

NATAKA Research Institute

Wone Press

Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series, No. 18 (2026)

Colonial Parasites and Colonised Hosts

The Psycho-Cosmocide of Cosmobian Existence in West Papua

Yamin Kogoya

First archived: 14 June 2026 | Second revision: 8 August 2026

Abstract

This paper develops a parasitological account of colonial civilisational capture through the Psycho-Cosmocide Framework and applies it to the case of West Papua. Drawing on six biological parasites—*Toxoplasma gondii*, *Ophiocordyceps unilateralis*, *Cymothoa exigua*, *Ampulex compressa*, *Sacculina carcini*, and *Dicrocoelium dendriticum*—the paper employs structural homology to model recurrent mechanisms through which colonial systems reorganise the conditions of collective existence. The central claim is that colonialism contains a neglected parasitological dimension that cannot be fully explained through coercion, hegemony, or political domination alone. Through progressive interventions in ecological foundations, language, memory, ceremony, and knowledge systems, colonial institutions may come to reproduce themselves through the participation of the populations they govern. The paper does not argue that colonialism is literally biological parasitism. Rather, it argues that biological parasitology provides a precise analytical model for understanding mechanisms of civilisational capture and reproduction. Using the concept of cascading incapacitation, the framework explains how disruptions at foundational layers of existence generate cumulative effects across transmissional and archival layers, contributing to the long-term erosion of cosmopolitan continuity. The paper contributes to decolonial philosophy by specifying a mechanism gap left open by existing theories of hegemony and coloniality and by providing a framework for analysing the reproduction of colonial systems through the transformation of reality-making structures.

Keywords: Psycho-Cosmocide; CPCV; colonialism; biological parasitology; structural homology; decolonial philosophy; West Papua; cosmopolitan existence; coloniality; collective memory.

Introduction

A persistent puzzle haunts the study of colonialism: how do colonised populations come to participate in reproducing systems that actively undermine their own continuity? The conundrum is acute in West Papua, where many indigenous Papuans regard Indonesian rule as a colonial occupation, yet simultaneously attend its schools, work within its bureaucracies, vote in its elections, and sustain its religious and economic institutions. Papuan parents invest heavily in educating children within these very systems, and Papuan intellectuals return from Indonesian higher education to administer the structures their communities identify as colonial. Younger generations increasingly speak Bahasa Indonesia rather than ancestral languages. None of this is unique to West Papua; the pattern recurs across colonised societies globally. This phenomenon matters because it cannot be explained by coercion alone. If colonial systems persisted only through force, their reproduction would weaken once force receded. Instead, the systems are often defended, extended, and transmitted intergenerationally by the very people whose worlds they displace. The question this raises is not simply how power is imposed, but how a colonised people becomes the active mechanism of their own ontological de-making and re-making—internalising a foreign reality as normal, desirable, or inevitable, and transmitting that reality to children as accepted and self-evident, a process that ultimately leads to their own extinction (Kogoya, 2026b).

Throughout this paper, the term *cosmobian* designates a people whose collective identity, moral order, epistemology, and ontological orientation are constituted through an ancestral, living relationship with a specific land, cosmos, and ceremonial order—a mode of being-in-the-world that is irreducible to any position within a universal civilisational hierarchy and that can only be fully understood on its own cosmological terms. Cosmobian existence therefore refers not merely to a worldview or cosmology, but to the integrated ecological, linguistic, ceremonial, mnemonic, and territorial infrastructure through which a world reproduces itself across generations.

The concept of cosmobian existence also differs from several neighbouring concepts frequently employed within anthropology, philosophy, and decolonial theory. It is not equivalent to a lifeworld in the phenomenological sense, because a lifeworld primarily describes the horizon of lived experience, whereas cosmobian existence includes the ecological, territorial, ceremonial, and intergenerational infrastructures through which that horizon is materially reproduced. Nor is it identical with contemporary notions of worlding, which generally emphasise processes through which worlds are enacted and performed. While worlding describes how worlds come into being, cosmobian existence focuses on the enduring architecture that enables a world to sustain itself across generations. Similarly, the concept extends beyond the notion of a cosmology understood merely as a system of beliefs about the universe. A cosmobian world includes cosmology, but also incorporates land relations, ecological knowledge, language transmission, ceremonial obligations, mnemonic systems, and the material conditions of continuity. The emphasis therefore falls not upon what a people believes, but upon the integrated structures through which a people generates, maintains, and reproduces its own reality.

The term is introduced because the framework's object of analysis is neither culture in general nor belief systems in isolation, but the cosmobian infrastructure through which a world remains capable of reproducing itself on its own cosmological terms. It is this infrastructure, rather than any single cultural element, that the Civilisational Psycho-Cosmocide Virus (CPCV) framework identifies as the primary object of civilisational capture. A new term is necessary precisely because existing vocabulary carries comparative hierarchies this paper seeks to analyse rather than reproduce. "Indigenous" carries legal and political meanings this paper does not invoke. "Traditional society" implies a primarily temporal characterisation. "Non-Western worldview" defines negatively against a colonial standard. To call a people's world a "cosmology" or "belief system" is already to subordinate it to a framework in which only one kind of knowledge counts as knowledge. Cosmobian existence, by contrast, names a form of world-making whose architecture—ecological, linguistic, ceremonial, archival—is self-generated, self-sustaining, and the direct object of the parasitological process this paper describes. Unlike other available terms, it specifies not merely a cultural position but an ontological infrastructure: the structured capacity to generate, sustain, and reproduce a world on one's own cosmological terms. This specificity is what the analysis requires.

The central argument of this paper can be stated in a single sentence: structural homology with biological parasitism provides a new mechanism for understanding how colonial systems reproduce themselves through the reality-making architecture of cosmobian societies (Kogoya, 2025), explaining why colonised populations so often become the active agents of their own ontological displacement. Everything that follows is the elaboration and defence of that claim.

Existing scholarship on hegemony, disciplinary power, symbolic domination, and internalised oppression offers crucial resources for understanding how power operates through institutions, discourse, and consciousness. Antonio Gramsci's account of hegemony explains why dominated groups consent to ruling ideas rather than resisting them (Gramsci, 1971); Frantz Fanon's analysis of the colonised psyche as divided and alienated illuminates the subjective experience of that consent (Fanon, 1952). What this literature has not fully theorised, however, is the mechanism by which a dominant civilisational system progressively reorganises the underlying reality-making architecture of another society—the prior infrastructure of perception, memory, language, and meaning through which ideas become thinkable at all—while simultaneously recruiting members of that society into perpetuating the very mechanisms of their own displacement (Kogoya, 2026b).

This paper's intervention is to supply that missing mechanism through a single theoretical move: the claim that certain forms of colonial civilisational expansion exhibit a structural homology with certain forms of biological parasitism. This is not a metaphor in the loose sense, nor a claim that colonial systems are literally biological organisms. It is a claim about shared organisational logic. Biological parasites characteristically succeed through infiltration, resource redirection, behavioural modification, and host-maintained reproduction—the host remains physically functional while its capacities are progressively repurposed to serve an external agent (Lafferty & Kuris, 2012).

The paper argues that colonial civilisational systems can operate according to the same functional logic at the level of meaning, memory, language, and ceremony, and that six well-documented biological parasites —each exhibiting a distinct mode of host manipulation—provide precise conceptual instruments for naming six correspondingly distinct mechanisms of civilisational capture.

The argument proceeds in three movements. First, it establishes the conceptual foundation: what the CPCV is, what kind of theoretical object it is, and what structural homology means as a method. Second, it works through the six parasites as mechanism-instruments, showing how each names a specific operation—fear-rewiring, behavioural redirection, organ replacement, removal of escape-imagination, redirection of reproductive energy, and elite internalisation—and how each operation maps onto a documented feature of the West Papuan colonial experience. Third, it demonstrates how these six operations combine to produce a cascading effect across the foundational layers of a people's reality-making architecture such that compromising the foundations is sufficient to destabilise the whole.

What follows is not a comprehensive theory of colonialism, nor an attempt to compress an entire philosophical system into a single article. It is the elaboration of one mechanism—structural homology between parasitic host-manipulation and civilisational capture—together with its evidentiary grounding in the West Papuan case and its principal theoretical implications.

Literature and Context

The vocabulary available for analysing colonial power is well developed. Gramsci's concept of hegemony describes how dominant groups secure consent by naturalising their worldview within the common sense of the dominated (Gramsci, 1971). Fanon's account of the colonised consciousness as a divided self—capture the subjective and psychoanalytic dimensions of colonial subjectivity (Fanon, 1952, 1963). Foucault's genealogies of disciplinary power trace how institutions produce self-regulating subjects without continuous overt coercion, and how those subjects come to reproduce the norms that formed them (Foucault, 1977). Bourdieu's habitus describes how social structures become inscribed in bodily dispositions so thoroughly that they operate below conscious deliberation (Bourdieu, 1977). Quijano's coloniality of power identifies a matrix of racialised domination persisting structurally long after formal decolonisation (Quijano, 2000). Maldonado-Torres extends this into the coloniality of being, locating coloniality at the level of lived ontological experience (Maldonado-Torres, 2007). Mignolo's concept of the pluriversal challenges the colonial premise that a single universal modernity constitutes the legitimate horizon of all human futures (Mignolo, 2000). Santos's epistemicide names the destruction of subaltern knowledge systems through the imposition of a single epistemic standard (Santos, 2016). Fricker's epistemic injustice identifies the specific wrongs done to people as knowers (Fricker, 2007).

Smith's decolonising methodologies reclaim research itself as a site of struggle (Smith, 1999). Assmann distinguishes communicative memory from cultural memory preserved through ritual, text, and monument (Assmann, 1995).

Read together, these frameworks converge on a shared insight: colonial domination operates substantially through internalisation rather than continuous force, and what is internalised is not merely a set of beliefs but a set of conditions for belief. Yet despite these important contributions, the literature leaves partially unresolved a specific question concerning the mechanisms through which a dominant civilisational order progressively reorganises the reality-making architecture of a host society. Existing frameworks illuminate consent, discipline, subject formation, epistemic hierarchy, and colonial persistence, but they do not generally provide a unified account of how disruptions to land, memory, language, ceremony, and transmission interact as components of a single reproductive process.

This is the gap the present paper addresses. Where Quijano describes the structural persistence of colonial power relations, this paper specifies a mechanism through which those relations become embedded within a people's reality-making architecture across multiple layers of existence. Where Gramsci explains why a population ceases to resist an imposed worldview, this paper asks what must happen to the prior conditions of perception and memory for that worldview to become thinkable as one's own. Where Foucault identifies the self-regulating subject as the product of disciplinary institutions, the CPCV framework asks which prior civilisational structures must first be weakened, displaced, or reorganised before that self-regulatory capacity can be redirected. Where Bourdieu describes habitus as structured dispositions reproduced below conscious deliberation, this paper specifies the process through which the structuring structures themselves become transformed. Where Mignolo calls for a pluriversal world, the CPCV framework analyses the mechanism through which one cosmological project systematically undermines the capacity of another to constitute and sustain itself. Where Santos and Fricker describe outcomes at the level of knowledge systems, this paper traces the pre-epistemic disruptions to land, memory, language, and transmission that make those outcomes possible.

The resource this paper brings to that task is biological parasitology. The decision to ground an account of colonial mechanism in parasitology, rather than exclusively in the conventional vocabulary of ideology critique, is itself a substantive theoretical choice. The existing vocabulary—hegemony, false consciousness, cultural imperialism, epistemic violence—remains indispensable, but it operates at a level of generality that does not always specify which capacities are targeted, how they are redirected, or why the host comes to experience an externally imposed transformation as self-directed. Parasitology offers a particularly useful level of specificity for addressing these questions. Decades of research on host manipulation have documented, in precise mechanistic terms, how organisms infiltrate host systems, modify behavioural and perceptual circuits while leaving others intact, and achieve reproduction through the host's own redirected activity (Lafferty & Kuris, 2012; Webster, 2007).

Gramsci can establish that a population has internalised the coloniser's worldview; parasitology helps identify which transmission channels were disrupted, which perceptual categories were reorganised, and what implications those transformations have for the host's capacity to recognise them as transformations at all.

While the foregoing discussion situates the framework within critical, decolonial, and memory studies traditions, it also enters into dialogue with Indigenous philosophical traditions that have long emphasised the relational, ecological, and place-based foundations of collective existence.

Gregory Cajete's account of Native science emphasises the inseparability of ecological knowledge, spiritual understanding, and communal continuity. Leroy Little Bear's articulation of Indigenous relational metaphysics similarly challenges the assumption that reality consists of isolated entities rather than dynamic relationships. Willie Ermine's work on Indigenous epistemology highlights the importance of inward knowledge and the ethical space through which different knowledge traditions encounter one another. Vine Deloria Jr. repeatedly argued that Indigenous worlds are constituted through particular relationships to land, place, and sacred geography rather than through abstract universal categories.

The present framework shares important affinities with these traditions. However, it differs in its specific analytical focus. Rather than developing an Indigenous metaphysics or epistemology as such, it seeks to identify the mechanisms through which the infrastructures supporting those worlds become reorganised, redirected, or displaced under conditions of colonial civilisational expansion. The concept of cosmopolitan existence is therefore intended not as a replacement for existing Indigenous philosophical traditions but as a framework for analysing the conditions under which such traditions sustain—or lose—their capacity for intergenerational reproduction (Kogoya, 2026a).

A Note on the Working Paper Series

The Psycho-Cosmocide Studies (Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series, Nos. 1–17) consists of working papers published independently through the NATAKA Research Institute and Wone Press, and made openly available via PhilPapers. These are not peer-reviewed in the conventional journal sense; they function as a working-paper series in which the broader Psycho-Cosmocide framework is developed iteratively across successive papers. The present article draws on specific concepts from that series — most importantly the concept of cosmopolitan existence and the sixteen-layer Civilisational Hierarchy of Reality Construction — and aims to present the structural-homology mechanism developed here in a form that is intelligible independently of the wider series. A condensed application of the same six-parasite mechanism subsequently appears within the Eight Atlases analysis of The Ecosystem of Papuan Extinction (Kogoya, 2026e); the present paper should be read as the fuller theoretical elaboration of that mechanism.

Methodological Note

Structural Homology and the Selection of Parasite-Instruments

Mary Hesse's influential account of theoretical models in science distinguishes positive analogies (features genuinely shared between a model and its target), negative analogies (features they do not share), and a neutral belt (features whose status remains uncertain and which the model may help illuminate) (Hesse, 1966). Metaphor, in the sense developed by Lakoff and Johnson, maps structure from a source domain onto a target domain in order to organise understanding; it is cognitively productive but does not in itself assert that the two domains share an underlying organisational logic (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

Structural homology, as the term is used here, makes a stronger claim than either metaphor or simple analogy. The term is employed in a systems-theoretical rather than a strictly evolutionary-biological sense. It refers to the recurrence of a closely corresponding functional architecture across distinct domains regardless of differences in substrate, historical origin, causal mechanism, or material form. Two systems may be considered structurally homologous when they exhibit functionally equivalent sequences of organisation and generate comparable systemic outcomes despite being implemented through different material processes. The emphasis therefore falls not upon biological similarity but upon organisational correspondence.

The present paper argues that biological parasitism and certain forms of colonial civilisational expansion exhibit such a corresponding functional architecture. The claim is not that colonial systems are biologically parasitic, nor merely that parasitism provides an illuminating metaphor. Rather, it is that both systems can be analysed as involving recurring organisational patterns characterised by infiltration of a host system, redirection of host capacities toward external reproductive ends, maintenance of the host as an active carrier, and reproduction through the host's subsequently redirected activity. In both cases, the host increasingly participates in reproducing a system whose organisational logic did not originate within it, often through actions experienced as voluntary, rational, or self-directed.

The argument therefore proceeds neither by metaphorical resemblance nor by direct causal equivalence. It proceeds by identifying a recurrent organisational pattern observable across distinct domains and examining whether that pattern illuminates empirical phenomena that existing frameworks leave only partially explained. The usefulness of the homology depends not upon the transfer of biological concepts into social theory as such, but upon the explanatory power generated by the comparison.

Understood in this way, parasitological vocabulary functions as an analytical model rather than a rhetorical device.

The validity of the homology is determined not by biological identity but by the degree of functional correspondence between the organisational patterns being compared. The question is therefore not whether colonial systems are literally parasites, but whether parasitology provides a

more precise account of certain mechanisms of civilisational capture than existing explanatory vocabularies alone.

Selection Criteria for the Six Parasite-Instruments

A legitimate methodological question concerns why these six biological parasites were selected rather than others. The selection is governed by three explicit criteria, applied conjunctively.

First, each parasite must exhibit a functionally distinct and well-documented mode of host manipulation rather than merely a variation of a mode already represented within the framework. The six selected cases satisfy this requirement. *Toxoplasma gondii* operates through neurochemical fear-redirection; *Ophiocordyceps unilateralis* through gradual motor and navigational reorientation; *Cymothoa exigua* through organ replacement while preserving surface functionality; *Ampulex compressa* through the targeted suppression of a specific behavioural capacity while leaving most other functions intact; *Sacculina carcini* through the systemic redirection of reproductive energy; and *Dicrocoelium dendriticum* through behavioural compulsion that appears, from the host's perspective, as self-directed activity. Each case identifies a distinct functional operation that is not reducible to the others.

Second, each mode of manipulation must exhibit a closely corresponding operation within a documented colonial process. The criterion is not superficial resemblance but correspondence at the level of functional organisation. Fear-redirection is examined through missionary interventions that alter the perceived legitimacy of ancestral practices; behavioural reorientation through educational systems that redirect vocational and epistemic orientation; organ replacement through processes of linguistic displacement; capacity suppression through the narrowing of political imagination; reproductive redirection through the capture of cultural and institutional labour; and compulsion-as-intention through the formation of colonially educated administrative intermediaries. The homology claim is advanced only where the colonial process exhibits a sufficiently comparable sequence of organisational operations to that identified in the biological case.

Third, the selected operations must be non-redundant and collectively capable of illuminating the cascading incapacitation process described by the CPCV framework. Together they cover a broad range of manipulative operations across multiple levels of civilisational organisation while minimising substantial overlap. The framework does not claim that these are the only possible biological models.

Alternative parasites were considered. For example, *Leucochloridium paradoxum* alters snail behaviour in ways that increase predation risk, but was not included because its principal mode of manipulation substantially overlaps with already represented categories and does not provide additional explanatory leverage within the present framework.

Falsifiability at the Level of Mechanism-Claims

The framework as a whole is not falsifiable in a simple Popperian sense, a characteristic it shares with many influential frameworks in social ontology, historical sociology, and critical theory, including Foucault's genealogies, Bourdieu's field theory, and Gramsci's account of hegemony. Its primary function is to organise inquiry, identify recurring patterns, and generate explanatory models rather than to operate as a single falsifiable hypothesis. However, individual mechanism-claims within the framework generate observable indicators that may be examined against historical, ethnographic, linguistic, and sociological evidence and may, in principle, be disconfirmed. The six primary indicators are outlined below.

For the *Toxoplasma*-type fear-redirection mechanism, evidence would be consistent with the model where missionary activity is systematically associated with the abandonment or delegitimisation of ancestral ceremonial practices even in the absence of direct prohibition. Where ceremonial life remains robust under comparable conditions, the application of the mechanism requires qualification.

For the *Ophiocordyceps*-type behavioural reorientation mechanism, evidence would be consistent with the model where formal education produces measurable shifts in epistemic authority such that ecological and ancestral knowledge lose legitimacy across generations while institutional credentialing becomes the dominant marker of authority. Where ecological knowledge systems remain substantially intact alongside institutional education, the mechanism cannot be assumed.

For the *Cymothoa*-type linguistic replacement mechanism, evidence would be consistent with the model where ancestral language transmission collapses within two or three generations despite the absence of direct legal prohibition, measurable through intergenerational transmission rates and speaker continuity. Where transmission remains robust under comparable colonial conditions, the application requires qualification.

For the *Ampulex*-type foreclosure mechanism, evidence would be consistent with the model where public discourse exhibits a measurable narrowing in the range of political futures considered conceivable or legitimate. Where multiple competing futures continue to circulate and retain social legitimacy, the mechanism is weakened.

For the *Sacculina*-type reproductive-redirection mechanism, evidence would be consistent with the model where time, labour, and institutional resources formerly devoted to cosmopolitan reproduction become progressively redirected toward the maintenance of colonial institutions. Where cosmopolitan reproductive institutions remain well-resourced and socially central, the homology requires revision.

For the *Dicrocoelium*-type elite-internalisation mechanism, evidence would be consistent with the model where colonially educated elites repeatedly reproduce colonial institutional structures while sincerely articulating community benefit. Where elite actors consistently articulate and pursue alternative cosmopolitan institutional projects, the completeness of the mechanism is weakened.

The framework therefore locates its principal empirical commitments at the level of specific mechanism-claims rather than at the level of the framework considered as an indivisible whole.

Section One: Conceptual Foundation—The CPCV and Structural Homology

The Civilisational Psycho-Cosmocide Virus (CPCV) is a theoretical construct developed to identify and analyse recurrent mechanisms of civilisational capture (Kogoya, 2025). It is neither a falsifiable empirical hypothesis in the narrow positivist sense nor a metaphor in the loose rhetorical sense. Rather, it names a process—architecture through which one civilisational system infiltrates, redirects, and reproduces itself within the reality-making architecture of another, operating across multiple layers of symbolic, institutional, linguistic, and cognitive organisation.

Five clarifications establish the conceptual status of the CPCV

First, the CPCV is not primarily a metaphor. As established in the Methodological Note, the framework distinguishes structural homology from both analogy and metaphor. The term "virus" should be understood in a functional rather than a literal biological sense. In virology, a virus is a non-living entity that reproduces by entering a host system and redirecting aspects of that system's reproductive machinery toward its own replication (Cann, 2016). This functional pattern provides the conceptual model for the homology proposed here. The term therefore serves as an analytical designation rather than a rhetorical flourish. In this respect, it functions similarly to concepts such as disciplinary power, habitus, or hegemony, which identify recurrent organisational processes rather than discrete physical entities.

Second, the CPCV is not a falsifiable empirical hypothesis considered as a total framework. Its epistemological status is closer to Fanon's analyses of colonial consciousness, Bourdieu's theory of habitus, or Foucault's genealogies of disciplinary power than to a predictive model in the social sciences. Individual mechanism-claims may be examined, challenged, and potentially disconfirmed through empirical evidence, as outlined in the Methodological Note. The framework as a whole functions as an explanatory architecture rather than a single testable proposition.

Third, the CPCV is not reducible to a descriptive account of institutions or social processes. Schools, churches, bureaucracies, media systems, and development programmes are important vehicles through which capture may occur, but the framework's primary object of analysis is the deeper reorganisation of the reality-making architecture through which those institutions become intelligible, authoritative, and self-reproducing (Kogoya, 2025).

Fourth, the CPCV is not primarily a political or economic theory of colonialism. Political domination and economic extraction remain indispensable dimensions of colonial history, and extensive scholarship already exists concerning both. The framework instead focuses on the mechanisms through which civilisational systems reproduce themselves within the symbolic, cognitive, linguistic, and ontological infrastructures of another society.

Fifth, the CPCV is not an ontology in the strong metaphysical sense. It does not claim to reveal the ultimate structure of reality. Rather, it provides a conceptual framework for analysing how civilisational systems penetrate, reorganise, and reproduce themselves within the reality-making architectures of other societies.

Three additional clarifications concerning scope are necessary

First, the framework does not reduce colonised peoples to passive objects of historical forces. Its focus is the architecture of capture rather than the totality of social life. Indigenous institutions may become sites of resistance; colonised populations may strategically appropriate colonial tools; and hybrid identities may emerge as forms of adaptation, negotiation, or counter-capture. Such phenomena are not anomalies within the framework but evidence that mechanisms of capture encounter continuous resistance and remain subject to contestation. The existence of counter-parasitological practices demonstrates that capture is never complete.

Second, the framework is not deterministic. It identifies recurring mechanisms of capture without implying that capture is complete, inevitable, or irreversible. Biological parasitic systems themselves exist within dynamic environments characterised by adaptation, resistance, mutation, and failure. The framework therefore proposes a structural logic of capture rather than a predetermined historical outcome.

Third, the framework distinguishes cultural contact from parasitological capture. Not all cultural influence constitutes evidence of CPCV. The relevant distinction concerns whether a society retains meaningful capacity to determine the terms under which external elements are incorporated. Exchange may be reciprocal or asymmetrical, voluntary or coercive, additive or displacing. Reciprocal exchange may contribute to cultural vitality, whereas asymmetric extraction progressively undermines a society's capacity for autonomous regeneration.

With these clarifications in place, the central analytical claim can be stated more precisely. Biological parasites frequently operate through combinations of infiltration, resource extraction, behavioural modification, reproductive redirection, and host maintenance (Lafferty & Kuris, 2012). In many parasitic systems, capacities for detection, avoidance, or resistance are themselves modified, producing behavioural patterns that contribute to the parasite's continued reproduction. The host increasingly participates in activities that serve the parasite while experiencing those activities as natural, adaptive, or self-directed.

The CPCV is proposed to operate through a structurally corresponding pattern at the civilisational level. Rather than infiltrating biological tissue, it operates through the symbolic architecture of reality construction, including language, memory systems, educational institutions, monuments, ritual structures, systems of value, and modes of transmission. Once embedded, the system progressively reshapes the host society's reality-making architecture from within. Categories of interpretation are reorganised. Standards of legitimacy, value, civilisation, rationality, and desirability are reconfigured. Practices and identities previously regarded as authoritative may

come to be reclassified as deficient, backward, or inferior according to the evaluative standards of the incoming system.

The framework's central claim concerns the mechanism through which this reproduction occurs: participation rather than continuous coercion. As transformation deepens, members of the host society increasingly reproduce the system through their own institutions and practices. Teachers transmit its categories, administrators implement its assumptions, families socialise children into its norms, and leaders defend its legitimacy. In this way, the system acquires a degree of self-reproducing capacity that progressively reduces its dependence upon the original colonising agent. From this perspective, recovery involves more than the removal of external structures of domination. It requires the restoration of the linguistic, epistemological, symbolic, and institutional infrastructures through which a society reproduces its own world across generations.

Section Two: Mechanism—Six Parasites, Six Colonial Operations

Toxoplasma gondii: Fear Redirection and the Missionisation of Cosmological Authority

Toxoplasma gondii achieves something no programme of overt coercion could: it causes its host to approach its own destruction with desire rather than fear. The parasite's neurochemical operation is precise—it suppresses the rat's specific olfactory fear response to cat odour while leaving all other cognitive functions intact. The rat does not become generally fearless; it specifically loses its fear of the one thing that will kill it, and then approaches the cat (Berday et al., 2000). Gramsci's concept of hegemony can tell us that the rat has internalised the cat's dominance as natural; it cannot explain the specific mechanism by which the approach comes to feel self-directed (Webster, 2007).

The CPCV framework proposes that a structurally corresponding operation occurs within certain forms of colonial missionisation. The claim is not that missionary activity literally functions as a biological parasite. Certain missionary projects and missionary discourses contributed to the reclassification of existing cosmological systems as sources of spiritual danger, error, or illegitimacy. Practices previously embedded within local systems of authority were increasingly interpreted through categories such as paganism, superstition, idolatry, or spiritual deficiency. Simultaneously, the symbolic order introduced by the mission was presented as a privileged source of truth, salvation, and moral legitimacy.

In the West Papuan context, missionary encounters frequently involved more than the introduction of a new religious tradition. They entailed the re-evaluation of pre-existing cosmological frameworks: practices previously embedded within local systems of authority came to be interpreted through categories such as paganism, superstition, or spiritual error (Giay, 1995). The ancestral world—the ceremonial obligations, the sacred forest, the spirit landscape, the ordering principles governing right relationship with land, ancestors, and cosmos—had functioned as the primary orientation system through which the Papuan person knew what was dangerous, what was sacred, and what constituted warning. The missionary project reclassified this entire orientation

system as itself the source of danger: as satanic, primitive, the thing to be feared and fled. Simultaneously, the coloniser's world was coded as salvation, progress, civilisation, and light.

The operation on the Papuan psyche was therefore not the elimination of the fear function but its systematic inversion. The structural homology concerns the reorganisation of orientation rather than the suppression of agency. In the biological case, the host's capacity for fear remains intact while its object is altered. In the colonial case, the capacity for moral concern, spiritual aspiration, and existential security likewise remains intact, but the symbolic framework through which these concerns are organised is transformed. What was previously regarded as sacred comes to be regarded as suspect; what was previously external comes to be regarded as authoritative. The mechanism claim is therefore one of fear redirection rather than fear elimination.

Ophiocordyceps unilateralis: Behavioural Reorientation and the Education System

Ophiocordyceps unilateralis, the zombie-ant fungus, achieves reproductive success not through immediate destruction of its host but through the progressive alteration of host behaviour. Rather than killing the ant outright, the fungus influences patterns of movement and locomotion in ways that position the host within environmental conditions favourable to the fungus's reproductive cycle. The host remains active throughout, yet its behaviour increasingly contributes to the reproduction of the fungal system rather than to its own adaptive interests (Libersat & Gal, 2014).

Within the CPCV framework, the Indonesian national education system in West Papua is interpreted as exhibiting a structurally corresponding form of behavioural and epistemic reorientation. Since integration into the Indonesian state, formal education has served as a principal mechanism through which narratives of citizenship, national identity, development, history, and political belonging are transmitted and normalised (Kirksey, 2012).

Students are educated through Bahasa Indonesia, introduced to Pancasila as the state's philosophical foundation, socialised into narratives of national unity, and taught historical frameworks that often prioritise national histories over local cosmologies, memories, and ancestral knowledge systems. This observation does not imply that education functions only as a mechanism of capture. Formal education has also provided literacy, technical skills, professional opportunities, and avenues of social mobility for many Papuans. The question posed by the CPCV framework is therefore not whether education is beneficial or harmful in the abstract, but how particular educational systems shape epistemic authority, cultural transmission, and the reproduction of institutional worlds.

The framework interprets this process as operating not only at the level of information transfer but also at the level of reality construction. Educational systems do more than communicate facts; they shape categories of legitimacy, authority, and social possibility. As students advance through the system, many acquire the credentials necessary to participate in state institutions and professions, becoming teachers, administrators, civil servants, religious leaders, and political actors. In doing so, they participate in reproducing the institutional structures through which they themselves were

formed. The educational system thereby acquires a degree of self-replicating capacity, with its categories and legitimating narratives transmitted through the activities of those it has educated.

The comparison with *Ophiocordyceps* does not suggest that students are passive victims or biological equivalents of infected ants. Rather, it identifies a structurally corresponding sequence: entry through an existing host population, reorientation of behavioural and epistemic pathways, maintenance of the host as an active participant, and reproduction of the broader system through the host's subsequent activity. The explanatory adequacy of this mechanism depends upon empirical evidence demonstrating that educational participation contributes to enduring shifts in epistemic authority and institutional reproduction. Where such effects are absent or substantially counteracted by resilient indigenous knowledge systems, the applicability of the homology must be reconsidered.

Cymothoa exigua: Organ Replacement and Linguistic Reconfiguration

The most philosophically significant feature of *Cymothoa exigua* is not that it silences its host fish. The fish continues to open and close its mouth, continues to feed, and continues to participate in its environment. What the parasite does instead is gradually replace the organ: the fish's original tongue loses its blood supply, atrophies, and disappears, while the parasite occupies the same functional position within the host's body (Brusca & Gilligan, 1983). From the outside, the essential activity appears unchanged —the fish still feeds through a tongue. What has changed is the architecture through which expression occurs.

Within the CPCV framework, the historical and ongoing displacement of Papuan languages by Bahasa Indonesia is interpreted as exhibiting a structurally corresponding process at the level of linguistic organisation. West Papua contains more than 250 distinct languages, each encoding specific systems of ecological knowledge, kinship structures, moral distinctions, and cosmological orientations (Evans, 2010).

These languages function not only as communicative tools but as structured frameworks through which social and environmental reality is categorised, interpreted, and reproduced.

Empirical linguistic studies document that many of these languages are undergoing rapid intergenerational shift, with a significant proportion classified as endangered, severely endangered, or critically endangered (Moseley, 2010; Simons & Fennig, 2023). This shift is associated with the expansion of Bahasa Indonesia through formal education, administrative systems, media infrastructures, and economic participation. Importantly, this process does not primarily involve the prohibition of speech. Speakers continue to use language in everyday interaction. Rather, the shift occurs through changes in domains of transmission: education, institutional life, and public communication increasingly operate through Bahasa Indonesia, while ancestral languages become less central to intergenerational reproduction.

The CPCV framework interprets this as a form of structural linguistic reconfiguration rather than simple language loss. The key issue is not whether communication continues, but whether the

linguistic systems that structure classification, memory, and cosmological interpretation remain continuously transmitted across generations. The voice remains, yet the linguistic architecture through which a particular world once spoke may progressively weaken, fragment, or disappear. The relationship between linguistic shift and conceptual reconfiguration should be understood as contingent rather than necessary, and as varying across communities, degrees of bilingualism, and patterns of cultural continuity.

Ampulex compressa: Behavioural Constraint and the Structuring of Political Imagination

The emerald jewel wasp demonstrates a form of control more subtle than domination through force. The cockroach is neither killed nor generally paralysed; it continues to groom itself, respond to stimuli, and perform many ordinary behaviours, appearing functional and autonomous to external observation. Yet the wasp's venom targets one highly specific neurological function: the capacity for self-initiated escape. The host does not lose movement in general—it loses the ability to generate one particular possibility of action (Libersat & Gal, 2014). The cage is effective not because the host is physically incapable of leaving, but because the thought of leaving no longer emerges as a meaningful option.

Within the CPCV framework, this mechanism provides a model for understanding how the field of perceived political possibility may be selectively structured. The claim is not that political subjects are rendered passive or unconscious, but that certain forms of action, institutional arrangement, or collective future become more readily accessible within public discourse, while others become less salient, less legitimate, or more difficult to conceptualise as viable. Doctrines of national integration, developmental necessity, administrative dependency, and managed autonomy may function not only as policy frameworks but also as constraints on the articulation of alternative institutional imaginaries (Chauvel, 2005).

The CPCV framework interprets such processes as operating at the level of imagination rather than at the level of overt coercion. A population may participate fully in governance, administration, and public life while the possibility of fundamentally different political arrangements becomes increasingly difficult to conceive as legitimate, realistic, or achievable. What is removed is not consciousness itself but a specific capacity of consciousness: the ability to generate and pursue pathways beyond the architecture of the existing system.

The mechanism reaches its strongest form when the limits of the prevailing institutional order increasingly appear as the limits of what is considered realistic, legitimate, or achievable.

This claim overlaps with existing accounts of ideological constraint in the work of Gramsci, Foucault, and Bourdieu. The contribution of the CPCV framework is not to replace these accounts but to propose a mechanism-centred typology of how such constraints may be differentially instantiated across institutional domains. The comparison with *Ampulex compressa* does not suggest the removal of political consciousness or agency. Rather, it highlights the preservation of general functionality alongside the selective inhibition of a specific capacity—in this case, the

capacity to generate and pursue political alternatives that fall outside the dominant institutional architecture.

Sacculina carcini: Reproductive Redirection and the Capture of Cosmopolitan Continuity

The most philosophically significant feature of *Sacculina carcini* is not its entry into the crab's body but its reorganisation of the host's reproductive system. Once established, the parasite redirects the crab's biological energies toward the maintenance and reproduction of the parasite itself, while the crab's own reproductive capacities gradually atrophy. The host continues to invest care, labour, and energy into reproduction, but the object of that reproduction has changed: the crab becomes a reproductive agent of the parasite while its own lineage progressively loses the capacity to regenerate itself (Høeg & Lützen, 1995). The parasite's success lies not in destroying the host's generative capacities but in capturing and repurposing them.

This provides a model for understanding the redirection of civilisational reproductive energy. Every cosmopolitan world possesses institutions and practices through which it reproduces itself across generations —language transmission, ceremonial life, ecological knowledge, ancestral memory, kinship obligations, moral formation, land-based education. These constitute the primary mechanisms through which a cosmopolitan world maintains historical, cultural, ecological, and cosmological continuity. The CPCV does not necessarily destroy these systems outright; rather, it progressively redirects the energies, resources, labour, and institutional commitments that once sustained them.

Time once devoted to ceremonial transmission is redirected toward bureaucratic administration; educational effort toward externally defined developmental goals; political energy toward maintaining structures inherited from the colonial order (Rutherford, 2012).

The result is not the disappearance of activity but its redirection. The host society continues to work, organise, educate, govern, and invest in the future, but an increasing proportion of that effort contributes to the maintenance and reproduction of structures external to the cosmopolitan order, while the institutions through which the cosmopolitan world reproduces itself are progressively deprived of the time, resources, and continuity required for their renewal. The host remains active and future-oriented, yet the future being produced no longer primarily serves the continuity of the host's own cosmological order. The significance of the mechanism lies not primarily in the destruction of reproductive capacities but in their progressive redirection toward the reproduction of another organisational order.

Dicrocoelium dendriticum: Elite Internalisation and the Disappearance of Compulsion

The lancet liver fluke is philosophically significant because it illustrates behavioural redirection that is not experienced by the host as external control. The infected ant does not perceive itself as obeying an alien command; the altered behaviour is experienced as its own. The parasite's success lies precisely in the disappearance of any distinction between the host's intention and the parasite's reproductive imperative —the compulsion to climb appears as ordinary action arising from within

the host itself (Carney, 1969). Domination reaches its highest form when it no longer appears as domination at all.

This provides a model for understanding the role of colonially educated elites in the reproduction of civilisational systems. The focus here is not betrayal, moral failure, or individual culpability, but the processes through which particular assumptions, values, categories, and standards of judgment become embedded within the formation of political, religious, educational, and intellectual leadership. Through schools, universities, bureaucratic institutions, development programmes, professional incentives, and systems of symbolic prestige, particular ways of interpreting reality are normalised and rewarded. Over time, these assumptions cease to appear as historically contingent inheritances and come to be experienced as self-evident truths.

The result is the emergence of governors who administer developmental programmes, educators who transmit official curricula, religious leaders who defend institutional doctrines, and intellectuals who interpret social reality through conceptual frameworks acquired within the dominant civilisational order (Chairullah, 2022)—in most cases sincerely, with genuine commitment to community wellbeing. The analytical question is therefore not whether such actors are honest or dishonest, loyal or disloyal, but how particular forms of consciousness are produced and reproduced through institutional environments that shape what can be recognised as rational, responsible, modern, or desirable.

One of the most consequential effects of the CPCV is not obedience produced through force but identification: the reproduction of the civilisational system comes to be experienced as personal responsibility, professional duty, enlightened leadership, or moral progress.

The host participates willingly because the distinction between its own aspirations and the imperatives of the system has become increasingly difficult to perceive. The analytical significance of this mechanism lies not in assigning blame but in examining how systems of power become internalised and reproduced through the very individuals entrusted with guiding the future of their communities.

Taken individually, each parasite-instrument identifies a distinct mechanism of civilisational capture. Taken together, however, they describe an interacting process through which orientation, behaviour, language, imagination, reproduction, and leadership become progressively reorganised. The significance of the framework therefore lies not in any single mechanism considered in isolation, but in the cumulative interaction among them. The next section develops this interaction through the principle of Cascading Parasitological Incapacitation.

The Six Operations in Concert

Each of the six parasites names a distinct mechanism —fear-redirection, behavioural reorientation, organ replacement, removal of escape-imagination, redirection of reproductive energy, and elite internalisation —and each has a documented structural counterpart in the West Papuan colonial

experience: missionisation, the education system, language displacement, the foreclosure of political alternatives, the redirection of cultural-reproductive labour, and the formation of a colonially educated administrative class.

None of these mechanisms operates in isolation. Missionisation (Toxoplasma) prepares the ground upon which the education system (Ophiocordyceps) can operate; language displacement (Cymothoa) narrows the symbolic categories available to the imagination that Ampulex's operation subsequently forecloses; the redirection of reproductive energy (Sacculina) supplies the labour and institutional continuity that colonially formed elites (Dicrocoelium) administer and reproduce. The six operations are therefore not six separate case studies but six descriptions of a single multi-vector process viewed from different analytical angles—a process whose cumulative effect is the subject of Section Three. The Toxoplasma and Dicrocoelium operations converge with particular visibility in annual ritual performance, where colonised elites publicly stage the managed faith of a disappearing people (Kogoya, 2026h).

Section Three: Evidence —Cascading Incapacitation Across the Foundational Layers

The six operations described above do not strike a cosmopolitan world at a single point. The Civilisational Hierarchy of Reality Construction identifies a series of cumulative layers through which any civilisation builds, sustains, and transmits their worlds, beginning with the ecological ground of Nature and proceeding through Natural Signs, Memory, Language, Oral Tradition, and onward to the archival and literary systems through which a civilisation records, explains, and reproduces itself (Kogoya, 2026c). The central evidentiary claim of this section is that the six parasitic operations infiltrate multiple layers simultaneously, but that their cumulative effects are governed by a cascading logic. Because each layer depends upon and accumulates the capacities of those beneath it, the CPCV does not need to colonise every layer independently—it needs only to sufficiently compromise the foundational layers for disruption to propagate upward through the entire cosmopolitan structure.

A methodological note is necessary before proceeding. The analysis below draws predominantly on the West Papuan case—not because the CPCV framework is, in its scope, a theory of West Papua specifically, but because West Papua constitutes the generative analytical site from which the framework was developed, the context in which its mechanisms are most fully documented, and the setting in which its claims achieve their highest degree of empirical resolution. Readers familiar with other cosmopolitan contexts—Māori communities in Aotearoa New Zealand, Aboriginal nations in Australia, Indigenous peoples of the Amazon Basin, Native nations of North America, or colonised African societies—will recognise analogous dynamics operating within their own circumstances. The mechanisms are general; the evidentiary depth is Papuan.

Layer One: Nature as the Primary Archive

Nature constitutes the foundational layer of cosmopolitan reality—the primary archive from which all subsequent layers derive their meaning, continuity, and referential life. Mountains, rivers, forests, and seasonal cycles are not merely physical features; they are living repositories of memory, knowledge, identity, and cosmological orientation. Within the cosmopolitan world, personhood itself emerges from an intimate, reciprocal relationship with a particular ancestral landscape (Kogoya, 2025). That landscape functions simultaneously as parliament, school, archive, courthouse, economy, and library —rivers, mountains, and forests are teachers, texts, and laws embodied in place.

This layer is attacked through the Sacculina logic: redirection and eventual destruction of the host's reproductive capacity. The Freeport-McMoRan Grasberg mine, state-sponsored transmigration programmes, large-scale logging concessions, and plantation expansion (Abrash, 2007) are not merely economic or demographic developments —they are assaults on the primary archive of cosmopolitan existence. When forests are destroyed, rivers polluted, and mountains excavated, the ecological knowledge accumulated across generations loses its referential ground: sacred geographies become inaccessible, ecological indicators disappear, and seasonal knowledge becomes detached from the environments that sustained it.

Simultaneously, the Toxoplasma logic operates here through fear inversion. The ancestral landscape —once the object of the cosmopolitan person's deepest attachment and responsibility —is recoded through missionisation, colonial education, and developmental ideology as primitive, dangerous, or spiritually suspect. The ancestral world is recast as wild and economically unproductive, its value measurable only through extraction, while attention and aspiration are redirected toward urbanised centres where meaning, prosperity, and modernity are presumed to reside. The host is induced to participate in the destruction of the foundation upon which its own reality depends. This is not merely ecocide; it is the systematic destruction and replacement of an entire cosmopolitan reality.

The consequences extend beyond the ecological layer itself. Once the primary archive is disrupted, the signs embedded within that archive become increasingly difficult to read. Forests cleared, rivers altered, animal populations diminished, and landscapes transformed by extraction can no longer function as stable repositories of information. The deterioration of Layer One initiates the deterioration of Layer Two.

Layer Two: Natural Signs and the Destruction of Ecological Reading

The second layer concerns the capacity to read nature—animal tracks, cloud formations, seasonal changes, river behaviours —as meaningful information about the living world. This is the earliest form of epistemology: the cosmopolitan way of knowing through sustained, embodied attention to the signs embedded in the ancestral landscape (Kimmerer, 2013).

This layer is attacked through the Ophiocordyceps logic. The Indonesian education system, mission schools, and developmental frameworks do not simply introduce new knowledge; they introduce a different epistemological orientation—a different answer to where knowledge

originates and how reality should be read. The authority of ecological observation is progressively displaced by textbooks, standardised examinations, and bureaucratic classifications. A Papuan child who once learned from the forest and the river increasingly learns from institutions detached from the ancestral landscape. As this process unfolds across generations, the capacity to read natural signs collapses through disuse—not merely a loss of practical skills but the loss of an entire mode of knowing. Epistemological dependence emerges: information once derived from participation in ecological reality is increasingly sought from distant institutions. The land continues to communicate, but fewer people retain the instruments to understand its language.

Memory cannot preserve what is no longer repeatedly encountered, practised, or recognised. As the capacity to read natural signs declines, the stock of observations, seasonal recognitions, ecological relationships, and environmental experiences available for remembrance also contracts. The weakening of ecological reading therefore progressively weakens the memory systems through which such knowledge was historically preserved and transmitted.

Layer Three: Memory as the Internal Archive

The third layer concerns human perception and memory—the internal archive through which environmental knowledge, remembered routes, recognised seasonal patterns, and ancestral stories are stored and transmitted across generations. The cosmopolitan person becomes a living archive of the ancestral world; memory here is not merely biographical but ontological, one of the primary mechanisms through which the ancestral world is preserved within individuals and reproduced across generations (Connerton, 1989).

This layer is attacked through the combined operations of Toxoplasma and Dicrocoelium. Through the Toxoplasma logic, the architecture of memory is reorganised by altering what is perceived as meaningful or worthy of remembrance: sacred mountains, ancestral sites, and traditional narratives that once occupied central positions are re-coded as symbols of backwardness, while churches, schools, and government offices assume greater prominence in the landscape of collective remembrance. The geography of memory itself changes—what was once central becomes peripheral, what was once sacred becomes forgotten, not through deliberate destruction but through gradual displacement. Simultaneously, the Dicrocoelium logic installs externally generated memory systems—Indonesian national histories, state ideologies, missionary narratives, developmental myths—not merely as information but as memory structures through which colonised societies come to understand themselves. Over time these implanted memories cease to appear foreign and become self-evident truths, absorbed into the taken-for-granted foundations of identity without recognition of their external origin. The ancestral memory system is rarely erased entirely; more commonly it is displaced, fragmented, and subordinated. The result is an ontologically hollowed subject: a person who possesses memories, but whose memories no longer primarily serve the continuity of the cosmopolitan world.

As ancestral memory fragments, the vocabulary, classifications, metaphors, genealogical references, and conceptual distinctions through which that memory is expressed become

increasingly difficult to reproduce. The weakening of Layer Three therefore progressively undermines Layer Four, because a language deprived of the memory structures that once animated it gradually loses both semantic depth and cosmopolitan continuity.

Layer Four: Oral Language and the Replacement of the Naming Tongue

The fourth layer concerns oral language —the capacity to name, communicate, and collectively interpret the world. The ancestral tongue encodes categories of perception, systems of relationship, moral obligations, ecological knowledge, and the sacred grammar through which the cosmopolitan world becomes intelligible; to speak a language is to inhabit a particular world of meaning (Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, 1986). This layer is attacked through the Cymothoa logic described in Section Two. The systematic promotion of Bahasa Indonesia as the language of education, administration, commerce, and official discourse does not eliminate Papuan speech, but redirects it through a linguistic system organised around a different civilisational reality.

As Bahasa Indonesia increasingly occupies the naming function of everyday life, the ancestral tongue weakens through disuse; each generation produces fewer speakers who receive it as their primary medium of thought and identity, and the categories of perception encoded within it become increasingly difficult to reproduce. The loss is not merely linguistic but ontological: a reality that can no longer be named with precision and cultural continuity becomes increasingly difficult to sustain.

Oral traditions cannot survive independently of the linguistic medium through which they are transmitted. Myths, genealogies, ceremonial narratives, historical accounts, and ancestral teachings depend upon a living language capable of carrying their meanings across generations. As the naming tongue weakens, the narrative archive loses the vehicle required for its reproduction.

Layer Five: Oral Tradition and the Destruction of the Narrative Archive

The fifth layer is oral tradition —the myths, genealogies, and narrative systems through which individual experience becomes collective memory, the point at which a cosmopolitan world acquires temporal depth and the capacity to transmit its understanding of existence across generations (Vansina, 1985).

This layer is destroyed through a combination of narrative delegitimation and narrative replacement. Ancestral narratives are progressively recoded as superstition, mythology, or spiritual error and relocated to the margins of social life—the existing narrative archive is reclassified as untrustworthy or obsolete, not merely supplemented by new stories. The missionisation campaigns documented in Giay's (1995) detailed ethnographic account of Me communities in the highlands explicitly targeted ceremonial authority structures, repositioning elders and ritual custodians as obstacles to progress while installing church leaders as the new intermediaries of spiritual and social legitimacy. Simultaneously, religious doctrines, colonial histories, developmental narratives, and educational curricula become the dominant sources of collective orientation.

Kirksey's (2012) fieldwork in West Papua documents precisely this pattern: communities that once organised social life around ceremonial cycles find those cycles shortened, simplified, or abandoned within one or two generations of sustained institutional schooling—not because they were prohibited, but because the social infrastructure required to sustain them has been progressively redirected toward the demands of formal institutional participation. Over time, fewer elders remain capable of carrying the full narrative archive, ceremonial contexts for transmission become rarer, and the intergenerational chain linking memory to identity weakens. What is lost is not merely information but a cosmobian mechanism of self-recognition: the living archive through which a people once knew themselves gradually falls silent.

At this point the cumulative logic of cascading incapacitation becomes visible. The destruction of ecological foundations weakens ecological reading; the weakening of ecological reading destabilises memory; the fragmentation of memory undermines language; the erosion of language interrupts oral tradition.

Each layer remains partially intact, yet each inherits the impairments of the layers beneath it. The result is not a series of isolated losses but a progressive cosmobian contraction.

The Principle of Cascading Parasitological Incapacitation

The critical theoretical insight that emerges from this layer-by-layer analysis is what the framework designates the Principle of Cascading Parasitological Incapacitation. Because each layer of the Civilisational Hierarchy accumulates upon those below it, the CPCV's attack does not need to perfectly colonise every layer independently—it needs only to sufficiently compromise the foundational layers for the damage to cascade upward automatically (Kogoya, 2026c).

When Nature (Layer One) is degraded, Natural Signs (Layer Two) lose their referential ground. When Natural Signs are no longer reliably read, Memory (Layer Three) loses its ecological anchors. When Memory is fragmented or displaced, Language (Layer Four) loses the experiential and cosmological categories through which meaning is organised. When Language is weakened or replaced, Oral Tradition (Layer Five) loses the medium through which it can be transmitted. The process continues upward through ceremony, material space, sacred architecture, writing systems, and archival knowledge. Each layer inherits the impairments of those beneath it. The cumulative result is the progressive destabilisation of the entire architecture of cosmobian reality construction—not through simultaneous assault on every level, but through the gradual failure of higher layers as their foundations become increasingly compromised.

The explanatory significance of the principle lies in demonstrating that civilisational decline need not proceed through the simultaneous destruction of all institutions; the compromise of foundational layers may be sufficient to destabilise the entire reproductive architecture over time.

This principle helps explain both the effectiveness of the CPCV and the difficulty of counter-parasitological resistance. A civilisation cannot sustain its highest forms of cultural and intellectual production if the ecological, linguistic, mnemonic, and ceremonial foundations upon which those

forms depend continue to erode. The production of cosmopolitan literature, philosophy, and scholarship—as this paper itself seeks to contribute to—is necessary but insufficient when pursued in isolation from the foundational layers that make such production possible.

The same principle, however, points toward the possibility of restoration. Just as incapacitation propagates upward through the hierarchy, regeneration can also proceed through cumulative reinforcement. A child who learns an ancestral language regains access to oral traditions; oral traditions strengthen memory; memory deepens relationships with ancestral landscapes; renewed relationships with land reinforce the ecological foundations upon which the wider cosmopolitan world depends. Restoration is therefore not the reverse of a single act of destruction but the gradual reconstruction of interdependent capacities across multiple layers—and it must be pursued simultaneously across those foundational layers, against a process that has had decades, and in some cases centuries, to establish itself. A structurally corresponding cascade, moving from ruptured land-relation through to a condition of metaphysical anaesthesia in which the system ceases to be perceived as domination at all, is traced across the Eight Atlases of Human Existence (Kogoya, 2026c).

The Lifecycle: From Entry to Ontological Zombification

The layer-by-layer analysis can also be read as a temporal account of how the six operations unfold within an individual, community, or population over time.

Initial contact occurs through what the framework terms the shadow-subject layer—the relational field through which colonial symbolic systems gain entry before conscious resistance becomes fully possible. The missionary arrives with metaphysical gifts, the schoolteacher with the promise of literacy, the administrator with the apparatus of development. At this stage, transformation does not appear as domination but as relationship. This corresponds most closely to the *Toxoplasma* operation: orientation begins to shift before the organism recognises that its orientation has been altered.

The second stage involves the gradual displacement of ancestral transmission systems. Language, ceremony, elder instruction, ecological participation, and collective memory increasingly lose institutional support while colonial institutions acquire greater authority and legitimacy. The third stage is internalisation: the categories, assumptions, and standards of judgment embedded within the colonial order cease to appear external and are increasingly experienced as self-evident truths. The fourth stage is self-reproduction: individuals formed within the transformed environment become the primary agents through which the system perpetuates itself. The Indigenous teacher delivers the colonial curriculum; the Indigenous administrator manages the colonial bureaucracy; the Indigenous intellectual reproduces the conceptual frameworks through which the system understands itself.

The terminal condition is what the framework designates as ontological zombification. The term is intended as an analytical designation rather than a moral judgement. It refers to a condition of unrecognised cosmopolitan displacement in which a transformed state is no longer recognised as

transformed. The concept does not imply any loss of intelligence, consciousness, agency, or human dignity; rather, it describes a situation in which the categories through which transformation might be recognised have themselves been progressively reorganised. The same terminal condition is independently named, at the level of individual and species-wide consciousness rather than the cosmopolitan case specifically, as the final stage of the Civi-lie-sational and Evi-lie-sational spectrum (Kogoya, 2026k).

The population no longer experiences itself as having undergone displacement or cosmopolitan reorganisation; instead, the inherited colonial order is experienced as natural, original, and self-evidently legitimate. Ancestral modes of knowing are not merely marginalised but reclassified as irrational or irrelevant. Under such conditions, projects of reclamation are frequently experienced not as recovery but as disruption or regression.

The decisive question at this threshold is whether functioning channels of living memory remain. If language, ceremonial continuity, ecological knowledge, ancestral relationships to land, or other repositories of cosmopolitan memory continue to survive, even in fragmented form, the possibility of regeneration remains open. If these channels disappear entirely, the cosmopolitan society loses many of the mechanisms through which it can recognise its own displacement. A further development of this terminal condition may be emerging through what the framework provisionally terms digital cosmological mining —the systematic commodification of attention, perception, memory, and identity through algorithmic systems that increasingly mediate human relationships to reality, potentially accelerating the same dynamics of displacement and replacement at a speed and scale that earlier forms of the CPCV could not achieve. This phenomenon is identified here as a direction for future investigation rather than developed as a substantive component of the present analysis.

Section Four: Implications —Philosophical Stakes, Scope, and Objections

Philosophical Implications

The parasitological framework carries implications that extend beyond the West Papuan case. Its most immediate philosophical significance lies in its challenge to a foundational assumption of liberal political theory: the autonomous subject as the primary unit of analysis. From Locke through Rawls, liberal theory generally presupposes a subject capable of forming preferences, identifying interests, and acting upon them (Rawls, 1971). The CPCV framework suggests that this assumption is insufficient for understanding colonised subjectivity because colonial transformation does not operate primarily by preventing subjects from pursuing their preferences. Rather, it operates by progressively restructuring the ecological, linguistic, mnemonic, ceremonial, and institutional conditions through which preferences themselves are formed.

A subject whose ecological foundations have been disrupted, whose naming tongue has been displaced, whose ceremonial life has been weakened, and whose archival traditions have been

subordinated may encounter few overt restrictions on personal choice. Yet the apparatus through which reality is interpreted, values are generated, aspirations are imagined, and futures are conceived has already undergone substantial transformation.

This suggests a form of unfreedom that is not easily captured by traditional liberal accounts focused primarily on formal choice and institutional constraint. It also points to the need for an ontological rather than merely institutional critique of colonialism—one that operates at the level of reality construction itself rather than solely at the level of law, policy, ideology, or political authority (Kogoya, 2026b).

A second implication concerns complicity. The Dicrocoelium analogue reveals the limitations of intention-based frameworks for understanding colonially formed subjects. The Papuan governor, the Papuan pastor, and the Papuan academic produced within colonial institutions may reproduce systems that contribute to the weakening of cosmopolitan continuity, yet this reproduction is often undertaken sincerely and with genuine conviction that they are acting in the interests of their communities. This does not eliminate moral responsibility, but it requires a more historically and psychologically nuanced account of political behaviour among colonially formed subjects (Fanon, 1963).

A third implication concerns urgency. The Principle of Cascading Parasitological Incapacitation demonstrates that civilisational decline does not proceed evenly across all layers. Once foundational layers are sufficiently weakened, higher layers increasingly lose the capacities required for autonomous regeneration. A civilisation may continue to produce books, institutions, intellectuals, and political organisations while simultaneously losing the ecological, linguistic, ceremonial, and mnemonic foundations upon which their long-term continuity depends. With each generation severed from ancestral transmission channels, with each language that falls below the threshold of living use, the reservoir of living knowledge available for future restoration diminishes. The question becomes not simply whether recovery is desirable, but whether sufficient foundations remain from which recovery can proceed.

Relationship to Existing Frameworks

Quijano's Coloniality of Power

Quijano identifies coloniality as a persistent matrix of domination that survives formal decolonisation through the organisation of labour, knowledge, race, and subjectivity according to a colonial hierarchy (Quijano, 2000). The CPCV framework operates at a different analytical level. Whereas Quijano identifies the structure of coloniality, the CPCV framework specifies a mechanism through which that structure becomes embedded within the everyday practices, memories, languages, and ontological assumptions of colonised peoples. In this sense, the framework provides a bridge between the coloniality of power and what Maldonado-Torres (2007) describes as the coloniality of being.

Smith's Decolonising Methodologies

Smith identifies research itself as a site of colonial domination and argues that Indigenous peoples must reclaim control over the terms, methods, and purposes through which knowledge about their worlds is produced (Smith, 1999). Her intervention is fundamentally methodological, concerned with transforming the conditions under which knowledge is generated and authorised. The CPCV framework complements this project by situating it within a wider hierarchy of reality construction. Her programme can be understood as a counter-parasitological intervention directed at the levels where knowledge is formalised, stored, and transmitted; the CPCV framework extends the analysis by asking why those layers become vulnerable in the first place.

Assmann's Cultural Memory

Assmann distinguishes communicative memory, sustained through living interpersonal transmission, from cultural memory, preserved through institutions, texts, rituals, and monuments (Assmann, 1995). The CPCV framework draws upon this insight but focuses on the dynamics of disruption: how communicative memory is weakened through the deterioration of ecological participation, memory systems, language, and oral transmission, while cultural memory is captured, redirected, and institutionalised within colonial archives and educational systems. Assmann explains how memory is structured; the CPCV framework examines how those structures become progressively incapacitated.

Santos's Epistemicide and Fricker's Epistemic Injustice

Santos describes epistemicide as the destruction or marginalisation of entire knowledge systems through the imposition of a singular epistemic standard (Santos, 2016). Fricker identifies forms of epistemic injustice through which individuals are wronged as knowers (Fricker, 2007). Both frameworks illuminate forms of epistemic harm. The CPCV framework extends the analysis by examining the conditions that make such harms possible: the pre-epistemic disruptions to land, memory, language, and oral transmission that make epistemicide at the knowledge-system layer structurally reproducible.

Mignolo's Pluriversal and Cosmopolitan Existence

Mignolo argues that colonial modernity imposed a universal framework of rationality, progress, and civilisation upon a world composed of multiple irreducible modes of existence (Mignolo, 2000; 2011). The concept of cosmopolitan existence developed in this paper can be understood as precisely the kind of ontological project that Mignolo's pluriversal requires to be taken seriously: a mode of existence constituted through ancestral relationships to land, memory, language, ceremony, and cosmological order, irreducible to any position within a universal civilisational hierarchy. Where Mignolo identifies the possibility of pluriversal existence, the CPCV framework analyses the processes through which that possibility becomes structurally constrained under conditions of civilisational capture: the progressive dismantling of the reality-making infrastructure through which the cosmopolitan world sustains itself, until what was once a self-

generating pluriversal existence becomes dependent on external civilisational structures for its own reproduction.

Principal Objections and Responses

Objection: Is this simply a reformulation of Gramscian hegemony?

The relationship between the CPCV framework and Gramscian hegemony requires careful clarification. Hegemony explains how domination becomes stabilised through consent, common sense, and the naturalisation of particular social arrangements (Gramsci, 1971). It is fundamentally concerned with how people come to accept and reproduce a social order as legitimate —with the content of what is internalised.

The CPCV framework addresses a different analytical question. Rather than focusing on the organisation of consent, it examines the layered conditions through which consent becomes possible in the first place. Language, memory, ecological participation, ceremonial transmission, and archival systems are not simply vehicles through which ideology travels; they are components of the reality-producing infrastructure through which subjects learn to perceive, interpret, and inhabit the world. A population whose language has been displaced, whose ceremonial transmission has been weakened, and whose archival systems have been reorganised confronts a transformation that extends beyond ideology alone. Gramsci can establish that a population has internalised the coloniser's worldview; parasitology can specify which transmission channel was disrupted, which perceptual category was reorganised, and what the implications are for the population's capacity to recognise the transformation as a transformation at all.

Objection: Does the parasite model remove human agency from colonised peoples?

This objection confuses the framework's analytical focus with its total explanatory scope. To identify mechanisms of parasitological capture is not to claim that those mechanisms always succeed, operate uniformly, or eliminate the capacity for resistance, creativity, and transformation. Biological parasitic systems themselves are characterised by adaptation, resistance, partial capture, and highly variable outcomes. The framework is concerned with explaining how particular forms of civilisational capture occur when they occur; it does not claim that such outcomes are inevitable. The possibility of resistance is built into the framework itself through the concept of counter-parasitological restoration. The objection also applies equally to established theories of power—Foucault's disciplinary power, Bourdieu's habitus, and Fanon's analyses of colonial consciousness—which seek to understand structural conditions shaping action without reducing human beings to passive objects.

Objection: Can colonised peoples creatively transform imported traditions rather than merely reproduce them?

They can and frequently do. Colonised societies have long engaged in processes of syncretism, hybridisation, reinterpretation, and creative appropriation. Religious institutions, educational systems, political structures, and cultural forms introduced through colonialism are often transformed in ways that exceed their original purposes. The CPCV framework does not deny these processes. Its concern lies elsewhere: whether the foundational structures through which a cosmopolitan world reproduces itself retain sufficient integrity to sustain autonomous regeneration. A community may successfully transform a missionary church into a site of Indigenous cultural affirmation while simultaneously experiencing the decline of its ancestral language, ecological participation, or ceremonial continuity. The framework therefore distinguishes between adaptive creativity within inherited structures and the preservation or restoration of the underlying capacities through which a cosmopolitan world reproduces itself on its own terms.

Objection: Rational Adaptation and Strategic Participation

A further objection concerns the interpretation of participation itself. A critic may argue that the behaviours described by the CPCV framework do not require any account of civilisational capture. Papuan parents send children to Indonesian schools because education provides employment opportunities, access to healthcare, mobility, and material security. Participation in state institutions may therefore represent rational adaptation to existing conditions rather than evidence of a parasitological process. This objection identifies an important distinction. The CPCV framework does not deny that such decisions may be individually rational. A parent who chooses education, employment, or medical access for their children may be acting entirely rationally within the options available to them. The framework's explanatory target lies elsewhere. It is concerned not with whether a particular choice is rational, but with how the structure of available choices came to be organised in the first place.

Rational adaptation and parasitological capture operate at different explanatory levels: the former concerns decision-making within a given field of possibilities, the latter the historical process through which that field is constructed, constrained, and reproduced across generations. The framework therefore does not interpret participation as evidence of irrationality but as a phenomenon requiring explanation at a deeper level than individual preference. The central question is not why people make rational choices within a colonial environment, but how that environment becomes the primary horizon within which such choices are made.

Objection: Does the framework risk re-essentialising cosmopolitan identity by treating pre-colonial societies as coherent wholes?

This is among the most significant theoretical objections that can be raised against the framework. The CPCV framework does not assume that pre-colonial societies were static, internally homogeneous, harmonious, or free from conflict and transformation. Nor does it propose a return

to a pure or uncontaminated pre-colonial condition. Its claim is more limited and more structural: that cosmopolitan societies possessed the capacity to generate, reproduce, modify, and transmit their own reality-producing institutions according to internally generated processes. The issue is therefore not cultural purity but cosmopolitan self-reproduction. The central question posed by the framework is whether a society retains the capacity to reproduce and transform itself according to its own reality-making processes, or whether those processes have become substantially dependent upon external civilisational structures. This is a relational and structural question concerning autonomy, continuity, and reproduction rather than an essentialist claim concerning fixed identities or immutable traditions.

Scope and Limits

The explanatory power of the CPCV framework depends upon the boundaries within which its concepts operate. Section One's three additional clarifications already establish that the framework does not reduce colonised peoples to passive objects of historical forces, is not deterministic, and distinguishes parasitological capture from cultural contact more generally; those limits govern here without restatement. One further limit follows directly from the parasite-instruments developed in Section Two: the framework accommodates hybridity. The decisive analytical question is not whether cosmopolitan elements remain present, but whether the structures through which those elements are reproduced retain sufficient integrity to sustain themselves on their own terms. Hybrid identities are not exceptions to the framework; they are important sites for analysing varying configurations of continuity, adaptation, capture, and resistance.

These limits are not qualifications imposed from outside the framework but conditions of its analytical coherence. The framework's claim is modest and specific: that a particular mechanism of civilisational capture can be identified, that this mechanism exhibits a structural homology with documented forms of biological parasitism, and that the resulting processes of redirection, displacement, and cascading incapacitation provide one way of understanding how colonial transformation propagates through the layered architecture of reality construction.

Discussion

The contributions advanced in this paper may be situated within three overlapping conversations: social ontology, insofar as it proposes a mechanism through which civilisational structures reproduce themselves within a society's symbolic and institutional architecture; theories of collective memory, insofar as it links ecological foundations, language transmission, and ceremonial continuity to long-term civilisational reproduction; and decolonial philosophy, insofar as it shifts attention from the outcomes of colonial domination to the mechanisms that generate and sustain them.

What does this analysis make available that was not available before? The framework's contribution may be understood under three headings.

First, it supplies a mechanism where the existing literature supplied an outcome or a structural description. Hegemony tells us that a population has come to consent to an imposed worldview; coloniality of power tells us that a racialised hierarchy of labour and knowledge persists structurally after formal decolonisation; epistemicide tells us that subaltern knowledge systems have been displaced by a single epistemic standard.

While these accounts provide powerful descriptions of outcomes, structures, and processes of domination, they do not generally offer a unified mechanism linking disruptions to perception, memory, language, and transmission within a single explanatory framework. The structural homology with biological parasitism supplies exactly this: a vocabulary for naming which specific capacity is targeted (fear-orientation, behavioural pathway, naming function, imaginative horizon, reproductive energy, elite formation), how it is redirected without being destroyed, and why the host comes to experience the redirection as self-directed. This is not a claim that the existing vocabulary is wrong; it is a claim that it operates one level up from where the present framework operates, describing the consequences of a process whose internal workings it does not itself specify.

Second, the cascading principle developed in Section Three offers an explanation for a pattern that is otherwise puzzling: why interventions that succeed at one layer—producing an indigenous literature, reviving a ceremony, establishing a language programme—so often fail to arrest the broader trajectory of cosmopolitan transformation. If the layers of a cosmopolitan world's reality-making architecture are interdependent in the way the cascading principle describes, then a single-layer intervention, however successful in its own terms, cannot by itself stabilise a system whose foundations continue to erode. This has a direct and somewhat uncomfortable implication for cultural revitalisation projects generally: success at the level of literature, art, or ceremonial revival may coexist with—and even mask—continued erosion at the level of land, language transmission, and ecological knowledge, the foundational layers on which those visible successes ultimately depend. The framework does not counsel against such projects; it suggests they need to be understood as necessary but insufficient on their own, and pursued alongside, rather than instead of, work at the foundational layers.

Third, the framework reframes the question of complicity in a way that has practical as well as philosophical consequences. If colonially formed elites reproduce the system they administer not through betrayal but through a genuine identification produced by the very mechanisms the framework describes, then strategies premised on persuading such elites that they are complicit—appeals to conscience, exposure of contradiction, moral argument—may be addressing the wrong layer of the problem. The *Dicrocoelium* analogue suggests that what is required is not primarily an argument that changes minds operating within an intact reality-making architecture, but a restoration of the architecture itself—of the ecological, linguistic, and ceremonial transmission systems through which a different set of categories, and therefore a different set of identifications, becomes available in the first place. This does not mean moral argument is pointless; it means moral argument addressed to colonially formed elites is likely to be most effective when it

accompanies, rather than substitutes for, the restoration of the foundational layers from which alternative identifications could emerge.

A further question worth raising concerns the framework's applicability beyond cosmopolitan contexts narrowly defined. The six mechanisms described in Section Two—fear-redirection, behavioural reorientation through education, linguistic replacement, foreclosure of imagined alternatives, redirection of reproductive labour, and elite internalisation—are not obviously restricted to societies whose reality-making architecture is organised around land, ancestry, and cosmology in the specific sense the term "cosmopolitan" denotes. Whether, and how far, the same structural homology illuminates processes of cultural and institutional capture in other settings—including settings within industrialised societies—is a question this paper raises but does not pursue, since doing so would require a separate analysis of what counts as the relevant "host architecture" in non-cosmopolitan contexts.

Conclusion

This paper has advanced a single central argument: that colonial civilisational expansion, as observed in contexts such as West Papua, exhibits a structural homology with documented forms of biological parasitism, and that this homology provides a useful mechanism for understanding how populations come to reproduce systems that progressively undermine the foundations of their own reality-making worlds.

Through the analysis of six biological parasites—*Toxoplasma gondii*, *Ophiocordyceps unilateralis*, *Cymothoa exigua*, *Ampulex compressa*, *Sacculina carcini*, and *Dicrocoelium dendriticum*—the paper identified six distinct operations of civilisational capture: the redirection of fear, the reorientation of behaviour, the replacement of the naming tongue, the foreclosure of imagined alternatives, the redirection of reproductive capacities, and the internalisation of the system through colonially formed elites. These operations do not function independently. Their effects accumulate and reinforce one another across the layered architecture of reality construction, producing what the framework terms the Principle of Cascading Parasitological Incapacitation (Kogoya, 2026c). The compromise of foundational layers—land, ecological participation, memory, language, and oral transmission—progressively destabilises the higher layers that depend upon them.

The principal contribution of the framework lies in its attempt to specify a mechanism where existing approaches have often provided structural descriptions, outcomes, or critiques. Coloniality, hegemony, epistemicide, and related concepts describe important dimensions of colonial transformation. The CPCV framework asks a prior question: what happens to the conditions through which perception, memory, meaning, and identification become possible in the first place? Its answer is that colonial transformation operates not only through institutions, ideologies, and political structures, but through the progressive reorganisation of the reality-producing capacities upon which those structures ultimately depend.

The mechanism named in this paper does not exhaust the broader Psycho-Cosmocide framework, of which it forms one part. Questions concerning the full sixteen-layer Civilisational Hierarchy, the domains of counter-parasitological restoration, and the wider implications of the framework for metaphysics, science, technology, and space-time have necessarily remained outside the scope of the present paper and are developed elsewhere in the broader Psycho-Cosmocide research programme (Kogoya, 2025; Kogoya, 2026a; Kogoya, 2026c; Kogoya, 2026d).

What this study has sought to establish is a more limited proposition: that the structural homology between biological parasitism and civilisational capture is theoretically coherent, analytically productive, and open to further comparative investigation.

Ultimately, the significance of the framework lies not in the figure of the parasite itself but in the question that figure makes available for investigation. Colonial domination has often been analysed through the lenses of power, ideology, law, economics, and violence. The present analysis directs attention to a different, though related, problem: the transformation of the conditions through which a people remembers, names, interprets, and reproduces its world. If those conditions are progressively weakened, redirected, or replaced, then the challenge confronting colonised societies extends beyond political subordination to the maintenance of the cosmopolitan infrastructures upon which long-term continuity depends. Whether the framework developed here ultimately proves persuasive will depend upon its usefulness in illuminating those processes across a wider range of historical and comparative contexts.

"The greatest victory of the colonial parasite is not killing the Papuan host, but teaching the Papuan host to mistake the survival of the Indonesian colonial system for the survival of the Papuan world."

References

- Abrash, A. (2007). The Amungme, Kamoro and Freeport: How indigenous Papuans have resisted the world's largest gold and copper mine. In F. J. Lechner & J. Boli (Eds.), *The Globalization Reader* (3rd ed., pp. 431–436). Blackwell.
- Assmann, J. (1995). Collective memory and cultural identity. *New German Critique*, 65, 125–133. <https://doi.org/10.2307/488538>
- 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>
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1972)
- Brusca, R. C., & Gilligan, M. R. (1983). Tongue replacement in a marine fish (*Lutjanus guttatus*) by a parasitic isopod (Crustacea: Isopoda). *Copeia*, 1983(3), 813–816. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1444342>
- Cann, A. J. (2016). *Principles of molecular virology* (6th ed.). Academic Press.
- Carney, W. P. (1969). Behavioural and morphological changes in carpenter ants harbouring microcoeliid metacercariae. *American Midland Naturalist*, 82(2), 605–611. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2423801>
- Chairullah, E. (2022). *Indonesia's Failure in Papua: The Role of Elites in Designing, Implementing and Undermining Special Autonomy*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003199908>
- Chauvel, R. (2005). *Constructing Papuan Nationalism: History, Ethnicity, and Adaptation*. Policy Studies 14. East-West Center Washington.
- Connerton, P. (1989). *How societies remember*. Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, N. (2010). *Dying words: Endangered languages and what they have to tell us*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Fanon, F. (1952). *Peau noire, masques blancs* [Black skin, white masks]. Éditions du Seuil.
- Fanon, F. (1963). *Les damnés de la terre* [The wretched of the earth]. François Maspero.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Pantheon Books. (Original work published 1975)
- Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing*. Oxford University Press.
- Giay, B. (1995). *Zakheus Pakage and his communities: Indigenous religious discourse, socio-political resistance, and ethnohistory of the Me of Irian Jaya*. Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks* (Q. Hoare & G. N. Smith, Trans.). Lawrence and Wishart. (Original work published 1929–1935)
- Hesse, M. B. (1966). *Models and analogies in science*. University of Notre Dame Press.
- Høeg, J. T., & Lützen, J. (1995). Life cycle and reproduction in the Cirripedia Rhizocephala. *Oceanography and Marine Biology: An Annual Review*, 33, 427–485.
- Kimmerer, R. W. (2013). *Braiding sweetgrass: Indigenous wisdom, scientific knowledge and the teachings of plants*. Milkweed Editions.
- Kirksey, E. (2012). *Freedom in entangled worlds: West Papua and the architecture of global power*. Duke University Press.

- Lafferty, K. D., & Kuris, A. M. (2012). Ecological consequences of manipulative parasites. In D. P. Hughes, J. Brodeur, & F. Thomas (Eds.), *Host manipulation by parasites* (pp. 158–168). Oxford University Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.
- Libersat, F., & Gal, R. (2014). Wasp voodoo rituals, venom-cocktails, and the zombification of cockroach hosts. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, 54(2), 129–142. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/icu006>
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2007). On the coloniality of being: Contributions to the development of a concept. *Cultural Studies*, 21(2–3), 240–270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380601162548>
- 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.
- Moseley, C. (Ed.). (2010). *Atlas of the world's languages in danger* (3rd ed.). UNESCO Publishing.
- Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. (1986). *Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. James Currey.
- Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power and Eurocentrism in Latin America. *International Sociology*, 15(2), 215–232. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580900015002005>
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Harvard University Press.
- Rutherford, D. (2012). *Laughing at Leviathan: Sovereignty and Audience in West Papua*. University of Chicago Press.
- Santos, B. de S. (2016). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against epistemicide*. Routledge.
- Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (Eds.). (2023). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world* (26th ed.). SIL International. <https://www.ethnologue.com>
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Zed Books.
- Vansina, J. (1985). *Oral tradition as history*. University of Wisconsin Press.
- 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>
- Kogoya, Y. (2025). *Psycho-Cosmocide: A Theoretical Framework for the Systematic Destruction of Indigenous Cosmologies, Consciousness, and Metaphysical Order*. Psycho-Cosmocide Studies, Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series No. 1.
- Kogoya, Y. (2026a). *Four Worlds, One Dying Earth: The Four Modes of Existence and the War on the Cosmobian World*. Psycho-Cosmocide Studies, Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series No. 17.
- Kogoya, Y. (2026b). *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.
- Kogoya, Y. (2026c). *From the Wreckage: Eight Atlases of Human Existence Under Total Colonial Domination*. Psycho-Cosmocide Studies, Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series No. 11.
- Kogoya, Y. (2026d). *Wonesis: Framework, Belonging, and the Antidote to Psycho-Cosmocide*. Psycho-Cosmocide Studies, Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series No. 16.
- Kogoya, Y. (2026e). *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.

Kogoya, Y. (2026h). *Easter Performances in the Time of Extinction: The Gospel of Psycho-Cosmocide in West Papua*. Psycho-Cosmocide Studies, Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series No. 10.

Kogoya, Y. (2026k). *A Foundational Theoretical Framework for the Study of Psycho-Cosmocide*. Psycho-Cosmocide Studies, Kurumbi Wone Working Paper Series No. 1(b).

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.