradition it examines. It requires frameworks that have been sustained outside the dominant civilisational project—in the land-based epistemologies, the oral transmission traditions, the ceremonial knowledge systems, and the cosmological orientations of peoples whose modes of knowing were suppressed precisely because they offered a coherent alternative. The inventory that follows is not a list of grievances. It is the examination table—the preliminary ground-clearing that a new construction requires.

THE INVENTORY OF WHAT MUST BE RE-EXAMINED

Memory. What do you remember, and who decided what was worth remembering? What was recorded, and in whose language, using whose categories, preserved in whose institutions? Memory is not a passive recording of what occurred. It is a constructed selection, shaped by power, filtered through the frameworks of those who controlled the means of preservation. The memories a colonised people carry of themselves have been partly replaced by the memories the colonising system has installed: memories of inferiority, backwardness, primitivism, gratitude, and need. These are not memories. They are programming.

Knowledge and Wisdom. What counts as knowledge, and by whose criteria? The dominant epistemological frameworks of the modern world—rooted in European Enlightenment rationalism and the credentialing systems that authorise who may speak with authority—are presented as universal. They are not. They are the knowledge-systems of a specific civilisational tradition that achieved global dominance through conquest and then declared its own methods to be the measure of all valid knowing. Land-based knowledge systems, oral transmission traditions, ceremonial knowledge, and ecological intelligence accumulated across millennia are not inferior modes of knowing. They are different modes, many of which have been proven, in their own domains, to be more accurate, more sustainable, and more comprehensive than the frameworks that replaced them.

Meaning and Value. Why does what you value feel natural to you? Because it was taught—not by deliberate instruction alone, but by immersion: by the stories that surrounded you, the images that reached

you, the rewards and punishments dispensed by the systems you inhabited from birth. The question is not whether your values were installed—they were, as all human values are transmitted through culture—but whether the system that installed them had your flourishing as its purpose.

Stories, Myths, and Legends. Every culture is held together by narratives: stories about origins, about heroes, about what was done and what was suffered, about what the cosmos is and what humanity's place within it amounts to. These stories are not decorative. They are structural. When a colonising power replaces the stories of a people with its own—substituting its heroes for theirs, its origin myths for their creation accounts—it does not merely change what people know. It changes what people can imagine. A people made to inhabit the coloniser's stories have lost the most fundamental navigational instrument available: the story of who they are.

Names, Symbols, Colours, and Signs. A name is not merely a label. It is an act of cosmological positioning, locating its bearer within a specific lineage, territory, and web of relationships. When indigenous names are replaced by colonial names—when places are renamed, people are renamed, and the original names gradually lost from living memory—what is lost is not linguistic diversity alone. What is lost is the map. The territory remains, but the legend that makes it legible has been torn away.

Language—Written and Oral. Language is not a container for thought. Language is thought. The categories available in a language determine what can be perceived, named, questioned, and imagined. A language carries the entire accumulated cognitive history of the people who developed it: their observations about the natural world, their relational ethics, their cosmological orientation, their understanding of time, causation, personhood, and obligation. When a language dies, this is not the loss of a communication system. It is the loss of a world.

The Perception of History. History, as taught in the dominant global educational system, is not a record of what happened. It is a narrative of what the victors chose to preserve, arranged in the causal sequence that justified their victory. To re-examine this history is not to deny that events occurred. It is to ask who decided which events mattered, in what sequence, toward what conclusion, and at whose expense.

The Eschatological Framework. Every civilisation carries an eschatology: an understanding of where things are going and what humanity is moving toward. The question that must be asked is whether the dominant eschatological framework—whether religious or secular—serves the people who inhabit it, or whether it serves the system that installed it. Does the promise of heaven justify the acceptance of earthly dispossession? Does the promise of development justify the surrender of the land?

The Ideas of Civilisation, Progress, Development, and Success. None of these concepts is wrong in the abstract. All of them become instruments of violence when defined by one civilisation and applied to all others as a universal standard. When civilisation means our particular organisation of human life, when progress means movement toward our particular vision of better, when success means the attainment of our particular goals—then these concepts cease to be descriptions of human flourishing. They become justifications for the destruction of every alternative form of it.

Heaven, Hell, Morality, and Ethics. The moral frameworks that most of humanity now inhabits have been profoundly shaped by the expansion of world religions that spread, in significant part, through the same civilisational apparatus that spread colonial political and economic power. This does not mean that these traditions contain no genuine ethical wisdom. But it means that the specific moral frameworks installed in

colonised peoples—the definitions of sin and virtue, the hierarchies of the sacred and the profane—were in many cases designed to produce precisely the psychological conditions in which Psycho-Cosmocide operates most effectively: submission to authority as spiritual virtue, patience with earthly suffering as preparation for heavenly reward, the abandonment of ancestral practice as a condition of spiritual legitimacy.

Politics and Economy. The political and economic systems that now govern virtually every territory on earth—the nation-state, parliamentary democracy, the market economy, property law, the international financial order—are not neutral instruments that humanity discovered because they were self-evidently best. They are the political and economic forms of a specific civilisational tradition, imposed through conquest, maintained through dependency, and legitimised through the claim to universality that is the hallmark of Psycho-Cosmocide in every domain it occupies.

What It Means to Be Human. At the deepest level, the question that must be placed under examination is the anthropological one: what does it mean to be a human being? The answers that the dominant global order has provided—the autonomous individual, the rational agent, the consumer-citizen, the self-made person liberated from ancestral obligation and ecological embeddedness—are not universal answers. They are historically specific answers produced by a specific civilisational trajectory, serving a specific economic order, installed through the mechanisms described throughout this paper into the consciousness of peoples whose own answers were incomparably older, more ecologically grounded, and in many cases more adequate to the actual conditions of human existence on a finite planet.

THE GREAT CONVERGENCE

Cosmological Anomie

The reason all of this must be examined now—urgently and simultaneously—is that the frameworks which have provided coherence and navigational capacity to human beings across all of these domains are collapsing at the same moment. This is what is meant by cosmological anomie: not merely the sociological anomie that Durkheim described—the breakdown of social norms in periods of rapid change—but the simultaneous failure of the cosmological frameworks that gave those social norms their ultimate grounding and legitimacy.

The great religious eschatologies are losing their authority at the same moment that the secular eschatology of progress is losing its credibility. The nation-state is being hollowed out at the same moment that the international order constructed after 1945 is fracturing. The market economy is generating ecological collapse at the same moment that it is producing social disintegration within the very societies that most fully embody it. Every map is failing at once.

What is emerging is not a new order but a condition of profound disorientation: a collective standing in the dark, with the old maps dissolving in the hands, and no new cartography yet available. This is the condition that older traditions have named in their own registers: the great flood of many indigenous cosmologies—the moment when the existing order is swept away, not as punishment, but as a necessary dissolution preparatory to a new beginning. The *Maluk Wone* of Lani cosmology (lit. anomie, chaos, disorder, darkness; the catastrophic overturning that precedes restoration; see Kogoya, 2021)—and the *Kali Yuga* of Hindu cosmology (Flood, 1996)—describe the age of darkness and dissolution that must be

fully entered before the cycle can turn. These are not identical frameworks. But they share the structural recognition that humanity has, across many traditions, prepared itself for the moment when all existing coordinates fail simultaneously, and the question of where the human being stands must be answered again, from the beginning.

It is in this context that Psycho-Cosmocide emerges not merely as a tool for analysing the condition of colonised peoples, but as the overarching diagnostic framework for understanding the condition of humanity as a whole.

What cosmological anomie reveals is that all of these frameworks, in all of these worlds, have been operating as systems of installed meaning rather than systems of discovered truth. The so-called First World and the Third World were, in this respect, equally inhabited by people whose sense of reality had been substantially constructed by systems that served particular interests rather than universal human enlightenment.

The dissolution of the maps is, therefore, not only a catastrophe. It is a threshold. The moment when it becomes possible to ask, for the first time with genuine collective urgency, what a map should be made of, who should make it, on behalf of whom, and with what understanding of what the human being actually needs in order to live—not merely to survive, not merely to consume, not merely to be managed—but to live in the full cosmological sense: embedded in place, connected to ancestors, oriented toward descendants, at home in the cosmos from which the civilisational parasite has, for too long, been working to evict us.

CONCLUSION

Recognition as the First Act of Survival

The movement from original nature through civilisation to Psycho-Cosmocide is not merely a historical sequence. It is an evolution of human perception itself — a gradual transformation in how reality is understood, constructed, and inhabited. In the state of original nature, human existence is holistic, integrated, and directly aligned with the equilibrium of the cosmos. With the emergence of civilisation, reality becomes partially organised through human-made systems. In Civi-lie-sation, these systems begin to distort truth. In Evi-lie-sation, distortion becomes systemic and generative of suffering. In Psycho-Cosmocide, the very fabric of perception and meaning is occupied. Wonesis emerges as the counter-current: a conscious awakening that seeks to restore clarity, memory, and connection, while remaining clear-eyed about the parasitic structures that persist.

The most dangerous moment is not when the host is attacked. It is when the host begins to cooperate — when destruction is no longer recognised as destruction, but accepted as normal, justified as necessary, and embraced as meaningful. The ultimate question, then, is not whether the civilisational parasite exists. The question is whether the host can still recognise itself beneath everything that has been inscribed into it.

This call to re-examine everything is not an invitation to despair. It is an invitation to the most serious and necessary work of this historical moment: the work of building new maps—or recovering old ones—that are adequate to the reality of what it means to be human on a finite, living, sacred earth. Psycho-Cosmocide names what has been done. Wonesis names what must now begin. The examination table is set. The question is only who is willing to place what they know upon it.

REFERENCES

- Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses. In *Lenin and philosophy and other essays* (pp. 127–186). Monthly Review Press.
- Andersen, S. B., Gerritsma, S., Yusah, K. M., Mayntz, D., Hywel-Jones, N. L., Billen, J., Boomsma, J. J., & Hughes, D. P. (2009). The life of a dead ant: The expression of an adaptive extended phenotype. *The American Naturalist*, 174(3), 424–433. <https://doi.org/10.1086/603640>
- Berdoy, M., Webster, J. P., & Macdonald, D. W. (2000). Fatal attraction in rats infected with *Toxoplasma gondii*. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 267(1452), 1591–1594. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2000.1182>
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. Sage.
- Cajete, G. (2000). *Native science: Natural laws of interdependence*. Clear Light Publishers.
- Césaire, A. (2000). *Discourse on colonialism* (J. Pinkham, Trans.). Monthly Review Press. (Original work published 1955)
- Chomsky, N., & Herman, E. S. (1988). *Manufacturing consent: The political economy of the mass media*. Pantheon Books.
- Coulthard, G. S. (2014). *Red skin, white masks: Rejecting the colonial politics of recognition*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Davis, M. (2001). *Late Victorian holocausts: El Niño famines and the making of the Third World*. Verso.
- Dawkins, R. (1982). *The extended phenotype: The long reach of the gene*. Oxford University Press.
- Dussel, E. (1995). *The invention of the Americas: Eclipse of “the other” and the myth of modernity* (M. D. Barber, Trans.). Continuum.

- Durkheim, É. (1897). *Suicide: A study in sociology* (J. A. Spaulding & G. Simpson, Trans.). Free Press.
- Elmslie, J. (2002). *Irian Jaya under the gun: Indonesian economic development versus West Papuan nationalism*. University of Hawai'i Press.
- Elmslie, J., & Webb-Gannon, C. (2013). A slow-motion genocide: Indonesian rule in West Papua. *Griffith Journal of Law & Human Dignity*, 1(2), 142–166.
- Fanon, F. (1967). *Black skin, white masks* (C. L. Markmann, Trans.). Grove Press. (Original work published 1952)
- Fanon, F. (1961). *The wretched of the earth* (C. Farrington, Trans.). Grove Press.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge* (A. M. S. Smith, Trans.). Pantheon Books.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). Herder and Herder.
- Flood, G. (1996). *An introduction to Hinduism*. Cambridge University Press.
- Giay, B., & Ballard, C. (2003). *Fugitive writings: An introduction to Papuan studies*. Deiyai/Elsham Papua.
- Goody, J. (1977). *The domestication of the savage mind*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks* (Q. Hoare & G. N. Smith, Eds. & Trans.). International Publishers.
- Hall, S. (1997). The work of representation. In S. Hall (Ed.), *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices* (pp. 13–74). Sage.
- Hau'ofa, E. (1994). Our sea of islands. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 6(1), 147–161.
- Hernawan, J. B. (2018). *Tortured land: Torture in Papua as a drama of power*. Deiyai/Western Sydney University.
- Hughes, D. P., Andersen, S. B., Hywel-Jones, N. L., Himaman, W., Billen, J., & Boomsma, J. J. (2011). Behavioral mechanisms and morphological symptoms of zombie ants dying from fungal infection. *BMC Ecology*, 11, Article 13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6785-11-13>
- King, P. (2004). *West Papua and Indonesia since Suharto: Independence, autonomy or chaos?* University of New South Wales Press.
- Kirsch, S. (2006). *Reverse anthropology: Indigenous analysis of social and environmental relations in New Guinea*. Stanford University Press.
- Kogoya, Y. (2021). *How Papua's Lani people view the world*. PNG Attitude. <https://www.pngattitude.com/2021/01/how-papuas-lani-people-view-the-world.html>
- Memmi, A. (1965). *The colonizer and the colonized* (H. Greenfeld, Trans.). Orion Press.

- Mignolo, W. D. (2000). *Local histories/global designs: Coloniality, subaltern knowledges, and border thinking*. Princeton University Press.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2011). *The darker side of Western modernity: Global futures, decolonial options*. Duke University Press.
- Mignolo, W. D., & Walsh, C. E. (2018). *On decoloniality: Concepts, analytics, praxis*. Duke University Press.
- Nandy, A. (1983). *The intimate enemy: Loss and recovery of self under colonialism*. Oxford University Press.
- Ondawame, J. O. (2010). "One people, one soul": West Papuan nationalism and the Organisasi Papua Merdeka. ANU E Press.
- Ong, W. J. (1982). *Orality and literacy: The technologizing of the word*. Methuen.
- Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power and Eurocentrism in Latin America. *International Sociology*, 15(2), 215–232. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580900015002005>
- Quijano, A. (2007). Coloniality and modernity/rationality. *Cultural Studies*, 21(2–3), 168–178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380601164353>
- Rutherford, D. (2012). *Laughing at Leviathan: Sovereignty and audience in West Papua*. University of Chicago Press.
- Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books.
- Scott, J. C. (2017). *Against the grain: A deep history of the earliest states*. Yale University Press.
- Simpson, L. B. (2014). Land as pedagogy: Nishnaabeg intelligence and rebellious transformation. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 3(3), 1–25.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). University of Illinois Press.
- Tuhiwai Smith, L. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples* (2nd ed.). Zed Books.
- Wa Thiong'o, N. (1986). *Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. James Currey.
- Webster, J. P. (2007). The effect of *Toxoplasma gondii* on animal behavior: Playing cat and mouse. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 33(3), 752–756. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbl073>
- Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Fernwood Publishing.

APPENDIX A

The Epistemological Stakes

In Plato's allegory of the cave, prisoners have lived their entire lives facing a wall upon which shadows are projected. The shadows are the only reality they have ever known. When one prisoner is freed and brought into the sunlight, the experience is not simply educational—it is disorienting and unwelcome. The light is painful. The world outside contradicts everything the prisoner had taken to be real. When the prisoner returns to describe what exists beyond the wall, the others resist. The cave is not simply a metaphor for ignorance. It is a metaphor for a consciousness structurally organised around a particular version of reality—one that cannot be revised without the revision of the self.

This paper is written from the threshold: from a position of having turned far enough around to see the fire, to recognise it as a fire, and to understand that the shadows on the wall are not the whole of reality. It points toward an exit that most inhabitants of the cave do not know is there, because they have been conditioned not to turn around.

The reader who encounters this paper from within the systems it describes—and this is arguably the majority of readers, regardless of whether they are colonised or colonising—may experience what follows as unsettling. Not because the argument is unnecessarily provocative, but because following it to its conclusion requires examining whether the values held as universal are in fact particular: the particular values of a particular civilisational project, installed through a process so thorough that they ceased to feel installed at all.

The reader is not asked to agree with every formulation. They are asked, however, to do something more difficult: to sit with the possibility that the framework through which they have evaluated the world—including the framework through which they will evaluate this paper—may itself be part of what is being described.