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ABSTRACT
Rather than taking the generally assumed parameters and tenets of the field of International Relations and of knowledge production for granted, this dissertation examines these assumptions in light of a contrasting mirror to gauge the likelihood of being able to generate knowledge that can respond to the concerns of this field, diminish the likelihood of war, and augment the chances for peace. The final conclusion is that the methodological approaches currently engaged within this field will not be able to respond in any significant way to the field’s goals due to the ‘eternally’ privileged thrust toward imbalance afforded through the separation-based ontological lens generally shared and employed to constitute the time-spacescape of Western-style academia. I show this through an elaborate contrast between the fruits afforded through the ontology of separation against those generated through an ontology of complete interconnectedness. For this contrast I draw on certain key principles of Andean philosophy as one particular collective manifestation of the lens of complete interconnectedness. For these principles to serve as an appropriate contrast, however, their common (re-)interpretations as found within both chronicles of the conquest and contemporary anthropological works must be thoroughly re-expanded through a lens of complete interconnectedness due to the reductionist effects of the lens of separation that was employed to document them. Once we get a glimpse of the more robust picture generated through this lens and its implications, we are then able to discern how even the relational methodological
approaches applied within the field of IR and in academia more broadly still adhere to certain separation-based parameters that preclude them from accessing, and therefore being able to use, the full implications of robust monism, which include being able to ontologically privilege balance as well as explaining how we are compelled to fall into the vicious cycles of epistemic violence, of resorting to a teleological framework for engaging reality, and expressing ourselves in terms of domination and submission.
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In order to live at ease in such a world one needs to love the world ‘just as it is,’ otherwise one lives in constant frustration, looking for a world ‘as it should be,’ and on that journey one does not learn to converse with variability. The Andean person neither lives in nor seeks an ideal world, instead he or she lives life as it is; accompanying it without aspiring to transform it, unlike the Westerner. The members of the community do not impose themselves on any form of life as someone superior who plans and directs his or her activities according to a utopian vision. If everything is regenerating continuously and if what is at issue is to accompany this flow, the lives of animals, runas [human beings] and rivers do not follow a pre-established plan but instead re-create themselves in each changing circumstance of life.

—Grimaldo Rengifo Vásquez, “The Ayllu”
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Seen from a distance, a social phenomenon inevitably appears in a different light from that in which it is experienced by a participant: a fish is the worst-placed creature to discover the existence of water.

—Gilbert Rist, The History of Development

This is not a dissertation that takes the basic precepts and architecture of the disciplinary field of international relations for granted. Rather it seeks to shed light on the assumptions that allow for the field’s constitution and show how the underlying logic derived from a generally shared ontological lens of ‘separation’ generates the corresponding assumptions and goals of this field and at the same time impedes their realization.

To be able to show how this is the case, I must pull us far enough out of the fishbowl so that I can clearly indicate the naturalized categorical claims and their accompanying logic that allow for and sustain the enterprise of academia in general and the field of international relations more specifically. To do so requires fully delving into the realm of philosophical ontology. For this reason, I will not be analyzing policy of any kind—whether it be of the state, an internationally funded development program or an inter-governmental organization. That just reproduces the categorical assumptions that build off of and entrench the separation-based constitution of the field of IR, and this is the very ‘water’ that I am trying to point out to the fish swimming in that fishbowl.

My strategy then is to delineate how two disparate, generally shared ontological lenses bear two incommensurate logics that in turn beget very disparate fruit.¹ The field of IR has been constituted through the more commonly known and employed ontological lens that I call the ‘ontology of separation,’ ‘ontological individualism’ or ‘unitarism.’ The monistic

¹ More lenses may exist but these two provide the necessary contrast for making my argument.
methodological approaches employed within IR (and academia more generally) still fit within the confines of the reach of this lens for reasons elaborated herein. The less familiar orientation that I call the ‘ontology of complete interconnectedness’ or ‘robust monism’ shows through contrast how this is the case.

In this exercise of philosophical ontology, it is not necessary to determine how far back either logic goes or who has said what about either one. Rather my objective is to illustrate what it means to predominantly hold, apply and reproduce each logic—or put a bit differently, to show the relationship between the general sharing of the ontological lens and the range of conceptual, practical and ontological possibilities that becomes afforded as a result. By contrasting these two lenses that generate very different realms of conceptual possibilities, we will be able to see the fishbowl that contains the field of IR as well as the implications for what that field is able to generate.

**IR in a Fishbowl**

Identifying the basic tenets of the field of world politics is a helpful first step toward conjuring that contrast. Perhaps the best place to see how we characterize and thereby reproduce certain common notions about IR as a field of study is in introductory undergraduate courses and textbooks. It is in this context that we as scholars of the field are challenged to distill the ‘spirit’ of IR from the rich complexities and subtleties found within the field’s burgeoning literature. In an introductory course, the goal is to convey the shared common denominators of the field in simple enough terms so as to pique an undergraduate student’s interests and potentially nudge her toward contributing to the field. The strategy that I have employed while teaching over the last 6 years roughly follows the approach presented in John Rourke’s (2008) *International Politics on the World Stage*. This text is one of several
introductory texts available on the market, and its narrative is representative of these pedagogical efforts.

The first task in an introductory course is to relay the main gist of the study of world politics. Although stated in many different ways, we normally explain that international relations is the study of war and other forms of conflict with the aim of increasing general security in the world. Now before delving into the two traditional currents of thought about conflict in the world and strategies for diminishing it, professors and textbooks alike can point to all of the areas of life that are related to and are affected by conflict so as to raise awareness of the relevance of this discipline’s focus. Among these areas we may find basic human rights such as the ability to have clean air to breathe, clean water to drink, actual flora and fauna to eat, and the ability to earn a living. Having access to health services and education as well as being able to express oneself in the political and social realms are also frequently indicated here. Since these dimensions are often very much contingent on a secure environment, their centrality to life justifies contemplating how we might avoid macro-forms of conflict or boost security.

Once we get the fairly conspicuous relevance of the field across to our students, we then move on to introduce the historical background to the field. To be able to discuss the relatively recent emergence of the nation-state and the inter-state system, we are often compelled to talk about the factors that led to their emergence. Toward this end we often address former competing systems of governance, the historical role of the Church in governance prior to the contemporary inter-state system, the rise of mercantilism/capitalism, and the impact of these political-economic changes on systems of governance.

---

2 I use the pronoun “we” because I assume that I am not alone in teaching an “Introduction to International Relations” or “Introduction to World Politics” course and that may use a similar tactic for grabbing students’ attention and interest in the field.

We can then delve into the intellectual, artistic and ideological notions stemming from the Enlightenment period in conjunction with the challenge presented by the rise of Protestantism as a preface for introducing the Thirty Years War, a milestone that has symbolically contributed much to the field of International Relations and academia more generally. Serving as a constant reminder of the atrocities that may be incurred when operating in the realm of invisible beliefs, the ‘memory’ of this war has promoted the Cartesian assumptions that undergird academic efforts today. That is, this historical signpost provides constant justification for focusing on the empirical, for eschewing that which cannot be falsified, and for privileging the mind and Reason over the murky subjective world of emotions and religious belief.

While these ideas are equally relevant to the discipline of IR, the Treaty of Westphalia (1648) is perhaps the main historical turning point that allowed for the field as we know it today, for it is taken as preliminary evidence of the nation-state’s appropriateness, practicality or adequacy as a system of governance for our modern world. To emphasize the continued relevance of this system of governance, we point to its replication throughout the globe since that period, although we may pause to contemplate the conceptual and historical inconsistencies involved in conjoining the terms nation and state as just a small warning of the ‘latent’ contradictions and potential conflicts inherent in this conceptualization and practice of governance today.

After reviewing these complexities, we then touch on how state sovereignty provides the definitional basis for seeing the inter-state system as horizontal and anarchical.\(^4\) By portraying

\(^4\) When one lives in a country like Ecuador, this point requires some serious finessing since the notion of sovereignty is not completely self-evident here. As a result I find myself often deviating to discuss how the varying levels of sovereignty came to be and how they are expressed in the world today. In this case, I may bring up the impact of the waves of decolonization of the 1950s-1970s on taken-for-granted aspects of the nation-state or address
the inter-state system as a context in which conflict and danger are a constantly potential threat, we can then introduce our students to the two classical schools of thought on how to navigate the uncertainty and constant potential for conflict spurred by anarchy. At this point we often make a very interesting maneuver to show how the various expressions of realism and liberalism arrive at their respective theories for maintaining peace and security in the anarchical interstate system. Here the Hobbesian and Lockean counterfactual experiments on ‘Man in Nature’ become a very useful pedagogical tool. Besides getting students to contemplate their assumptions about human nature, they show how the leap is made between these assumptions and ideas about what is needed to govern best within the nation-state (the widest territory that can be governed both conceivably and practically today) and about how to engage inter-state relations within an anarchical context.

This maneuver is very interesting for one major reason. Drawing the parallel between this experiment, current forms of governance and theories about minimizing war and then presenting the two sides of the debate as if they were totally opposite approaches blinds us to seeing that both approaches assume nature to be ominous, threatening, and anarchical itself and that a clear division is assumed to exist between humans and nature and even between individual humans in both cases. In this way, liberalism and realism just seem to veer off in irreconcilable directions, but their ontological assumptions are the same.

Because we too are in the same fishbowl and embrace the same lens, we do not realize this. Nor do we realize that the separation-based assumptions that undergird the field in general are just one way of seeing the ‘world’ or that we are reproducing these same common divisions when teaching about these disparate approaches of realism and liberalism. In fact, we could say contemporary trends like the impact of trade liberalization or technological development on a state’s capacity to regulate its territory.
that this shared lens characterized by categorical definitions, linear time, and the assumption of existential separation informs and gives shape to the fishbowl that houses the field of international relations, affords the existence of this debate by making the idea of conducting a thought experiment on ‘man in nature’ a conceptual possibility, and constitutes the basis for conceptualizing society, anarchy, social order, the social contract, the mandate for governance, etc.

The realist and liberal schools are not the only ones to reproduce these central assumptions. The alternative theoretical/methodological traditions also comply with the same ontological rules in order to be able to participate in the field of international relations. In fact, when we briefly introduce our students to historical materialism, postmodernism, constructivism, feminism, queer theory, etc., we are more focused on presenting what makes them different from the traditional approaches—that is, the ways in which they contribute to the field that the other approaches do not or cannot—than on how these approaches take the established baseline of the field as given.5

Despite this lack of ontological discussion, back in the classroom we are often driven to remind students that all of these efforts are directed at generating strategies for minimizing, reducing or stopping macro-forms of conflict as a way of ensuring general security and welfare. Stated in more positive terms, those studying the field generally aim to increase security and peace with general economic and environmental well-being as factors that contribute to the former. In this way we reaffirm that all approaches or strategies in this field depart from this particular common denominator. While this is an important and noble endeavor in many ways,

5 I recognize that an undergraduate course may not be the ideal context for this discussion. Besides detracting from the overall smoothness of the narrative that we are providing, it is simply too big of an elephant to get students to wrap their heads around given time constraints and curricular demands. It is also uncertain as to how much those who develop IR theory in general recognize that this is the case, which diminishes even further the chances of having this kind of discussion.
we must look at the assumptions that have been used to create the fishbowl that allowed for its appearance in these terms in order to understand what kinds of possibilities become afforded and their implications for the field’s purportedly desired outcomes. For this reason, the next section elaborates on a conceptual alternative to ‘fishbowl,’ the time-spacescape. This concept is the fundamental piece that will allow us to contrast the fishbowls of international relations, Western-style academia and ‘Western-style culture’ to the fishbowl generated through the ontology of complete interconnectedness.

**Time-spacescapes**

Instead of talking about fishbowls, I would like to use the term ‘time-spacescape’ to describe that social space generated through interaction in which certain resources are shared and reproduced during a particular time in a particular place. I emphasize time and space together, because the specific emergent conjunction of both dimensions is where co-constitutive interactions take place. While an always-emergent phenomenon, a time-space conjunction is afforded through a specific background shared among those who use the commonplaces that correspond to that background. This shared background could be considered the developed aspect of the time-spacescape, and with each new emergent moment that developed aspect is being re-produced. At the same time, what is lived, said, done, practiced and thought in that emergent time-space conjunction can be called the developing aspect of the time-spacescape, and it shapes what is afforded in future emergent moments.

The ontological lens predominantly embraced among those constituting the network in a given time-space conjunction constitutes the primary ‘shared resource’ of that time-spacescape. That is, what is shared, first and foremost, is a particular way of conceiving our hook-up to the world/cosmos, and this assumed hook-up, an ‘unjustifiable’ leap of faith, gives shape to the
particular field of possibilities to which we may have access. Sharing this lens as an ontological filter is the initial way in which we limit the constant barrage of information that is available at any moment. It helps us to prioritize that to which we pay attention.

In this way we may conceive of a time-spacescape as sitting against a backdrop of the field of infinite possibilities. While its contours constantly move and flow like a swarm of bees, its developed aspect occupies a general area that is dynamically inhabited. Moreover, time-spacescapes vary in size due to the variety in group size of those embracing that particular set of shared resources in a given time-space conjunction. Additionally, the members of one time-spacescape can participate in several others at the same time. These multiple memberships, besides the constantly developing aspect of the time-spacescape, is part of what makes it impossible for us to rigidly define the boundaries. These characteristics also imply that some time-spacescapes fit inside others and still others may encompass several, more specific time-spacescapes. The broader time-spacescapes rest on shared resources that are more widely relevant, whereas the narrower versions, while springing off of the more general resources, also involve specific resources whose reach or relevance is limited.

With these features, we may imagine how time-spacescapes dynamically overlap, intersect, and interweave through social interaction. Because of shared resources that can potentially contradict each other, these interactions can restrain or open up the expression of patterns characteristic of each involved time-spacescape. Here irreconcilable tensions can appear, demonstrating the ‘competitive’ aspect of these spaces. At the same time the distinct time-spacescapes may also complement each other or simply not have a ‘charge’ either way.

---

6 This leap of faith is deemed “unjustifiable” through criteria embraced within academia. This is not necessarily the case for other realms of existence.

7 I owe the “swarm of bees” metaphor to Foucault (1990), which can be found in his chapter entitled “Method.”
Given this basic overview of the time-spacescape, we may now examine how the most basic shared resource of a time-spacescape—the ontological lens—engenders certain fruit within its respective time-space conjunction and how this fruit may be incommensurate with the fruit of time-spacescapes based on a disparate ontological lens. By exploring how the logics, dimensions, principles and products that correspond to distinct lenses interact across time-spacescapes, we may identify the ways in which the logics and corresponding fruit complement each other or are irreconcilable and what happens in these instances. Throughout this dissertation I will try to answer these questions regarding the fruits of two diametrically opposed ontological lenses: one that privileges separation and the other that insists on complete interconnectedness.

It is important to note here that while these basic building blocks generate several kinds and types of time-spacescapes through their embeddedness in particular time-space conjunctions, they also generate a basic logic that permeates all of the respective variations and that is contingent on the lens itself. For example, the ontology of complete interconnectedness has informed the generation of many time-spacescapes, most of which today are considered to be backwards, barbarian, underdeveloped, uncivilized, etc. Most aboriginal peoples of the world have shared this lens and have generated distinct fruit through their specific time-space conjunctions. The specific manifestations of the logic that derives from ontologically privileging the relation in one time-spacescape are understandable to those of other time-spacescapes that share the same logic. Similarly, the ontology of separation has also generated several seemingly disparate manifestations, including the Judeo-Christian and Islamic traditions, and these too employ a commonly shared logic that stems from making separation the primordial ontological consideration.
In this text I will refer to three ideal-typical time-spacescapes that constitute varying breadths of the logic stemming from ontological separation. The broadest time-spacescape that houses the other two is the “Western-style time-spacescape of separation.” Within this most general fishbowl, we find the “Western-style academic time-spacescape,” which, in turn, houses the most specific time-spacescape in question, that of the field of international relations. The fourth time-spacescape in question—a rendition of the potential fruit of the ontology of complete interconnectedness as expressed through commonly discussed Andean principles (although not necessarily articulated in the same way as is commonly done today)—provides the critical contrast in lens, logic and fruit for the first three.

These renditions are wholly ideal-typical—that is, they do not in any way claim to represent ‘reality’—due to the forever emergent, fluid and dynamic nature of their contours. They do not exist ‘in reality’ as I describe them here, until of course, I describe them and in that way make them real in this singular, specific articulation and no other. Instead, these ideal types paint a particular picture against which we may make comparisons and contrasts. In this way they can give us insights as to how we have (re-)produced and continue to (re-)produce our reality.

At the same time these ideal-typical descriptions do not appear out of thin air. I am able to delineate them here because each time-spacescape hinges on a set of resources shared within the developed aspect of the respective shared background. That is, certain patterns within the field of all possibilities have been woven over and over again through the particular set of continually reproduced shared resources, and these are identifiable even if as passing, ephemeral points of expression. With these specific resources in mind, then, I briefly describe the Western-style time-spacescape and the Western-style academic time-spacescape to add to the description.
of the time-spacescape of international relations elaborated above. Then I move on to develop
the contrasting time-spacescape of complete interconnectedness, which will permit us to view
the other time-spacescapes’ basic tenets much more clearly.

The Western-style Time-spacescape of Separation

The broader, more expansive time-spacescape, in which the other two separation-based
time-spacescapes are couched, is the Western-style time-spacescape of separation. All three
share an ontological lens that privileges separation in terms of how we conceive our hook-up to
the cosmos, and this lens constitutes the basis for understanding how human beings ‘relate’ to
each other, to nature and to the cosmos. When the lens assumes separation first, the resulting
articulation of reality is necessarily reduced and categorical in nature, and this has many
implications for what becomes conceptually available and how it may be conceived.

In the case of this dissertation, the more general Western-style time-spacescape refers to
uses of the logic that derive from the ontology of separation that are not specifically seen as
‘academic’ but that are still wed to the products normally associated with what has been called
‘Western civilization.’ For example, the entire Judeo-Christian tradition, the Inquisition, the
Renaissance period, the Thirty Years War, and the practice of colonialism, capitalism and
development are all products of this logic. It has been present and practiced much longer than
the other two narrower separation-based time-spacescapes.

Certain ideas and historical phenomena emerged through the logic of this time-
spacescape and afforded the rise of the Western-style academic time-spacescape as we know it
today. For example, in the wake of the Thirty Years War, people in Europe shared a legitimate
fear of a return to the ‘Dark Ages’ or another full-on war based on beliefs that are unable to be
disproven. In response, Cartesian emphasis on reason rose in popularity as a way to avoid these
ills, obviously without the concomitant realization that the same ontological lens and logic that generated such a war to begin with was the basis for Descartes’ remedy. Also stemming from this logic was the divorce between the political and religious realms that fundamentally informed the shape of the nascent nation-states in that period. Over time too, the basic tenets of a liberal project gained ground: literacy rates increased and people took heightened interest in participating in governance and in the market—although as separate and separable spheres.  

Ontological separation also concurrently informed modifications to the systems of governance, propelled the system of capitalism, and fomented an individualistic approach to cultural/social systems. Overall, these events, trains of thought, and practices of the era provided the ideational fodder that initiated popular access to institutions of ‘higher learning,’ known as academia today, whose purpose has been to teach and produce knowledge about the world.

The Western-style Academic Time-spacescape

The narrower time-spacescape more specifically directed toward the academic activities of teaching and research, populated by specialists in their respective fields, and characterized by the institutions, ideas, practices and discourses surrounding teaching and research is what I call the Western-style academic time-spacescape. The time-spacescape of international relations is couched within it and as such shares the same general resources. The nebulous bounds of this time-spacescape hover around what are considered to be the parameters for Western-style knowledge production in terms of scientific inquiry. Again I use Western-style because this time-spacescape does not just take place in some imaginary ‘West.’ All academic institutions

---

8 In the end, though, while measures were increasingly implemented to avoid another war of such disastrous impact, the ontological lens that propelled the logic that led to the war was the same one employed to generate preventive strategies. If those left in the wake of the Thirty Years War had questioned their ontological lens, the world would have been a very different place. Instead, Christmas and Hanukkah—both remnants of the logic of separation—are still widely celebrated. Similarly, the US continues on its missionary quest to free the world with ideals that flow from this Judeo-Christian tradition. Palestine and Israel are still in conflict, and both factions’ religions are premised on an ontology of separation for it is the only way we can get to monotheism.
worldwide that have a research component and that strive for accreditation based on certain ‘international’ standards for appropriate knowledge production all embrace a particular, very basic logic regarding how to go about generating legitimate knowledge that corresponds to this time-spacescape.

This logic may be glimpsed through the very basic things we take for granted in academia. Following is a rudimentary list of assumptions that spring forth from ontological separation and to which those pertaining to this time-spacescape adhere to varying degrees. The first fundamental assumption is that academics regularly see reality as uncertain. If it were certain, then there would be no reason to produce knowledge about it. In this case, the completely new and unique emergent moment is a constant reminder of this existential uncertainty, not a demonstration of cosmic support or security. In this context our job as academics is to make that reality a little less uncertain by producing knowledge about it. A correlating assumption here is that as we overcome that uncertainty, we will feel better (and can make others feel better) about where we ‘stand’ in this world/cosmos. These ideas also imply the presuppositions that generating knowledge is possible and that knowledge can be accumulated and improved over time. We can see these notions at play in the constant methodological battles over which approach renders the kind of knowledge that most detracts from uncertainty. For this view to be possible, time must be conceived as linear in nature. In fact, this linear time scheme can be evidenced in the consistently expected and taught approach to planning out a research program, executing it, and generating conclusions about the original concept. It also lets us teach history as a chronological phenomenon among many other things.

This mandate of generating knowledge is also contingent on our ability to use reason, and from this view, reason is a particular human faculty that is separate and separable from the rest of

9 Descartes’ Discourse on Method is a strong example illustrating this assumption.
our sensory and emotional systems. As the Thirty Years War showed us, we cannot trust the other mechanisms through which we sense and process information. Because humans have ‘consciousness,’ ‘logic,’ the capacity of cognition or just simply the ability to communicate via human language, these capacities, it is assumed, allow us to make inroads on mitigating uncertainty.

In the face of so much (existential) uncertainty, our minds, in conjunction with our will, allow us to have control over how we manage the methodological process of gathering data, processing it and turning it into knowledge about our world. This assumption rests on what has been called an “internal locus of control,” where the results of one’s efforts in general and over the methodological process in particular are intrinsically attributed (Sue 1978; Eränen and Liebkind 1993, 958).10 These assumptions are the basis for the concept that humans can act on their environment to improve it or make it more amenable to their needs.11 This conceptualization reflects and further drives the view that humans are both different from and superior to other life forms, which is also fundamental to the academic endeavor.

Another commonly promoted idea within knowledge production is that specialization allows us to generate better or more useful knowledge. By specializing, it is thought, we will be able to cover more ground. The first partition exhibiting this attitude is the dividing line between the natural and social sciences, which again reflects the assumed separation between human beings and the rest of the world. From this initial division, this penchant for specialization has propelled the proliferation of disciplines within this academic enterprise.

10 See also Black (1990) for further development of this concept in terms of cross-cultural engagements.

11 In Must You Conform? Robert Lindner coined this notion as being ‘alloplastic’ in contrast to being ‘autoplastic’ where one adapts and changes oneself to accommodate the circumstances.
Overall what we see is that the large majority of the most basic assumptions by which we operate daily in academia rest on an ontological privileging of separation. Probably the most prominent characteristic stemming from this lens is the privileging of fragmentation—be it of one’s information-sensing-and-processing system, of the trend toward specialization within the disciplines, of time into segments or of relations into existentially autonomous categories. One central area in which we witness the drive to fragment is in methodological debates.

Due to its tight relation to philosophical ontology, this realm has created a truly fascinating scenario: the range of methodological possibilities is quite broad. In the field of international relations, these range from neopositivism/falsificationism and critical/scientific realism to analyticism and reflexivity (Jackson 2011). The former hold much more steadfastly to ontologically individualistic propositions, and the latter are much more relational in their ontological orientation. These last two though are engaged in a fairly tricky endeavor. While their embraced ‘monistic’ lens provides a means for glimpsing other ways of engaging reality, they must also walk a discursive tightrope to explain how what they generate as methodological strategies still responds to the overarching goal of knowledge production. If they do not account for a ‘sufficient’ number of the assumptions listed above (always determined in the moment of negotiation), then they can easily be accused of no longer participating in academia but in something else. The problem is that having to engage in this negotiation actually conjures incommensurability and precludes these approaches from reaching their full conceptual potential.

Because these monistic approaches still respond to parameters that have been defined through an ontologically individualistic lens, I call them forms of truncated monism. These parameters define the limits of the monistic realm about which we can legitimately produce
knowledge through a particular, artificially generated partition: the ‘naturalized’ parameter of human language. This boundary definition reinforces the categorical assumptions of humans as separate from (and superior to) nature and of the mind/logos as separate from (and superior to) the rest of our information-sensing-and-processing centers, demonstrating in turn the degree to which they are responding to ontologically individualistic conceptual forebears. While this strange place of hybridity proffers extremely important lessons at the end of this dissertation, the most important observation to take from this discussion right now is that the Western-style academic time-spacescape solidly rests on principles and assumptions afforded through the ontology of separation.

The Andean-style Time-spacescape of Complete Interconnectedness

The time-spacescape serving as a contrast to the last three is based on a diametrically opposed ontological lens that I call complete interconnectedness or robust monism. Of the potential variations generated through this lens, I am focusing on a version that arose in the Andean region. However, the version that I present here is not widely embraced in its fully robust sense today. In fact, we normally only witness fragments of it, making this Andean-style time-spacescape of complete interconnectedness much more clearly an ideal-type.

The Andean time-spacescape based on complete interconnectedness has been repeatedly ‘pierced’ over time by the fruits of ontological separation, and the assimilation of these piercings has shattered the coherence of this ideal-typical time-spacescape. Depending on how much of the logic of separation has been assimilated, the level of coherence among the fragments will vary. For example, traces exist in the urban areas of Ecuador, but their expression is so modified that people no longer recognize the link between the contemporary practice and the logic of
complete interconnectedness.\textsuperscript{12} Within predominantly indigenous communities, a more coherent version of the logic that corresponds with the ontological lens of complete interconnectedness is practiced, but it is often still cracked with fissures deriving from the use of the fruits of ontological separation.

These fissures were created when the colonizers arrived, when ‘idolatry’ was sought out and destroyed, when the idea of the need for modernization was introduced, when the drive to overcome poverty became a state obligation, when this obligation required incorporating those of the informal economy into the formal economy, when monocropping became the single-most important logic for food production and security, and when the only way for a country to survive came through being a legitimate and competitive participant in the global economy. Many more forms of piercing occur on a daily basis through migration, proselytization, commercialization, cable television, technology, resource extraction, etc., and the incentives for further splitting keep coming. In fact, the more familiar and more predominant Western-style time-spacescape has effectively closed out most spaces for the legitimate acknowledgment, expression, practice or reproduction of this more robust form of monism.

Nevertheless traces of this lens are still readily detectable in the Andean social fabric today, because the shared resources that stem from an ontology of complete interconnectedness still constitute a significant portion of the region’s contextual and conceptual background. In this sense, each new ‘piercing’ becomes assimilated into a rich set of shared resources that are already woven into the developed aspect of the background. So while the robust integrative coherence of this logic has been dissolved in some very central ways, specific features continue

\textsuperscript{12} Here several examples come to mind: the piles of sweets that are sold during Corpus Cristi, the making of \textit{fanesca} (a kind of soup) supposedly for Good Friday, the use of medicinal plants as home remedies for everything from a cold to menstrual cramps to diabetes, configurational set-ups for celebrations, protocol, forms of reciprocity among families, the expectation of gratitude, a non-confrontational approach to conflict, and the list goes on and on.
to persist and rear up in some unexpected areas and daily practices, like maintaining the continuity of the energy in a social gathering, a general awareness of completing cycles, reciprocity within the human-only realm, etc.\(^\text{13}\)

By moving into the realm of philosophical ontology, we can tease out the logic that stems from this ontological lens, re-apply it to the existing fragments, and then piece them back together in a much more robust and integrated fashion. This procedure will provide insights into contemporary practices today as well as into historical remnants that those using a lens of separation have not been able to comprehend coherently. Since this lens and its fruits are so generally unknown in their more robust form, particularly within the Western-style academic time-spacescape, most of the dissertation is dedicated to fleshing out the corresponding principles and logic so that they can serve as a mirror for being able to see the ontology of separation and its respective fruits more clearly.

For now though we can characterize this time-spacescape of complete interconnectedness as exhibiting certain key fundamental features. The first assumption is that absolutely everything is alive and connected. From this lens, humans are not seen as separate or separable, but as an integrated aspect of an interconnected whole that includes all life and the cosmos. In this case no distinction is drawn between the natural and cultural worlds. A corresponding conclusion based on these precepts is that, as an integral part of the whole, we must recognize, respect and honor our complete interconnection for long-term survival.

As part of this mandate, this approach relies on a much broader definition of what is counted as detectable and/or communicable. While language is the common communicative

\(^{13}\) I am pointing to a context that would be very much conducive to the kind of archaeological, genealogical research proposed by Foucault (2010 [1969]). Many signs of the rich archaeological depths of this social fabric are presented constantly, and establishing the links between the current situation and its roots based on the fruit of complete interconnectedness would be a fascinating endeavor.
means among human beings, energy is the medium fundamental to all live Beings since the very basic constitution of any life form is energy. With a communicative system as vast and deep as the ether, we can detect much more than what is allowed through just language by reading the frequencies and vibrations that pass through this shared medium.

These basic tenets arise out of and give shape to a very different type of knowing. I intentionally use the gerund here, in contrast to the substantive ‘knowledge,’ to portray its forever present-tense, forever emergent, relational and anchored character. Knowing is a condition of being that denies the ability to accumulate, progress or improve, but instead affords the possibility of re-visiting, re-producing and re-membering in very contingent fashion. It is infinite because knowing is always being played out anew in robustly unique circumstances. From this perspective, dynamism is privileged here, not consistency or categories, and this dynamism is wholly embedded in that forever emergent, specific context afforded through past interactions.

These very briefly sketched principles allow us to see how calling this knowing either ‘traditional knowledge’ or ‘obsolete forms of knowledge’ is incorrect on two counts. First, the ontological lens itself denies the possibility of knowledge as a substantive category. Second, its constant attention to the emergent present moment hardly renders it traditional—and ‘obsolete’ even less so. So why do we typically get this idea about the fruits of complete interconnectedness? These labels happen to be the teleological fruits of the logic of separation that most people share today to varying degrees. This is why Grillo (1998a) can confidently assert the following:

Whatever evaluation that can be made of the Andean world in terms that are foreign to it, simply does not concern it. That is why there exists in the Andes a great mismatch between Western or Westernized intellectuals and the Andean people. The Andean world and the modern Western world are incommensurable (128).
Fortunately this dissertation is not an evaluation. I rely heavily on these incommensurate differences as a source of contrast to allow us to better appreciate the water in which we swim in the field of international relations and in Western-style academia more generally as well as identify some of the characteristics of the IR fishbowl (that is, the logical means) that preclude achieving the field’s purported ends.

**The Main Point**

In the field of international relations, war and other kinds of conflict that put human security at risk are seen as the ‘ill’ that needs to be resolved so as to better ensure general human security. If we take these forms of conflict as instances of imbalance—in any way it may be conceived, whether as power-based, social, economic, political, discursive imbalance or any other—then the oft imagined antidote is some form of balance—whether that be through a realpolitik-style balance of power, democratization, sustainable development, a communist revolution, etc. It does not matter that these strategies among themselves be contradictory. What matters is the fact that each one promotes a particular way of re-gaining balance in the face of the imbalance reflected in conflict and in the factors leading up to conflict.

In light of this scenario, the main point of this dissertation is to demonstrate the philosophical ontological paradox created by using the ontological lens of separation in the field of international relations. This lens has served as a basis for the emergence of this discipline and has afforded this formulation of the ‘problem’ as well as corresponding strategies for its resolution. At the same time, it is the same lens that, when predominantly shared, can only engender ontological, and therefore both conceptual and energetic, imbalance. This means that none of the aforementioned strategies—nor any other that flows forth from this lens—will actually be able to make progress toward the given sought-after form of balance. For this reason,
as long as we continue to re-produce this orientation’s corresponding logic to any degree, efforts to produce knowledge in the field of IR toward the commonly supported goals of decreasing war, increasing peace or engendering sustainable development will not be able to fulfill them. To show how this is the case, the large majority of this dissertation is dedicated to developing a set of fruits stemming from complete interconnectedness as an example of a lens that actually demands constant conscientious consideration of balance before imbalance.

Before providing an overview of the dissertation, I must briefly clarify one implication of contrasting the robust fruits of a time-spacescape based on complete interconnectedness with the ‘hybrid’ fruits of truncated forms of monism within the separation-based academic time-spacescape. The major implication here is that while the naturalized boundary of human language helps to generate knowledge according to the standards of scientific inquiry embraced within the Western-style academic time-spacescape, it is this same limit that severs these truncated approaches from the more robust form of monism and as such from its most important contribution. To arrive at the ‘ontological mandate’ of inculcating dynamic balance, it is necessary to assume complete relationality. Breaking up that realm with an artificial boundary inherited through the legacy of ontological individualism actually privileges the categorical over all of the subtler relational work provided through these methodological approaches. For this reason, achieving the goals that IR claims is not ontologically afforded from within these truncated monistic approaches either.

The case of comparing the fruits of a robustly monistic lens to relational fruits that are subsumed to a framework based on an incommensurate logic is extremely insightful for understanding how the logic deriving from complete interconnectedness interacts with that of the ontology of separation. In the case of complete interconnectedness, we learn that its logic is so
wholly integrative and integrated that one degree of privileging separation unravels it, such that its main contributions are no longer accessible. The compartmentalizing tendency of the ontology of separation on the other hand, afforded through a categorical conceptualization of our hook-up to the cosmos, allows for two simultaneous maneuvers that are telling. First, this tendency actually allows for entire ‘monistic’ realms to be encompassed within a separation-based time-spacescape as categories themselves. Yet, this ability to house an extremely vast monistic realm (the world that is socially constructed through human language) as a category is tempered through the necessarily reductionist nature of this logic, such that arriving at robust concepts and notions that emerge from the ontology of complete interconnectedness is prevented. This dissertation seeks to demonstrate how these are the case.

To develop the logic characteristic of an ontology of complete interconnectedness, I first recount relevant anecdotes that brought me to this concern in Chapter 2. These vignettes allow me to identify the key principles and transversal themes of this ontological orientation to which the ensuing sections are dedicated. Before delving into the principles however, I pause to elaborate on some of the methodological considerations that undergird my work in Chapter 3.

The next six chapters conforming Part II of the dissertation develop key Andean philosophical principles to illustrate the type of fruits that are borne through this orientation. However, because these principles have historically been re-interpreted through a separation-based lens, I must (re-)expand the concepts’ capacity and potential to be consistent with the ontology of complete interconnectedness. This exercise allows us to see concretely the reductionist impact of employing ontological individualism for interpreting the fruits of another lens.
Part III is dedicated to the ontology of separation, its corresponding logic, and the time-spacescapes populated with its fruits that are pertinent to this argument. Chapter 10 demonstrates how the ontology of separation ontologically privileges imbalance before balance, which necessarily renders any effort to foster balance a compensatory act against the primordial thrust of the lens, by describing the anatomy of epistemic violence and ‘real’ domination. Then, Chapter 11 executes the next two critical steps toward making my final argument. The first half of the chapter reviews all of the partitions that characterize the separation-based time-spacescape of Western-style academia. Establishing this panorama is critical for being able to show exactly what is and is not engaged by those undertaking alternative methodological strategies that integrate relational principles into their frameworks. By indicating how the truncated monists, the strongest proponents of relational principles in the field of IR, still abide by certain fundamental pillars of this separation-based time-spacescape, I am able to assert that all methodological efforts to date that seek to produce knowledge that will contribute toward IR’s goal of decreasing the likelihood of conflict throughout the world cannot do so due to the very ontological lens used to apprehend the situation.

I end the dissertation with a final synthesis of the general lessons garnered throughout the dissertation on the contrasting ontological lenses and their respective initial leaps of faith and afforded logics. From there I am able to contrast in tandem the respective fruits generated through each lens, and this provides the necessary platform for examining what happens when we try to embrace both lenses in part at the same time for methodological purposes. After exploring a bit further the limitations of this incommensurate strategy, I then proceed to propose my own suggestions for how to approach the overarching goal of fomenting balance in a very different fashion.
PART I

ONTOLOGICAL DISJUNCTURES ‘IN THE FIELD’

Immersion in the ‘field’ called ‘Ecuador’ provided me with the necessary contrasts to generate an ontological disjuncture so strong that I had to spend years first exploring its nature and then trying to figure out how to articulate what I was experiencing and explain how it was not compatible with what is known academically as ‘ontological monism.’ During this time each Being that came onto my path forced me to try to reconcile the ontological assumptions I was making as researcher with what I was experiencing on a daily basis in Ecuador—from actual fieldwork to living and teaching. Over time I realized that the principles of the post-structuralist/social constructivist approach that I was employing had some misleading similarities with what I was experiencing in day-to-day life—and some grave differences.

Accordingly Part I attempts to outline some of the sources of this ontological disjuncture in preliminary fashion and discusses the methodological challenges and implications that accompany it. Specifically Chapter 1 draws from a variety of sources to sketch the fruits that led me to the realization of incompatibility between the ontological lens that I was using and the fruits that I encountered deriving from a time-spacescape based on complete interconnectedness. While this disjuncture between the relational methodological approaches of a time-spacescape predominantly generated through ontological separation and the fruits of a lens of complete interconnectedness is what permitted me to ‘see’ the argument elaborated in this dissertation, one of the major challenges for this work is to demonstrate how Western-style academia as we know it today is itself a fruit of the lens of separation and that when we encourage folks to go forth, study and examine the fruits of the former time-spacescape in order to ‘produce knowledge,’ we are insisting on an incommensurate venture. This is not to say that we cannot ‘study’ ‘Others’ but that we need to be keenly aware of the ontological assumptions that we are making when we
go to study those ‘Others,’ of what we assume is a possible outcome of that study, and of these assumptions’ implications. In many cases we are starting with some incommensurate notions that from the outset delimit what becomes possible. For example, even when students are methodologically trained in more relational orientations, their optic is still marked by certain features of the ontology of separation that preclude them—at least initially—from being able to see the fruits of complete interconnectedness in terms of complete interconnectedness.

Given the challenge of making the fruits of complete interconnectedness evident in their own terms, Chapter 1 presents a variety of expressions of time-spacescapes based on complete interconnectedness to begin to point to the products stemming from this ontological orientation. In this chapter, I do not limit myself to illustrations originating with indigenous nations residing in Ecuadorian territory, because it is important to show that while the specific expressions of the fruits may vary from Native People to Native People, the principles according to which they abide are aligned with a common ontological lens based on an initial leap of faith that insists on complete interconnectedness. Relaying the various anecdotal fragments helps to give a tentative overview of these principles that will be more fully developed according to an ideal-typical Andean tradition in Part II.

Chapter 2, then, is dedicated to addressing some of the methodological issues involved in tracing an ideal-typical time-spacescape based on complete interconnectedness in any context given the widespread and prevalent application of the ontology of separation. In the first section I discuss the challenge of picking out and up the shattered pieces of this ontological orientation in the contemporary southern highlands of Ecuador. There I elaborate on current cultural practices and their potential historical roots that led to their specific contemporary behavioral manifestation. The second section then addresses both the issue of re-articulating Andean
philosophy into academic language and the general paucity of literary sources that allow for a more robust understanding of the principles. Next I point to some of the potential ways in which misunderstandings may have been generated in the third section by reviewing some of the cultural challenges that I faced as foreign researcher. I end that chapter though with an explanation as to how—even in light of all of the challenges presented here—this work is useful, important and valid in its own way.
CHAPTER 2

GLIMPSES OF AN ONTOLOGY OF COMPLETE INTERCONNECTEDNESS

When a people predominantly share an ontology of complete interconnectedness, they, together with all of the beings that populate that time-spacescape, foster a way of interacting with the cosmos that distinctly contrasts with many of the basic precepts deriving from an ontology of separation shared through the Western-style academic world today.\(^{14}\) Because of the expansive reach of the logic on which the latter is based, time-spacescapes generated by a widely shared ontology of complete interconnectedness have been gradually eroded through processes of delegitimation and the nostalgic painting of this lifestyle as either a relic or fairy tale. Despite the fact that today in Ecuador what we see of this time-spacescape are mere traces and fragments reproducing themselves as discursive ghosts—as different-colored threads woven into a richly complex social fabric that is extremely textured and heavy—I can say that my experiences in Ecuador have shown that this ontological orientation and its corresponding effects on the time-spacescape are not lost nor are they out of anyone’s reach. In fact, allowing myself to play with these ontological assumptions about our hook-up not just to the world but to the cosmos is what has made me sense and know the difference in inhabiting each time-spacescape and living with their respective consequences. Furthermore, the anecdotes included herein hardly beckon a historical past. All of them come from the last decade.

---

\(^{14}\) When I say “Western-style academia” I am speaking of very basic assumptions about how to produce knowledge, such as the division between the natural and social sciences. I understand fully that the label “Western” is inadequate, particularly since the “West” is nebulous and infused with other traditions, such as the Native American traditions that I cite here. However, the “Western” ways to which I am referring is a predominant philosophical ontological tradition based on ontological individualism. Yes, some academics are trying hard to get out of the reach of this shared ontological orientation. Yet, they are still operating within the basic divisions that emerged with the creation of the academy itself. Moreover, when I say “Western-style,” I am trying to call attention to the encounter of the products of this orientation throughout the world. So for example, one finds “Western-style” universities in Ecuador and Ethiopia, which means that their set-up replicates much of the logic that has now become “international standard” for higher education. Later, I argue that anyone can hold any kind of ontological orientation for any length of time, yet the shared time-spacescape reflects a particular predominant orientation shared by the group.
This chapter is a preliminary step toward the goal of developing an ideal-typical portrayal of a time-spacescape based on the ontology of complete interconnectedness so as to bring to light through contrast many of the assumptions made in a time-spacescape based on the ontology of separation. It reviews a variety of anecdotes and passages that point to an ontological incommensurability between the time-spacescape based on complete interconnectedness and that out of which Western-style academia was born. It is through these fragments that the principle questions of this dissertation were apprehended.

The following stories highlight the kinds of experiences that made me aware of two different breadths of monism and then to question the implications of each for ‘knowledge production.’ While I include perspectives from four different indigenous nations present in Ecuador to show the widespread relevance of this ontological orientation in the Andes, the Andeans have hardly been the only ones to predominantly share an ontology of complete interconnectedness in the formation of their particular time-spacescape. This just happens to have been my particular path to recognizing another ontological lens. Plenty of other ‘aboriginal’ cultures throughout the world have their roots in the same ontological lens. These include the Native American traditions found throughout the northern, central and southern continents of the Americas, as well as those found throughout Africa, Asia and the Southern Pacific.

This very point elucidates how the particular fruits of having a predominantly shared ontological lens can vary in name, history and contextual details. However, the predominant use of a given ontological lens, whether it be of complete interconnectedness or separation, will lead to similar perceptive tendencies which shape in turn how the world/cosmos and our connection to it gets interpreted. So one important point in this dissertation is to be aware of both the
predominantly shared ontological lens and its corresponding (cultural) fruits that derive from sharing that lens in a given geographical and temporal context.

The Challenge, the Contrast, the Stories

Since arriving in Ecuador and being exposed to various methods of traditional medicine, I have had one gnawing concern: If traditional medicine rests on tens of thousands of years of trial and error in terms of its treatment of human ailments, then, in an age where we see anthropomorphically induced disease, how does traditional medicine deal with illnesses like HIV/AIDS, superorganisms such as influenza A (H1N1), and, closer to the Ecuadorian context, increased cancer rates among inhabitants of the Ecuadorian Amazon in the wake of the herbicide fumigations of Plan Colombia, accelerated industrial mining and oil extraction. One day I found just the right person to ask about this issue at a conference on traditional medicine at the Central Bank of Ecuador in Cuenca: a Poné (traditional healer) of the Tsáchila indigenous group from Santo Domingo de los Colorados. Dressed in clothing characteristic of his people, he had brought with him different sacred plants and natural remedies. I sensed that he would be able to respond to my question: How does traditional medicine keep up with the times when the times seem to be spiraling out of control with the harmful effects of stuff humans produce? I gave him the examples above.

Like a breath of fresh air, he was totally candid with me: “You are thinking like a gringa!” “Perfect!” I exclaimed, “Please tell me what you mean by that!” “You see,” he proceeded, “you are not clearly seeing how it is that we relate to the cosmos, how we are all

---

15 While the fumigations for Plan Colombia take place in Colombia, these chemicals seep into the Ecuadorian ecosystem (soil, plants, fish and humans primarily) both as air-borne particles and through rain run-off into the rivers that flow from Colombia into Ecuador. See both Acción Ecológica (2003) and Amicus Curiae (2003). For the findings on increased cancer rates due to petroleum extraction see Hurtig and San Sebastián (2002).

16 I have recreated the conversation here, since it was a rather spontaneous and serendipitous moment. I have tried to remain true to the message that this messenger imparted.
interconnected and have access to all life forms. Plants are living beings, which means that they
are dynamic and evolve. Also, anything that we create as humans still remains within the
field of all possibilities, which means that the plants—who want to help us in our existence
here—are able to respond. So when I go on a journey to help heal someone, I ask which plant
wants to respond to this person’s need. I do not always know exactly what the person suffers
from, so I wait to see which plant wants to respond by revealing its desire to me. In this case, a
plant that might have traditionally responded to diabetes might now respond to cancer. It
depends on the actors involved.” Still thinking like a gringa, I cynically mused, “Now what does
he do, go into a trance and ‘see’ plants who are jumping up and down, raising a frond and saying
‘Pick me! Pick me!’?” My cynicism about communicating with plants precluded my ability to
’sit’ in the message at the time.

The Pono went on to tell me of a warning from his ancestors about when his community
could see clearly to the horizon, that is, when the ceibo trees would be cut down. His elders
warned that when this happened his people would face unknown hardships. Today they can see
clear to the horizon, which has meant a faster penetration of chemical/synthetic materials and
illness. However, what these new ‘foreign’ air-, food- and water-borne agents have meant to him
as Pono is that he must do more communicating with the plant spirits to find out what would help
his people.

Despite my initial cynicism, this medicine man’s response to my question has haunted me
for years as I have had encounter after encounter with similar messages. What does this type of
knowing imply for our Western approach to knowledge production? How did the Pono (and
many others since then) have access to this kind of knowing and not me? How was my own
entrenched programming shaping how I see the world and the kinds of knowledge that I (re-)
produce?

Then, in terms of my own methodology, other doubts crept in: If I was engaging in a
monistic project that was based on the linguistic turn, then what did it mean for this man to
engage other communicative faculties? Was this another kind of language? Could we call it
language? What kind of knowledge was he generating in this way? How did my supposedly
monistic ontology, my mind-world monism, developed after several years of arduous study,
relate to this other ‘more robust’ form of monism? How could they both be monistic and yet be
so radically different? What does it mean to produce knowledge according to the one version of
monism in the face of such a broader conceptualization of a knowable and detectable reality?
What do these versions of a monistic hook-up reflect about the spaces in which they are
generated? Things were not adding up easily.

After several years of contemplation, here I present the answers that have emerged up to
this point in my journey of exploring these questions. I also seek to show how these
differences in ontological suppositions give shape to the reality we have co-created and what it
means to deny the one approach from being a ‘legitimate’ form of knowing in academia. For the
purpose of clarity, I will call the Poné’s version of monism “robust monism” because it reflects a
time-spacescape that embraces an ontology of complete interconnectedness. The ‘academically
legitimate’ version of monism that I learned—and that fortunately prepared me to ‘get’ some of
what the Poné was trying to tell me—is what I refer to as “mind-world monism” as Jackson
(2011) has coined it, “truncated monism,” or the versions of monism that have emerged from
within the Western-style academic time-spacescape.

17 Taking on this ontological awareness has had a snowball effect that leaves me with the confidence that I will
surely be exposed to other insights that may change what I write here.
Other snippets illustrate other key aspects of this more robust version of monism. For example, Philippe Descola (1993) upon studying a different indigenous group in Ecuador made a similar observation to mine from his perspective on the ontology of complete interconnectedness:

The Achuar have not completely subdued nature by the symbolic networks of domesticity. Granted, the cultural sphere is all-encompassing since in it we find animals, plants and spirits which other Amerindian societies place in the realm of nature. The Achuar do not, therefore, share this antinomy between two closed and irremediably opposed worlds: the cultural world of human society and the natural world of animal society (Descola [1986] 1993, 399 qtd. in Latour 1993, 14).

In the Achuar’s world, people, animals, plants and spirits are all in one wholly interconnected monistic domain. Here there is no separation.

In a similar vein, Edward T. Hall’s (1977) field research on culture led him to the realization that not everywhere did they divide nature “into inanimate and animate and intrapsychic realms,” which he claims “is strictly the product of Western European thinking [and that] other cultures carve up the universe differently.” He attests:

The Hopi, for example, should have no difficulty recognizing the transactional nature of dealing with plants and animals, for they talk to their crops and their sheep and to all growing things, just as they talk to their children so that they will grow and develop properly. The Hopi tell us that they cannot conceive of anything growing and flourishing except with love, care, and encouragement (145).

---

18 I intentionally write “from his perspective” because just the assumption that nature can be completely “subdued” to the cultural sphere as if it were a (teleo)logical process is to assume the appropriateness of an anthropocentric maneuver discussed later in this dissertation.

19 Hall (1977) provides another insightful example of a wholly monistic approach similar to Descola’s observation above:

Carlos Castaneda’s Yaqui sorcerer of Sonora does not distinguish between three categories of transactions, but lumps them all into one. To him, man cannot be separated from nature. He conducts his transactions according to an elaborate system of knowledge in which detailed information is required concerning the specific habits, attributes, and characteristics of plants, animals, and people, all of whom fall into categories that are either suitable or unsuitable for a particular person to deal with. A given individual may have to avoid one of the categories of magic, and all the plants and animals as well as the knowledge associated with that magic. Hunters relate to one cluster of living substance, while men of knowledge have another set. It is important for the Yaqui man of knowledge to control the forces in himself and the forces in nature and to balance these forces intelligently. Man has a personal relationship with everything. What one needs
So what is often taken in the West as an anthropomorphization of plants and animals by treating them with the same kind of “love, care, and encouragement” is, from this perspective, a critical element for encouraging growth among all living beings. In fact, Yves Guillemot’s (2003) work in Peru has allowed him to correct this anthropocentric conclusion of “anthropomorphization” typically found in the West by arguing that it is instead a “cosmogonization,” that is, to show how the human is a reflection of the cosmos, not the other way around (48).

Another voice responsible for passing on Native American Teachings, Jamie Sams (1990) from the Seneca Tradition, affirms Hall’s findings:

Native people from all parts of our world have lived in harmony with the plant kingdom of their areas and have used the plant kingdom’s gifts to assist them in survival. The indigenous people of Mother Earth have only used what they needed and have not hoarded, out of fear of scarcity, the offerings the trees have given. In our Native American Tradition, we gather all plants in a ceremonial and sacred manner. In my Tradition, we approach the largest plant of the species since it is the oldest and largest. When we receive a feeling or message that it is all right, we pass the first seven plants or trees we could gather from so that the next seven generations of humans will be provided for. In honoring our children and our children’s children we ensure a future for all creatures as well as the plant kingdom.

If we receive a ‘no’ when we ask permission from the Chief Plant, we move to another area to gather and ask permission once again. If we are gathering pine nuts, for example, we only take a little from each tree so that our Brothers and Sisters of the creature kingdom will also be provided for. How do we know when we have gathered enough from one plant? It is easily recognized by those in tune with our green Sisters from life is power, but that power can be used or find its way only in certain directions, which are set by the karma of the particular individual (145-6).

---

20 A surprising case is found in Anthony Aveni’s (1997) work. Here this well-noted founder of archaeoastronomy attempts to elevate the status of the astronomies of the Mayas, Incans and the architects of Stonehenge in relation to contemporary understandings of astronomy. While arguing time and again, “we must resist the egocentric habit of transplanting our notions and ideas across the vast sea of time and implanting them in the heads of our predecessors” (185), Aveni still uses naturalized commonplaces as in the following excerpt:

In ancient times…the entire cosmos was an expression of wills imposed by animate anthropomorphized forces that made up the state, just like their kingdom here on earth. Every object in the sky was alive with a personality of its own, ready to unleash its power for good or evil on mortals below. That the tides, the wind, and the rain could be predicted by watching celestial events seems reasonable enough, but the health and wealth of kings and peasants? Hardly—at least for us! (192, emphasis added).

21 After some personal reflection on this point, the deep interconnectedness assumed in this ontological orientation does not imply any directionality at all in terms of who becomes like whom. Rather, the same attributes are found in humans, animals, plants, and the cosmos alike.
and Brothers. The plant will not let go of its fruit, herbs, or nuts when we have taken enough. The plant will strengthen its limbs and refuse to let go. This is the way in which the giving nature of the plant says, ‘You have taken enough, move on’ (71).

Sams’ point recalls the Poné’s teachings: How does one go about asking for permission from a plant? How are the messages communicated from one Being to another when a common ‘language’ is not available? What does it mean to be “in tune with” the green Sisters and Brothers? How do you get there? From what is presented here, being in tune with plants and animals first requires recognizing the ‘Other,’ albeit in another life form, as connected to oneself and honoring that life Being before taking from it. Because this ontological position starts with interconnection instead of separation as a primary guide for sensing/feeling one’s way through reality, I call it the ontology of complete interconnectedness.

We have seen as well that the other ‘stuff’ that makes up our ‘world’ is not dead, but an intricate, alive part of the whole. A mestizo friend here in Ecuador, who is an anthropologist focused on Ecuadorian gastronomical practices, had an encounter with the Secoya people of Ecuador. A member approached him with a question: “What is the difference between you and me?” Now, before sharing the Secoya’s own answer, I must digress for a moment for a better understanding of both the question and answer. The term mestizo has a complex status in Ecuador. While its most basic meaning simply denotes biological mixing, it plays a critical segregating role in the discourse on Ecuador’s ‘national ideology.’ According to national policies and discourses, everyone in Ecuador is ‘mestizo,’ but in daily lexicon mestizo indicates those who are ‘not indigenous’ (and ‘not black’). Non-whites become included into the mestizo category through the process of racial whitening (blanqueamiento) and/or cultural assimilation (Clark 1998b, Muteba Rahier 2008, Whitten 1999 and 2008, and Whitten and Corr 2001). Those who choose not to assimilate or are not genetically diversified (enough according to appearances) do not get included into this category and as such are not considered ‘citizens,’
thereby constituting an easy justification for their exclusion from basic rights (Becker 2007, Clark 1998a, Colloredo-Mansfeld 1998, Pallares 2007, Sattar 2007, Sawyer 2004, and Stutzman 1984). So when the indigenous Secoya directed this question toward a descendent of the colonizers and then turned around and gave the answer himself: “For you some things in the universe are dead. For me, all is alive – even rocks,” he was speaking to the differences in ontological orientations, in cultural logics between those who remained ‘true’ to indigenous ways and those of colonial legacy.

This position has been upheld throughout both the Northern and Southern hemispheres. Again, speaking for the North American (native) tradition Sams (1990) confirms this position:

In Native American culture, we see everything as being alive. Each living thing has a specific role as a teacher and family member. Everything on Earth, whether stone, tree, creature, cloud, sun, moon, or human being is one of our relatives. … Each part of our Planetary Family … represent[s] the sacred living extensions of the Great Mystery, placed here to help humankind evolve spiritually (v-vi).

Very recently this position was echoed in New York during a presentation of South American indigenous proposals on climate change, food sovereignty and “Well Being” to the Eleventh Session of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues of the United Nations. 22 Miguel Palacín Quispe, president of the CAOI (the Andean Coordinator of Indigenous Organizations), made the following observation about the indigenous cosmovision 23:

22 This latter concept derives from an indigenous term (‘Sumak Kawsay’ in Quechua) and has been coopted by contemporary Andean presidents representing “21st Century Socialism.” Sumak Kawsay and its Spanish correlate El Buen Vivir have become major buzzwords recently in debates on economic development. This is extremely ironic since the fundamental conceptualization of the world on which Sumak Kawsay is based is so totally opposed to the context for which it is being employed. (In Ecuador, the word for the language descended from the Incans is Quichua whereas in Peru they call it Quechua. While I am writing this from Ecuador, I have decided maintain consistency with the Peruvian scholars that I cite herein.)

23 I use ‘cosmovision’ in English to contrast with ‘worldview.’ However, ‘cosmovivencia’ is a much more adequate term in Spanish, because it correctly points to two instances of conceptual reductionism signaled by ‘worldview.’ First, ‘cosmos’ is much more expansive than ‘world,’ and second, using the term ‘vision’ limits its reach to only one sense. ‘Vivencia,’ in contrast, while commonly translated as ‘experience,’ is a derivative of the verb ‘vivir’ (‘to live’). In this sense it emphasizes the ‘lived’ dimension of experience, and that includes using all of one’s senses as

35
For the indigenous peoples … the human being is a part of nature, we are her children. And everything that surrounds us is alive: water, plants, animals, mountains, forests. Ours is not a religious spirituality, we don't make a cult of 'supernatural divinities'; it is our way of expressing the link among all living beings, the respect and gratitude to the Pachamama.\footnote{Translated from “CAOI presenta las propuestas indígenas frente al cambio climático, soberanía alimentaria y Buen Vivir,” Andean Coordinator of Indigenous Organizations, May 8, 2012, http://www.coordinadoracaoi.org, (accessed May 10, 2012). Thank you Lucía Gallardo for sending me this bit of complementary information.}

What is clear from these remarks is that this ontological orientation assumes that everything is alive and interconnected. The interrelated family of which we are just a part is much larger than just us human beings. This point has an important first implication: If everything is alive then it is difficult to denominate anything a “thing” because it drives us back into the perception that it is inert. For this reason, throughout my work, I try to use the term “being” where possible to draw attention to this ontological difference.

Both quotes also bring up another central aspect of this ontological orientation: The monistic space is so robust that spirituality is not other-worldly nor is it separate or separable from either knowing or the reason for knowing. Grimaldo Rengifo (1998a) addresses the empirical nature of spirituality from this cosmovision. Here he uses “person” to denominate any “being”:

In the Andes we are all people and we are all related, and the life of each does not obey mandates from supernatural beings which transcend us (as is the case with the Judeo-Christian God); rather it emerges from conversations between similar and equivalent beings. Since there is no separate reality – no supernatural world – the Andean deities or huacas are manifest – they dwell here, they are evident, they can be seen, they are accessible to our senses – since they are within the world and are, like any other being, treated like persons (97-98).

Spirituality then is not something that deals with some ‘out there’ but is all about phenomena that can be perceived right here, right now. This has serious implications for what is considered to be well as being acutely aware of the emergent, generative present moment-place. In this way ‘cosmovivencia’ could be understood as ‘cosmic living.’ (Thank you Francisco Lojano for pointing this out to me.)
the purpose of sensing and processing information (a step before knowledge generation), which is further developed below.

Given this set of principles, we can now contemplate one last anecdote. The aforementioned anthropologist’s wife, another mestiza, while teaching at a Western-style university in Cuenca, Ecuador faced an uncomfortable moment when a student of hers, a Saraguro shaman (another indigenous nation in Ecuador), questioned the relevance of this kind of education. Instead of pointing directly at her class, he shared his concern about the way in which his son was being taught in school. He recounted his surprise, when reviewing his son’s grade-school science textbook, to find that it claimed that water was a ‘dead’ substance, that it was inert, ‘without life,’ and unchanging.

This went against everything he knew to be true about water. Water as just two particles of hydrogen and one particle of oxygen denied the spirit that he knows water to have, negated water’s quality of exuding life, of providing life, as the source of our own. It pained him, he said, that his son would have to learn and be tested on this other reality that so starkly contrasted to the cosmovision of his people and dishonored the life-giving and sustaining energy that water gives us. He had resolved to make his son understand the differences between their way of understanding reality and the Western way.

This man’s shock and pain results from the encounter of two different ontological lenses to perceive and understand water. His son’s textbook, representing ontological assumptions that are passed on and reinforced throughout a Western-style education, places emphasis only on the particles in separation and his people’s tradition places it on the energetic relationship between space and the particles, which denies the possibility of separation. The ontological lens that initiates with separation leads to seeing each thing, being, tendency or phenomenon as
existentially autonomous. This in turn puts an initial focus on the perceived unit or what I call “one category in separation.” The lens that starts with the relation must necessarily begin with two beings, things, tendencies or phenomena to constitute a relation, so the initial starting point for perceiving and conceiving of the world is with “two components in one relation.” The only way to get to ‘one’ in this case is through two aspects that are tied together. This difference in applied ontological lenses would explain why the particles are privileged in the ‘Western’ tradition and why the Saraguro see water in terms of the life that arises through the interaction between the material particles and the void in which they are suspended.

For those who share an ontology of complete interconnectedness, including the Saraguro, Tsáchilas, Achuar, Shuar and other Native American nations across the northern and southern hemispheres, everything is in relation. Within each being, space and matter are always interacting in relation, and the energetic impulses that constitute that interaction reflect the life force of that and of all beings. While each configuration of particles constitute the different beings, space and energy permeate all. This energetic interaction between matter and space is the case for everything from the DNA and the space in which it is housed all the way up to the cosmos where the stars, planets and other celestial beings move in perfect relation to the void that holds them. Furthermore, because space is the common denominator in all and energy is transmitted through that space, communication among all beings occurs vibrationally through energy. This deep interconnection from the macrocosm down to the microcosm and among all living beings through the medium of space is how humans are able to align themselves with cosmic cycles, how the Poné is able to communicate with the plants, and how the guinea pig upon being rubbed over the sick person is able to show immediately what organs are affected upon being splayed and analyzed.
Water, according to this concise alternative for conceiving the vastly interconnected nature of reality, is seen first and foremost as a live Being that stands in relation to all through the space that connects us. Energetically it generates life through the interaction between its particles and the space in which they are suspended. Its prominent role within the world for allowing life in others makes water a particularly sacred Being to whom one gives thanks and from whom one asks permission for a particular use. For example, water’s connection to oneself needs to be acknowledged and honored first and then permission requested before ‘using’ it to quench one’s thirst or wash one’s hair. Water lends itself as a gift for one to care for oneself and others.

The account of water based on an ontology of separation relayed through school textbooks, in contrast, only takes into account one component of the dynamic relationship between two critical elements.25 This actually generates a compounded loss: To not acknowledge the space in the account of water as H₂O is to deny the ‘other half’ of the relation and the relation itself. This automatically dismisses the ‘life-giving’ qualities of water as an integrative, live Being. Moreover, the singular focus on the material denies the possibility of knowing one’s own integral relationship to this vital liquid in the more robust sense. In addition, from this perspective if someone were caught asking the water for permission to receive its blessings in the form of cleansing, re-balancing and fluidity before taking a shower or jumping into the ocean, he or she would be considered crazy.

In the end each orientation has very different outcomes for the status of knowledge. In the ontology of complete interconnectedness, what one gets is a knowing through nurturing a relationship with water whereas the ontology of separation can produce the knowledge that water

25 If space is considered, then each component is ontologically dealt with one at a time and so the consequences are the same.
has X, Y and Z properties. While the latter can tell us a lot about the constitution of a thing, in this case water, all that information lacks the relational context in which any of it might be able to make sense. In the former case, knowledge about the properties is irrelevant if one has yet to know water by honoring and nurturing one’s relationship to this Being.

Let me be clear: just because water is considered to be a lifeless substance from a lens of ontological separation does not mean that a concern for water is not demonstrated by those who embrace this ontological orientation. It could easily be argued that they in fact are just as concerned about water as the Saraguro man. Certainly people know that life on the planet would not be possible without water, and in this sense water is equally emphasized as life-giving. Environmental movements and campaigns as well as people’s daily efforts to conserve this vital fluid are evidence of this concern. Even within the field of IR, we forecast that the next major wars will be over this public good because people recognize its vital importance. However, the way in which that concern is conceptualized, expressed and acted upon is distinct from a concern for water shown from within a perspective of complete interconnectedness due to the difference in ontological lenses.

When one starts with an interpretive lens based on one-in-separation, as in the child’s textbook, the particles of water are not automatically contemplated in relation to the space in which they are suspended nor is the connection between oneself and the sacred being of water through the space that connects us all automatically honored. Instead, the particles are the primary focus because they constitute the material, empirical and countable aspects of water that allow us to differentiate water from other substances. Furthermore, the life-giving quality of this commonly encountered phenomenon is understood in terms of its biochemical functions, not in

---

terms of its interconnection through space or of the energy that results from the complementary interaction between that space and the particular particles that constitute water. In this sense water may be critical for hydration and all kinds of biochemical processes taking place in the body and on earth, but it is also ontologically separate and separable from us. It may constitute 60-65% of our bodyweight, it keeps us alive by carrying out its hydrating and dis-solving functions, but its own particular life force is not acknowledged from this perspective, much less seen as an integral part of our own.

In other words, water is both lifeless and life-giving at the same time through the perspective of one in separation. When we cannot see the relation between the particles and the space in which they are housed, it becomes easier to conceive of water as an already constituted substantive noun. When water is an inert, separate entity rather than a live being with whom we engage in relation, the ‘life-giving’ quality of its biochemical attributes is relegated to instrumentalism. Seen through a lens of separation, both the substantive-oriented character of this phenomenon and the instrumentalist sense of what that substantive is supposed to be for or do are captured in the terms normally used to qualify water in the Western-style time-spacescape: good, resource and commodity.27 Once this live component is converted into a substantive noun as exemplified in these labels, we can then speak of it as being used, managed, wasted, exploited or saved. This perspective is reinforced through the assumption that since humans are alive and have the capacity of reason, they have the right and mandate to act upon a lifeless substance primarily because it does not and cannot think for itself. For this reason, in most of these environmental campaigns, public policy and development programs, we see calls

for the need to better manage and administer the resource. Moreover, project developers and policy formulators usually turn to widely accepted standards of scientific processes for measuring the quantity, flow and cleanliness of water for information on which to base their decisions. In each of these cases, the subject is acted upon, not interacted with. It is a controlled resource.

Clearly this approach does not lead to honoring water as a live element that is part of us or that constitutes us through its life force. The pain the Saraguro man feels is due to the reductionism deriving from an ontology of separation. It constitutes—for him and others that embrace an ontology of complete interconnectedness—a form of epistemic violence to the robustness of life with which we share relation.

What the case of water shows is that different ontological lenses render differences in interpretation, which in turn imply different strategies. These lenses do not just apply to the particular case of space and matter but are the ontological points of departure for seeing everything in the world/cosmos and our relationship to it. Privileging one-in-separation over two-in-one relation represents a primordial ontological distinction that has engendered rather large consequences for the world we have come to construct and the methodologies we have created to study it. This dissertation is dedicated to exploring these differences through the contrast between Andean philosophy and international relations theory as a reflection of more general patterns within Western-style academia.

Before delving into the central features that characterize a time-spacescape based on a shared robust monism, however, a few methodological considerations are in order. The next

---

28 Lewis Feldman (2007) and Hunt (2004) are perfect examples of this kind of work in terms of policy and project formulation/implementation.

29 Hoekstra and Chapagain (2008) is a thorough resource for estimating footprint and resource use.
chapter discusses some key methodological concerns in my efforts to study and describe an ideal-typical Andean cosmovision that reflects a shared ontology of complete interconnectedness.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

While there are as many Andean cosmovisions as there are ‘Andeans’ and those interested in studying the Andes, the purpose here is to provide a contrast through an ideal-typical characterization of a time-spacescape that emerges out of a shared ontology of complete interconnectedness. Three principal factors have affected my ability to find primary sources on the ontological orientation of the Andean cosmovision, and they include my historico-geographical location, a general lack of bibliographic source material dedicated to the ontological analysis of this orientation, and my constitution as researcher. I elaborate on each of these factors below before discussing my principle strategies for developing this ideal-type.

Historico-geographical Location

Geographically I have been situated in the southern highlands of Ecuador. I am situated in a region that had historically been in the process of being taken over by the Incans for only 40-60 years when the Spanish arrived. The shared background of this historico-geographical context includes the aftershocks of colonialism, slavery, indentured servitude, sharecropping, missionary work, a very hierarchical social order as well as more ‘modern’ calls for development, consumerism, education standardization and project formulation and evaluation. Because these practices are outgrowths of an ontology of separation, whatever shared ontological preferencing of complete interconnectedness there may have been only exists today as fragmented remnants, and they are at best very syncretic manifestations of these traces. In many ways the time-spacescape based on an ontology of complete interconnectedness that I address here has all but been annihilated. Nevertheless some fragments are readily observed and serve as evidence of the resources that are still available in the shared background—that have been and
will continue to be woven into the very fabric of Andean reality. Available in daily social practices, the shape of institutions, etc., they point to a logic that is radically distinct from that which sustains ontological individualism.

These traces have been critical for discerning the main features of this time-spacescape. Take for example the very distinct characteristics of social gatherings in Cuenca. In most social functions it is common practice to empty out the middle space of a room and have all of the chairs lining the four walls (making a square ‘circle’). It is also common for everyone to sit in their respective chair and be served an alcoholic drink in a small cup about the size of a shot glass. In more intimate occasions people will use a single cup refilled by a pitcher to serve all one by one. If outside in this case, what little remains in the cup after someone has had a drink gets tossed out onto the ground and the cup is filled again. This process normally continues into the wee hours of the morning. If a person tries to leave the party (the circle)—unless there are obvious reasons for the need for his departure—he normally has to listen to a long discourse about how he is being ‘ungrateful’ and is disappointing the group. This is not your ‘run of the mill’ peer pressure. One can find oneself locked into a house; one’s keys may be confiscated; and/or the phone might not be made available to call a taxi.

As a foreigner this set of party practices may seem incredibly onerous. Why can’t I drink when I want a drink? Why can’t I leave when I want to leave? Why do we have to stay seated in a circle until the time comes to dance and then I somehow find myself back at my original seat? Where is the space for gadfly action to be able to go talk to people one-on-one and then change company when the conversation seems to come to a close? How in the heck do people continue to drink like that while sitting for so long and not fall asleep? These are all commonly
encountered thoughts among foreign exchange students (myself included) that deal with this particular set of festive idiosyncrasies.

In my course on cross-cultural communication I often ask my Ecuadorian students what exactly they are doing at these parties. I then inquire about when they light only one cigarette when in a social group and share it among all people standing there and then light another one en seguida (right away) to continue the smoking circle (when they are not all regular marijuana smokers). They cannot explain these phenomena to me, they say, they know nothing else. Just as in most language-games or cultures, people are so used to the rules by which they play that they normally do not even realize they are there much less be able to explain their historical roots.

However, after facing these circumstances time and time again, one quickly comes to the realization that these are all readily observable syncretic adaptations of practices still found in some indigenous communities that tend toward a shared ontology of complete interconnectedness. For example, in community justice practices, the community members stand in a circle and witness the justice doled out in the center. The circle and the fact that everyone is facing toward the offenders actually demonstrate community support. No one is ‘turning his or her back’ to the offenders but instead is energetically supporting their re-alignment with balance.\(^{31}\)

Sacred ceremonies, particularly those that last all night, are another example of this common set-up. Here again, everyone is seated in a circle. Particularly for serious events, this

\(^{30}\) The term “community” is not well received by many indigenous groups. The term normally applied is *comuneros* for those pertaining to a particular group, which would be the case here.

\(^{31}\) How the offense is conceptualized is very different as well. Most often, the offenders are seen as being out of balance, and this state of affairs is not just the personal fault of the offenders. Everyone is involved in engendering harmony. For this reason too all are present and standing in a supportive circle so that the energy can be re-balanced among all beings pertaining to the life of the community.
circle is not to be broken, for it represents the commitment of each person as a member of the community toward the intention of the ceremony. If the circle is broken, so becomes the level of energy toward that group commitment. Additionally often in ceremonies, chicha or any other drink is shared one by one from a single gourd or cup. Again, this act of sharing a cup reinforces the shared commitment to collective action even when celebrating the union of a couple for instance. Part of what is received in the cup is poured onto the Pachamama (Mother Earth) as an offering of gratitude because she provided that source of nourishment. Finally, while all kinds of singular conversations go on outside of the ceremony, the group activity with its silences and common punctuations is for building group solidarity and energy toward the intention.

These are just a few very brief illustrations of regularly observed practices that reveal traces of a time-spacescape shaped by an ontology of complete interconnectedness even though they clearly portray the extent to which the practices themselves and their purpose have changed over time in the particular area where I live. Nevertheless these forms of syncretism plus the stories delineated in Chapter 2 represent some of the main sources fueling what might be called my ‘ontological disjuncture’ as researcher. They challenged me to examine more closely why I was not able to make sense of them. In that spirit, I sought out texts specialized on Andean philosophy and began to receive many recommendations from friends here. Even though my students, swimming in their own fish bowl, were unable to describe and explain the water in which they are immersed, these texts, namely Estermann (1998, 2003, 2009), Lajo (2003, 2007), Guillemot (2003), Rengifo (1998a, 1998b), Grillo (1992, 1998a, 1998b), and Ishizawa with Grillo (2002), filled many of the gaps created through my ‘grounded’ experience. As in the case of any human being, my unique path of signification and interpretation meant that I did not completely resonate with everything each one had to say, but I was certainly able to identify the
concepts and words that gave ‘sense’ to my experience. The concepts and principles, selected for and described in Part II, about relations, time-space and our connection to the cosmos as well as their corresponding lessons and conceptualizations of life and its purpose are the product of an organic process of facing contrasts, contemplating their meaning and implications, and seeking out possible explanations for those phenomena that I experienced as irregularities, idiosyncrasies and disjunctures.

**Bibliographical Challenges**

The second major factor affecting my research is the paucity of bibliographic source material on Andean philosophy that brings to light the major ontological differences between the Andean cosmovision and Western-style approaches to knowledge production. One may attribute this, as Javier Lajo (2003) does, to the “greenness,” not of Andean philosophy, but of its re-articulation into academic language (134).

The reasons for the incipient nature of this endeavor are several. First, those trained in ontological philosophy have not historically focused on this philosophical tradition. Simultaneously, those who transmit this wisdom do not talk about it in ontological philosophical terms for the commonplaces of that lexicon come from the Western-style academic time-spacescape. Third, those writing on the interactions across these time-spacescapes are focused more on how the fruits of each time-spacescape interact instead of on the logics that afford those fruits. For example, the onslaught of neoliberal policies, consumerism, globalization, and migration are just a few areas that deal with the incommensurability of these two approaches. Very few authors work to distill the ontological presuppositions about our hook-up to the cosmos that give each respective time-spacescape its particular shape.

---

32 Suzana Sawyer’s *Crude Chronicles* is a particularly excellent example that documents the effects of these incommensurabilities in the Ecuadorian Amazon.
A fourth reason is that Western philosophical traditions have excluded the knowing generated through Andean philosophy, rather than embracing it (which may very easily explain the first reason). Estermann (2009) captures this point well:

We are dealing with a violent and excluding act of “definition” that excludes \textit{a priori} the other. When one defines “philosophy” as a product elaborated by individuals (philosophical persons) and expressed in written texts (essays, articles, books), using a binary logic and a discursive rationality, thus one excludes \textit{per definitionem} all philosophical expressions that do not have an individual author, that are not put down in writing, that do not obey the logical principle of the formal non-contradiction and that apply a non-discursive rationality. Ergo: \textit{non philosophia est} (133).\footnote{For this particular publication I took considerable liberties in re-translating the text from the original Spanish into more understandable English.}

In exchange, this—like other philosophical traditions not based on the ontology of separation—is at best recognized as “‘thinking,’ ‘cosmovision,’ ‘mythology,’ ‘religiosity,’ or simply ‘ethno-philosophy’” (Estermann 2009, 133).\footnote{While I often use “cosmovision” here it is to place emphasis on the breadth of the ontological gaze in contrast to “worldview.” For me, this ontological orientation, just like any other philosophical ontology, is based on philosophy. To use the term “cosmovision” does not take away the right to also call it philosophy.}

Western-style universities in the Andean region readily demonstrate this attitude. Here these philosophical traditions are not considered to be ‘sufficiently sophisticated’ to be included in any curricula except as exotic ‘Other’ in some anthropology departments (found in the nation’s capital) or in sociology and ‘development studies’ (which abound). In this latter area of study, those groups that have historically embraced the ontology of complete interconnection are portrayed as the ‘poor’ ‘Other’ to be modernized and in need of improving his or her corresponding lifestyle.\footnote{The persistent presence of ethnic groups that do not assimilate culturally and that hold on to a greater degree to this ontological orientation is perceived as a “sore spot” in Ecuador’s record for carrying out its national goal of “modernization” for the purpose of improving “international standings.” See Sawyer (2004), Weismantel (2003) and Weismantel and Eisenman (1998) for clear demonstrations of this disdain. Reasons, however, must exist as to why assimilation has not fully taken place even with persistent arduous efforts to impose it.}
This logic is also seen in the typical conceptualization of Ecuadorian history as only legitimately starting with the arrival of the Spanish, with written history. Since in the pre-colonial era nothing was written down, it is often denominated ‘pre-history’ in university curricula. This label is usually accompanied by the general assumption that nothing is really worth studying, much less valued from that era. As a result most curricula start their history courses with the colonial era. In short, the ways of knowing discussed herein are systematically excluded from Ecuadorian Western-style universities that aspire to be accredited according to international standards.

The same disdain is encountered in public policy and budget allocations (another reflection of the education system that feeds these institutions). The local ‘Houses of Culture,’ for example, responsible for publishing works about cultural patrimony receive minimal budgets, which keep publications from reaching beyond the provincial level. However, even if I had access to all of these local publishers, the total amount of text produced among these populations is still much smaller in relation to population size than in more Western-style populations. In this case I sense that the orientation to time corresponding with the robust monism of Andean philosophy does not encourage esteeming writing or reading as activities central to life. Even though writing and consequently reading take place in the present tense, they are not directed at the present tense. Rather, writing for academic purposes is normally seen as an attempt to hold onto the past for future readers, indicating a linear orientation to time reflected in an ontology of separation. It is a cumulative venture. Writing/reading efforts build on past efforts in the hope that someone in the future will be able to put it all together.

36 In the case of the International Studies program in which I teach, a systematic devaluing of that which comes from before the arrival of the Spanish actually precludes students—of whom several are potential future diplomats—from being aware of, much less valuing, the historical and cultural heritage that they represent to the world.
Given the very present-tense time orientation embraced within an ontology of complete interconnectedness, an increased amount of writing published in the Houses of Culture would indicate greater cultural assimilation. In fact, what one often finds is that those who do write by having been trained in academic writing style usually have assimilated quite a bit of the culture that accompanies the training. It is not surprising then to find that, as people take on the practice of writing and publishing for academic purposes, what they produce is more in line with Western-style understandings of ‘science.’ Moreover, since in formal training very little time is dedicated to comparing and contrasting various approaches in ontological philosophy, the writing that reflects successful cultural assimilation is usually steeped in ontological confusion.

The oral tradition in contrast reflects the temporal-spatial focus of complete interconnectedness. It is always anchored to the current context at hand and involves a conscientious impromptu re-calling out of the background of shared resources for their re-application right here and right now. This is why the key elements of the Andean culture are still primarily transmitted through oral communication and social and family practices (Lajo 2003, 135).

Wisdom from this perspective is understood to derive from sources that require a deeply present-tense focus. This point helps explain how many sources for the discussion that follows were simply experienced in daily life, in daily interaction and not encountered in written texts. The learnings that are derived from this present-tense-oriented process nevertheless have some uncomfortable implications for academic composition. For example, when the sources of wisdom themselves are not books or peer-reviewed articles but rather clouds, hawks, changes in plant behavior or cosmic alignments, iconography from the past, etc.—though ‘empirical’—they do not lend themselves to proper citation in Turabian style or to being included in the References
List at the end of one’s book. Nor do they facilitate the academic practice of garnering legitimacy by citing high-profile or classic scholars. The general lack of resulting literature attests to this.\textsuperscript{37} After my experiences, however, I am convinced that this is just this kind of contrast needed to show how a different philosophical ontological lens may privilege a different conceptualization of knowledge and therefore different corresponding activities. This point is discussed more fully in the text below.

\textit{My Constitution as Researcher}

Finally my constitution as a ‘privileged’ outsider,\textsuperscript{38} as a gringa, has clearly affected my research in a variety of ways.\textsuperscript{39} My first challenge has been to grasp many of the high-context subtleties of this culture. High-context cultures for Hall (1977) are those “in which people are deeply involved with each other and … in which information is widely shared.” In these cultures, he states, “simple messages with deep meaning flow freely.” Low-context cultures, in contrast, are “highly individualized, somewhat alienated [and] fragmented…in which there is relatively little involvement with people” (39). Because low-context cultures typically have heterogeneous populations,\textsuperscript{40} messages are more explicitly articulated using many more words. In this case, the United States tends to be low context and Ecuador at the very opposite end of the continuum. So in addition to the difficulty of translating cultural contrasts in general, my own

\textsuperscript{37} That the very principles of this ontological orientation result in a general disinterest in reading and writing may very well be the reason why this philosophical tradition is not considered to be a “real” philosophy according to Western-style standards.

\textsuperscript{38} The outsiders that are not of Western-European descent (at least visually) do not receive the same “privileged” treatment. As a general rule of thumb, the lighter one’s skin and hair color, the better the treatment one receives in this society thanks to the colonial legacy.

\textsuperscript{39} Despite the derogatory “taste” of this term due to the historical context out of which it arose in Mexico (Green Go!), up to this point in Ecuador I have felt comfortable with the way in which my Ecuadorian compañeros point out the fact that I am obviously a foreigner in that context.

\textsuperscript{40} See Tönnies (1937, 1998).
cultural lack of practice of ‘reading between the lines’ on everything makes grasping the subtleties implicitly communicated in Ecuadorian culture even more of a challenge.

Cross-cultural immersion throws one into the slow, arduous process of learning to interact ‘successfully,’ which requires grasping what the ‘Other’ is trying to convey and being able to respond according to the shared rules of conduct and discourse. While it is impossible to ever ‘get’ a message in the way that another is trying to relay it, it is still possible, after hearing similar messages from different people in a variety of circumstances, to finally ‘get’ what people have been talking about or ‘get’ the cultural value or logic sufficiently to appreciate the message and to become aware of the difference in social expectations for behavior. One typical cross-cultural encounter illustrates this idea well.

Several ingredients that come into play in the following scenario derive from what I call the chuchaki colonial, or the colonial hangover. Continually reproduced features of this hangover include believing that anything that comes from the outside of Ecuador is better than what is already here, maintaining a hierarchical, top-down society, and discouraging the open expression of feelings.41 These important considerations add to the complexity of the encounter that follows.

Cuenca, Ecuador is still a very ‘colonial’ town. In this context, how one hands anything over to another person is of tremendous significance. A proper handover involves putting the requested or expected object directly into the hands of the recipient. It is not necessary to use two hands like in Japan, but a courteous demeanor and deliberate passing into the hands, not dropping or placing the thing onto the table or counter, constitute the norm.

---

41 Incan expansion involved a similar imposition of a hierarchical order, which would have already started to prepare the ground for in this area they only existed for the arrival of the Spanish 40-60 years later.
When a handover does not demonstrate sufficient respect and consideration in a post-colonial hierarchical context, it usually elicits all kinds of collectively shared memories whereby the person receiving the brunt of such disrespect is psychologically likened—or psychologically likens herself—to the status of ‘Indian’ or ‘slave.’ It is a psychological ‘jab’ that reminds her of her mixed (and therefore ‘inferior’) status. Due to the amount of significance read into the gesture and the sensations and emotions conjured by such an act, the strategy used to hand something over is usually thoughtfully contemplated in this context. Certainly an Ecuadorian does not have to necessarily ‘think’ about executing a proper handover much. The cultural training is already geared toward not eliciting the emotional response described above. Nevertheless, they are much more aware of the potential of that response, because they too come out of this shared background.

In the United States, in contrast, the gesture of handing something over is not so highly packed with communicational significance. In a mostly horizontal, democratic and low-context society, a simple handover is not emotionally charged (unless of course it occurs during an already charged moment). Indicative of the difference between low-context and high-context cultures, people of a low-context culture are not programmed to think about how that gesture might be perceived in a ‘regular everyday’ interaction, because it is not ‘read into’ in the same way. Instead, one does it without expending much energy thinking about it—whether it be a toss of the keys to a friend, putting money or charge card down on the counter at the store, or even in a classroom giving the number of copies needed for the students in a particular row to the first student so that she may take one and pass the others back.

So if a foreigner from the US in Cuenca places the money on the tray for the cashier to pick up without handing it respectfully into her hands directly, the gesture conveys a terrible and
perceived-to-be-intentional insult.\textsuperscript{42} (Tossing something to anyone is much worse: It can be enough to elicit a cultural heart attack!) Because it is such a serious sign of disrespect, the offended person will usually expend energy fuming over the inappropriate hand-over, yet here comes into play another feature of the \textit{chuchaki colonial}: that of not being able to openly express one’s sentiments. Ironically the same high-context aspect of the culture that packs more meaning into a single non-verbal gesture also keeps the shock, disdain and overall anger from being expressed openly back at the perpetrator. Usually this ‘dislike’ is expressed through even less direct, more non-verbal and subtler cues, which, if the perpetrator is coming from a low-context culture and is ignorant of the implications of his act, will usually go unnoticed. Particularly in a more ‘public’ relationship of consumer-cashier, it is highly unlikely that the perpetrator will even detect a problem in the first place.

Now, the third dimension of the \textit{chuchaki colonial}—the belief that anything that comes from the outside must be better than what is found in Ecuador—plays two potential roles. In a first instance, the foreigner, while still eliciting a psycho-cultural knee-jerk reaction on behalf of the offended person, will most often receive an overly friendly, accommodating response in return. This compounds the issue by detracting even further one’s potential for detecting a problem. Then, when this sign of disrespect gets associated with an outsider that is ‘revered’ due to the colonial hangover, the impact of the culturally shared message that gets triggered of ‘not being enough’ or of deserving of such disrespectful behavior as generated through the colonial encounter can potentially have greater weight. A more effusive friendly response to this gesture would to me indicate—after several years of watching these interactions—that either the ‘message’ is being received more seriously in terms of historical cultural programming or that

\textsuperscript{42} The store clerk may be a difficult example, because they fall much further down on the social hierarchical ladder. Nevertheless, one can still sense a reaction from the cashier in this very case when one “forgets” and hands the money over “thoughtlessly.”
the foreigner’s behavior is even more egregious than what is expected and the person is trying in
the most socially appropriate way possible to nudge the perpetrator on his way.\textsuperscript{43}

As shown here, simply identifying that there is a problem is difficult enough. The next
level—deciphering the cultural logics that generate the clash—has been a central preoccupation
of mine as researcher. This step has required becoming aware of the scaffolding that represents
my own cultural programming in addition to that of the Ecuadorian/Andean culture(s). The real
challenge for me however has been, as in this case, to ‘naturalize’ very foreign behaviors so that
I am not constantly setting off cultural alarms. One thing I have certainly realized is that things
are handed over much more often than what is normally perceived!

These considerations are further compounded by my size and strong personality.
Especially as a woman, these characteristics are rather overwhelming in a culture that
emphasizes humility, limited emotional expression, and respect for or fear of what others might
say of one’s actions.\textsuperscript{44} While many would normally become reticent with me for these reasons, I
have been fortunate to find people willing to be frank with me, walk with me and explain things
to me in a more direct fashion.

These are just a few instances of the kinds of challenges faced when immersed in another
cultural context in general and when moving from a low-context to a high-context culture
specifically. This kind of interaction has made me keenly aware of how my presence affects
others’ responses and gives me an idea of all that of which I am completely ignorant. Of course I

\textsuperscript{43} The recently huge influx of US retirees in Cuenca, Ecuador—thanks to a 2009 award from International Living
for “best foreign town in which to retire”—is intensifying this dynamic, particularly given a general lack of Spanish
skills let alone cross-cultural communication skills among the immigrants. I am curious as to how long and how far
the emotional response will continue to be publicly repressed and how the frustrations will be expressed in the
future.

\textsuperscript{44} I often admire Ecuadorian women’s ability to cook up a huge several-course meal, graciously receive guests,
serve them something to drink with a cordial smile while pulling things out of the oven or stirring whatever is
cooking on the stove, and then at the end of all that work say “Please forgive me” as the guests are saying their
good-byes.
will never be able to know to what extent my ‘privileged’ position as white outsider has
influenced that to which I have been exposed simply because I will never be able to get out of
this body, status or cultural background.

With so many challenges, one may wonder about what this kind of research has to offer.
This very constellation of circumstances, my long-term engagement with it, and the awareness
that has come from it can be very telling of the differences in logics that produce the respective,
 contrasting cultural fruits. For example, the extreme cultural contrast extant in Cuenca has
helped me identify much more quickly and easily that which is different from what I know. This
in turn allows me to inquire about these social practices, beliefs, values, history, etc. on a daily
basis, and the identified responses then lead me on to other questions.

So in the case of the handover, for example, my presence and ‘ignorant’ behaviors
generated enough friction for me to realize that this was something about which I needed to
inquire and remedy if I wanted to engage smoother daily interaction. Like most aspects of
 culture, people can tell you what they feel—pain, surprise, disappointment, etc.—when they
encounter a particular phenomenon, but they cannot tell you why they feel that way. Yet,
because I do not belong, people are willing to explore aspects of their society in ways that they
would not have to or want to with other members. Being able to open a more explicit (low-
context) dialogue has created a very fruitful space for interaction once trust is established that
has allowed for further debate, exploration, discussion of observations like the one described
above. Quite simply the very ‘foreign-ness’ of this time-spacescape provides the contrast I need
to make my argument.45

Despite the concerns listed above, we can tease out, as is done below, certain pillars of a
philosophical orientation, a way of life based on an ontology of complete interconnectedness.

45 This final benefit is what makes conceptual translation so much more difficult.
Since the purpose here is to provide an ideal-typical characterization of a cultural logic and its products for contrast, this ideal-type does not have to be a ‘perfect’ rendition of this philosophy (Weber 1949). It must however be ontologically consistent and coherent enough to provide a glimpse of just how robust a monistic philosophical ontology can be. Only in this way will I be able to demonstrate the reductionist effects of the ontology of separation and show how even the monistic approaches found within Western science still reflect that intellectual inheritance. The best part about this contrast is that it allows us to see what gets lost in a truncated version of monism within the Western-style academic time-spacescape, identify the limitations and costs of such approaches, and contemplate its implications for ‘knowledge production.’

For the more systematic portrayal of the principles of Andean philosophy that follows, in addition to findings from my field research, I rely heavily on the few sources that exist on this philosophy which primarily come from Peru or from foreigners that have focused on that area due to the prominence of the Incan legacy. I primarily use the works of Lajo (2003), Rengifo (1998a and 1998b) and Grillo (1998a and 1998b), not because they are specialists in Incan philosophy, but because they effectively and clearly describe the primary principles of Andean philosophy and show how these are different from what is normally understood in the Western-style world. More importantly, these authors ‘get’ the wisdom being proffered from this perspective such that they remain ontologically consistent in their discussions, which is difficult to find given the prevalence of ontological dualism within the academic realm today. For these reasons these authors offer the basis of an ideal-typical construction of a time-spacescape against

---

46 I have nevertheless tried to be as accurate as possible regarding the senses portrayed through readings and encounters, which has been critical for coming to an understanding of how a cultural logic and its corresponding “products” (practices, discourses, values, etc.) are related to a generally shared philosophical ontology.

which to contrast not only the Western-style academic time-spacescape but also the monistic approaches found therein within the field of IR.

With these considerations in mind, I proceed to the systematic review of the features that characterize an ontology of complete interconnectedness in the Andean context. The specific principles to be covered include parity, pacha (time-space), ayllu (the social dimension of time-space), wata (specific life cycles) and the information sensing and processing system before finishing the section with the overall purpose of this set of features: dynamic balance. The rationale for including these particular principles is described next.
PART II

THE FRUITS OF AN ONTOLOGY OF COMPLETE INTERCONNECTEDNESS:
KEY PRINCIPLES OF ANDEAN PHILOSOPHY

The surprise and challenge that I sensed when experiencing the anecdotes above came from the contrast between the ontological filter I had been using to interpret my world and the more robust orientation that was being shown to me. Through my interactions with beings who embraced a much more robust form of monism than myself, what became extremely clear was how completely different the conceptualizations of commonly observed phenomena could be based on the given ontological orientation. To give a sufficient glimpse of this contrast and of how even a small ontological shift can open up a completely different cosmos, Part II of this dissertation develops the main features of Andean philosophy more fully as the fruits of a robustly monistic philosophical ontological orientation.

Another, perhaps more important, lesson from these interactions though has been how dangerous it is to assume ontological compatibility between the commonplaces of two different language-games used to describe an apparently similar phenomenon, as we saw above in the ‘simple’ case of water. This practice regularly happens in disciplines charged with exploring and explaining cultural differences as in the case of anthropology. The tricky part comes when the generally shared ontological orientations greatly responsible for shaping these cultural differences are not included in these explanations. As a result, concepts get re-translated through the ontological lens that helped constitute the interpreter’s particular culture, not the lens that constituted the exhibited cultural difference. This maneuver, be it conscious or unconscious, aware or unaware, has pretty severe ramifications especially when translating across incommensurate lenses. For this reason, in the sections that follow, I simultaneously aim to demonstrate how researchers who embrace a lens constituted by ontological dualism have
traditionally interpreted these concepts. Showing the ways in which the potential robustness of each concept is curtailed when (re-)interpreted through an ontologically dualist lens actually enables imagining the potential fullness of each concept from within an ontology of complete interconnectedness.

The ‘interpreters’ that use incommensurate lenses for this purpose are not limited to anthropologists however. Chroniclers and lexicographers from the conquest, missionaries, archaeologists, astronomers, regional specialists, tourists, diplomats, migrants, international businesspeople, and even Andeans themselves have also engaged in this type of filtering. Since my main concern for this dissertation is to link the insights provided here to the field of IR as an embedded part of the Western-style academic time-spacescape and the resulting implications of the predominantly shared ontological orientation for ‘knowledge production,’ I focus primarily on the particular trajectory of those who recount the conquest to those who study these accounts in the Western-style academic time-spacescape (as opposed, say, to examining how this has occurred through the globalization of business practices, the impact of migrants returning to their homeland or even the implementation of internationally funded development projects). The chroniclers were a critical generation of ‘outsiders’ because they inscribed their re-interpretations, which set the stage for the next round of re-interpretation in academic study of the region. For this reason, most of my evidence of the re-interpretations originates in the chronicles and in academic texts that generally reflect ontological individualism as the interpretive lens.

It is important to underline that Andean philosophy is just one of the many ways in which a predominantly shared ontology of complete interconnectedness can be manifested and that no single Andean philosophy exists. Nevertheless their shared ontological lens gives rise to
similarly shaped features, since the general assumptions that characterize an ontology of complete interconnectedness act as transversal themes informing the principles of an ideal-typical Andean philosophy. Still the particularities of each version however are contingent on the historical trajectory of interactions in a particular temporal-spatial context.

In Part II I review some of these transversal themes as a general basis that informs the particular principles of Andean philosophy to help us see how the concepts become reduced through a re-interpretive lens. Among all forms of monism the initial point of departure of no separation is generally accepted. However, the degree or breadth of interconnectedness may vary according to the particular variety of monism. In robust monism, for instance, interconnection is complete; no separation exists at any level such that time-spacescapes reflecting this approach do not differentiate among the cultural, natural and spiritual worlds in the cosmos.

Because all forms of monism privilege the relation, they do not conceive of the related elements as a priori categories but instead focus on the co-constitutive process of interaction, privileging the generative nature of the relation. Each element is constituted through relation with the ‘Other’ in the emerging present moment making the present the particular timeframe of focus. Here we jointly act and co-create. Here, we can sense what is being afforded through the already constituted (past) context. Then, as we act, this joint action (re-)informs the shared background of the time-spacescape in which the related elements are interacting and as such gives shape to future affordances.

The interrelated character of reality also gives rise to conceptualizing it in network terms. For some, as in the case of Foucault, that which holds the network together are power relations,

---

48 Even though it takes us until Chapter 11 to review the distinctions between mind-world monism and robust monism, their differences in breadth begin to become apparent here.
but this limits the conceptualization of the network to the human-only sphere. For those embracing robust monism, energy is what holds the network together.\(^49\) When the energy constituting the relations takes ontological primacy, as seen in the anecdotes above, other transversal assumptions emerge in robust monism over more limited understandings of monism. I summarize them here despite their continual reference in the anecdotes above, since they afford the space in which the Andean philosophical principles reviewed below emerge.

The first cross-cutting assumption of robust monism is that all is alive. Because all that is alive vibrates through the energy in the interaction between space and matter, the spectrum of beings recognized as interconnected ‘Other’ is extremely broad. Furthermore, the principles surrounding and expressed through the interaction between space and particles are ‘multidimensional’ or ‘multiscalar’: that is, they span from being applicable to a single human cell or between the atoms found in rocks all the way out into furthest imaginable galaxy.\(^50\) It follows then that all alive, interconnected beings are also equivalent in that they share these attributes as living beings. This makes it possible for all to be in communication and for the range of what is considered to be detectable to go beyond conventional limits assumed within the Western-style time-spacescape.

Building on these precepts that emerge out of an ontology of complete interconnectedness, the principles of Andean philosophy reviewed below proffer a window into a robustly monistic cosmos. Parity, or the balanced pair of complementary opposites, is the first pillar of the Andean cosmovision. It embodies the notion of ‘two-in-one relation’ in a very robust sense. Elaborating on this feature requires extra clarification due to terminological

\(^{49}\) Foucault’s work has the potential for robustness, because it could easily be re-read in energetic terms, but he was wholly focused on the anthropocentric sphere.

\(^{50}\) The multidimensional nature of these principles means that they can be applied to beings as well as to activities or tendencies. This is explored below.
confusion that has led to and/or reflects ontological confusion. So in addition to developing this feature and then showing how it is reduced through an interpretive lens of ontological individualism, this chapter unpacks the general assumptions made in each ontological orientation and their corresponding conceptual and practical fruits. Step by step, I show how each orientation arrives at the particular conceptualization it engenders. This process serves as a basic ontological mapping and lexicon that is useful for exploring the remaining features of Andean philosophy as well as the fruits of the ontology of separation covered in Part III.

The second half of the parity chapter explores the sacred Andean parity-based relation between the masculine and feminine principles to flesh out this idea. This relation is described before examining media that symbolize this parity-based relation that give a glimpse of the robust sphere that this concept could inhabit through complete interconnectedness. The depiction of its potential fullness is then followed by an analysis of what happens when an ontologically individualistic lens is applied to (re-)interpret this concept.

Another parity-based relation constitutes the second Andean concept: *pacha* the time-space conjunction as a single notion. In this case I start with the reduced version of *pacha* as interpreted through ontological separation and then chip away at the enclosures to demonstrate the potential fullness of this concept from the perspective of robust monism. This principle is particularly insightful in terms of how a language-game is indicative of a shared ontological orientation to the world/cosmos and how even the act of translating terms out of their embeddedness in a time-spacescape risks ontological slippage, particularly when commensurability is not considered or the respective ontological orientations are not made explicit. Complemented by Lajo’s (2003) explanation of the cosmic dynamic or movement of time through space developed here, the principles involved in the *pacha* concept are particularly
critical for our understanding of the ‘logical’ insistence of complete interconnectedness on balance.

A third principle of Andean philosophy is the social dimension of the *pacha*: the *ayllu*. In that chapter I start with the broadest sense of this term by looking at how it emerges out of the always-emergent-yet-anchored character of interconnectedness. Relying on Rengifo’s (1998a) explanation of the cosmic, natural and human elements of the *ayllu*, we explore how these interrelated constituent parts comprise the more robust ‘social’ dimension of this deeply monistic time-spacescape. Then I analyze an instance of how this concept is explained in the literature to illustrate how reductionism works for this principle. This journey is particularly insightful since it shows how several of the robust dimensions of this concept may be grasped from a lens based on the ontology of separation without ‘getting’ the underlying logic. When this happens, the depiction reads like a mystery story of isolated clues with no logic that provides the integrative glue that allows them to all make sense and ‘hang’ together.

Another severely reduced term when translated into a language based on ontological individualism, *wata*, the fourth dimension, elaborates on the cyclical aspect of *pacha* in conjunction with the *ayllu*. This highly specific understanding of the life cycle helps us to appreciate the complexity available in the emergent present moment by placing ontological attention on the configuration of all life cycles in their respective points of development that converge on this accessible point. The deeply emergent focus that affords this concept also has radical implications for how the past and future are conceptualized, which are also reviewed in this chapter. Additionally, when cyclical—instead of linear—time is taken into account in conjunction with the points already made, we are better able to discern the subtle differences created in how we conceive of knowledge/knowing.
Differences in the status of knowledge/knowing that emerge from the respective ontological lenses also require taking a step back to explore how information is understood to be sensed and processed. The next chapter reviews the approach used in the Andean cosmovision as the fifth element of this philosophical orientation. Arising from very different presuppositions about our hook-up to the cosmos, this more holistic multichannel approach to sensing and processing information rests on an extremely broad definition of ‘detectable.’ This section elaborates on how such a system functions and the corresponding differences in terms of what is considered detectable.

The final chapter of Part II builds on all of the previous principles to explore the centerpiece of Andean philosophy: synchronizing, harmonizing or dynamic balance. I first establish how the ontological leaps of faith linked to complete interconnectedness and the specific principles of the Andean time-spacescape afforded through this lens lead to this overall drive. Then, the first of this chapter’s four main sections explores the primary means through which this harmonizing takes place: the ‘wider’ conversation. The distinct purpose and mechanics of this more robust, energy-based conversation are elaborated and contrasted to language-based, human-centered communication. Then we center on the three ‘moments’ in the wider conversation—(a) listening/reading the signs, (b) following as a specific approach to responding, and (c) speaking/co-creating with greater awareness—as integral elements of the parity-based cycle of ayni. This cycle, normally viewed as comprising the phases of mutual nurturing and mutual following, is another way of addressing the wider conversation as the means for engaging in dynamic balance.

The second section of this chapter examines how the parity-based cycle of balance and imbalance generates the necessary friction to encourage integration and alignment. In this
section I employ the cycle of well-being and illness (of sumak kawsay and llaki kawsay) as a way of illustrating how people relate to these balance-imbalance cycles as co-creative participants and how these co-creations are imbricated in the relations in which the person is immersed. The third section then turns to the energetic stagnation that results from unattended imbalance and the corresponding Andean strategy for disrupting it. Given that all is co-creation, tinkuy may be practiced on any form of energetic stagnation be it ‘personal’ or ‘collective’ in nature. This final component clarifies how the whole process of harmonizing is conceived as a primordial thrust within this philosophy as well as providing critical concepts for understanding the subsequent illustration of reductionism. I wrap this chapter up with a short analysis of a text that portrays, from the perspective of ontological separation, the Incan practice of Capac Hucha, a form of ‘human sacrifice.’ The text is extremely insightful because it shows what happens when the overall logic of complete interconnectedness is not assumed when attempting to interpret the fruits it bears. The prior development of the robust character of the preceding features allows us to see vividly the incommensurability of these two ontological lenses and the reductionism that necessarily takes place when we employ an ontological lens of separation.
CHAPTER 4

JUK AS A PARITY-BASED RELATION OF COMPLEMENTARY OPPOSITES

The ontology of complete interconnectedness from the Andean perspective assumes two complementary leaps of faith: relation is inescapable and our componential nature precludes us from ever becoming ‘complete’ as separate entities. The inescapability of relation is the primary premise of a monistic view of our hook-up to the cosmos, and when an ontological orientation begins with the relation, it is impossible to contemplate any element ‘by itself.’ We cannot know existence outside of relation. Evidence for our ‘incomplete’ character is seen in our reliance on plants and animals for food, on rivers, lakes and basins for freshwater, and on trees for oxygen. ‘Incompleteness’ is also highlighted in the common biological requirement for a union between the male and female sexes to procreate and through the amazing intricacy of ecosystems throughout the world. This condition is also experienced at the level of identity: We cannot know who we are without being in relation to all that comes across our paths. The interconnected and incomplete character of all makes all beings interdependent.

This ‘incomplete’ state is ‘overcome’ the most through the parity principle between complementary opposites, as illustrated through the examples of masculine/feminine, down/up, yes/no, bad/good, strong/weak, flood/drought, night/day, hot/cold, pull/push, assert/acquiesce, integrate/separate, and enter/exit. In fact, complementary contrast in parity is the most effective

51 “Juk” is the Peruvian derivation of the term ‘one.’ In Ecuador, “shuk” is used. However, to remain ‘true’ to the original source (Lajo 2003), I have elected to continue using juk. In the case of this dissertation, I am trying more to get at the principles than at the exact expression in Quichua/Quechua. In this sense this is a similar approach as the shaman who uses his or her particular techniques based on the same energetic principles. The techniques and the ways of describing them may be different, but the principles themselves hold.

52 I use this term as a way to describe the ever-emergent nature of the two components of any relation in one word. Nevertheless, as we will see by the end of the dissertation, we can never be ‘incomplete’ either because that automatically construes the possibility of something ‘complete’ on some plane of existence. I continue to use the term for now however to establish the difference in ontological conceptualizations between the two lenses. I also refer to this ontological shift as being one of focusing on the componential aspect of the relation or insisting on the categorical as given.
channel for “completing the circle” according to this philosophical tradition. What this implies however is a focus, not on how each element can become complete, but on how the relation can become fully “one” or whole through its two related components.

In fact, the notion of parity is so central that everything in the Andean world according to this philosophical tradition is “sexed” so as to reflect a complementary whole. Rengifo (1998a) describes this state:

In the Andes it is not conceivable that any of its members can be asexual; all are sexed since all renew themselves. There are male rains and female rains...; male and female mountains; male and female plants; male and female starts; there is male water and female water and the child is the product of a heterosexual relation between persons of the same species (100).

In this way, paired opposites represent potential wholeness through interconnectedness and complementariness. Furthermore, because the momentary ‘completion’ through a complementary pair is life-giving and life-generating, parity is a highly valued principle from this perspective.

In addition to incompleteness and complementariness, parity also emphasizes the equivalent nature of the related elements. For example, in any parity-based relation, such as expansion/contraction, left/right, in/out, dark/light, each element can only be conceived of in relation to the other. In this sense neither component is more or less than the other because each one is absolutely critical to both elements’ existence.

Equivalency is also expressed in another way in the concept of parity: through the proportional balance fostered between the related elements. Seeing the relation first in an ontological sense emphasizes the emergent aspect of co-constitution, which encourages a focus on always tending the relation in the present moment. For parity, this requires nurturing an emergent balance between the respective elements. Proportionalization in Andean philosophy
according to Lajo (2003) is an activity that corresponds to parity and focuses on engendering a dynamically balanced state between complementary opposites.

In this way the parity principle conjures the image of a metaphorical barbell, whereby the bar represents the relation between the weights on either side. While foregrounding the link between the weights, the barbell concept more importantly reminds us that we cannot put too much weight on either side over the other. Otherwise, as one side is reinforced and the other remains relatively lighter, the barbell will stand straight up going completely out of balance and creating risk of injury. Since the weightiness of this metaphor detracts somewhat from the emergent, dynamic aspect of this principle, it would have to be a barbell whose weights were extremely light or in constant movement.

As seen in the chapter’s introduction, happening upon complementary opposites in the world does not necessarily mean that ‘parity’ always be the corresponding interpretation of this situation. How these commonly apprehended phenomena are understood and labeled depends upon the ontological lens being used to perceive them. For example, in disciplines that contribute to knowledge on the Andean region such as anthropology and archaeology in Western-style academia, these paired opposites are most often referred to as “dualisms” and not “parity-based relations.” This conceptualization, based primarily on an ontological lens of separation, houses a completely different set of possible assumptions, conceptions and outcomes.

Because this particular aspect gives rise to confusion in terminology and concepts that affects the entire dissertation, I first address how the differences in the interpretation of paired opposites reflect distinct predominantly shared ontological orientations. To show this I first map the two ontological orientations and delineate how they lead to dualism and parity as their respective fruits. This initial clarification is essential for both of this dissertation’s primary tasks.
First, through the ontological mapping that accompanies the clarification, we can more effectively contrast the ideal-typical time-spacescapes that reflect distinct (and incommensurate) philosophical ontological orientations. Then, the more explicitly defined lexicon that emerges from this section provides the basis for analyzing how the monistic approaches are enframed within IR.

Then I explore how the fruit of one lens can be interpreted through another lens, examining how terminological compatibility is inappropriately assumed when using ‘dualism’ to describe ‘parity-based relations.’ From there I discuss what results—both in terms of filtering/interpretation and of assimilation—from assuming compatibility and applying an ontologically dualistic lens to a concept based on complete interconnectedness from another time-spacescape. Here we consider how this form of epistemic reductionism necessarily curtails the more comprehensive potential of the concept or phenomenon that is being (re-)interpreted and how easy it is to assimilate the new logic within a time-spacescape based primarily on complete interconnectedness once this reductionism takes place. I end this section by clarifying the terms that I will use to indicate the respective ontological orientations and the time-spacescapes that they engender when commonly shared.

Relying on the conceptual work elaborated in the first half of this chapter, the final part aims to illustrate first the robust character of parity-based relations as a fruit of an ontology of complete interconnectedness and then how it becomes so reduced through an interpretive lens of separation that it is no longer recognizable as parity. For this task, I concentrate on the respective elements of the most sacred parity-based relation in the Andean cosmovision and their illustration through different media. Then I show how this particular relation’s depiction through
a classic chronicle reveals the extent to which such robustness becomes reduced to give a sense of how epistemic violence has taken place for this concept.

**Interpretive Lenses**

To illustrate the predicament created when robust concepts such as parity representing the fruits of an ontology of complete interconnectedness are filtered through an interpretive lens based on the ontology of separation, I have intentionally selected an example that is not outstanding. Rather it is a regularly encountered strategy for describing these complementary opposites emphasized in various native cultures. In his interpretation of a well-known depiction of Andean cosmogony, archaeoastronomer Anthony Aveni (1997) highlights the following: “A page from a manuscript, produced shortly after the conquest by the chronicler Joan Santa Cruz Pachacuti Yamqui…dramatizes two basic structural principles of Inca cosmology: dualism and vertical hierarchy, both of which persist today and figure prominently in Inca alignment schemes” (151). He continues on with an observation about dualism: “That all things should come in twos is not an idea unique to the Inca worldview. Day and night, winter and summer, male and female—these are a few of the entities we all experience that give rise to the idea that order in the world consists of paired opposites” (151-152). This particular discussion and the remainder of his text—while acknowledging the relevance of paired opposites for ‘ordering the world’—do not explain how this is the case and never indicate the role of the relationship between the two, much less point to how they constitute a complete whole.

These absences reflect the central issue of using ontological individualism to interpret paired opposites: reductionism. A significant portion of the robust concept of parity described

---

53 Similar uses of this strategy can be found in Isbell (2008), Silverblatt (1987) and pioneering work by John Murra in the field of Andeanist studies.
above and all of its rationale are lost through this interpretive lens. They are no longer mentioned because they no longer figure ontologically within the conceptualization of dualism.

The issue here is that dualism, duality and parity all refer to complementary opposites, which actually gives the impression that they are compatible and interchangeable terms. The “taste” of these commonplaces however reflects distinct ontological traditions. For instance, parity, which arises out of an ontology of complete interconnectedness, starts with the co-constitutive, inescapable relation between two. Duality and dualism, due to a taste ensconced in ontological individualism, initiate with two “existentially autonomous” phenomena that just happen to have a closer relation than with other phenomena.

Not explicitly articulating the applied ontological lens exacerbates the problem by glossing over it, making it impossible to discuss the issues that arise from applying an incommensurate lens. This fairly common omission is encountered throughout the literature on Andean studies, which spans the disciplines of anthropology, sociology, archaeology and astronomy. The lack of practice of explicitly articulating one’s applied orientation reproduces the primary ontological orientation embraced in the culture, education or training related to those fields, which happens to be completely incommensurate with the Andean version of complete interconnectedness.

Patrick Jackson (2011) has observed that philosophical ontology is least often addressed within those schools of thought or methodological orientations that already reflect the predominant approach to knowledge production. Today, this approach tends to be dualism (ontological individualism) across the disciplinary board. Even though Jackson’s statement appears within the context of International Relations, his point is valid for most disciplines that attempt to emulate the standards of “Western-style science.”

54 See his second chapter for the development of this point.
Eschewing discussion of the adopted philosophical ontology may make a lot of sense in terms of communicative efficiency, but presuming the predominant ontological orientation is a rather precarious venture particularly when interpreting the fruits of a time-spacescape that reflects a distinct ontological orientation. Because ontological individualism or dualism is so naturalized and assumed, it is rarely even taught in explicit terms. This absence regularly translates into an author’s lack of clarity on her own ontological stance and even less on the implications of that stance for knowledge production. The blind application and re-production of this lens can actually obfuscate more than guarantee “progress” in knowledge production.

Before reviewing in more detail how it is that ontological dualism makes us lose the totally tethered, relational, incomplete and emergent aspects so key to this Andean concept of parity, I first need to elaborate on the relationship between the “dualism” used above to describe paired opposites and the “dualism” of philosophical ontology as well as that between “parity” and the ontology of complete interconnectedness. To do so, I ontologically map out each lens to show how their particular logics lead to the respective terms of dualism and parity.

- Monism as philosophical ontology
- Ontology of complete interconnectedness
- Parity (two-in-one relation)

- Dualism as philosophical ontology
- Ontology of separation
- Ontological individualism
- Unitarism (one in separation)

The ontological orientation highlighted in the left-hand column foregrounds the relation. The column on the right gives ontological primacy to the unit in separation by conceiving of the world/cosmos as a divisible sphere. Confusion arises because parity, duality and dualism all
share a focus on “two” just like monism, individualism and unitarism focus on ‘one,’ and yet they are found in distinct columns due to the ontological orientation that undergirds their use.

Before engaging with the characteristics of each column, I must clarify that I am not attributing “essences” to either parity or dualism. Rather, I am referring to the imprinted traces of the ontological framework that remain from the embedded use of these terms in their respective time-spacescapes. While labels do not have essential meanings that distinguish them from others according to nominalist arguments, they do have what Shotter (1993b) refers to as a “taste” of past uses that limits the way in which they can be used to make sense to others. This “taste” in the case of parity and dualism corresponds with the respective ontological lenses used to interpret paired opposites. With this point in mind I proceed to describe the characteristics of each ontological orientation as well as trace their “logics” to their respective fruits.

Signaled in the right-hand column, ontological dualism starts with the existence of two separate worlds because the initial ontological leap of faith is that of separation, and any division always implies two sides. If one is separate, this expression only makes sense when indicating that thing, being, condition or phenomenon from which one is separate. This ontological orientation and its corresponding assumptions represent the more commonly encountered approach to understanding our hook-up to the cosmos today (which makes the discussion of complete interconnectedness so queerly tedious).

Using separation as an ontological point of departure sets off a series of actions and assumptions that reinforce the perceived separation. First, because the elements are seen as separate, they are also seen as existentially autonomous. This conceptualization facilitates attributing an essence to each distinct entity. When this happens, the assumed unbridgeable gap

---

55 Here is the context in which Shotter (1993b) talks about the taste of a term: “I would like…to raise questions about the degree to which speakers (authors) are limited in the degree of new sense they can make by the ‘taste’ of a word’s past usages, to raise questions, in particular, about its embedding in well-formed narrative traditions” (190).
and essential difference between it and anything or anyone else are reinforced. This maneuver also encourages seeing the elements as already constituted entities, which in turn leads to making a methodological maneuver of starting with these *a priori* categories as “real,” substantive, definable or enclosable.

When the word “dualism” is applied to the phenomenon of paired opposites, the assumed ontologically autonomous nature of the related components can be evidenced in their treatment as *a priori* categories. To treat a component as *a priori* is to assume that they have already been formed. So while the relation may be informative, curious, interesting, etc., it is not the (co-)constitutive *raison d’être* of each element. The relation is not the only means through which each element gains existential meaning as in the case of the ontology of complete interconnectedness. They already have this meaning before coming into relation.

Moreover, the pre-determined nature of the category gives it a “timeless” quality. Understood to be “complete,” it already existed in the past, is a given in the now, and will remain a fixed category in the future. In this way each element in a dualism or duality is a separate notion that just happens to be the opposite of another similarly ontologically autonomous element. So inside/outside, expansion/contraction, mind/emotions, etc. are not seen as critical, wholly tethered, interdependent complements but as existentially separate opposites.

By de-emphasizing the relation and emphasizing the ontologically independent nature of the complementary opposites, ontological dualism makes each element examinable in separation. This maneuver allows us to give singular attentive primacy to matter (as in the textbook’s definition of water limited to its particles above) to the exclusion of the space in which that matter is suspended and in denial of the co-constitutive relation between them. This is why, even though the term is called “dualism” in methodological discussions of philosophical ontology,
Lajo (2003) calls the resulting focus on one-in-separation “unitarism.” From Lajo’s Andean perspective, unitarism permits gazing at one thing without considering it in relation to something else, thereby reflecting and/or opening the space for mind-world dualism (137-149). This maneuver also allows the separable, independent concept of “one” to be aggregated and disaggregated with ease.

While dualism starts with two sides in separation that, through the very assumption of separation, lead to a focus on one element at a time, monism (listed in the left-hand column) takes a contrasting route. Monism starts with one space of no separation in which the relation takes ontological primacy. Since the “one” phenomenon is the relation, it actually houses two components at a minimum. From this perspective, individual components do not make sense without their complement.

This “simple” conceptualization houses both the expression of the incomplete character of each being/component and their completion through relation. This is the basis for the logic of parity. Conceiving of something or someone as incomplete necessarily requires having an idea of its contrary—becoming complete. Incomplete/complete, itself a parity-based relation, is cyclically resolved through relation. The parity principle also demands that attention be paid to the quality of that relation. Co-constitution can be most “complete” when engaged through complementary opposites thereby making parity-based relations the epitome of two-in-one relation.

The term *juk*, meaning “one” in Quechua, provides insight into this principle. As Rengifo (1998a) explains: “*Juk* in Quechua is not the exclusive number one of the decimal system; instead it is the way of referring to the couple: one with its complement(s)” (100). *Juk*, in this sense, refers to one relation between complementary elements and not to one element in

---

56 In Ecuador this term is understood as *shuk*. 
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separation or to two related elements that do not complement each other. When separate and even when together but not complementary, the parts do not fill out a “complete” space for mutual recognition/constitution. In this sense, the notion of parity “conditions” the two in relation, which rests on the initial leap of faith of the incomplete character of each being in the cosmos and its parity-based complement that provides “completedness.” We could say then that monism is actually “one” (relation) through (at least) “two” (components).

An important aspect of putting this much emphasis on the relation as the place where the components are in the constant process of being realized is that it necessarily changes the temporal focus to the time-space where the relation is actually engaged, that is, to the emergent present moment. Where ontologically privileging separation leads to the assumption of “timeless” a priori categories, making the relation the ontological centerpiece immediately redirects attention to the making and (re-)making of the components—be they concepts, things, beings or phenomena—through their co-creative mirroring in the dynamic emergent context.

This brief glimpse of how these logics play themselves out points to the confusing nature of the terms’ respective roots of ‘mono’ and ‘duo.’ Despite their very distinct ontological points of departure, dualism and monism are oddly similar in that they can both emphasize two elements. Initially one division must assume two separate sides and one relation must consist of two components. The method of arriving at ‘two’ though differentiates the terms. The two components of dualism are separated by an unbridgeable gap whereas monism’s two are entrenched in an inescapable relation.

The distinct paths for arriving at two imply very different outcomes for each logic. When tethered through inextricable relation, the two (or more) components conform a minimum basic

---

57 As we will see in Chapter 11, this conclusion of the need for parity is not reached within more truncated versions of monism, because it is predicated on robust relationality. The academic versions of monism cannot assume complete interconnectedness due to the parameters outlined for the production of knowledge.
building block: two-components-in-one-relation. When it is a separation that produces two sides, nothing holds the components of each side together at the ontological level. The assumed separation engenders a perception of existential autonomy, which leads to a focus on only one side, element or component – not even necessarily “at a time” as if in related sequential order.

Given how each ‘logic’ unfolds, the numerical connotation of each term is rather misleading. The singular connotation of monism is consistent only when addressing just the relation and not the components. However, since this orientation also requires paying attention to the elements and their proportional presence in the relation, the corresponding two (or more) components of that relation can render this term misleading. While ontologically privileging the relation, the singular connotation of monism does not convey the complexity implied by its basic building block. Dualism in turn has the opposite problem. Even though dualism starts with two sides of one separation, the resulting focus on one element in separation hardly conveys a sense of “two.”

Table 1. Feature analysis of two ontological lenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philosophical Ontology</th>
<th>Dualism</th>
<th>(Robust) Monism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Leap of Faith</strong></td>
<td>Separation, relation can only exist secondarily</td>
<td>Inescapable relation, interconnectedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of focus of initial leap</strong></td>
<td>1 separation → 2 spaces/ sides to separation</td>
<td>No separation = 1 space, 1 relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Through subsequent Assumptions</strong></td>
<td>Existential autonomy possible on each side</td>
<td>Incompleteness of the parts that constitute the relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resulting Number</strong></td>
<td>1 side at a time</td>
<td>2 components in 1 relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eventual outcome of logic</strong></td>
<td>Unitarism</td>
<td>Parity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Confusion arises then not only because of the numerical connotation of the terms but also through the ‘timing’ of the epistemological appearance of both ‘one’ and ‘two’ in the unfolding of each respective logic. The development of these logics is summarized in Table 1 above. Understanding these ontological lenses and their particular “logical” developments is critical for comprehending how, when generally shared, they give shape to the time-spacescape in which those who share it live and what happens when a lens from one time-spacescape is used to understand phenomena embedded in and arising out of another. Next I review some of the central features of these lenses before examining how it is that while “parity” and “dualism” seem to describe the same phenomenon of paired opposites, the ontological lenses that are presupposed in their respective “tastes” imply very different processes of perceiving, filtering, interpreting and engaging the phenomenon. I close this section with a discussion of how the reductionist aspect of ontological individualism affects the filtering and interpretative process and lends itself to generalized ontological slippage through assimilation before moving on to clarify the terms that I will use throughout this dissertation and why.

When the respective ontological orientations above are generally shared throughout a given population, their distinct starting points engender very different fruits (concepts, labels, practices, etc.). Both reflecting and characterizing the respective time-spacescapes out of which they arise, these fruits emerge specifically out of a historical moment in time and context that are infused with a whole web of socially shared rules and resources available from past interactions in that time-spacescape. A fruit gets its particular “taste” over time by being enmeshed in this interactive process. In Shotter’s (1993b) description of a term’s past uses, affordances and “taste,” he refers to Bakhtin whose words informed his idea:

All words have the ‘taste’ of a profession, a genre, a tendency, a party, a particular work, a particular person, a generation, an age group, the day, the hour. Each word tastes of the
context and contexts in which it has lived its socially charged life; all words and forms are populated by intentions (Bakhtin 1981, 293 qtd. in Shotter 1993b, 231).

Bakhtin’s observation makes it easier to conceive of the commonplaces “parity” and “dualism” (or anything else for that matter) as the fruits of a particular predominantly shared ontological orientation with a “taste” emerging from the contexts and intentions of the corresponding interactive process.

In addition to emerging out of these specific contexts, the use of these ontological lenses and their respective fruits feeds back into the particular shared background and as such shapes the future characterization of the time-spacescape and “taste” of the relevant fruits. In other words, the lens and its corresponding fruits are co-constitutive. They serve as already constituted shared filters for perceiving, understanding, interpreting and analyzing our world and their use re-constitutes them for interpreting future emergent moments.

Another characteristic of these lenses and their fruit is that they serve as completely “naturalized” filters as the appropriate way for taking in, processing and acting on what is perceived to be reality among the web of beings that uphold them, making their use and reproduction extremely smooth and almost imperceptible. These filters function similarly to the way in which Wittgenstein (1958) describes the rules of a language-game: We cannot get outside of them and we do not realize that they are even there.\(^58\) In §103 he posits, “You can never get outside it; you must always turn back. There is no outside; outside you cannot breathe.”—Where

---

\(^58\) I intentionally create a space for flexibility here between an ontological lens and the rules of a language-game. Wittgenstein’s description is extremely useful for “seeing” the connection between language-game rules and the generally shared ontological lens—which is critical for our understanding of the use of dualism and the use of parity-based relation in the playing out of a language-game. However in robust monism, our perceptive filters are based on energy, not language, and it is energy that feeds the characteristics of a language-game. In this sense, relationality is constituted through energy, not language, which means that human language is not the limits of our world. This point will be further developed in the following chapters.
does this idea come from? It is like a pair of glasses on our nose through which we see whatever we look at. It never occurs to us to take them off.”

Another key observation arising from the nominalist camp is that this pair of glasses, this set of rules, this filter built on ontological assumptions is completely arbitrary, but we give them consistency by constantly using them without questioning them, their status or their costs (or what Edward T. Hall calls “extension omissions”). Because this consistency—maintained among those who use similar features—allows for smoother interactions, we become incredibly invested in maintaining it. In fact, when anomalies or exceptions to the rules present themselves, they are normally ignored, explained away, denied, silenced or avoided as much as possible. So instead of arbitrariness, we “see” consistency through the constant re-constitution of a given commonplace, which is how its “taste” becomes so tenacious.

Because these ontological lenses are totally comprehensive as to the reality we perceive, it could also be said that no phenomenon is ever apprehended outside an entire meaning-making system based on its corresponding lens. In this sense too, no phenomenon is ever completely new or random, but instead arises out of a historical trajectory of uses, tastes, perceptive patterns, etc. Nonetheless while phenomena emerge out of the specificities of an emergent time-spacescape, the ontological filters used to interpret those phenomena may vary. Most often it is the same ontological lens that produced the fruit that is used to re-constitute the phenomenon. At
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59 An example of how these ontological rules operate would be to notice how few people in the Western-style time-spacescape question the usefulness of the “scientific method” or the desire for “improved quality of life.” That would be to engage in a matter of ontological philosophy. “Science” and the quality-of-life mantra both emerge as the fruits of applying the same ontological lens to reality. The overarching lens is so generalized and naturalized that very little at the ontological level is questioned, especially when most everyone is playing by the same rules. In making this point, Wittgenstein (1958) is also desperately attempting to get the dualistically programmed mind to realize that there simply is no outside. About one hundred aphorisms after the one cited in the text above, he writes about the “two sides” of the language-game or in this case the social fabric: “Language is a labyrinth of paths. You approach from one side and know your way about; you approach the same place from another side and no longer know your way about” (§203). This is because you cannot even get to the other side. Then as a critique of dualist philosophers, yet another hundred aphorisms later, he claims that they are trying to do the impossible: “What is your aim in philosophy?—To shew the fly the way out of the fly-bottle” (§309). Again, there is no “outside” to which we can arrive.
other times, however, persons may apply a distinct lens particularly if they come from another
time-spacescape based on another generally shared ontology. So for example, paired opposites
in a time-spacescape based on complete interconnectedness are understood as parity-based
relations, but those studying that time-spacescape’s culture who ontologically prioritize
separation often have re-interpreted them as dualisms. When this happens, the interpretive
ontological lens does not correspond and is even incommensurate with the ontological lens that
produced the focus on parity. In this sense, my concern is not about how two “random”
complementary opposites are labeled and filtered but about how the fruits of one ontological
orientation are interpreted through other lenses.

Let me be clear: I am not talking about cultural differences here, although that is how
they are often interpreted. Cultures feature a given set of practices, artifacts, shared
beliefs/values, etc., and these features result from how the shared ontological orientation
interacts with the particular emergent historical and contextual specificities among the members
of the group that embrace, affirm and pass on these features. Ontological lenses are prior to
cultural lenses. In this sense, several cultures can be based on a similarly shared ontological
lens. For example, many “aboriginal” cultures throughout the world from North and South
America, Central, South and Southeast Asia and Africa share an ontology of complete
interconnectedness despite very stark differences in language, culture and geographical location.
And throughout Europe one can witness a generally shared ontological lens of separation.

Historically the “settlers” or “colonizers” from Europe took this lens to “new”
destinations such as the Americas, Asia and Africa. In areas where the settler population was
significant (and/or where the indigenous population was much more aggressively obliterated)
such as in the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, the shared ontological lens of
separation remained strongly intact giving birth to fruits like Manifest Destiny. In other areas such as Central and South America, South Asia and Africa, the invaders had to engage more actively with those who held a lens of complete interconnectedness. While the differences in these interactions were considered to be cultural, the least reconcilable distinctions were ontological. Even though the resulting syncretic features afforded in each context today depend on the specific sequences of previous interactions and the particularities of the fruits of each time-spacescape, the reductionist impact of ontological individualism on the more integrated and integrative logic of complete interconnectedness is consistently witnessed. For this reason despite the fact that we still see interaction across time-spacescapes based on distinct predominantly shared ontological orientations today, the large majority of shared ontological lenses have integrated a significant degree of ontologically individualistic patterns. (Those readily observed in the Andean context are reviewed under assimilation below.)

The difference between culture and ontology become clearer by examining the academic disciplines of anthropology and archaeology (and in part sociology). These disciplines identify culture and/or its features as their general raison d’être. Cultural behaviors and differences are their central assumption and constitute the principle focus of study. However, because these fields of study arise within the Western-style academic time-spacescape—as we will see in Part III—the basis for their emergence as “disciplines” is anchored in ontological individualism. Moreover, this very ontological lens has historically provided the predominant methodological approaches used within these disciplines. Only recently in the last four decades or so have these methodological approaches been questioned. Yet the traditional approaches remain
predominant. Even among those questioning the ontological underpinnings of the applied methodologies, contemplation of how the studied cultural features of the ‘Other’ are also fruits of a predominantly shared ontological lens is not centrally discussed or incorporated into research programs. In other words, while seeing, feeling, studying, and discussing cultural differences are the primary academic activities especially for anthropology, acknowledgment of the ontological lens embraced by the interpreter is still only incipient and consideration of the generally shared ontological lens that bore the observed and interpreted fruit is almost nonexistent.

Discussion of the fruits of a predominantly shared ontology does not appear in the Western-style academic time-spacescape primarily because ontology is typically addressed as an individual thing within it. This conceptualization of ontology works well within a time-spacescape already constituted around ontological individualism, but it actually reflects a particular shared ontological stance about the individual. From a robustly relational stance, ontology is also a shared phenomenon, which might help explain the silence about the fruits of shared ontology.

Even the acknowledgment of the relevance of philosophical ontology to the production of knowledge is still not a completely common practice within academia. As Jackson observed above, discussion of the philosophical ontological options within academic disciplines is not routine except for in the philosophy of science. There is a fine line between the drive to make ontology explicit and what could be perceived as opening a methodological Pandora’s box, especially among those well-established in the methodological strategies of the predominant philosophical ontological stance. Instead of training field researchers to become aware, question
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60 After the long historical trajectory of colonization and other forms of domination, it does not seem ironic that the methodologies corresponding to this ontological orientation be applied to contexts that have historically tended more toward an orientation of complete interconnectedness.
and observe how their particular ontological stance is affecting what they generate as knowledge (and much less to contrast their own ontological orientation with that of others whom they are studying), they are taught the “tried and true” methods, which simply reproduces the predominantly shared ontological lens of separation. In a context that downplays their existence and influence, addressing such primordially naturalized ontological lenses and their corresponding fruit can be difficult.

Another important aspect of ontological lenses is that even though academics tend to be more concerned about ontology than the general public, absolutely everyone utilizes an ontological lens to filter how he or she sees reality, that is, to interpret everything, even the fruits of another time-spacescape. So even though students of anthropology and archaeology are the most commonly recognized culprits of not being aware of the ontological lens they use and of assuming ontological compatibility among beings of different time-spacescapes, they are not the only ones to do so. Those operating within the realms of diplomacy, international law, international public administration, international business, the international non-profit sector and overseas retirement tend to be even less aware of the problem of ontology and just as apt to use an unquestioned lens to (re-)interpret the fruits of another time-spacescape with terms that are imbued with an incommensurate taste.

Even though we cannot get out of using our lens to filter that to which we pay attention, we can become aware of the processes of filtering and interpretation and the issues that they present. Here I focus on two critical instances of the lens’ use to begin to build awareness of their existence. At the “individual” level, one’s embraced ontological lens shapes how we filter and interpret “reality.” It is indicative of how we conceptualize our hook-up to the cosmos. Then, when ontology is seen as a shared phenomenon, we can also examine how features of one
ontological lens can be assimilated into a time-spacescape predominantly or historically shaped by another. We explore both of these instances below in the particular case of complementary opposites to shed light on how re-interpreting the parity principle as dualism has involved the exchange of a term, the term’s taste as well as the shared ontological orientation that fostered that taste. This conceptual exercise lays the necessary groundwork for examining all of the Andean principles covered in Part II.

**Moments of Employing Our Ontological Lens**

**Filtering and Interpretation**

The case of paired opposites, such as ‘up/down,’ ‘left/right,’ ‘light/heavy,’ effectively demonstrates how these lenses operate in very distinct fashion. As seen in the respective developments of each ontological lens’ logic above, the unfolding outcome of how commonly encountered paired opposites are treated is predicated on how their relation is conceptualized. Both ontological individualism and the ontology of complete interconnectedness acknowledge that the pair shares some kind of relation through their condition of being opposites. For ontological individualism that relation merely connects two existentially autonomous categories, while for complete interconnectedness it is the constitutive centerpiece of either component’s existence. The “timing” of when the relation appears epistemologically drives this difference. For complete interconnectedness relation is the initial ontological starting point, and for ontological separation, it comes secondary to the *a priori* nature of the respective categories.

Following that every phenomenon emerges out of a particular context and corresponding meaning-making system and yet can be re-interpreted by a non-corresponding lens, I would like to look at how paired opposites as parity-based relations constitute the fruits of a time-spacescape based on complete interconnectedness and how these fruits have been re-interpreted
through a lens of ontological individualism. In the Andean context, complementary opposites are cherished phenomena, because they embody the strategy for engaging wholeness in light of this orientation’s initial ontological presupposition of interconnectedness and a focus on the componential (in contrast to the categorical). By ontologically privileging the relation, the lens of complete interconnectedness must insist on the emergent, inextricable and interdependent character of the related components. This disallows any sort of disaggregation and requires considering the relation first and both components always together as the most basic building block of this ontological perspective. To examine a component independently, not in conjunction with its complement, makes no sense from this perspective.

So when colonizers, priests, archaeologists, anthropologists, development ‘experts’ and diplomats have stumbled upon these highly valued parity-based relations, many have applied their naturalized ontological filters to perceive and interpret these phenomena. In general, these groups of ‘interpreters’ with their inherited ontology of separation, just like Aveni cited above, have commonly used the label “dualism” to describe these revered parity-based relations. This maneuver is afforded by the assumption of compatibility between the terms parity-based relation and dualism, which comes from an unawareness of how another ontological lens can be shared and bear different ‘fruits’ even for the ‘same’ commonly observed phenomenon of paired opposites.

The continued pervasiveness of this maneuver can be evidenced among the foreign exchange students I receive in Ecuador a few times a year. Originating from various liberal arts colleges and universities in the US, I am always amazed to see that the work with which they are most familiar for understanding the Andean context derives from Claude Lévi-Strauss (1963). Either in their regular coursework or in pre-departure workshops, they are often taught that his
contribution is the most insightful for understanding Andean culture because it captures the “dualist” essence that is Andeanism.  

In spite of the apparent compatibility between dualism and parity-based relations, Lévi-Strauss’ (1963) work in structural anthropology is completely incommensurate with the parity principle so central to this cosmovision. Deriving from a legacy of Saussurian linguistic structuralism and Freudian psychoanalysis, structural anthropology emerged out of an intellectual tradition based wholly on ontological dualism, not complete interconnectedness. In this tradition, Saussure’s *langue* and *parole* and Lévi-Strauss’ ideal structure of culture and its messy daily manifestations are divided by an unbridgeable gap, not welded through a primordial connection. Because the “two” arise as a result of this separation, structural anthropology and the ontological lens that afforded it are incapable of grasping the robustness of the parity-based relation of Andean philosophy. Parity is not about the fact that the two sides exist, which underpins a dualistic philosophical ontological orientation as in this case, but about the relation *between* the complementary opposites.

Because of their incompatibility, when an interpretive lens of ontological individualism is applied to the parity-based relation, epistemic reductionism occurs through the move from a wholly tethered “two-in-one relation” to “one in separation.” The numerical connotation of the *label* “dualism” may focus on “two,” but the *ontological lens* that corresponds with its taste starts with the existential autonomy of the parts. The relation in this case is secondary, not the primordial mechanism through which the components are constituted. As a result, this maneuver allows for separate epistemological treatment of the components by subsuming the
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61 Their varied origins mean that they are taught by various professors, and these professors were taught by others, and so on. What one might call an intellectual tradition for me denotes the reproduction of the ontological assumptions that undergird the practice called academia and a lack of sensitivity to the ontological orientations and fruits of other time-spacescapes.
“coincidental” relation to the autonomy of the elements. Epistemologically the centrality of the relation disappears from view. That is, the ‘Other’ is no longer the necessary complement and does not even have to be acknowledged while speaking of its paired opposite. This makes it possible to speak just of “leadership” without having to address “follower-ship,” of climbing ever higher without desiring to descend ever lower, or of “progression” without embracing “regression,” etc. In this way ontological individualism leaves us contemplating each component in separation.

This re-interpretation would not be an issue if it did not involve some serious costs in the breadth of the realm of possibilities. When the relation and the necessary acknowledgment of one component’s complementary opposite are lost through a re-interpretation based on one-in-separation, the outgrowths spurred by this integrated orientation are also lost. For example, once the central role of the relation in the constitution of the tethered parts goes unacknowledged, the focus on the emergent present tense loses its critical importance in the co-constitutive process. This makes it possible to conceive of and perceive ontologically autonomous, *a priori* categories. Once the relation is no longer co-constitutive, once the incomplete character of us all is not acknowledged, we no longer have to consider the centrality of the ‘Other’ in our own identity or in our understanding of the cosmos. One of the biggest costs of focusing on one-in-separation is the loss of the basis for parity, or the mindful attention to the relation and the proportionalization of its components, by disabling the drive of this orientation toward reciprocal nurturing and dynamic balance.

Instead the *a priori* categories that arise from the compartmentalization of “separate” and “separable” elements foster conceptual stagnation, because focusing on the categorical deadens the interactive, emergent, dynamic possibilities that come through the relational. For example,
the wisdom that comes through the interaction between the two elements as seen under divine geometry below is completely precluded by supposing the separation necessary to conjure *a priori* categories. By removing the need to tend the relation and to honor and be grateful for the co-creative and co-constitutive ‘Other,’ the progression of separation favors individualism, competition, hierarchy and domination (which are elaborated further in Part III).

So even though initially “dualism” and “parity-based relation” seem completely compatible terminologically because they both describe paired opposites, the ontological lenses that are imbued in each term’s respective “taste” as meaning-making systems lead to radically different outcomes. Correspondence between the two labels is clearly not the case. To assume compatibility between the labels and to re-interpret that fruit of complete interconnectedness as dualism, in the end, is to engage in epistemic violence. Because this reductionism is not simply an ephemeral moment in re-translation but involves a whole re-embedding of the concept into a completely foreign meaning-making system, the implications of this maneuver and its assimilation can be quite devastating.

The major issue with this maneuver for those already embracing the interpretive lens that forces the reduction is that it is practically imperceptible—just like the general use of one’s ontological lens. Despite its initial imperceptibility, the implications of applying an incommensurate ontological lens become apparent in what follows from the use of these labels. As the discourse and action surrounding the use unfold, how are the components treated—as existentially autonomous or wholly tethered? As the discourse and its accompanying incommensurate lens are engaged, one can observe the enactment of a particular set of assumptions and strategies and watch the implications unfold in the subsequent treatment of these paired opposites. That is when the next interactive step also becomes clear: the
assimilation of “dualism” into the shared background of the time-spacescape historically built through a shared ontology of complete interconnectedness. By analyzing this point in the following section, we can contemplate the impact of generalized ontological slippage.

Assimilation or Generalized Ontological Slippage

The path to generalized ontological assimilation starts with a single interaction. In the particular case at hand, calling a parity-based relation a dualism is a momentary re-interpretation of that concept, but once that label gets reused among the inhabitants of a time-spacescape based on complete interconnectedness, the process of adopting a new commonplace into the language-game has begun. This is particularly the case when operating across linguistic barriers such as when the Andeans had to learn Spanish during the colonial era and now English during the ‘age of globalization.’

However, as we have seen, this means that its accompanying “taste” also begins to be assimilated. When the new taste derives from an ontological lens that is reductionist in comparison, ontological slippage is committed. Just as a commonplace is adopted, propagated and sustained, the slip is shared and spread one interaction at a time. So what initially starts as the adoption of a commonplace like ‘dualism’ in a time-spacescape historically based on robust monism ends—through the assimilation of that term’s taste—with the replication of slippage into ontological individualism among those participating in that time-spacescape.

When discussing generalized slippage into ontological individualism within a time-spacescape based historically on complete interconnectedness, a few of the characteristics of the assimilated ontological lens and their effects on the process should be considered. First, because the reductionist tendency of ontological individualism is the ‘simpler’ direction of the two, moving ontologically from robust to reductionist happens much more quickly and easily than the
other way around, especially when aided by the initial imperceptibility of the switch. In addition to this ease of slippage, as the term and its taste become assimilated, the replication of this reductionist lens has an “encroaching effect” whereby the integrative logic of the more robust conceptualization begins to unravel. Assimilation, in fact, does not even have to be anywhere near complete to dismantle the integrated and integrative nature of complete interconnectedness. Only ‘pockmarked’ instances of reductionism are required to begin to wedge a space between tethered components before separation begins to be privileged.

In the Andean context, evidence of generalized ontological slippage into epistemic reductionism abounds. Specifically related to parity-based relations re-interpreted as “dualisms” in the academic arena, even Claude Lévi-Strauss’ work is still regularly used by Andeans themselves to analyze Andean myths and re-applied as “Andean Structural Dualism” (Calero del Mar 2002). Also related to the resulting optic of one-in-separation, we can look to the general adoption of the Western-style model of education as reflecting the pervasiveness of ontological assimilation. Within the economic arena, the permeated stronghold of the logic of capitalism and its common bedfellow “development” also point to the degree to which the logic of separation has in many ways unraveled complete interconnectedness. Not surprisingly capitalism’s biggest critique arising out of another philosophy also wholly based on ontological dualism, Marxist structuralism, has been equally rapidly embraced and strongly supported in both political and academic circles. The strong presence of the logic of separation is also evidenced in the spiritual realm through widespread conversion of most of Latin America to the Judeo-Christian tradition, initially with the Catholics and now with a wide variety of evangelicals. Of course, many have called this process syncretism or the effects of globalization, but I would like to direct our attention to the specific reductionist directionality of the syncretism at the ontological level.
One of the costs of assimilating epistemic reductionism can be seen in Lajo’s (2003) attempt to re-assert the lens that used to be predominant before the widespread assimilation of ontological individualism. Among the principles of Andean philosophy that he seeks to clarify in contrast to the Western-style time-spacescape, parity is probably the most critical to re-constitute and difficult to put back on the conceptual table. Parity-based relations have for so long and in such a permeated fashion been (re-)conceived as reduced dualisms that Lajo is particularly wary to make sure that his readers understand that he is not talking about the same thing as dualism. In a first instance he explicitly announces, “the concept of parity is qualitatively different from that of duality” (168). Then, when discussing how a ‘parity-centered’ system lends itself to proportionalization, or dynamically balancing the relation between the complementary elements instead of “reasoning” or generating knowledge, he warns, “and watch out, here we are not proposing the dualism of Matter-Spirit, and even less of Good-Evil” (168). With this maneuver he strips himself and his readers of the ability to use these discursive resources because of the degree to which their taste has been overwhelmed by an incommensurate ontological lens.

When conceived from an ontology of complete interconnectedness, Matter-Spirit or Good-Evil are parity-based relations. “Evil” is the co-constitutive requisite for understanding “good,” so there is no reason to epistemically ostracize or banish it. Similarly matter can only take form by being suspended in and through the ether. In this sense we should still be able to talk about them conjointly.

However, Lajo prohibits the discussion of Matter-Spirit and Good-Evil because the commonplaces that traditionally stood for a parity-based relation are now almost completely conceived of as a priori categories that together compose a dualism or duality. Especially for an
audience so gripped by the logic of separation, Lajo may simply have found it easiest to remove these discursive resources from the field of usable possibilities. Perhaps he felt that by obliterating the possibility of their use, he could pull the reader out of this incommensurate predicament so that she could differentiate the ontological point he is trying to make in contrast to the common use of dualism to describe complementary opposites. Yet removing discursive resources from the field of possibilities still represents a cost. Moreover, as entrenched as the assimilation of epistemic reductionism has become, there is no guarantee that his readers will even “get” his point about parity and even less that they will engage in a generalized “uphill” switch to a more robust ontological stance.

This casualty is only one instance of a long list of socially shared consequences of assimilating aspects of a reductionist ontological lens. In fact, using “dualism”—completely devoid of an explicit identification of philosophical ontology or methodology—to re-interpret concepts that arise out of a time-spacescape based on a distinct predominant ontological lens is a rather treacherous endeavor. It involves the real risk of engendering generalized ontological slippage within the time-spacescape that produced the monistically robust fruit. The extremely important implications of this maneuver will continue to be demonstrated and explored throughout this dissertation.

**Clarification of Terms**

As part of my own effort to propagate awareness of the importance of ontology and its embeddedness in the taste of the terms we use, I want to explicitly articulate how I conceive the labels I use especially in light of the potential for mistaking compatibility between these two ontological lenses in the case of the commonly encountered phenomenon of paired opposites. Because the terms presented above are heavily steeped in past uses and engender confusion, I
first review the issues that I have with each term specifically so as to explicate my final choice of terms.

First, monism adequately emphasizes no separation and a focus on relations. However, it does not necessarily require focusing on all relations. That is, the breadth of the realm of “no separation” is variable depending on where one decides to draw the limit. This variability allows for very limited forms of monism that do not have to arrive logically at the same principles as more robust forms. (The importance of this point will become clearer as we move through the dissertation.) While monism holds the potential for robust breadth, it does not necessarily ensure that breadth and so therefore does not adequately capture the ontological orientation that I am trying to convey.

Monism’s correlate, dualism, is confusing quite simply because the same term is used to describe paired opposites from this ontological perspective. Moreover, as shown above, dualism implies two yet when the logic is fully carried out it results in a focus on one, which makes the term misleading. For this reason I have tried to eschew labels that have a numerical connotation that do not specify how or when that number is the case in the development of the implied ontological logic.62

While monism and dualism describe the space conjured by the initial leap of faith of each ontological orientation, Lajo (2003) focuses his analytical attention on the “logical” end result of robust monism and dualism through his terms “parity” and “unitarism.” Both of these concepts make the relation—its presence or absence—central: Parity is only possible by starting with the
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62 In the search for an adequate term to describe the ontological/epistemic robustness reflected in Andean philosophy, I have contemplated Josef Estermann’s (2009) suggestion that this tradition (along with the Vedic tradition of India) be called “non-dualist,” which, as he clarifies, “is not the same as a metaphysical monism” (139). While I understand his need to get out of using monism for these reasons, “non-dualism” is a problematic label for two reasons. It may mean no separation, but “non-dualism” may also preclude a focus on “two,” which, as we see in parity, is still necessary for understanding the ontological primacy of the relation since the minimal number of components necessary to constitute a relation is two. Second, in just being the “anti” of dualism, it does not acknowledge the central role of the connection.
relation and unitarism only by denying it. In fact, when clarified as the end-result, unitarism—a synonym of ontological individualism—is quite accurate for the point I am trying to convey for this ontological lens since once the relation is removed from the ontological formula and separation is assumed, the singular unit is the final focus.

Parity, however, presents more of an initial issue because of how it conditions the realm of possibilities for complete interconnectedness. Parity arises from the two initial leaps of faith of interconnectedness and the componential nature of the related elements in robust monism. In the drive to overcome our incomplete character, to achieve dynamic balance, the parity principle privileges complementary relations of contrast. This puts an initial qualitative enclosure around the relational realm by prioritizing a certain kind of relation.

Parity’s form of enclosure though is qualitatively different from that of monism. For monism, the breadth of what can be considered to be “in relation” may vary according to the embraced defining boundary. Truncated versions of monism draw the line around those who use language as humans know it. In this case the enclosure occurs around the arbitrary category of human language in contrast to robust monism, which denies any sort of separation. From this perspective complete interconnectedness extends from the most microcosmic elements of our cells out to the macrocosmic galaxies of the cosmos. Parity, as a fruit of robust monism, does not deny the completely interconnected character of all, but it does privilege one kind of relation over another as a strategy for engaging the ontological assumptions of interconnectedness and emergent-yet-anchored components. As a central tenet of Andean philosophy for fostering wholeness and balance, this concept works well. However, as a way to initially define a robustly relational realm, parity unnecessarily conditions the kinds of relations that are prioritized.  
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63 While not all beings, phenomena or concepts are at first glance complementary opposites for other beings, phenomena or concepts, it is possible that all instances have their complementary opposite, just like energetic
this reason I feel that it is safest to be more inclusive when addressing the relational character of our hook-up to the cosmos.

In my own work then, I would like to emphasize the central point of whether separation or relation is ontologically privileged, because it is this difference that unleashes the distinct ontological processes and gives birth to different types of time-spacescapes and their corresponding fruit which I am addressing in this dissertation. For the ontological orientation that foregrounds separation, I use “the ontology of separation” and “one-in-separation” to emphasize the absence of the relation and “ontological individualism” and “unitarism” to capture the resulting singular focus of this lens. I avoid dualism as much as possible to eschew the confusion reviewed above.

In the orientation privileging the relation, I employ “ontology of complete interconnectedness” to express the amplitude and the all-encompassing nature of relationality. I use “two-in-one relation” to highlight the minimum basic building block of relationality. Placing emphasis on two-in-one relation still engenders an acknowledgment of the incomplete character of the related elements, which in turn can spur the contemplation of parity as a potential ultimate outcome of this logic. I also use “robust monism” to signal a monistic space that privileges relation in the broadest sense possible and to draw attention to the breadth of the detectable world in which all separation is understood to be illusion.

---

impulses. This consideration becomes a conceptual possibility through the multidimensionality encountered in Andean philosophy. We may contemplate parity in moments of contrast as a form of “fractalized” complementariness. It may be that upon “disembodying” the complementary contrast and perceiving it as existing in specific momentary expressions, in the things that beings do, believe or say, parity as an initial ontological supposition may possibly become always the case (like interconnectedness and the componential nature of the related elements) in that it is the only channel through which mutual “self”-recognition can take place. I am still contemplating this point perhaps due to my own dualistic hangovers, and so I am not (yet) in the position to propose and fully encourage this leap. What I can assert however is that contrast is an important mechanism for learning about ourselves and our world, and complementary contrast is the central idea of parity.
With this ontological mapping and terminological clarification we are now equipped to contemplate the robustness afforded by an ontology of complete interconnectedness and the reductionism that accompanies the use of a (re-)interpretive lens based on the ontology of separation. Parity is the first principle to provide the fodder for contrast, and we examine the most sacred Andean parity-based relation to make this point.

To sufficiently fill out the Andean-style ideal-typical time-spacescape based on complete interconnectedness so that it will allow us to situate the monistic approaches within IR and identify the implications of such a positioning, the rest of Part II is dedicated to developing features stemming from the left-hand column above. Part III elaborates on the time-spacescape of the right-hand column that reflects an ontology of separation and corresponds to the general Western-style time-spacescape, in which the Western-style academic time-spacescape and the field of international relations more specifically are embedded.

**The Robustness of Parity**

**The Sacred Andean Parity-based Relation**

This section examines the hallmark of Andean indigenous philosophy, the original divine parity-based relation of the feminine and masculine elements so that we may begin to get a glimpse of how the elements interact. We then explore how this two-in-one relation is represented through a variety of Andean media to further build the robust character of this concept only to then show how drastically the application of an ontologically individualistic lens reduces it in the final part of this section. We turn now to the sacred Andean parity-based relation to begin showing the “plenitude” with which a concept in this philosophy may be imagined.
In his critical work in re-constituting the notion of parity, Lajo (2003) has described the original Andean “two-in-one relation” as follows:

From the beginning [the indigenous cosmovision] starts by conceptualizing the origin of all as a PARITY. From the beginning there are two different elements, two essences that among other characteristics are complementary and proportional. Together they compose two parallel but combined cosmos, in which the unit does not exist except insofar as it has a correlate or counterpart that equalizes it or not according to the moment at hand (145).

The components of this parity-based configuration are complementary. Consistent with the common tendency in nature to require two complementary opposites to regenerate life, each element of this mother-father parity has its respective features that are critical for the constitution of the other. From this perspective, absolutely nothing is conceivable without its complement. Identity formation does not and cannot exist outside of a mirroring of, by and for the complementary opposite.64

Lajo expresses the next integral point for our understanding of this parity-based relation when he says, “the unit does not exist except insofar as it has a correlate or counterpart that equalizes it or not according to the moment at hand.” In the first instance, “the moment at hand” emphasizes the emergent nature of the constantly re-constitutive aspect of each element. Next, in that emergent moment, interaction with the other affords (or not) an equalizing character. That is, it can either foster or detract in dynamic fashion from a proportional relation between the correlates. Proportionality may provide wholeness through this parity-based relation, but the

64 A skeptical question that would be very possible from the perspective of ontological individualism could be: If “in the indigenous world, everything comes in pairs,” then how are the singular moments, units, concepts or tendencies that are equally if not more prevalent in the world conceptualized and accounted for? A first response would be: “That which is presented as uneven/not-pair (or ‘ch’ulla’ in the Puquina language) exists only apparently or transitorily; they are states of momentary transition” (Lajo 2003, 145). A second response, which should become more apparent throughout this text, is that with most of the world embracing an ontology of separation, we have through our joint action created more and more ‘single’ (transitory) entities, which would reinforce the possibility of making this contrasting observation. Quite simply, an object, concept, tendency, etc. in the singular sense without a complementary opposite to make a whole is not an ontological option due to the perceptive privileging of the relation first. This is why when a singular being or tendency is encountered, its complement is typically sought out immediately among those who practice this philosophy.
dynamic emergent nature of the relation makes imbalance an equally potential possibility. For this reason tending the relation and nurturing the proportional character of its elements are such critical considerations from this lens.

In many Andean accounts, the mother and father elements that constitute this sacred parity considered the origin of all are conceived of as *Pachacámac* and *Viracocho* respectively. According to one of the earliest written chronicles of the colonial era, Inka Garcilaso de la Vega’s *Royal Commentaries*, the Incan king Atahualpa, in a poignant encounter with Spanish conquistador Fray Vicente de Valverde, attempted to make sense of the Christianity professed by his ultimate conquerors through Andean logic. Garcilaso de la Vega reports that Inca Atahualpa “says, ‘the God three plus one, that are four…by any chance is it not the same that we call *Pachacámac* and *Viracocho*?’” (Garcilaso de la Vega 1960, 51 qtd. in Lajo 2003, 96). In articulating it this way, he forces the Holy Trinity consisting of all masculine elements plus the Virgin Mary “into his tetrametric logic.” Lajo (2003) uses this maneuver to support his argument: “He clearly makes an allusion to two Andean gods, which according to our parity-based logic, are ‘mother and father’ respectively” (96).

In his 1989 rendition, Garcilaso de la Vega describes the respective features that constitute the complementary nature of this parity-based relation. One god, *Viracocho*, was visible through its materialization in the Sun, and *Pachacámac*, in turn, was invisible (75-76). To the visible god the Incans “offered sacrifices and dedicated great festivals,” but to the invisible god, “they did not make temples to him or offer him sacrifices.” They alluded to the sun “on every occasion” but “they did not dare to utter [*Pachacámac’s*] name” (70). In contrast, *Pachacámac* was ‘worshipped’ “inwardly, as an unknown god” (75). Despite the fact that this
god “had not allowed himself to be seen[,] they believed he existed” and actually “held him in
greater veneration than the Sun” (75).65

That one god could be visible and consequently was visibly celebrated while the other
invisible and respected so much so as to not be mentioned is concurrent with accounts of the
masculine and feminine principles. The masculine element is understood to represent the
material, structural and tangible, while the feminine element is fluid, intangible and represented
by the black creative void, responsible for creating, giving birth and nurturing and to which all
return. These parallels are further developed below.

The meaning of Pachacámac gives us some clues about the link between the invisible
and feminine aspects of this element. This word has two roots: “pacha, ‘the world, the universe,’
and cámac, present participle of the verb camay, ‘to animate,’ derived from the noun cama, ‘the
soul’” (Garcilaso de la Vega 1989, 70). Together then, according to Garcilaso de la Vega’s
definition, “Pachacámac means ‘him who gives life to the universe what the soul does to the
body’” (70). Later, he clarifies, “If asked who was the Pachacámac, they would say ‘he who
gave life to the universe and sustained it’” (70). The generative, life-giving force from this
perspective is consonant with the feminine energetic principle.66

Salomon’s (1991) discussion of the particularity of camay that emphasizes the constant
nature of this creative force and impedes proper translation, demonstrates that it is difficult to
portray this term in a single word in English:

Camay escapes the seemingly handy glosses ‘to create’ (because ‘create’ connotes an ex
nihilo act, while camay connotes the energizing of extant matter) and ‘to fashion’

65 The strange use of masculine pronouns to describe the mother principle is addressed in the analysis of
reductionism at the end of this section.

66 In this case, it may be easier to think of Pachacámac and Viracocha as cosmic principles of quantum mechanics
than as deities in the way that we think of god. We are both Pachacámac and Viracocha through and through, and
they are us.
(because ‘fashion’ suggests only an initial shaping of inert matter, whereas \textit{camay} is a continuous act that works upon a being as long as it exists) \cite{18}.

Neither the act of creating nor of giving shape to some thing or being is a one-time deal from the Andean cosmovision; sustaining life force is a constant on-going emergent activity. This sustaining action is reflected in the present participle \textit{camay} as “animating.” That which animates, or the \textit{camac}, then is constantly vitalizing, infusing one with life-force.\cite{16} At the level of \textit{pacha} as the cosmos characterized by time-space (more fully covered in the next chapter) then, \textit{Pachacámac} is the great void out of which all things come and to which all things return and that which constantly (re-)generates life.

\textit{Viracocha}, in turn, as the masculine principle, is epitomized by the light of the sun and reflected through all that is visible. Structure, matter, substance and light all demonstrate this principle. Like the sun, what is readily and consistently observed reflect the masculine component of this parity-based relation.

The invisible as source (\textit{Pachacámac}) and the visible as manifestation of all that emerges from, and all that is energized by, that source (\textit{Viracocha}) are necessary complements. The one is inconceivable without the other. The illustrations below bring to light the various ways in which this complementariness works.

\textbf{Andean Media on the Parity Principle of Feminine-Masculine}

Through various Andean media, this concept of parity reveals its potential robustness available for understanding paired opposites when viewed through a lens of the ontology of

\footnote{While Garcilaso de la Vega back in 1609 called “\textit{camac}” a present participle, Salomon (1991) describes it as “the agentive form, a “\textit{camay-er}”)” \cite{18}. Given his description above this would mean that a \textit{camay-er} is one that is constantly vitalizing. While the grammatical label is inconsistent, the concept between a \textit{camay-er} that is constantly vitalizing and the present participle “vitalizing” or “animating” points to potentially different roles for word forms in a language based on the deeply present tense. The ever-present and constant role of that which vibrates or breathes life into form in Quechua could also very easily be a present participle. This however would constitute future linguistic research.}
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complete interconnectedness. Like any media, they may be symbolized, re-membered and re-produced according to different ontological logics. However, their symbolic richness still allows us to get a glimpse of the robust character of parity. Media covered here range from linguistic commonplaces, a key archaeological find in the form of an idol, iconography, and architectural design.

The first medium to reflect the parity principle is language. Here Lajo (2003) draws on four interrelated Quechua words that demonstrate the reciprocal and interdependent nature of the masculine and feminine principle. The most basic term *yana*—as an adjective—means “black, dark, deep dark,” complementing the notion of the void discussed above (Lira 1982 qtd. in Lajo 2003, 97). As a noun this same term denotes a woman who is in love or subordinated to a man or a man who is in love and subordinated to a woman (Lajo 2003, 97). This first term already highlights the presence of both the masculine and feminine elements in either sex. In this case, the feminine principle—being in love or being subordinated to the being that is loved—can apply to either sex. With the addition of a one-lettered suffix, the second term, *yanan*, in turn, conveys the material and light aspects of its complementary opposite through its definition as “substance, essence, flower of flour” or pure white as a noun (Lira 1982 qtd. in Lajo 2003, 98).

The next two terms emphasize the interrelated and interdependent character of *yana* and *yanan*. For example, *yanapay* stands for reciprocal cooperation, the action of helping or working with someone according to that person’s orders/desires (Lira 1982 qtd. in Lajo 2003, 99). The central Andean principle of reciprocity emphasizes that wholeness comes through dynamic and cyclical give and take, and *yanapay* suggests that doing for an ‘Other’ is also doing for oneself. The final term, *yanantin*, deriving from both *yana* and *yanan* together with the suffix “tin” means “both lovers together.” This agglutinating suffix is particularly important since it indicates the
inseparability of the two together (Lira 1982 qtd. in Lajo 2003, 99). The next medium pictured below transmits *yanantin* where I develop this concept more fully.

The Illawi idol, a famous stone relic of the Puquina people, embodies the tethered aspect of *yanantin* as lovers and relays key implications of this condition.

![The Illawi idol](source: Javier Lajo, *Qhapaq Ñan: La ruta Inka de la sabiduría*, (Quito: Abya-Yala, 2003), 163.)

Pictured here, this Puquina idol makes inseparability particularly central by depicting a man and a woman tethered back-to-back by two sacred snakes, or *chokoras*, and points to the wholeness that can be derived through the relation of complementary opposites. Again, this is not just “completion” between the sexes but between elements as well, both of which are present in all things, beings, ideas and phenomena.

The message relayed here is that at any given moment either half can only grasp a 180-degree view, reflecting each component’s incomplete character. The full 360° view is only possible through complementary opposites. Being tethered back-to-back to achieve 360 degrees is extremely symbolic of the necessary contrast that only complementary opposites can provide. Each component needs to cover a full 180 degrees of the total 360 in order to achieve *juk* or “complete” complementary contrast. In a parity-based relation, then, each component makes an
absolutely unique and equivalently essential contribution toward their shared wholeness. In this idol the initial ontological presuppositions of interconnectedness and incompleteness as well as the final implications of this orientation of wholeness and balance could not be more evident.

With its powerful capacity to relay very complex notions in pictorial form, iconography is another medium through which we can also find the intertwined and interdependent nature of the feminine and masculine elements. All three of the following ancient symbols stand out on a preliminary visual level for the contrasting black and white. The black element, just like yana above, represents the feminine and the white, like yanan, the masculine. Upon this initial contrast, each icon highlights another aspect of the parity principle in its own way.

![Figure 2](https://example.com/figure2.png)

**Figure 2.** Iconography symbolizing yana and yanan. Source: Javier Lajo, *Qhapaq Ñan: La ruta Inka de la sabiduría*, (Quito: Abya-Yala, 2003), 98.

In the yin-yang case of the Tao above, each “teardrop” is pierced by a dot of its complement. Like yana, this depiction acknowledges that both energetic principles reside in each sex. Next, while all three portray a spiral movement which emphasizes the dynamic interpenetration and intertwining of the two elements, the Maya-Quiche icon’s rounded movement is more prominent and the interpenetration more conspicuous with the interjection of straight “spikes.” The Incan case, in turn, adds the contrast of form to that of color through the shape of the lines that divide the elements. The straight lines represent the structure that can be built out of the material world or the masculine element. The curved lines, forming waves, symbolize in contrast the feminine
principle or the dynamic fluidity with which energy passes in wave-like form through all of matter.

The fourth medium, architectural design based on “divine geometry,” plays on this complementariness of form. The “masculine” straight lines and the “feminine” roundedness of the Puquina-Incan icon above are commonly replicated as squares and circles respectively in Andean architectural design as a display of the key role played by parity in divine geometry.68 Here Lajo draws on a study of two plazas on the Amantan island of Lake Titicaca by Víctor Rodríguez Suy Suy whose names reflect the correspondence between the shape and its respective element. *Pachamama*, the name of the circular plaza, means “mother (feminine) time-space,” and *pachatata*, or “father (masculine) time-space” denotes the square plaza (Lajo 2003, 83).69 Together the circle and square are the parity-based components of “divine geometry” because they are fundamental to generating the most important geometric Andean symbol, the *chakana* (pictured below). This shape allowed the Incans to determine both the value of Pi and the ideal angle on which the Earth’s rotation would foster earthly balance, or *Yanan-Tinkuy* (20° 43’). The balance derived from rotating at this angle, also called the line of truth (*Pachatússan* or *Ch’ekkalluwa*), would support “life and biodiversity and would maintain the seasons and climates as ‘normal’ at all latitudes” (Lajo 2003, 106).70

---

68 Another oft-encountered way of portraying the feminine and masculine elements is through a triangle that points up (masculine, much like a mountain) and a triangle that points down (feminine, much like a valley). While the parity principle has generally been shared throughout the Andean region, it is curious to see which element was of greater importance to each identity group. In the Azuay and Cañar provinces of Ecuador, chiseled “square” rock formations that characterize Incan influence stand in easily viewed contrast to the uncut “rounded” rock formations of the Cañaríis.

69 The only bibliographic information provided is that it was a conference presentation by the cited author at the 46th Congress of Americanists entitled “Pagando la Tierra: Un ritual en la Isla de Amantan.”

70 For more on this sacred geometry, see Javier Lajo (2003) and Carlos Milla (1992).
This symbol especially underlines the importance of the second aspect of parity: the relation *between* the interconnected elements. The Andean Pi and optimal rotation angle can only be determined through the *interaction* between the squares and the circles, between the masculine and feminine elements. Each element in separation cannot bring us to wisdom as the interactive balance between the two can.

The three concentric circles used to constitute the sacred *chakana* pictured here also symbolize the Andean concept of time-space. This is another important medium that builds on the richness of the parity principle. However, because it also reveals how reductionism operates in the dimensions of time and space, this final medium is covered in its own section below.

**Illustration of Reductionism**

Now that we have seen just how robust the concept of parity can be, I would like to return to Garcilaso de la Vega’s “odd” references to *Pachacámac*. In his classic text, just as in many other texts that have emerged thereafter on the topic, Garcilaso de la Vega refers to the feminine-principled god *Pachacámac* as “him.” If so much emphasis in Andean culture is placed on the primacy of the complementary interaction between these two primordial sacred
principles, the feminine and the masculine represented in *Pachacámac* and *Viracocha*, then how could one be so insensitive to the different natures of these two elements? In this section I aim to show how this slippage comes from applying an ontologically individualistic lens to interpret a concept based on complete interconnectedness. I demonstrate step by step how reductionism takes place and how this logic makes the cited androcentric assumption a possibility.

Interpreting both sacred forces of this sacred complementary pair in completely androcentric terms could easily be attributed to linguistic differences between Spanish and Quechua, since Garcilaso de la Vega was explaining these Quechua-based concepts in Spanish. In fact, Salomon (1991), when discussing the *Huarochiri Manuscript*, points to the gender issue encountered in Quechua. On translating this language into English he observes, “there are generally common sources of ambiguity (as the English reader sees it) in regard to gender, number, and time. Quechua does not have grammatical male-female gender and in some cases the sex of a named person is unclear” (36). So without clarity as to the entity’s gender, grammatically or otherwise, the god’s gender, in its translation into a language that does have grammatical gender like Spanish, will simply be a default option in the language into which the concept is now being expressed. In this case, god (*dios*) in Spanish is a masculine term, so the masculine pronoun may simply have been that which corresponded to this word.

Another very literal possibility could have derived from the fact that the god “had not allowed himself to be seen.” As the logic goes, “If you cannot see the god, then you cannot really know the nature of that god.” The strategy then is to resort to the use of a generic pronoun, which, in the case of an unknown sex, tends to be the third-person masculine option (“*él,*” “*lo*” in Spanish; “he,” “him” in English). Again, ‘simply’ by default, the feminine-principled god would be re-portrayed in masculine terms.
I would like to suggest, however, that a different process occurred that would also substantiate these two possibilities. In this particular case, Garcilaso de la Vega, like many others who have followed, was applying an ontological lens based on separation. As we saw earlier in this section, by starting with the *a priori* category as a singular autonomous unit instead of with the relation between two incomplete beings, the lens of one in separation does not and cannot comprehend the robust notion of parity and all that it implies. From this perspective there is no drive to look for, let alone consider, complementariness in a completely entwined, interrelated and interdependent form. We are looking at gods who share the similar nature of ‘god,’ the essence that allows them both to take on this label, not gods that together must necessarily make up a complementary whole or *juk*. In this sense Garcilaso de la Vega’s choice of pronoun is an example of epistemic reductionism, where a parity-based relation hinging on the complementarity of the feminine and masculine is reduced to a masculine-only (re-)interpretation of both gods.

Step by step I would like to demonstrate how androcentrism arises as a product of using this reductionist logic. For this task I rely heavily on the points developed above in the section on ontological mapping and the consequences of using one lens to interpret the fruits of another. While in ‘reality’ this process does not necessarily present itself in the same order, this particular ideal-typical rendition is a possible response of someone using ontological individualism to make sense of finding two central divinities instead of just one in a culture that emerges from a shared ontology of complete interconnectedness. Helpful for understanding how we go from a

---

71 It is possible that the Incans themselves had already started using the lens of separation to a sufficient degree so as to lose sight of the complementarity needed for two sacred principles. This would actually be consonant with their executed drive toward imperialism. For the purpose of my argument, it does not really matter whether it was the Spanish or the Incans or both that generated a doubly androcentric conceptualization of these two sacred principles. What is important here is to see how the respective ontological lenses afford certain maneuvers/fruits. When employing a lens of separation, complementarity and balance are simply not afforded as key considerations.
complementary pair to a doubly androcentric model of two gods, we could pictorially conceive of the process in the following way:

![Diagram of four stages](image)

*Figure 4. Progression from a *juk* of complete interconnectedness to a doubly androcentric conceptualization.*

The first instance portrays a case of *juk*, depicted as a complete circle with line down the middle indicating the two halves of a whole. The product or fruit of a time-spacescape based on a predominantly shared ontology of complete interconnectedness, this picture symbolizes the tight-knit, co-constitutive parity-based relation between the masculine and feminine elements.

The next scenario (2) portrays how the two components of this *juk* are deciphered through a lens based on ontological individualism. The tethered, inextricable relation is removed from view, and the two halves are conceptualized as ontologically separate, making the two gods existentially autonomous. The fact that the half circles still face each other represents the ‘coincidental’ relation that comes subsequent to the definition of the *a priori* category of ‘god.’ By ontologically rendering the relation secondary to the category, the focus on the need for contrast provided through their complementariness to create the cosmos is lost, even though their positioning still allows for its acknowledgment. By losing this focus, we also lose the mindfulness that each complementary element must be sufficiently present, or proportional, for life to be (re-)generated (not only in the initial creation of the cosmos but in its constant re-creation).

Attributing ontological autonomy to each half circle or component makes unitarism possible as shown in the third step and leads to a singular focus on just one of these parts conceived of as being ontologically whole unto itself. The idea of a whole circle that becomes
complete through two complementary elements is now completely lost from view, and the focus moves to the unit as an a priori stand-alone category, which is what engenders a focus on the “god” category as having an essence and being complete, not on a relation between two divine energetic principles that are emergent and in constant interaction.

Through this last maneuver then, when someone with this ontological lens happens upon a parity-based relation, the category ‘god’ is applied first. Contemplation of the relation can only follow this initial presumption. In other words, the application of the same ontological status of the a priori category ‘deity’ to the two elements takes precedence over the relation and the necessary complementariness between the paired opposites that is played out through that relation. The ‘Other’ is no longer the absolutely necessary, tethered, and co-creative ‘other half.’

When re-conceptualized not in relational terms but in categorical ones, the given symbolic shape of the deities and direction in which they face are less about honoring the function of the complement through relation than about respecting the parameters that define the category. This explains how—when the two related components are re-conjured as an ontologically individualistic “dualism”—the two halves end up facing in the same direction due to their similar existential category ‘deity.’ What matters for this categorical re-interpretation is the replicability of the shape for other instances of the same category not the emergent complementarity of the components.

Ontological individualism gets us to the creation of two similarly bounded entities that share the same categorical status. By erasing the necessary complementariness between the two, the sexed identity of the components should not really matter, right? Then why are both deities addressed in masculine terms? How is it that the response is doubly androcentric and not doubly gynocentric when we are addressing ontologically individualistic components?
I would wager that the resulting use of “he” instead of “she” to describe the two deities is actually tied to the more “visible” nature of the masculine energetic principle, whereby the more conspicuous, tangible and direct element becomes the more prominent of the two. This may in part explain why “he” is the generic default pronoun for any object or being whose sex is unknown. Surely, when going from complementary balance or proportionalization to a categorical replication of the unit in separation, sustaining a “gynocentric” orientation based on the invisible void, the intangible, the fluid would be much more challenging.

By asking this question I am not suggesting that the androcentric option “he” should be replaced with a gynocentric “she.” That would be to miss the whole point of the argument, which is that ontological individualism necessarily reduces the number of options from two-in-one relation to one-in-separation. Since one-in-separation is categorical and not relational, the possible expression of sexed complementariness—or the interdependent complementariness of any set of paired opposites for that matter—is eradicated. I am far from promoting an either/or situation. Instead, I am trying to show what gets lost from the ontological realm of possibilities when an insistence on “both/and” gets reduced to an “either/or” logic. In fact, calling the feminine-principled god a “he” is much less disconcerting than the whole set of ramifications that accompany using the generally reductionist lens that led Garcilaso de la Vega to use “he” in the first place.\(^\text{72}\)

---

\(^\text{72}\) This discussion conjures an interesting point regarding the interaction between the ontologically individualistic lenses of the colonizers and the shared ones of complete interconnectedness of the natives. In this colonial encounter the Andeans were accused by the Spanish for being effeminate, a judgment call based on criteria shaped through a reductionist lens. When faced with the dilemma of having their ‘both/and’ philosophical principle be enframed within an ontological lens that only allows for an ‘either/or’ response, it follows that those predominantly embracing complete interconnectedness would opt for the perceived-to-be stronger or more concrete of the two options in response to the lack of choice. Instead of insisting on rigorously maintaining a more robust ontological lens that fomented balance—which was seen as a particularly feminine quality—especially in the face of such a lack of balance of the era, it was probably easier to turn around and respond ontologically in kind—assimilating the more masculine-oriented features of the colonizers.
To recap then, to make this doubly androcentric maneuver Garcilaso de la Vega was relying on a lens of ontological separation based on pre-determined categories to perceive, understand and convey his world. Once the categorical status of deity was replicated for both deities, the relative centrality of the emergent and complementary energetic principles was lost, leaving him with the option of using a pronoun that could be generically applied to any object or being of unknown or yet-to-be-established sex.

The life context of the author might explain his embrace of an ontologically individualistic filter. In 1539, Garcilaso de la Vega was born to an Incan princess and a Spanish conquistador in the city of Cuzco (the heart of the Incan Empire). Even though this time-spacescape had historically reflected an ontological lens of complete interconnectedness, the Spanish had been in the area for 11 years and had conquered his city five years before his birth. By the time Garcilaso de la Vega published his book in 1609 at 70 years of age, the colonial encounter had already been in effect for more than 80 years and forms of assimilation had already been established on the Americas side. Furthermore, the chronicler had already been living for almost 50 years on the Iberian Peninsula—a context steeped in this orientation—and was a self-professed diehard Catholic.73 In just considering how Garcilaso de la Vega went linguistically from Quechua to Spanish, philosophically from the Andean cosmovision to being converted religiously to Catholicism, and physically from a time-spacescape based historically

---

Similar to this Spanish interpretation of the Andeans, it is not coincidence that Hollywood in the movie “Avatar” portrays the focus of complete interconnectedness as being the feminine side that eventually capitulates to the either/or masculine-dominated option. Here again, because an ontologically individualistic lens is incapable of grasping a ‘both/and’ complex, when someone of this lens happens upon the fruits of complete interconnectedness, epistemologically they are forced into an ‘either/or’ schema. From this perspective, balance between the masculine and feminine, which requires acknowledging, recognizing and honoring the feminine other is immediately relegated to an inferior effeminate position.

73 How the Judeo-Christian tradition is based on ontological individualism is reviewed in Chapter 11.
on complete interconnectedness to another steeped in ontological individualism, his reductionist account of this philosophy is hardly surprising.

To be fair though I must add one more observation. While the “corruption” of parity-based opposites and other robust Andean concepts cited here is often attributed to the reductionist tendencies that accompanied the Spanish conquest, one may argue that the Incans themselves had already begun the slide into ontological individualism. To be certain, falling out of parity-based balance certainly does not require Spanish presence; shared ontological slippage is not just a matter of assimilation. Even though the Spanish’s more thoroughly ensconced logic may have accelerated the slippage and increased the breadth of its grip more quickly, I would suggest that even the Incans themselves forgot to foster both sides of the metaphorical barbell equally and to tend to the components’ proportionalization through relation.

In his piece promoting Andean philosophy, Grillo (1998a) himself argues that the arrival of the “plague” of Spanish conquerors came due to an imbalance already encountered in the region. In discussing how the life cycle of the plague (of the colonial hangover) must be coming to an end, he writes:

This plague will not be able to regenerate itself among us because to do so it would require the same conditions of serious imbalance of harmony in the Andean world in

---

I include Grillo’s (1998a) passage because it describes so beautifully such a distinct interpretation of colonialism: And that is how we were – here in the Andes, with our mode of being, with our experiential baggage – when five centuries ago there arose among us a terrible plague from whose impact we have not totally recovered, although we are very near a complete cure.

The plague is a living being which appeared suddenly in our Andean world just as sometimes a strange plant will appear in our chacras (fields) – a plant we have not planted and do not know, that we do not like but that we cannot easily eliminate. In our living world, because the plague is a living being it has to live, it has to eat and one cannot kill it with impunity because if it is there it is because the Apus (mountain deities) have wanted it. Otherwise it would not be there. We are dealing, certainly, with a very strange being in our world. Whereas all Andean beings try to contribute to the nurturance of the harmony of our world, with greater or lesser ability, the plague, in an obvious and impudent way, tries to disturb the Andean world, to disharmonize us. Its attitude challenges us and makes it evident that our capacity to harmonize ourselves is not sufficient, because if it were, the plague could not bother us. The plague makes us feel our weaknesses and this helps us because it motivates us to become stronger. The plague is a being who, if it does not deserve our love because of its behavior, does deserve our respect because it makes us see our defects (131).
which it was first generated. These conditions no longer exist because since the very moment that the plague appeared we have been healing ourselves, that is we have been nurturing the re-establishment of harmony in our world” (Grillo 1998a, 134).

For Grillo, then, great disharmony was already extant in the region to attract such a plague in the first place.\(^75\)

So how could generalized ontological slippage take place in the pre-Hispanic Andean world? When one of the halves of the divine *juk* is invisible like *Pachacámac*, it becomes quite easy to pay more attention to that which shines (the material, the particles) especially when it is the only thing conspicuously celebrated. This over-emphasis on the visible can initially lead to the barely perceptible slip from conceiving of the two elements as constituting a whole circle separated by a perforated line to two ontologically autonomous and separate halves facing each other. Visually and ontologically this slip does not seem to be so drastic, at least on the surface.

However, as we have seen throughout this piece, once the visible is ontologically conceived as separate from the invisible, they become categorically re-conceived as existentially autonomous beings. In this moment the relation also becomes secondary, the temporal orientation is re-focused, and the mindfulness of balance or the tending of the relation gets lost. Once one begins to ontologically privilege separation over interconnection, one of the first symptoms to ensue is the drive to determine the relative strengths or weaknesses of the two halves in question. The “autonomous” subject now stands in a place to be able to judge an essentialized ‘Other.’ This exercise of ranking another according to one’s imagined criteria

\(^75\) Upon reading over this admittance to Incan imbalance which Grillo believes called on the Spanish Conquest to disrupt the imbalance and reset Andeans on a path of healing and balance, it seems rather strange that Lajo (2003) does not discuss this ‘small’ detail on parity, especially in light of the competence with which he makes the argument about parity and its accompanying activity proportionalization. It is not surprising however since he is such a prominent proponent of Incan wisdom, which strategically is rather critical for putting Andean philosophy on the academic map. Nevertheless, Lajo (2003) is careful to cite the Puquina people—predecessors to the Incans who gave them the basis of their language, conversational reality and shared background of the time-spacescape (before “the generalized slip”)—when conveying the full implications of parity (the focus on relationship, co-constitution, interdependence/interpenetrability, impossibility of separation and proportionality between the related elements, etc.).
eventually leads to the justification of domination at any scale. For this reason, we see a parallel
between the Incans’ expansionist zeal to see their cosmovision realized “as above so below” and
the Spanish Conquest.\textsuperscript{76} A quick and easy slip into ontological individualism by
overemphasizing the visible god over the relation \textit{between} the visible and invisible gods would
explain their own drive to expand and conquer other Andean peoples.

In light of these considerations, it may have very well been possible that Garcilaso de la
Vega was simply relaying the new common “Incan” wisdom of his time. It may also suggest
that popular knowledge about the Incan empire may be accurate in overemphasizing the Incans’
love of the Sun. If this is the case, then Garcilaso de la Vega’s embrace of an ontologically
individualistic lens started well before his move to the Iberian Peninsula.

Whether it was just the Spanish or the Incans and the Spanish to engage in ontological
dualism remains to be fully researched. The fact, however, that this chronicle among many
others since then provide a doubly androcentric account of the sacred Andean parity-based
relation of \textit{Pachacámac} and \textit{Viracocha} demonstrate the effects of epistemic reductionism. Here
the building block of a complementary two-in-one-relation undergoes categorical re-definition
where “deity” and not complementary emergent relation is privileged—a maneuver that leads
directly to the imbalanced doubly masculine account.

These observations lead to one final consideration: If the Incans, the most prominent and
well-known people of the Andes and of South America in general, engaged in a generalized
ontological slip, then how can I assert the “integrity” of Andean philosophy? First, purity,
whether philosophical or biological, has never existed and never will, which is why I am
sketching two ideal-typical time-spacescapes to contrast in this dissertation. The Andean

\textsuperscript{76} The drive to dominate as also witnessed in Spanish expansionist policies plus how the logic of ontological
individualism leads to these mental machinations are covered more fully in the next chapter.
principles that I outline here, no matter how they have been re-interpreted, twisted or “corrupted,” house the space necessary for exemplifying the very robust nature of the fruits borne of a predominantly shared ontology of complete interconnectedness. Their historic existence is expressed through the various media examined here and through the sacred sites, remains and icons of other Andean peoples, such as the Cañari, Valdivia, Achuar, Shuar, Puquina, etc. Traces of the robust notion of parity and other Andean principles can still be detected in syncretic social practices today. Incan cosmogony is one expression of the possible range of fruits of Andean philosophy, which is one version of a predominantly shared ontology of complete interconnectedness. It just so happens that this particular version, through its historical and contextual specificities, underwent generalized ontological slippage into separation, a loss of mindfulness of balance and a resulting emphasis on domination. For this reason, I conscientiously focus instead on six ideal-typical Andean principles in this chapter.

This general chapter on parity makes several key observations for the entire dissertation, particularly at the level of ontology. First, any phenomenon reflects a shared set of meaning-making resources that are based on foundational ontological assumptions predominantly shared within the time-spacescape where the phenomenon is found. Yet anyone can and will interpret that phenomenon with his or her respective ontological lens that has gotten its particular shape through the accumulation of that person’s interactions.

Because complementary opposites represent stark interpretive differences between each ideal-typical ontological lens examined in this dissertation, this chapter first reviews their distinct logics regarding this phenomenon. Their major difference stems from whether they privilege relation or separation as the primordial ontological assumption. In the case of Andean
philosophical principles, the former orientation has afforded the generation of the robust fruits in question and the latter has been used to re-interpret those fruits. The complex basic building block of two-in-one relation that characterizes the ontology of complete interconnectedness is what produces very robust conceptual fruits, and ontological individualism’s resulting insistence on one-in-separation, when applied as an interpretive lens to those fruits, reduces the parity-based relation.

Using a distinct, reductionist and incommensurate ontological lens to re-interpret the robust fruits of complete interconnectedness is to apply a totally distinct meaning-making system not only to its initial perception and interpretation but also to its subsequent treatment. How that (re-)interpretation unfolds within the corresponding meaning-making system leads to very different outcomes and incurs significant losses within the conceptual field of possibilities. Due to the robust/reductionist disparity, even a pockmarked assimilation of ontological individualism into a time-spacescape built primarily off of complete interconnectedness seems to be quite effective at dismantling the integrative logic of the latter.

To show how the costs of this reductionism become entrenched through generalized ontological assimilation, this chapter then turns to the robust notion of the sacred Andean parity-based relation. Historical descriptions of this relation and analyses of media reflecting this principle fill out the robust character of this concept and thereby allow us to see clearly how severely reduced the concept becomes through the (re-)interpretive ontologically individualistic lens of Garcilaso de la Vega.

Not putting ontological primacy on the relation has equally important implications for the other fruits borne out of this ontological orientation. These are gradually elaborated in each illustration of reductionism that accompanies its respective Andean principle developed below.
Hopefully through these illustrations it becomes apparent just how incommensurate the venture of using a lens based on separation is for interpreting the principles of Andean philosophy.

The next chapter reviews another Andean principle, time-space or *pacha*. In this case, I start with the reduced interpretation so that I may build up to its more robust conceptualization due to the difficulty of expressing this concept in a language like English whose taste is generally steeped in ontological individualism. Once I elaborate on the robustly dynamic Andean cosmic model of time-space and illustrate its dimensions further through the Illawi idol of Puquina, inventory is then taken regarding the lessons one can glean from this case of epistemic reductionism.
CHAPTER 5

PACHA: TIME-SPACE

Reduced Pacha

A second principle of the Andean cosmovision, pacha, has also suffered from an ontologically individualistic gaze in various ways. While its more robust translations include “cosmos” and “time-space” as an inextricable parity-based relation, Garcilaso de la Vega translated it, when defining Pachacámac under parity above, as “world” or “universe.” Cosmos is much more robust than either of these two terms. In general a much narrower concept than cosmos, “world” primarily connotes the dimension of space, not time. Even “universe,” which seems to be interchangeable with cosmos, has an ontologically individualistic taste that informs the epistemological appearance of ‘uni’ or ‘one’ that makes getting at the idea of pacha a challenge. The ‘uni’ of ‘uni’verse is taken to signify a singular component in separation, not a relation of two tethered complementary elements. That is, universe is not understood as a juk but as ‘the only’ universe that we know, again the product of a categorical, not relational, lens. To disrupt this naturalized singular quality and encourage a focus on the relation between a complementary two that makes a whole, Lajo (2003) has used the term “pariverse” (two ‘uni’verses in parity-based relation) to describe the two parallel cosmos representing the divine masculine and feminine energetic principles (163-164).

In the traditional Andean understanding of the cosmos, time-space are inseparable dimensions and only conceivable in relation to each other (Lajo 2003, 152). With pacha embodying the logic of juk, we can conceive of pacha as a multiscalar relation between the specific moment and physical place. The problem with this wholly enmeshed notion is that when one attempts to translate it into Spanish or English as traditionally spoken, we are forced to reduce the robustness of the concept. Both languages reflect and reconstitute an ontological
preference for unitarism by conceiving of ‘tiempo y espacio’ or ‘time and space’ as separate and separable phenomena. No concept of juk—a single term referring to the wholeness that only can come through two-in-relation in complementary contrast—or specifically of an always conjoined concept of time-space exists in either language, which makes conveying this juk logic of time and space as always in relation and only conceivable in terms of each other much more elusive in these languages.

Let’s see how this works in the case of The Huarochirí Manuscript translated by Frank Salomon and George L. Urioste. The original manuscript, written in Quechua, is an account of “ancient and colonial Andean religion” from an area that was not Incan but subject to Incan expansion in what is now South-central Peru (Salomon and Urioste 1991).77 The earliest reference to this document was in 1608 by Father Francisco de Avila, a clergy member charged with extirpating idolatry in the Checa region.

In this particular version, the translators are spectacularly transparent in their monumental efforts to interpret this key text from the colonial period in the Andes from Quechua into English. Salomon’s introductory essay is particularly insightful regarding the considerations that go into the final translation of the major recurring concepts, which in many cases correspond with the Andean principles developed here (Salomon 1991). For this reason I regularly use this treasure to illustrate the distinctions I am trying to make below.

In the section entitled “Pacha: earth, world, time, place,” Salomon (1991) describes how this term is portrayed in the manuscript: “Huarochirí people called the world and time together pacha, an untranslatable word that simultaneously denotes a moment or interval in time and a locus or extension in space—and does so, moreover, at any scale” (14). Given its

---

77 In this particular translation, Urioste transcribed the original document and Salomon composed the introductory essay. Together they produced the final translation.
‘untranslatable’ nature, Salomon and Urioste are then put into the position of having to make choices as to how they finally translate the term into English. Citing an example, Salomon expounds on the issue:

In chapter 18 (sec. 221) the Mountain Man, foreseeing the arrival of those destroyers who would turn out to be the Spanish, says, “Alas, brothers, the pacha is not good.” He could have meant anything from “this is not a good situation” (or “moment” or “conjuncture”) to an idea as grand as “the world is no longer good” or “the epoch is no longer good” (14).

In any of their translation options—when taking the mandate of finding a concise, easy-to-read, compatible expression in English seriously—we see that Salomon and Urioste (1991) are forced to prioritize one element over the other. Interestingly when they finally choose “world,” space trumps time and they bolster the assumption of ontological separation between the two dimensions (96). Here the English language reproduces the ontology of separation by forcing a ‘both/and’ concept in which separation is not an option into an ‘either/or’ situation by having only separate and separable components available for translation. Consequently, when attempting to translate one concept that is a fruit of an ontology of complete interconnectedness into a language based on a shared ontological orientation of separation, reductionism begins in the act of translation.

This neatly reflects how the complete circle with a perforated line running through it can be perceived as two halves of a circle facing each other but not connected. In fact, most substantives in English and Spanish signify either category in the latter situation not the emergent relation that comprises two inextricable components. This paucity of labels that indicate the relation becomes evident when we look at ‘relational’ efforts within academia to re-center attention on the co-constitutive, emergent moment. Because we do not express this focus in our nouns, many have strategically privileged active verbs to emphasize the activity going on in the emergent moment. While this works to draw our attention to that co-constitutive point, the
verb does not directly conjure the two-in-one basic building block required of complete interconnectedness. In this case, the new ontologically individualistic host language actually removes the ontological starting point of any juk expression—that is, the relation between two—from the realm of possible privileged ontological foci. This makes it impossible for one to know in either English or Spanish what gets lost from not having that conceptual notion available within its respective field of possibilities. In addition, because this translation is occurring across time-spacescapes, the reductionist impact of using an interpretive lens of separation has the potential to be even further embedded and less noticeable than when it is implemented in the same general language-game.

This should be sufficient reason to be extremely wary of one’s own ontological lens and the shared lens that bore the fruit that one is attempting to translate. Yet, the act of translation actually detracts from the likelihood of this awareness. First, translation reinforces the assumption of potential compatibility between commonplaces across time-spacescapes through its very mandate to find corresponding labels in the new host language. Because we find words that are used in roughly the same way in similar contexts across time-spacescapes, we assume that somehow they reflect a similar ontological lens. To use Wittgenstein’s (1958) ancient city metaphor that describes the spatial contours of a language-game, this assumption of compatibility is to assume that the outline or borders of the ancient cities, or time-spacescapes across which one is translating, overlap. Compatibility however is not the case. Language-games and their respective tools, like ancient cities, develop in their own specific ways. The ‘taste’ of any given term, for example, comes about through a particular set of past uses, unique configurations of language-game rules, and emergent, contextual considerations. This ‘taste’ precludes finding a ‘true’ fit or correspondence between commonplaces of distinct languages.
Nevertheless, translating without entering the realm of philosophical ontology typically continues to be the case. Perhaps this is because the very mandate of translation to find correspondence pulls one’s potential focus away from identifying either one’s own ontological lens or the generally shared lens of the time-spacescape whose fruits are being translated. So instead we just struggle with the slight inconformities of use between terms (like for parity and dualism). With this strategy, however, engaging in translation often signifies engaging in epistemic violence.

In light of what can be lost, I try my best to re-articulate pacha (and all of the other principles) in terms that are more robust than how it is normally interpreted into English, even if this means using uncomfortably wordy or foreign expressions. I do believe that overt cognizance of the issue can help us nip reductionist interpretive tendencies in the bud, even if the capacity of the English language for this endeavor is still very limiting.

**Robust Pacha**

With this discussion in mind we can now elaborate on the Andean cosmic dynamic model which emerges out of the parity-based concept of pacha. Reflecting the integrated and integrative logic of this philosophy, this model continues to build on the concepts of parity, equivalency, multidimensionality and dynamic balance. I first review the classic model before elaborating on the parallels it shares with the idol of Illawi first introduced under ‘media’ in Chapter 4.

**The Cosmic Dynamic**

The Andean cosmic dynamic of time-space involves three different time-space conjunctions or pachas. Represented as three concentric circles, they figure prominently in the
creation of the *chakana* reviewed under the medium of ‘divine geometry’ in parity. Here I reproduce Lajo’s (2003) rendition:

![Figure 5. The Andean cosmic dynamic of time-space. Source: Javier Lajo, *Qhapaq Ñan: La ruta Inka de la sabiduría*, (Quito: Abya-Yala, 2003), 153.](image)

In its expression of parity, this model moves the relation to the forefront by portraying it as its own circle. Here the outer and inner circles are the components, and the middle circle is their relation.

In English texts on this Andean model, general translation consensus for the inner circle, *uku pacha*, is “underworld” and for the outer circle, *hanan pacha*, is “upperworld.” I prefer to use ‘lower time-space conjunction’ and ‘upper time-space conjunction’ respectively. Again, ‘world’ is limited and limiting in that it does not indicate the time element inherent in this concept. Lower and upper time-space conjunctions are proffered as more robust alternatives, but with a serious note of caution. We will soon see that even the directional notions of ‘lower’ and ‘upper’ are totally relative in this conceptualization. They do not have the assumed sturdiness that we normally attribute to ‘up’ and ‘down;’ they are relational concepts that depend on the emergent context.

Sandwiched between the other two *pachas* and acting as their interface, the *kay pacha* is the here and now. Lajo (2003) describes the special place and role of the *kay pacha*:
Between the two circles exists a field of encounter of the internal and external circles: the *kay pacha*, or the world of the here and now, which in reality is a threshold (*punku* or *chakana*), door and bridge, as a knowable movement of the other two spheres, but is what occupies or captures our consciousness. The *Kay Pacha* sees or feels with our consciousness the *Uku Pacha* from which it flows or comes, but it also remembers the *Hanan Pacha*, or external sphere of the time where the past walks (151).

In this cosmic dynamic, the here and now is the only accessible point that beings embodied in the three dimensions have to the future (*uku pacha*) or the past (*hanan pacha*). Completely anchored to the location in which it is experienced, the present consummates the interactive relation between the past and the future. Here, we re-produce the past and constitute the future.

A key component of the cosmic dynamic model is the sacred Andean parity-based relation between the feminine and masculine principles. The *Uku Pacha* expresses the feminine principle as the innermost circle. This cosmic Source symbolized here as the womb of Mother Earth is seen as the dark void out of which all things come and to which all things return. The *Uku Pacha* is also found in the subtle, fluid space through which all energy passes. The outermost circle of the *Hanan Pacha*, in turn, represents the Father Sky that houses the masculine principle of *Viracocha*. In contrast to the creative void out of which the future arises, the *Hanan Pacha* as the past symbolizes the place onto which the elders pass. In this *pacha*, the structural, material and light aspects of life are also manifest.

The cosmic dynamic model additionally encapsulates the energetic tendencies of these two elements that give form to being. In the center *uku pacha* represents the integrative magnetic force that draws all matter together. On the outside *hanan pacha* symbolizes the electric charge indicative of the masculine element that pulls particles apart into separation. The electric force counterbalances the magnetic to keep the particles from collapsing upon one another, and the magnetic force in proportionalized parity keeps the configurations of particles
from disintegrating. The corresponding tension between these two forces experienced in the present moment is an expression of kay pacha.

Being able to move from discussing the hanan and uku pachas as residing in the sky and within the earth to addressing the role of the uku pacha as space that houses the material particles representative of the hanan pacha and then down to their complementary energetic impulses that reflect the feminine and masculine principles is very common within Andean philosophy due to the multiscalar and multidimensional nature of its principles. The kay pacha in this sense is that point of juncture between the components of a parity-based relation no matter the scale of the related dimensions.

In addition, this model of the cosmic dynamic represents more than just the possibility of proportionalizing the past and future in the kay pacha. All parity-based relations are realized and potentially proportionalized in the here and now. In the Andean world, the proportionalizing process hinges on the dynamism of the present moment, which actually arises through the double movement of time. This is the other major component of this model figured as two arrows on the left half of the diagram above.

Symbolized by two entwined sacred serpents, called the chokoras, amarus, or yacumama and sachamama, time undulates in cyclical fashion in both directions to generate ever-new emergent moments. In this model, one serpent has its head in the uku pacha and the other in the hanan pacha, and together in undulating fashion they generate the parity-based double movement of time (Lajo 2003, 151).78 These serpents’ movement is the “oscillating time [that] flows out of the Uku Pacha but returns to it in permanent cycles” always passing through the

---

78 The image of two entwined serpents is often inappropriately confused with the Amphisbaena (Lajo 2003, 151). Here it is not one serpent with two heads, but two engaged, entwined, complementary, interdependent serpents. When the serpent is portrayed as having only one body with two heads, it emphasizes their complete ‘juk’ nature, meaning so entwined and so complementary is their co-constitutive relation that they actually become a whole juk (just like the complete circle with just a simple—and often difficult to discern—line through it).
threshold of the *kay pacha* while extending out to the *hanan pacha* (Lajo 2003, 153). This dynamism again can only be sensed in the emergent moment specific to a particular spatial location.

That the serpents’ bellies are in the here-and-now threshold between the upper and lower time-space conjunctions is extremely symbolic of how human beings relate to this cosmic dynamic and of the importance of balance. While time oscillates through the three *pachas* (and while some humans may be able to ‘travel’ to other dimensions), humans’ and the sacred snakes’ material bodies, their bellies, still remain in the *kay pacha*. As Lajo (2003) explains, “consciousness may expand or contract, but … we should never move the ‘stomach’ away from the here and now, because this error is the principal source of imbalance and therefore illness” (151). Quite simply, mindful attention needs to be directed at filling the belly, at being wholly present. To be anywhere else (mentally, spiritually or temporally) other than the present is (a) to forget that the only ‘functional’ moment to which we have access is the present time-place, (b) to engender imbalance between oneself and the present circumstances (one’s surroundings), and (c) to create illness in/for oneself and the whole.

This point plus the others reviewed above are more fully illustrated in the symbolism of the Puquina idol reviewed under parity (Figure 1). We turn to it here to continue to build on the integrative parallels of Andean logic.

The Cosmic Dynamic in the Idol of Illawi

In the Idol of Illawi the woman and man, in addition to representing the female and male in human form, also represent the *uku* and *hanan pachas* and the feminine and masculine energetic principles respectively. That these complementary opposites are bound together by sacred serpents is significant in many ways. Since serpents in the Andean cosmovision
symbolize wisdom, the messages they share in this idol could be seen as conditions for gleaning that wisdom. For example, the snakes’ tight embrace of the couple stands out immediately. Recognizing the inescapability of that embrace, of the relation, is the first step toward wisdom. Then, because the serpents hold together complementary contrasts, the type of components that are in relation is also important for wisdom. Complementary contrast is key for mutual mirroring through which the components can achieve co-creative re-generation. Next, because these snakes also happen to be the chokoras that oscillate across the pachas to generate the dynamic present moment, their presence also signifies that wisdom only comes through navigating that moment. Together these first three pieces indicate that wisdom according to this cosmovision is derived through dynamic parity-based interaction, not through already constituted elements in separation.

Recalling the lesson of the serpents’ bellies needing to be in the kay pacha reviewed above, here the serpents’ bellies lying across the humans’ bellies at their juncture reinforces the point about the equivalency between divine and human elements. In this case the principle by which they must commonly abide is that they need to be focused on the present moment to preserve and re-generate life and harmony. When we are not fully present in the dynamic fluctuation of time through space, we cannot sense what is being afforded in that emergent moment or foster balance.

Besides conveying principles that apply to all beings in the kay pacha, another key element to consider here is the multiscalar, multidimensional flexibility of the conditions. For instance, the parity reflected in the woman and man in this idol can be applied to human bodies, plants, animals, energetic impulses, the earth and sky, any kind of interaction, etc. Its expression is contingent on the specificity of the moment-place.
The position of the snakes’ heads express another aspect of this transversal theme. In this idol, while each serpent points its head in the same direction as either the woman or the man, together they supposedly indicate the double movement of time. If one insisted on the common translation of ‘upperworld’ and ‘underworld’ for *hanan pacha* and *uku pacha* respectively, then one might argue that these do not represent the *chokoras* that oscillate across the three *pachas* since their heads do not point up and down. The translation itself precludes one from seeing that each snake’s head still points toward its respective *pacha* through a multidimensional application of these principles. Here the man is on the right, which is usually conceived as the masculine side. The masculine-principled Father Sky or daytime begins in the East where the sun rises, giving us dawn and heralding in the ancestors. All of these aspects point to the *hanan pacha*, where symbolically the serpent’s head on the side of the man is directed. The woman on the left symbolizes the West, where the sun sets allowing for nighttime, or the *uku pacha*, to reign. Her respective serpent points its head in this direction as well.

This ‘re-positioning’ of up/down as right/left or east/west reflects the extremely fluid and dynamic nature of a wholly monistic, relational world. However, when understood from an optic of one-in-separation, the drive to define each direction categorically impedes this flexibility. This is another reason why those that still embrace this cosmovision see the Western approach as too rigid, too constricting, too ‘dead.’

A lot can come out of such a symbolic idol on the integrative logic of Andean philosophy and this cosmic dynamic in particular when an interpretive lens based on complete interconnectedness is employed. First, it reinforces the concept that all relations are realized, engaged and proportionalized through the encounter of time-space in the *kay pacha*. Relations and the two-in-one building block they comprise are emergent, wholly present-tense phenomena

79 Thank you Starr-Bresette for sharing this insight with me.
that are also completely anchored in a specific place. To focus on any other place or timeframe would signify missing what is being afforded in the present time-place. While balance and imbalance are equally possible outcomes of engaging with the dynamic emergent moment through interaction, ontologically privileging the relation and its corresponding building block engenders awareness of this possibility and allows it to become an intention in each emergent moment.

These lessons are wholly contingent on ontologically privileging the relation and the ‘logical’ steps that follow starting with the relation. Having to reduce pacha to an ‘either/or’ situation through translation completely unravels the whole integrative logic. Having to choose either time or space, for instance, as an appropriate translation in either English or Spanish removes the possibility of the two-in-one complex of time-space and the juk that the kay pacha represents between the hanan and uku pachas. While lack of juk-like concepts indicates the inadequacy of Spanish and English, trying to convey a concept like pacha into either language results in epistemic reductionism. We cannot easily conjure the two-in-one building block or its accompanying emphasis on balance. This casualty precludes an ability to see how tightly integrated all of these principles are when understood from the logic of complete interconnectedness. Forcing the translation then is one way—in fact an even less detectable way—of facilitating shared ontological slippage and epistemic violence.

The next principle, ayllu, continues to build on the integrated and integrative complexity of this philosophy. Grasping its robust breadth also requires a clear awareness of the ontology of complete interconnectedness, its logic and corresponding fruit.
CHAPTER 6

NO SEPARATION IN THE AYLLU

Our community is not something in itself; it is not an institution, it is not something given or established. Our community is our way collectively to accommodate ourselves among ourselves, according to what is fitting to each moment of the continuous conversation which we sustain with the circumstances of life in order to continue living and generating. This is our form of life. Our community is not simply a human environment, rather it is all of us who live together in a locality: humans, plants, animals, rivers, mountains, stars, moon, sun. Similarly, our ayllu, our family, is not only the people of our blood lineage; rather we are the whole of the human community of the locality (runas) and also our natural community (sallqas) and our community of the sustainers of life (huacas) with whom we share life in our locality (Pacha) in the annual telluric-sideral rhythm (wata).

—Eduardo Grillo F., “Development or Cultural Affirmation in the Andes?”

The Andean principle of ayllu, or the social dimension of pacha, relies the most on the full breadth of complete interconnectedness. This chapter first seeks to elaborate on the robustness of this term before showing how its potential breadth and accompanying concepts become truncated and misconstrued when filtered through an interpretive lens that embraces any degree of ontological individualism.

Traditionally this term has been translated as kinship systems or social organization. Rengifo (1998a) insists that the ayllu cannot be reduced to this, because the ‘social’ in this cosmovision includes all Beings in the here and now: the sallqa (nature), huacas (deities) and runas (human beings) (89). In this ayllu—a non-hierarchical world of equivalents—“the runas do not feel themselves to be superior to and distant from the members of nature or inferior to the deities or huacas.” In fact, they are “just one more member of nature; they are…nature itself”

80 Actually in Quechua the plural is expressed with “kuna” rather than “s.” I am following Rengifo’s lead in simplifying the re-application of these terms into Spanish and then English by applying “s” at the end to signify the plural.

81 This equivalency is why the term “worship” is inappropriate for what has been perceived to be “spiritual” activities. Equivalency does not allow for the external directing of energy. Instead reciprocal nurturing is what is engaged: Taking care of the other (which is “you” in the interconnected sense) and allowing yourself to be taken
Due to the interpenetrable nature of all beings, the typically conceived dividing lines are quite blurred. As Rengifo points out, “the notion of runa … includes what the West considers as man but also incorporates ‘within it’ the notions of sallqa or nature and of huacas or deities” (90).

This conjures a different conceptualization of what is deemed detectable in the robustly monistic sphere. Confirming others’ points made in the anecdotes above, that detectable reality involves the whole ayllu and nothing beyond it. Rengifo (1998a) expounds: “we only make visible what is perceived in an obvious way in the Pacha: the deity mountains or Apus, the community of the runas; and the [sallqa] – that is, what is not cultivated by the runas” (120).

The interconnected nature of these equivalent beings actually makes them “relatives.” For example, Rengifo notes, “the peasants consider the potatoes of their chacra [a field cultivated by runas] to be their daughters, and when they are newly incorporated they are called daughters-in-law.” Hail, a part of sallqa, is considered to be a godfather, and Apus as huacas are grandfathers (91). The limits of what we can detect within that wholly monistic, interrelated sphere are drawn based on our particular point in the kay pacha: We are embedded there and nowhere else in the three dimensions, and it is only at that point that we may engage resources to co-create reality through the relation. (This aspect is further elaborated in the following chapters.)

---

82 In Latour’s work *We Have Never Been Modern*, he notes that “all natures-cultures”—meaning those time-spacescapes that espouse an ontology of complete interconnectedness—“are similar in that they simultaneously construct humans, divinities and nonhumans” (106).

83 It is common to simply state pacha for the here and now (since it is the only time-space to which we have access) and only use kay pacha when specifically distinguishing it from the uku and hanan pachas.
In addition, each relative is understood to be integral to life, reflecting in another respect the notion of equivalency throughout this cosmovision. Here Rengifo (1998a) asserts, “The whole Pacha is a community of interconnected living beings, in which man and water are as important and alive as are the huacas and the wind in terms of the regeneration of life” (97). In a time-spacescape of equivalent beings, then, “the ayllu is lived as a grouping of relatives runas, relatives chacras, relatives sallqa and relatives huacas who all live in one ‘house’ or Pacha which protects them.” This concept cannot be reduced to just human ties, Rengifo (1998a) argues, but is a much broader, much more inclusive kinship system than has traditionally been interpreted (91). A key aspect of this very robust definition is Rengifo’s emphasis on its lived or experienced quality, which is a very different expression than trying to describe the parameters of a set category. That language will be seen under the illustration of reductionism.

We can use a relational approach to culture as a bridge toward understanding the complex and changing nature of the ayllu despite the fact that this concept in the cross-cultural-communication literature does not extend beyond the human realm. When culture is understood in more complex network terms, the identity group that inherits, embraces, shares and re-constitutes a culture is analogous to how the ayllu is an emergent, dynamic social dimension of the time-spacescape. From a network perspective, the breadth of a culture depends on the size of the identity group that adheres to and upholds the respective mores, values, beliefs and practices of that culture. In this sense, cultures could potentially be as narrow as two people or as broad as an entire civilization. Furthermore, because people belong to various identity groups, cultures overlap through ‘shared membership.’
The shared culture that pertains to a given identity group (at whatever scale) emerges through the interaction among its members.\textsuperscript{84} It is a communicative co-constitutive phenomenon, whereby people pull and use commonplaces from the shared (‘developed’) background and, through their interaction, re-constitute these ways of communicating for future encounters. In this way, the developed aspect of each respective culture established through past interactions is what people perceive as the boundaries between cultures. At the same time these boundaries are fluid and are constantly being re-negotiated and re-defined in ever-new and emergent circumstances.

The ayllu shares similar features, just at a much more inclusive scale than a cultural identity group. In Quechua ayllu is used in the same emergent, contextual and specific way. Here I cite Rengifo (1998a) at length to give a fuller picture of its similar conceptual and social flexibility:

The ayllu also does not have fixed physical borders. In certain circumstances, my ayllu is my community or ayllu of ayllus. But if I am in the community I can say that I belong to the ayllu of my paternal name, or to the ayllu of my Apu of reference, or to the ayllu of the sector in which I live. In other contexts, for example if I am in the provincial capital and if I am asked about my ayllu, I can answer referring to the name of the district to which my community belongs and with whose Apus I feel familiar, and thus the ayllu also can be my province and one is always in the ayllu. In this sense kinship is fairly malleable and can expand or contract according to the circumstances a group experiences at a particular point in time (93).

Rengifo’s (1998a) description of ayllu highlights a few common dimensions between these two concepts even though a cultural identity group is not conceived in parallel with kinship. For example, one can never be outside of relation in either the ayllu or the identity group. This is what allows us to understand the ‘social’ dimension of a given time-space conjunction in network terms. This metaphor allows one to grasp the multiple, overlapping ayllus and identity

\textsuperscript{84} Interaction with non-members is equally important, but that requires much more elaboration than what is necessary here to make this point.
groups in that dimension. It also places emphasis on the need to rely on the emergent context, on the specifics of the moment-place to know to what ayllu or socially inclusive notion of the ‘Other’ one is referring, especially in the face of such malleable borders. Identifying the culture shared by an identity group is contingently determined in the same way. This contingency on the emergent moment-place is what lends these terms their flexibility.

**Distinguishing Features**

Despite all of these similarities, the ayllu—when conceived from a wholly monistic ontological stance—is a much more robust concept than even identity group. This point is evidenced in three aspects of this robust concept: interconnectedness, interpenetrability and the ‘incomplete’ character of the component. These features that stem from an ontology of complete interconnectedness are explored in relation to the ayllu here.

**Interconnectedness**

In the first and most obvious instance, ayllu, by including deities, plants and animals through the supposition of complete interconnectedness extends well beyond the reach of a culture’s identity group. Even though ayllu and identity group are equally ‘social,’ their difference in breadth stems from how the interconnection is conceived. A relational approach to culture sees the identity group as being interconnected through language. In the ayllu, in contrast, all beings are interconnected and in communication with each other through energy. Seeing energy as the basis for interconnection affords a much more inclusive view of what can be considered ‘social.’

This primordial tenet of the ontology of complete interconnectedness is similarly central for the other features that follow, so it is important to examine how this interconnection works so as to permit such a robustly conceived social dimension. To grasp the dimension of the term
‘social,’ we must first get out of a reductionist focus on matter, for the space in which that matter is suspended is key here. While ‘space’ is traditionally understood in the Western-style academic time-spacescape as the ‘non-empirical,’ the interpretation of ‘space’—again just like the ‘dualisms’ discussed under parity—is also contingent on the employed ontological lens. An example of an ontologically individualistic reading of ‘space’ comes from Rengifo (1998a) himself when he attempts to describe the monistic Andean world to an audience that normally assumes ontological individualism: “The world is full of forms of life without the mediation between them of ‘space’ and ‘emptiness’” (98). That space to which Rengifo is referring is the one perceived as a gap when the ontological focus is on the material only. This perceptive preferencing of focusing only on the visible, on matter, emphasizes the perception of difference, which reinforces the tendency to separate conceptually. In this way ontological individualism encourages a lack of acknowledgment of the element that connects us all: the shared space in which those particles are suspended.

Within the Andean cosmovision, “the presence of ‘Other,’” Rengifo (1998a) observes, “does not make its appearance as something distant and different from oneself” (98). This perspective becomes possible when the particles are conceived as always being in relation to ‘space,’ the element through which energy flows and that we all share. Incorporating the common denominator of space into the basic ontological building block among all beings means that separation among humans, nature and the cosmos is impossible. Separation is merely an illusion that becomes possible through an ontological overemphasis on only part of the cosmos: the particles.\(^85\) Surely though that separation seems real due to the density of existence in the three dimensions.

\(^85\) When one learns to switch back and forth in terms of perceptive prioritization between the particles and the space in which they are suspended, we can begin to appreciate the holograms or constructions that we create and how we
When one realizes that all material forms are simply different configurations of particles that share energy through the space that connects us, the fundamental equivalency of all things becomes apparent. This is what Rengifo (1998a) means when he says, “In the ayllu all share the same attributes” (94). Through the space they share and the energy that flows through that space, all beings can and do communicate with one another. How this communication works though is developed more thoroughly in the next two chapters.

Interpenetrability

Another aspect that becomes conceivable once space is acknowledged in tethered relation to matter is the interpenetrability of each being in the ayllu. The element of space makes all members of the ayllu interpenetrable on the energetic plane. Rengifo (1998a) expounds on this point:

Such fluidity of borders [just like the ayllu] is also found in each of the forms of life of the ayllu (be it runa, huaca or sallqa). In each runa live the forms of life of the huacas and the sallqa, just as in every Apu live the forms of the sallqa and runas, and in every tree of the sallqa live forms of runas and huacas. An attribute of the ayllu is interpenetrability and an absence of exclusion among the various forms of life (Rengifo 1998a, 93).

This is why Andeans have been known to say that a runa becomes a grasshopper or tree, that a mountain is a person, that a chameleon becomes a piece of bark or rock, or that a snake is the father of a whole nation.

The Huarochirí Manuscript contains an important case that clearly reflects the assumption of interpenetrability. In his discussion of the meaning of camay (used to describe Pachacámac under parity above), Salomon (1991) employs an excerpt to illustrate the use of this term that also happens to clarify the conceptual foundations for interpenetrability. He cites a continue to give them form by breathing energy into them, by treating them as real. Slipping into an ontological emphasis on space reminds us of their illusory character.
situation in chapter 14 (sec. 191) where some men “boast of their speed,” and this is what they recount:

“I am a condor shaman!” Some men answered.
“I am a falcon shaman!” said others.

Not coincidentally the interpenetration that allows each shaman to take on the special attributes of each bird occurs through camay, the vitalizing energy that emerges from and passes through the creative void.

To show how Salomon and Urioste (1991) get to the translation that they use, Salomon (1991) reviews the grammatical sequence deriving from the verb camay. The camac, or agentive form of camay, is the one that constantly vitalizes or animates (16). In this cosmovision that assumes interpenetrability, “all things have their vitalizing prototypes or camac, including human groups” (16). Then that which is ‘fountainized’ or continuously receives the life force is the camasca, which, as Salomon notes, is the participial form of this verb meaning “infused with camay” (16). With the grammatical layout of the term, we can begin to make more sense of the more literal translation that Salomon provides where the birds are regarded as camacs:

“I am the camasca of the condor!”
“I am the camasca of the falcon!”
“I am one who flies as a swift!” (16).

This description of the vitalizing energy found in the manuscript exemplifies the notion of interpenetrability. Salomon (1991) points out an important aspect of this interpenetrability, camac here is “not an abstraction or mental archetype,” but “seems to suggest a being abounding in energy as physical as electricity or body warmth” (16). This makes sense since the ‘breath of life’ (energy, life force) flows through the space in which the particles of matter are suspended, resulting in a vibration, electricity, ‘body warmth,’ frequency, resonance, etc.
If Salomon were not using an interpretive lens based on separation, then he would probably not mention an ‘abstraction’ or ‘mental archetype,’ because they are not ontologically possible from within a system that starts with a two-in-one building block.\textsuperscript{86} From this perspective ‘abstracting’ out of the here and now or creating an extension of the mind in the form of an archetype is not an option. All must make sense in relation, not in separation.

In further elaborating on the relationship between the \textit{camac} and its \textit{camasca}, Salomon (1991) notes that “religious practice supplicates the \textit{camac} ever to vitalize its \textit{camasca}, that is, its tangible instance for manifestation” (16). This observation recalls the parity-based relation between \textit{Pachacámac} and \textit{Viracocha}. In order to exist, \textit{Viracocha}’s material dimension needs to be infused with the creative life force, and at the same time \textit{Pachacámac}’s creative force cannot be known without its live physical manifestation. Because all beings that exist within the three dimensions all consist of particles that are infused with energy that give them their existence, this fundamental divine parity-based relation permeates all of existence in the \textit{kay pacha}.

This poses a question then about how \textit{camay} works: If \textit{Pachacámac} is the furthest reaching vitalizer that extends in multiscalar fashion from inside one’s cells out into the galaxies, then how is it that other beings, \textit{huacas, sallqa} or even \textit{runas}, can be \textit{camacs} that attend to or vitalize certain sets of beings or localities? One must first recognize that all specific \textit{camacs} are themselves vitalized through \textit{Pachacámac}. Then, the particular configuration of particles that results in a particular kind of existence ‘houses’ a particular kind of energy, a kind of knowing that is different from other molecular configurations. So the more specific \textit{camacs} share the energy and knowing that come through the lived experience of her or his ‘bodily’ form.\textsuperscript{87} This

\textsuperscript{86} Even the uncertainty expressed with “seems to suggest” indicates a lack of “knowing” in the lived sense.

\textsuperscript{87} I enclose ‘bodily’ in quotes because even the wind or hail can be a \textit{camac}, which makes it a bit difficult to imagine those kinds of body.
life force or energy gets relayed through spatial interpenetration and can then infuse the camasca’s material existence as well. 88

So for example, within the Huarochirí Manuscript, a llama-shaped constellation is seen to act as a camac, infusing “a powerful generative essence of llama vitality, which causes [its camasca, the] earthly llamas to flourish” (Salomon 1991, 16). Through interpenetration, this vitalizing energy and the ‘knowing’ that accompanies it are transferred through space and at the same time ‘inform’ material existence through this infusion. In this sense, camay could also understood, as Salomon (1991) defines it, “to charge with being, to infuse with species power” (16).

Just as varying levels of vitalizing force are encountered across different types of camacs, those who are “infused with camay,” the camasca, enjoy varying degrees of camay. For example, “an ancha camasca person is a ‘very powerful’ one,” says Salomon (16). So while “camay means specific form and force,” it does not allude to the amount of potency provided or received (Salomon 1991, 16). So as these men boasted of their speed as a reflection of the degree to which they were camasca of the bird species with whom they shared an affinity, they were addressing how the generative force of each of these sacred birds penetrated through and vitalized them via the space between the particles and nourished their ‘material’ capacity of speed. In this sense, the specific vibration of each being is share-able and integrate-able because it is energy. If we singularly focus on matter, however, the subsequently perceived separation does not permit acknowledgment of this interpenetrability.

So far these features remind us of the difference in epistemological ordering of our hook-up to reality. The ontology of complete interconnectedness, for instance, first sees our

88 It is on this plane that one could elaborate on the ‘deadening’ effects of genetically modified organisms and processed foods.
interconnection through the ether, through energy, and then sees difference in forms of life as expressed through molecular configurations. In Andean philosophy, even though the first, broader assumption is that of interconnection, these ‘bodily’ distinctions are highly valued because they create the friction, the contrast that allows us to recognize who we are. Moreover, as we see in the case of interpenetrability, the camay housed in these other forms of life can infuse us with other kinds of knowing.

Ontological individualism, on the other hand, subsumes the most global aspect (space or energy represented as relation) into a secondary position by starting first with distinct bodies that stand in separation. This somewhat odd ontological prioritizing starts then with a reduced ontological realm and therefore necessarily generates a reduced conceptualization of the relations themselves. Rather than being conceived as a universally shared attribute of physics, relations now emerge subsequent to the constitution of the ontologically autonomous components that happen to be in relation, which then puts us in a place of having to discern the conditionality, significance, degree and type of relation. In the former case relationality is a law of physics from which other principles are derived. In the latter it is a matter of study for categorization.

The ‘Incomplete’ Character of Any Component

The third trait that distinguishes the robust concept of ayllu from a more relational conceptualization of the identity group is the ‘incomplete’ character of all interrelated elements. This feature becomes evident through an ontological lens that wholly privileges the relation. In a dyadic situation, the parity principle provides a strategy for momentarily overcoming this existential condition through relation. The configurational aspect of the ayllu though prods us to contemplate how the parity principle is applied in emergent, network terms. How does ‘mirroring’ or ‘co-creation’ happen in interactive configurations of multiple actors?
To answer this question, we need to restate the conceptualization of our ‘incomplete’ character and the response it can generate within an ontology of complete interconnectedness. Our ‘incomplete’ character is a critical component of being interconnected. Evidence of our interdependence permeates all of existence in the *kay pacha*. To survive biologically we need the consistently momentary and cyclical ‘completions’ that come through air, water, food, the sun and moon. We also need the ‘Other’—any being in the robustly defined sense that one encounters in the *ayllu*—to know ourselves. Normally contemplated as identity formation, here our ‘self’-discovery comes through the contrasts that ‘Others’ provide in interaction. Difference in this sense is embraced and valued because it nurtures our ability to recognize ourselves; it helps us to ‘have life.’ This scenario can engender gratitude toward the contrasts that ‘Others’ provide, even though they may be difficult or challenging, as well as the awareness that we too provide the same ‘service’ to ‘Others.’ When this outlook is shared within the *ayllu*, it can foster a generalized tendency of mutual nurturing where nurturing the ‘Other’ is seen as nurturing oneself and vice versa.\(^8^9\)

In a world of no separation, complete equivalency, interpenetrability and incompleteness, this sense of nurturing is applied to the whole *ayllu*. Rengifo (1998a) describes this state of being in the Andean context:

This helps in understanding the ease with which an Andean nurtures and also lives being nurtured by a llama or a potato, because in him or her nest the other forms of life, just as in the other forms of life nests the human form. It is not that a member of the human community in certain circumstances ‘represents’ the oca, the carachupa or the maize, but rather that in that moment he or she and the community experience the circumstances as the oca, carachupa or maize itself. Andeans do not represent forms of life because they

---

\(^{8^9}\) This concept of reciprocity or mutual nurturing and listening is also called *ayni* in Quechua. It is further developed in Chapter 9.
have neither separated nor disaffected themselves from nature [or] from the *huacas*. In them the *sallqa* and the *huacas* dwell; they are at once *sallqa* and *huaca* (94).90

In this account, we see neither the anthropomorphism nor the cosmogonization discussed in Chapter 2. Here, there is simply no initial separation, and this primordial interconnection allows for both the assumption of interpenetrability and emphasis on mutual nurturing.

With this reminder of the link between starting with interconnectedness, recognizing our incomplete nature, and taking on an understanding of reciprocity, we can begin to speak of how mutual nurturing and mutual listening can be conceived as taking place at the level of the *ayllu*. For this we must also remember two major conceptual tools. First, the *ayllu* must be understood as an emergent network. Second, we only have access to and can engage that network from our particular emergent point of the *kay pacha*. In this sense, the complementary contrast through which mutual nurturing and listening occur becomes a momentary, multiscalar and fractalized notion. ‘Fractalized’ is a concept based on emergence, not separation, so it is not the same as saying 'segmented' or 'compartmentalized.’ Fractals come out of other fractals: Wholly embedded in the context, they inform future fractals. Time-place after time-place, the specificity of the social configuration and emergent circumstances shape the nature of the fractal.

In this sense, the fractalized contrasts—that nurture us and allow us to know who we are—are simultaneously fleeting and anchored. Concurrently though, cyclical time allows us to

---

90 I want to stress again that while Rengifo talks about this as if most Andeans still maintain this posture, this does not describe my general experience in the Andes. Without a doubt, traces of these principles remain evident on a daily basis (which is how I am still able to re-construct this ideal-type), but they have been fragmented through the assimilation of the logic of separation. While some communities may still practice this philosophy in wholly collective fashion, the contemporary Andean context has been syncretized to a large degree, with most people displaying characteristics that reflect certain dimensions of ontological individualism. In the overarching syncretic context that I know, indigenous leaders can be bought out, mountains can be destroyed for mining, water can be knowingly contaminated, roads can be built through sacred mega-biodiverse time-spacescapes, trash can be haphazardly dumped, dogs can be poisoned and wives can be beat into submission without a blink of an eye, without a single thought about nurturing the wider *ayllu*, and without there being any kind of discursive resources left to remind people of the need to care for all of the *ayllu* for one’s own sake. The context that I know is permeated with an anthropocentric attitude, except for when conjuring ideas, things or concepts, like “God,” to continue to instill fear in the people through ontological isolation. Again, as a gentle reminder I am describing an ideal-typical time-spacescape that is built through a predominantly shared ontology of complete interconnectedness.
see how the contrasts come back around and around until we integrate them. Integrating involves recognizing some aspect of ourselves that the contrast triggers and working through it until it is ‘incorporated,’ at which point it no longer constitutes a contrast. From the perspective of this cosmovision, we choose whether to acknowledge that this is what is going on, to acknowledge the ‘Other’ for producing the trigger and to attend to its integration, or not. If we choose to integrate it, we gather more tools to engender balance in dynamic form. If not, then we simply get to keep facing similar contrasts on a permanently cyclical basis.

Undoubtedly the full implications of this final differentiating trait described here may only be conceptualized in light of the robust versions of the first two which surge forth through an ontology of complete interconnectedness: the full breadth of the ayllu and a respect for and honoring of the interpenetrable quality of the social network in the kay pacha. One must also apply this lens’ integrated and integrative logic to get to this point. A vision that underscores any degree of separation cannot see the reason for gratitude toward the ‘Other’ robustly defined because the ‘Other’ is not recognized first as part of oneself or as the source of ‘self’-recognition. From this perspective, the contrasts that ‘Others’ provide are reason to further reinforce the perceived separation. They are hardly considered as an opportunity to gain wisdom. In more drastic forms of an ontology of separation, these contrasts serve as justifications for xenophobia, homophobia, misogyny, fear of bacteria or ‘germs’ and even of nature in general, which in turn avails the capacity to willingly and openly dominate or destroy the ‘Other.’

In sum, the Andean principle of ayllu shares certain features in common with a relational approach to culture through the identity group, such as the emergent, contemporary network and dimensional flexibility. Because ayllu arises from an ontological insistence on relationality occurring through energy, not just human language, it also displays features generated through
interconnectedness, interpenetrability and incompleteness. So far this robust concept has allowed us to see how much broader the social dimension could be through interconnectedness, given us insight into how beings can share their *camay* with others on the interpenetrable plane, and shown how interactive wisdom arises through momentary, yet cyclical fractals of contrast.

Now we turn to the illustration of reductionism. Relying on a clear understanding of all of the principles covered to this point, this case seeks to illustrate how varying degrees of reductionism can result from differences in the breadth of the adopted ontological lens and show how an interpretive lens of separation attempts to make sense of *ayllu* for the purpose of translating it into a language that also privileges ontological individualism. Here again we witness how the conceptualization of the term gets curtailed and how this in turn reduces one’s capacity to see how this integrative logic works.

**Illustration of Reductionism**

The case of *ayllu* provides insight into varying degrees of potential reductionism. For example, one could still understand the social dimension in emergent, relational terms and just limit its scope to the human realm. In this case, the resulting idea would be even more similar in ontological shape to the relational conceptualization of cultural identity groups. The primary reason for this reductionist maneuver would be because relations are conceived as being constituted by human language not energy. While this truncated version of monism provides important degrees of subtlety to our understanding of culture and the fluidity of its boundaries, it remains incapable of grasping the full reach of *ayllu* and other concepts that are borne by embracing complete interconnectedness.

---

91 This delimitation, as we will see, is the fundamental difference between monistic methodological approaches in international relations and in the wider Western-style academic time-spacescape in general and an ontology of complete interconnectedness. We will continue to see the ramifications of drawing the defining line of the monistic realm at human language as we continue through this dissertation.
While the previous three sections on interconnectedness, interpenetrability and ‘incompleteness’ point to some of the limitations generated by a relational approach that stops at the anthropocentric perimeter, the degree of reduction becomes even more severe when an ontological lens of separation is used to interpret the concept of ayllu. Removing the relation from the center of attention is a particularly fatal maneuver when dealing with the social dimension in any of its guises. A slip into ontological individualism implies perceiving ayllu first as a category whose parameters need to be defined instead of as an emergent, contingent, flexible concept. Since those dealing with Andean concepts usually have to find a way to incorporate the relation due to its central role in everything, to aggregate it through this lens though means that it appears epistemologically after the identification of the existentially autonomous components.

Either of these scenarios could feed into the traditional ‘re-interpretation’ of ayllu as the set of kinship patterns or “relations of kinship and descent which exist among a human group related consanguineously and living in a particular territory” (Rengifo 1998a, 90). This traditional re-interpretation, embraced by most foreign anthropologists and chroniclers, prominently emphasizes the parameters of the categorical, provides little to no notion of emergence, and is fenced in to apply only to human beings. Moreover, it stands in stark contrast to Rengifo’s emphasis on the lived aspect of ayllu noted above.

With this panorama then, Salomon’s (1991) explanation of this concept found in his introduction to the Huarochirí Manuscript provides interesting fodder for seeing what happens when an ontologically individualistic interpretive lens attempts to grasp the ayllu of complete interconnectedness. What is first notable about this text, besides the utter transparency of

---

92 As we will see below, when emergence is actually identified as an important component within the cosmosvision, its implications do not translate across concept development. That is, it is mentioned but not integrated into the interpretive logic itself.
Salomon’s thinking process that makes this exercise possible, is that nowhere in his introductory text does Salomon explicitly acknowledge the ontological lens he applies to his interpretation of the manuscript. As discussed under parity, this absence of acknowledgment usually signifies that one is simply re-producing the predominant ontological orientation of the given field in the Western-style academic time-spacescape. This is rather critical since, as we have seen, using an interpretive lens based on ontological individualism to understand the fruits of complete interconnectedness is a completely irreconcilable venture. As such, this absence of acknowledgment can have some serious implications, and this case illustrates some of these well.

Here I closely follow Salomon’s (1991) two-page elaboration of the concept, sticking faithfully to the order in which he presents his argument. Because ‘the evidence’ on which he bases his elaboration of ayllu consists of early texts that (re-)interpreted this philosophy (chronicles and dictionaries), the text of the Huarochirí Manuscript itself, and more recent texts that attempt to generate a more relational interpretation within Andean studies, his description of this term provides insight into the varying degrees of reductionism that can occur through a lens of separation and allows us to better understand how these ontological assumptions shape the end-product. While the following blow-by-blow analysis of Salomon’s elaboration of ayllu may seem overly meticulous, this level of detail is necessary for watching how an ontologically individualistic lens is applied to this fruit of complete interconnectedness and what consequences emerge as a result.

Salomon (1991) first entitles the section “Ayllu: corporate landholding collectivity self-defined as ancestor-focused kindred.” Then, with a use of ayllu as commonly found in the text, he ruminates, “But what was the makeup of the ayllu?” (21). Already, the question he asks

---

93 This omission seems to be a common practice when translating “fixed” documents for anthropological purposes. In any case, this absence implies that the translator has not considered the potential problems of ontological incommensurability, but this does not seem to be an exceptionally “aberrant” case, just a more common one.
believes his focus on a categorical interpretation of this term. Instead of asking how or when it is used in relation to its embedded context, he wants to know its constitution. He then cites Gonçález Holguín, a great lexicographer coming from the same time period as Garcilaso de la Vega, but laments that Gonçález Holguín “gives a definition of ayllu so broad as to include virtually all kinds of descent, kinship, and even territorial solidarity” (Gonçález Holguín [1608] 1952, 39-40 qtd. in Salomon 1991, 21). Labeling this definition as “too broad” is evidence that the extremely variable, emergent and flexible nature of a principle based on complete interconnectedness does not figure as a possibility through his ontological lens. With this maneuver he also shows that he is insisting on capturing definable categorical parameters.

Next, Salomon turns to Francisco de Avila’s classic definition, where “an ayllu was something like the Spanish kin group defined by a shared surname, which would suggest patrilineal bias” (Arguedas and Duviols 1966, 257 qtd. in Salomon 1991, 21-22). In light of Rengifo’s complex description of ayllu above that includes all live beings (runas, sallqa, chacras and huacas) found within the kay pacha, Avila’s early interpretation shows how starkly reductionist a lens based on separation can be. Salomon, after witnessing the richness of this term through its various uses in the Huarochirí Manuscript, also treats Avila’s definition as too narrow. However, because he is using the same reductionist ontological approach as Avila, he seeks to improve upon this early re-interpretation of ayllu by pointing out the contradictory evidence from the manuscript so as to expand the parameters of the category. In this sense he continues to employ the same lens, such that when instances from the text extend beyond Avila’s traditional re-interpretation, they are ‘aggregated’ to the laundry list of parametric possibilities (hence explaining the section’s ‘odd’ title).
What is extremely interesting about this maneuver is that while every single instance he cites from the manuscript would easily fit into the more fluid and broadly social understanding of *ayllu* described by Rengifo above, his ontological lens has him focused, much like a detective, on identifying bits and pieces that will allow him to generate more comprehensive and more accurate categorical boundaries. Because this strategy of using the evidence to widen the parameters is derived through ontological individualism, it does not require understanding how the principles themselves allow for conceptual flexibility based on relational emergence.

For the first exception to Avila’s ‘rule,’ Salomon demonstrates that the manuscript manifests that there is more to this concept than just “a corporate unilineal principle” (Salomon 1991, 22). Citing a line from chapter 7, he quotes, “There is within this *ayllu* a patrilineage [yumay] which bears the name Chauincho” (Salomon and Urioste 1991, 64 qtd. in Salomon 1991, 22). From this he infers the following two points: first, “*ayllu* is a separate concept from patrilineage” and second “an *ayllu* could contain more than one patrilineage.” With this he concludes, “*Ayllu* is therefore not the minimal or the only unit of descent ideology” (22). With this he breaks the boundaries set by Avila and creates the space to include other considerations.

The very next line in the manuscript, which describes a person as being “a member of the Chauincho *ayllu*,” requires another explanation (Salomon and Urioste 1991, 64). Given Rengifo’s (1998a) demonstration of the flexibility based on contextual specificity of this term above, it is not surprising to find a family *ayllu* within a community *ayllu*. It is a network within a network, an identity group that fits within a broader identity group. However for Salomon (1991) the seemingly contradictory evidence throws off his search for definable categorical parameters. As a result, he addresses this evidence in conjectural terms: this passage “suggests
that the term *ayllu* could subsume the concept of lineage,” but, he admits, this “makes it difficult to distinguish the two in certain instances” for the purpose of adequate translation (22).

I take this point as evidence of the incapacity of an interpretive filter based on ontological individualism to grasp the fluid, emergent and contingent nature of all concepts that emerge from a predominantly shared ontology of complete interconnectedness. In this case the loss pertains to the social dimension that cannot be divorced from a particular time-space. By starting with one in separation, one necessarily is relegated to a reductionist interpretation, which has a serious ripple effect. If you do not ‘get’ the logic that generated that concept, then it is difficult to grasp either the whole robust concept or the integrative nature it shares with any other idea that flows from the same logic.

We see this in Salomon’s next step in which he attempts to apprehend the elusive nature of *ayllu* by examining this term’s use in relation to “spatial” considerations. First, the text shows that a “a given territorial settlement (*llacta*), which we usually gloss ‘village’, could have multiple *ayllus*.” He cites chapter 13 as evidence: “in each village, and even *ayllu* by *ayllu*, people give different versions…” (Salomon and Urioste 1991, 87 qtd. in Salomon 1991, 22). Instead of capturing the emergent time-space specificity, Salomon studies how this could be so through the spatial dimension only. He examines the *ayllu*’s members’ relationship to the land and observes, “The tellers saw rights to land and other immovable assets as lodged in the *ayllus*.” To illustrate this point he uses a case of what invaders do after a land takeover from chapter 24: “As soon as Tutay Quiri’s children had expelled those Yunca, they began to distribute among themselves, according to their own *ayllus*, the fields, the houses and the *ayllu* designations” (Salomon and Urioste 1991, 119 qtd. in Salomon 1991, 22). As a result, this space-based
evidence allows Salomon to expand Avila’s original categorical definition to include “landholding collectivity” within its parameters.

The next move to amplify those parameters comes from the same scenario in the manuscript. Let’s see how the logic works here:

This passage then tells us that even the invaders felt bound to redefine their own organization based on the pattern of preexisting local ayllus, which suggests they had a high degree of corporate definition and legitimacy as well as important functions. Since it goes on to say the Yasapa ayllu people were silversmiths, one may further speculate that some ayllus practiced, or at least were traditionally associated with, occupational specialties (Salomon 1991, 22).

With this “exceptional” use of ayllu as a “brotherhood” of occupational specialization, “corporate” gets tacked onto “landholding collectivity.”

Without a more integrative understanding of the whole philosophy, Salomon completely misses the fact that when these people took “on the pattern of preexisting local ayllus,” it was probably in recognition of the ‘organic’ evolution of that particular time-spacescape that included all the beings of the greater ayllu. Even though the runas were removed or vanquished, all the other beings—on which they were depending to survive—were still there, and their nurturing contribution needed to be honored. So if silver, a Being of the greater ayllu, had ‘consented’ to being worked and to sharing its energy with the ayllu of runas, then it makes sense that the next group would do the same in honor of the imperative to inculcate dynamic harmony in that specific kay pacha. In this sense, Salomon (1991) does not use an integrative approach across the concepts found in the manuscript. That is, while he can see and even acknowledges the importance of other beings within the Andean cosmosvision in other instances, he does not integrate this observation into his analysis of the evidence on ayllu here (16-19). Instead, his lens facilitates their compartmentalization.
Continuing on with his detective work that functions to generate more accurate
categorical parameters, he articulates his working definition to date: “it is relatively safe to think
of the *ayllu* as a named, landholding collectivity, self-defined in kinship terms, including
lineages but not globally defined as unilineal, and frequently forming part of a multi-*ayllu*
settlement” (Salomon 1991, 22). So far then his argument has established the first half of this
section’s title “corporate landholding collectivity self-defined as ancestor-focused kindred.” He
has yet to explain how he got to the second half. In light of this task, Salomon proceeds to ask,
“what exactly were the kinship criteria of inclusion?” (22). Again the question, by seeking to
identify criteria of categorical inclusion, demonstrates that the category is still ontologically
privileged even though that category may be contingently self-defined, which would happen
through interaction or relation.⁹⁴ Furthermore, that Salomon calls this question “an ancient
mare’s nest in Andean research” suggests that within this corpus of knowledge almost all
students have been using the same categorical strategy in the attempt to enclose this ‘elusive’
concept.

Salomon then defers to Spalding’s more relational work, which he considers to make
important inroads toward untangling this conceptual quandary (Spalding 1984, 28-30, 48-52 qtd.
in Salomon 1991, 22).⁹⁵ Where Salomon discarded Gonçález Holguín’s definition of *ayllu* right
away, Spalding incorporates and builds off his work: “Gonçález Holguín shows us that the most
general sense of *ayllu* and its derived words is ‘that of grouping elements or persons together on
the basis of similarity or species, or dividing up a larger group on the basis of the same criteria’”
(Spalding 1984, 29 qtd. in Salomon 1991, 22). This description reflects in part the more

---

⁹⁴ A more relational approach in this case would recognize first the contingency of such an emergent concept and
would trace the instances of emergence and the configurations and circumstances surrounding that emergent use of
*ayllu* to explore how the idea of the social dimension is co-created.

⁹⁵ For this argument Salomon also suggests seeing Castelli, Koth, and Mould de Pease (1981).
relational or contingent dimension of this concept. Additionally it is not so enclosed that it
cannot include the other beings of the ayllu. In fact, Spalding mentions just for a brief instant
Gonçález Holguín’s acknowledgment of the potential inclusion of other beings: “‘Similarity of
species’ could mean taxa such as animal or plant species, but, when applied to people, ayllu
usually meant ‘descendants of a common ancestor’” (Spalding 1984, 28-29 qtd. in Salomon
1991, 22). Here it becomes possible that ayllu is not just about humans, but as soon as Spalding
states, “when applied to people,” the human realm becomes the only category of focus.

Through this very small window, we can still see an ontologically individualistic lens at
work in terms of how the plant and animal kingdoms are conceived of as potential ayllu
participants in two ways. The first involves the epistemological order in which the category and
the relation appear. For example, a perspective based on complete interconnectedness would
first acknowledge the interconnected character among the plants, animals, huacas and humans.
This does not mean that the species would not or could not be considered as distinct from
humans. In fact, diversity in species as seen above is highly valued in Andean philosophy
because it indicates an abundance of life—‘success,’ if you will, in nurturing a life-giving, life-
generating environment. Greater diversity also implies more specific sources of life force
(camay) and wisdom, which, as we saw under interpenetrability, can be shared through our
interconnection. Getting to this understanding however requires that our primordial
interconnection be ontologically privileged.

Although initially too broad for Salomon, Gonçález Holguín’s definition still privileges
separation. Here primary emphasis is placed on the categories of plant and animal species as an
idea separate from the human race. Since existential autonomy is attributed to the components in
separation, to the given configuration of particles, the relation then appears as an attribute
pertaining to existentially independent things or beings, as shown under the discussion on dualism. In this sense, the relation may still occupy secondary importance or relevance, which is how we find so many ‘relational’ approaches today seeking to contribute to our understanding of the categorical, but its generative capacity is negated. By starting with the category of species as potentially defining an ayllu, as Gonçalez Holguín, Spalding and Salomon all do, the idea of an ayllu consisting of all interconnected beings of a particular emergent moment-place is already removed from the conceptual field of possibilities.

The second hint of ontological individualism in this brief instance is that only mentioning plants and animals and not huacas denies the basic shared attribute of the ‘physical’ existence among all of these beings. It is this shared attribute of the parity-based relation between space and the particles, between the ether and matter, that leads to an understanding of interpenetrability, rich communication and mutual nurturing. This case shows how any time the ontological boundary is anthropocentrically drawn—even in more relational approaches that delimit the monistic realm to human language or even in any endeavor to generate knowledge for the ‘social sciences’—ayllu cannot be conceived as a ‘social’ dimension that includes huacas, sallqa, chakras and runas all at once as living together in equivalency in one time-space conjunction, simply because they permit the singular focus on one group, runas, to the exclusion of all others.

Salomon is no exception. Because he sees the ayllu as being ‘self’-defined, that is, by humans only through human language, he is incapable of seeing the more inclusive breadth of the concept. While it seems strange that Salomon (1991) himself be quite aware of the importance of the huacas and other beings in this cosmovision (16-19), this lack of integration of principles across concept development is perfectly understandable through this reductionist lens’
insistence on compartmentalizing existentially autonomous components, including the enclosure around the anthropocentric domain. Unfortunately though keeping each element in its distinct compartment through a separation-based logic cannot grasp either the integrated and integrative logic that corresponds with an ontology of complete interconnectedness or its fruit. By radically curtailing the field of imaginable possibilities, this situation poses a significant obstacle to Salomon’s search for a more ‘comprehensive’ understanding of *ayllu*.

In the next part of the text, Salomon cites others who are also attempting to work within this anthropocentric domain. He first proffers Spalding’s specification of the *ayllu*: “The term was commonly defined as any group—family, lineage, or generation—whose members were related to one another through their descent from a common ancestor’, that is, an ancestor-focused bilateral kindred” (Spalding 1984, 28-29 qtd. in Salomon 1991, 22). Next he refers to the work of classic Andeanist Zuidema, sharing that he “has developed the argument toward a detailed model of ancestor classification and cultic organization” (Zuidema 1973, 16-21 qtd. in Salomon 1991, 22). Here we are witnessing more of the same classificatory work that seeks to define the categorical boundaries better thereby ‘improving’ on early re-interpretations. Especially within a pre-enclosed anthropocentric domain, this seemingly generally accepted approach to Andean studies still misses the logic that produced the concepts.

The next maneuver is even more curious because he focuses on two relational corollaries from Spalding’s work to improve on his categorical definition of *ayllu* (Salomon 1991, 22). The first piece of the first corollary is that “like such spatial terms as *pacha*, *ayllu* is the name of a concept of relatedness” (Salomon 1991, 22). As seen in parity and then again in *pacha*, the emergent relation, the interaction between the elements, not the elements themselves, is key. So

---

96 This maneuver echoes the incommensurability found in Alexander Wendt’s (1999) constructivist realism within contemporary international relations theory. Using relational tools does not and cannot get us any closer to defining the parameters of the category.
to say ‘concept of relatedness’ is extremely consonant with the primordial presupposition of complete interconnectedness. However, in this same line we can also see the reductionist impact of ontological individualism: If ayllu like pacha are concepts of relatedness, then why state that pacha is a ‘spatial’ term particularly when its juk quality of relatedness makes it a temporo-spatial term?

The robustness of pacha, which Salomon himself indicates in a previous section before proceeding to employ a reductionist translation, does not even appear here as a conceptual consideration. Instead, his reduced translation carries over to the formula he proposes for understanding the relational aspect of ayllu. Not seeing, using or applying the implications of always having to address the relation—in this case time and space together—in emergent specificity evidences the tenacity with which Salomon holds on to his ontologically individualistic interpretive lens to dissect the ‘problem.’ In short, if the ayllu is the social dimension housed in the (kay) pacha, then a truncated conceptualization of that pacha will necessarily translate into a reduced idea of its social dimension.

The second part of Spalding’s first corollary conjures a similar quandary. It posits that because ayllu is a concept of relatedness, it is not “an entity with specific dimensions.” That is, it “has no inherent limits of scale; in principle, it applies to all levels from sibling groups to huge kindreds, clanlike groups, or even whole ethnic groups defined by reference to common origin and territory” (Salomon 1991, 22). So again Spalding and Salomon correctly identify an important characteristic of this relational term—its multidimensional flexibility. Yet, just like for the case of the cultural identity group, Spalding’s relational insight stops at the limit of the human realm. This maneuver cannot conceive, let alone portray, the distinguishing features of ayllu elaborated above under interconnectedness, interpenetrability and incompleteness.
Spalding and Salomon are able to identify the transversal features of relationally and multidimensionality as important due to their prominence in the various versions of the Andean cosmovision. However, the interpretive lens they use cannot comprehend the implications of such features because it engenders epistemological fragmentation not integration. Odder still, the function of identifying these two relational elements in this case is to better specify the constitution of the category, even though these features could easily be in keeping with Rengifo’s robust definition of ayllu above. In this way Spalding’s relational work ‘informs’ Salomon’s definition through yet another, more comprehensive, categorical refinement: “An ayllu can readily be understood as consisting of multiple patrilineages (or, in principle, matrilineages) insofar as any given member can trace descent from the ‘founder’ or apex via a given child of the ‘founder’ (and so forth, in potentially segmenting ramifications)” (Salomon 1991, 22).

From here Salomon presents two examples of the emergent relational quality and multidimensional aspect of ayllu: the first from a Bolivian case study and then from the Huarochirí Manuscript. Describing the first case, he writes: “Platt has clearly demonstrated a varied-scale usage among modern Bolivian highlanders, who reckon upward from the ‘minimal ayllu’ small clusters of patrilocal rural neighborhoods-up through ‘minor,’ ‘major,’ and finally ‘maximal’ ayllus that ascend to include the entire ethnic group” (Platt 1986, 230-231 qtd. in Salomon 1991, 22). Avila, Salomon, Spalding, Zuidema and now Platt all begin with an anthropocentric enframing of ayllu, a collective act that simply indicates the long-term impact and reach of applying ontologically individualistic assumptions. Again referring to the maximal ayllu as a grouping of human beings only, makes acknowledging co-presence, co-constitution, co-creation or the robust communication implied by complete interconnectedness impossible.
The second illustration from the Huarochirí text presents no surprises. Salomon posits:

In the Huarochirí manuscript, the usage of *ayllu* terminology becomes less confusing if one recognizes that an *ayllu* may be part of a larger *ayllu*. In this sense, the “children of Paria Caca,” the large (perhaps ethnic) group that forms the mythology’s collective subject, a group of people “who all descend from one forefather” (pref., sec. 2), is a “maximal *ayllu*” (Salomon and Urioste 1991, 41 qtd. in Salomon 1991, 22).

Again, the ‘maximal *ayllu*’ only describes a human grouping. At the same time this quote further reinforces the claim that Salomon is using an interpretive lens based on separation: The variation in the usage of *ayllu* terminology can be confusing only when we try to fit this concept into an *a priori* category that can be defined and enclosed. Again, when conceived through a lens of complete interconnectedness, the variation in use is not a mystery but a logical outcome of the corresponding ontological presuppositions. So by talking about making the use of the terminology ‘less confusing’ Salomon belies his interpretive lens.

In fact, it is because of his interpretive lens that he presents Spalding’s second corollary almost as a surprise. The *ayllu* is not just kinship and blood, Spalding argues, but “practical purposes” seem to have something to do with inclusion. Here Salomon paraphrases her argument: “for practical purposes it was not precise genealogy that finally decided who belonged to an *ayllu*, but rather social conduct—including political alliance—befitting a genealogically connected person” (Spalding 1984 qtd. in Salomon 1991, 22). Again, this is the outcome of looking at the ‘exceptions to the rule’ with a rule that has been defined by those using a lens that insists on the primacy of the categorical.

Through the principle of mutual nurturing, this contingent ‘condition’ of membership is perfectly understandable. When the well-being of the *ayllu* is a constant, dynamic consideration, all the relations of that social dimension require constant tending, which in turn demands being in robust conversation. As such, balance, well-being or *sumak kawsay* hinges on the participation, contributions to, and nurturing of the conversation by the *ayllu*’s beings, and this
involves listening, responding, adjusting, and accommodating on behalf of the participants. In
this respect, even though bloodlines ‘count’ for a whole system of kinship, mutual energetic
investment (reciprocity) in the shared relations can easily take precedence.

Instead of being conceived as the energetic nurturing for the well-being of the *ayllu*,
participation through Salomon’s lens is understood in ‘practical’ terms, and this investment
through mutual nurturing is labeled ‘social conduct.’ While there may be something ‘practical’
about focusing on generating group harmony based on the emergent dynamics of the
configuration at hand, these expressions strip this concept of its main point as social dimension
from this perspective. Salomon’s (1991) next clarification continues to use the same type of
language:

> As with many concepts in the domain of kinship, *ayllu* may be understood partly as an
ideology built up to explain patterns of behavior rooted in the residence rules, which in
turn often reflect the demands of a given geographical, technological, and demographic
reality. Access to *ayllu*-held assets (and claims to collective *ayllu* ownership continued
far into the colonial era) was given in return for exchanged labor and exchanged ritual
participation on a kinship model (22-23).

While the results of such mutual nurturing may appear to be best understood in economistic
terms from an interpretive lens based on separation, *ayllu* ‘membership’ is not about rights and
responsibilities or about *homo economicus* but about the ‘mandate’ of mutual nurturing and
listening.\(^97\) Moreover, the other members of the *ayllu* that are not human are not ‘assets’ from
the perspective of complete interconnectedness, but Brothers and Sisters. The simple use of this
terminology shows the degree to which the logic that gave form to robust fruits like *ayllu* or
mutual nurturing goes undigested. Furthermore, using this economistic language tends to beget
more of the same logic and encourages the dis/aggregating tendencies of ontological

\(^{97}\) This point gives us a fleeting glimpse of a very different conceptualization of the ‘social contract’ on which I
intend to elaborate in a future publication.
individualism, which detracts even further from the capacity to integrate these concepts in robust form or grasp the logic that engendered them.

Salomon (1991) continues to utilize the same type of compartmentalizing language in his description of an exception to the ‘kinship’ rule he encounters within the *Huarochirí Manuscript*. He elaborates:

One can see in the myths of Concha *ayllu* (chap. 31, sec. 391) that genealogical connection alone was insufficient to bestow land on the two Concha lineages that had become politically disconnected. But adoption combined with political or marital alliance was seen as sufficient to create *ayllu* entitlements even when there was no genealogical tie (chap. 31, sec. 403). *Ayllu* was a political fact, and cultic practice lodged in it regulated practical matters of economy and power (Salomon and Urioste 1991, 136, 138 qtd. in Salomon 1991, 23).

As the closing text to Salomon’s description of *ayllu*, this quote reflects the fragmented and fragmenting approach of ontological individualism for dealing with social existence based on its ‘dimensions’ – politics, religion, economy, power, biology, family, etc. We will examine this tendency more closely in Part III of this dissertation.

From this analysis of Salomon’s text on the *ayllu* we can extract a few general observations. First, from an ontological lens based on complete interconnectedness, all of the evidence cited from the *Huarochirí Manuscript* makes clear sense and perfectly aligns with Rengifo’s description of *ayllu* elaborated in the first half of this section. Understanding the variant emergent nature of *ayllu*, then, requires a complete ontological switch. This implies not hanging on in any way to the ontologically individualistic idea that this term’s specific parameters as an *a priori* category may be identified.

Salomon’s work, in contrast, wholly starts with ontologically individualistic assumptions, which do not permit him to grasp the logic that afforded *ayllu* or the concept itself. Instead this lens directs his efforts toward pinning down the defining characteristics of such an *a priori* category. To this end, he embarks on an abductive journey that consists of using evidence found
in the *Huarochirí Manuscript* to build on, correct and refine Avila’s early, very reductionist (re-)definition of this term as kinship. This lens is not only key in shaping his methodological strategy but is what allows him to take this initial ‘category’ of kinship as given and as the basis of his efforts. Nevertheless, it is important to remember that Salomon is just one of many anthropologists and archaeologists dedicated to ‘Andean studies’ who have made this same maneuver to unravel the mystery of this concept’s elusiveness actually created by using the very same lens.

This analysis is particularly insightful because it shows varying degrees of reductionism. First, while wholly embracing a lens of ontological individualism, Salomon assumes an initial category of kinship and runs into contradictory evidence in the text demonstrating this concept’s elusive character. Salomon’s initial efforts involve no relational tools, which make it rather impossible to explain the emergent variation in use. At this point he hits ‘the wall,’ so to speak, of a singularly ontologically individualistic lens.

Notwithstanding his ontological lens however, Salomon, like me or anyone else, can discern the ‘scattered remains’ of Andean philosophy through this text and in other myths, ceremonies, daily practices, etc. in the Andean context. Nevertheless, where I use these traces to re-generate their robust quality by using an interpretive lens based on complete interconnectedness, Salomon, due to the compartmentalizing tendency of the ontology of separation, is unable to integrate the bits of evidence that he picks up in piecemeal fashion. By using a one-in-separation logic instead of two-in-one-relation, he ends up having to make conjectural statements because he cannot see the connections from the perspective of an integrative and integrated logic. The issue here is that because Salomon is equally witness to the prominence of the relation in this cosmovision, he proceeds to fall into the trap of thinking that
he can use components of one approach to get answers for another. With this he turns to Spalding’s more relational work on the matter.

This maneuver is made possible because he is never explicit about his applied ontological lens or that of anyone else. Moreover, because of the subtler insights these relational tools provide, this strategy of incorporating them actually makes Salomon think that he is getting closer to discerning the boundaries. This supposition that using relational tools will get us to a more accurate definition of the categorical is incorrect. The relational tools consistent with an emergent and completely context-contingent concept cannot do anything to further nail home a more comprehensive and accurate definition of a category called ayllu. Despite this incommensurate venture, using relational approaches, even within an interpretive lens primarily based on ontological individualism, can undoubtedly provide subtler, more convincing insights about the concepts, as shown both in the cultural identity group and in ayllu. The more sophisticated products emerging from the use of these tools result in what I mean by ‘degrees of reductionism.’

Another important lesson here regards the opposite sense: Using this reductionist approach cannot in any way help us grasp the full implications of complete interconnectedness. Even a more relation-focused ontologically individualistic lens cannot conjure the full implications of robust relationality, because adding relational concepts to the strategy of widening categorical parameters is still to put the relation in a secondary position in terms of epistemological appearance. This makes the relation lose its central generative capacity and therefore renders the conceptualization a juk two-in-one-relation impossible.

98 This implication is further developed with regards to the monistic approaches adopted within the field of international relations in Chapters 11 and 12. In that case, the relation still comes in second place to the categories of ‘academia,’ ‘knowledge production,’ ‘social sciences,’ ‘human language,’ and ‘international relations.’ The relational analyses are applied only once these boundaries have been embraced.
Overall, this text includes some very important insights about the role of philosophical ontology in this kind of interpretive endeavor. First, using an interpretive lens based on separation to understand this concept necessarily misses out on the rich expressive possibilities of *ayllu*. It cannot comprehend this fruit’s robustness. Then, this particular case shows how using the incommensurate strategy of employing relational concepts toward an ontologically individualistic goal results in varying degrees of reductionism. More importantly it effectively demonstrates how we humans can create ‘problems’ where none exists. In this case the original enclosure of *ayllu* through a reductionist lens followed by its consistent re-production thereafter by those thoroughly embracing the basic ontological assumptions of separation created a great deal of consternation over a problem that the lens itself created.

Perhaps the central ‘nugget of wisdom’ that we can pull from this illustration though involves the very different tendencies of the two logics when their respective time-spacescapes interact. Through its fragmenting, segmenting and compartmentalizing tendency, ontological individualism has the capacity to ‘house’ degrees of other lenses, even though the use of tools deriving from those lenses do not contribute effectively to this ontological lens’ mandate of categorical definition. Complete interconnection in contrast demands ontological consistency throughout in order for its integrated and integrative logic to work. Incorporating any degree of ontological individualism—even a partition as ‘simple’ and naturalized as the one between humans and all else—completely undoes one’s capacity to grasp the logic of complete interconnectedness, because this is to insist that the relation is not generative in *all* cases. So in addition to losing the robust character of this specific concept of *ayllu*, any form of reductionism through the assumption of partitions effectively unravels the integrated and integrative logic of complete interconnectedness.
This chapter on *ayllu* started with the robust version of the concept as described by Rengifo. I then likened this concept to the identity group of a more relational approach to culture, not because the latter deals directly with kinship, but because its relational character reflects similar flexibility and contingency in use. Nevertheless, *ayllu* is much more robust a concept than the cultural identity group, and the traits that lend it this robustness—interconnectedness, interpenetrability and incompleteness—were elaborated next. The first distinguishing feature, interconnectedness, showed us how the potential reach of the ‘social’ dimension expands well beyond a human group that generates and maintains a culture when complete interconnection via energy is the primordial ontological assumption. This shared attribute also creates the ontological possibility of the second characteristic, interpenetrability, which cannot be acknowledged when the relational field is delimited by human language. Finally, the ‘incomplete’ character of any being that is singularly conceived, which also only comes into view when privileging the relation, is ‘completed’ through his or her tethered relation to the ‘Other,’ rendering him or her already complete but only through relation. Recognition of this condition can encourage the practice of mutual nurturing as a fractalized, momentary but cyclical, notion that conscientiously seeks to foster dynamic balance within the whole social dimension of the *kay pacha*. Together these three traits plus the flexible contingency of use highlighted through the relational understanding of the identity group reflect the full potential of *ayllu*, which, all the while, can also encompass the kinship ties so emphasized in the chronicles and anthropological/archaeological work.

After developing the full potential of this concept we turned to the various moments and ways in which an interpretive lens based on ontological individualism diminished its conceptual breadth. I used Salomon’s (1991) elaboration of *ayllu* as a window to show how its initial
reductionist (re-)interpretation as kinship alone created the problem of this term’s ‘elusiveness.’ I then demonstrated how Salomon uses this same lens to generate the strategy he applies to excavate the ‘true’ meaning of this term. This scholar has meticulously worked to use the exceptions to this initial reductionist definition to expand the parameters of the categorical conceptualization of ayllu.

In addition to this strategy, Salomon also pulls from a few relational concepts elaborated by Spalding, which, while adding to the subtlety of our understanding of how ayllu is used, cannot contribute to the specification of more accurate categorical parameters. This maneuver is indicative of an incommensurate strategy to use relation-based concepts toward categorical ends. It also provides insight into how we get to varying degrees of reductionism, where Avila conjured the most reductionist definition of this term by remaining the most ‘true’ to ontological individualism and where Gonçález Holguín, Spalding and then Salomon incorporated relational aspects that diminished the level of reductionism.

The principles clarified throughout the robust conceptualization of ayllu in conjunction with the model of the cosmic dynamic in the last section inform the complexity proffered by the fourth dimension of Andean philosophy that characterizes the ontology of complete interconnectedness. Wata, or life cycle, elaborates on the cyclical aspect of pacha and provides, when applied to the whole breadth of the ayllu, an extremely rich and complex layer to the ever emergent, yet anchored present moment. In this case the emergent moment-place to which we have access is actually a point at which the particular moments of the respective life cycles being lived by the members of that time-space conjunction converge. In this sense, as all the beings in the ayllu collectively move through their watas and find themselves at ever-different emergent points of their particular life cycle, robustly unique new moments are being afforded. While this
concept can radically change how we understand the ‘newness’ of each emergent moment and its complexity, its traditional translation as “year” into languages based on ontological individualism severely reduces that capacity. The next chapter endeavors to demonstrate how this is so.
A *wata*, or life cycle, is a highly specific term that applies to each being in the *ayllu*. When specifically and collectively applied to the present configuration of beings, the differentiated set of life cycles and their respective ‘moments’ help us to see the complexity involved in conceiving of time as a single, emergent, cyclical point as the only time-place to which we have access. Normally, though, this term is translated as “year” into Spanish and English. This particular articulation of *wata*, however, incorrectly assumes compatibility with the linear approach to time reproduced in the use of “year” in the cultural contexts where these languages are spoken. *Wata* can and does afford much more than this.

A few definitional clarifications would be useful before explaining how this is so. First, any life cycle involves moments of “germination, growth, maturation and ‘death,’” paralleling the expansive/contractive cosmic dynamic of the serpents across all three *pachas* (Rengifo 1998a, 101). Second, life cycles vary in duration according to the life form, and life forms here are conceived of in very broad terms. For example, ants, humans, hurricanes, even the plague have their own *wata*. The rotation of the earth around the sun, the beating of a human heart and the breath of a mouse are also variations of *watas*. These examples highlight the great variation of ‘relative’ speeds through which beings can move through the four phases of their *wata*. Moreover, all of these specific *watas* in a broad concept of *ayllu* are in process all at once, already in cosmic alignment, and contributing to extremely new circumstances in every emergent moment that is generated through the pumping of the *chokoras* through the three *pachas*.

If the *kay pacha* is experienced as a single time-space point, then we can imagine that the particular circumstances of that point are being informed by the given set of *wata* ‘moments’ in which all interconnected beings of the *ayllu* find themselves in that very instant. In this sense,
each one’s *wata* affects relationally the configurational, circumstantial condition in which each member finds him or herself. Through this very alive conception, we can understand this accessible point of convergence among *watas* as a site of constant emergence and flux. Furthermore, the cyclical aspect of all *watas* feeds into the general cyclical nature of time. The diagram below attempts to portray in much reduced form the emergent present time-place as the point of encounter of all beings within the *kay pacha* at their respective points of emergence in their life cycles:

![Diagram](image)

*Figure 6. Rudimentary conceptualization of wata cycles emerging and interacting in synchronous fashion from the perspective of a singular kay pacha point at which one accesses reality.*

Already we are very far away from the simple linear notion of ‘year’ of the Gregorian calendar. *Watas* as specific cycles with a present-tense-and-place focus illustrated as a single dot have very little in common with linear understandings of time. The only instance—albeit a major one—in which this term actually means “year” is in the particular “life cycle” of the sun, and yet it is still not understood linearly but cyclically and consisting of 13 lunar cycles.⁹⁹ Using

---

⁹⁹ The sun’s *wata*, in complementary fashion with the moon’s *wata*, is extremely central for agricultural activities, which is how the Gregorian calendar could make inroads into this cultural context (Rengifo 1998a, 102). The major difference is that the sun’s ‘birth’ happens at the June solstice, when it is culturally understood as a ‘cold’ sun because it is not able to warm the earth even on a sunny day. Even Guaman Poma (1992) portrays it as a small sun in his chronicles. The ‘cold’ sun then builds up to the big, warm sun of the December solstice at which time it starts its decline down to its symbolic death at the next June solstice (Rengifo 1998a, 99).
the sun’s \textit{wata} as the only metric of time and in linear fashion loses the richness of taking each being’s current moment in their respective \textit{watas} into consideration. By being universally applied to all, it subjects all to the same considerations and encloses them within a similar linear time scheme. Again, assuming any degree of compatibility between \textit{wata} and year is to misconstrue the nature of the orientation and to severely reduce the conceptual possibilities that could emerge from such a robust conceptualization of time.

The Andean cosmovision places so much emphasis on the present time-place, because we have access to neither the past nor the future time-space conjunctions. Yet, both still play an important role in shaping the \textit{kay pacha}. I briefly outline here how \textit{wata} in conjunction with the \textit{kay pacha} engender a different conceptualization of the past and the future. Furthermore, because a linear conceptualization of time and a time-space understood as a co-constitutive emergent point lead to such different understandings of ‘knowing,’ I begin to point to these differences here to prepare for the next chapter on information sensing and processing.

First, though, a re-statement of the robust present will facilitate making the ontological switch. The \textit{kay pacha} calls our attention to the emergent, present time-place because it is the only point to which we have access. It also upholds the idea of co-constitution: In that moment, the past, which constitutes or provides the affordances for dealing with that new present moment, gets re-constituted through the use (and therefore re-production) of the resources it provides. As such present action shapes future affordances by informing the shared background.\footnote{This is an alternative articulation of the double-movement of time mentioned by Lajo (2003) in Chapter 5 on \textit{Pacha}: In the present moment we are both informing the shared background of the past (time moving in the direction of the \textit{hanan pacha}) and (re-)constituting what is available for the future (timing moving in the direction of the \textit{uku pacha}).} The unique complexity of each new present time-space becomes more imaginable through the contemplation of how all beings of the \textit{ayllu} are moving through their respective \textit{watas} of
different lengths. At each new moment-place the particular set of respective points at which all beings find themselves is completely unique. People who embrace this ontological orientation are very conscientious of this dynamism. Rengifo (1998a) observes, “Since there is no linear notion of time – that is a historical, progressive and evolutionary sense of time – Andean kinship, just like the climatic seasons of the *wata*, regenerates itself cyclically and is, as we say, perennial” (95-96).

With this vision of the very unique, emergent, re-generative time-space, we must re-conceptualize both the past and the future as they are understood in cyclical terms. First, the past involves two principle concepts that require re-figuring, memory and knowledge, which are developed below.

‘The Past’: Re-member-ing Instead of Memory, Knowing Instead of Knowledge

Re-member-ing

The past is gone; it is no longer accessible. Instead, fragments from the past are re-membered, re-produced and re-applied to new circumstances. So when “the Andeans say: ‘just as the grandparents did it, so do we do it,’” they are not talking about a monotonous replication of the past (Rengifo 1998a, 119). Rather this point highlights a dynamic, present-tense-oriented understanding of memory, re-defined as the “human faculty to preserve ideas previously acquired” (Rengifo 1998a, 119). This does not imply having access to the past, but knowingly using “socially” shared resources from the communal background to engage in a co-constructive activity.
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101 From this ontological position, Plato’s argument regarding the river having an essence would make no sense. However, Heraclitus’ argument of never stepping into the same river twice would have been quite in keeping with this logic.
Rengifo (1998a) elucidates how the wisdom that is passed down by the elders is conceived in a very emergent sense: “Memory for the Andean is – as the Mexican Carlos Fuentes puts it – ‘the strength of the past in the present’” (119). Memory, he continues, “helps to keep alive what has happened, to guide one in the execution of an activity, to make present what has happened.” However, ‘memory’ “does not indicate the precise manner of doing so” (119). Here, wisdom derives from a knowing that our ability to re-generate life through memory happens in the specificity of the here and now.

The manner of carrying out any task and its timing are determined in the present moment through conversation in the new circumstances that afford its reproduction. “The conversation that takes place” among all ayllu members “in the present circumstances,” observes Rengifo, includes both the beings that are here and the ancestors in runa, huaca and sallqa form. Through this conversation, a re-membering of the ancestors’ learnings “does not lead…into reiterative activities but into re-creative ones” (119). In other words, each re-member-ing is an act of pulling the pieces of these lessons together for their completely new application to new circumstances. Obviously then, even though we do not have access to the past, it still plays a critical role in what we do and how we understand the here and now. It affords the available set of resources from the shared background from which the activity of re-membering draws so as to apply them in new ways to the unique current circumstances.

Knowing

If memory is not a bank of intact visions of what happened in the past but a constant activity of re-member-ing fragments through their current application, then the same can be said for knowledge. “Knowledge” as a substantive noun conveys an established quality, a ‘thing’ that has already been determined in the past on whose parameters we can count for use today. From
a cyclical, non-progressive, present-tense orientation, knowledge is not *a priori*, but instead an always emergent activity. It is ‘knowing.’

This ‘simple’ point implies then a difference in each conceptualization’s purpose. In an ontology of separation, knowledge is produced as an accumulated and accumulatable good. The assumption underlying this cumulative project is that through (linear) time we should be able to better understand our reality if we continue to add to the body of knowledge. With a more robust notion of *ayllu* and a deeper, more complex focus on the present tense-place provided through *pacha* and *wata*, ‘knowledge production’ does not make sense for two reasons. First, the sought-after substantive end-result is not a possibility. Knowing is never ‘complete’ but constantly being (re-)constituted. Second, ‘production’ here is treated as a purposive activity that is engaged uniquely by the producer. In the case of a robust notion of *ayllu* housed within the *kay pacha*, knowing is a ‘collective’ activity in the same sense that ‘self’-discovery comes through relation, through contrast with the ‘Other.’ In this case, the emergent activity of knowing involves a much heavier dose of receptivity to and an open honoring of the guidance provided by a broader definition of ‘Other.’ Rather than investing energy in a ‘dead’ ‘permanent’ illusion like knowledge, knowing is to intentionally breathe life into and be in two-way conversation with all that is in the emergent, present time-place. This requires being agile and flowing in accordance with the dynamic present moment-place instead of being driven by some ‘internal’ control mechanism. Moreover, in light of this ontological orientation’s injunction toward mutual nurturing, ‘knowing’ also involves being sensitive to what one is doing to co-create and reconstitute reality in that moment.

The distinction between knowing and knowledge is exemplified in the conflict created through the international legal framework on intellectual property today. The notion of a patent,
for instance, is wholly based on individual ‘self’-direction, whereby the individual gets rewarded for her ‘invention.’ This international regime’s corresponding set of concepts is the fruit of ontological individualism and sits in stark contrast to the ‘collective’ conceptualization of emergent knowing. Unfortunately for the communities that still embrace this latter approach, multinational pharmaceutical companies are able to take advantage of their ‘traditional’ knowledge (which is hardly ‘traditional’ since it is still and always emerging anew) through bioprospecting and, once they identify the plant’s ‘active ingredient’ in Western terms, still be completely backed by this international regime without a single credit to the collective knowing that provided the clues. In addition to reflecting the obvious power differentials, the incapacity of an institution like the World Intellectual Property Organization to grasp and protect this other approach to knowing hints at the incommensurate nature of the two approaches.

The irreconcilable difference between knowledge and time as one type of relation and between knowing and time-space as another is also demonstrated through attitudes toward reading and writing. Even though the acts of reading and writing occur in the present moment, they typically do not engender a focus on the very present act of doing so but instead draw our attention away from the present time-place. Since not focusing on the present time-place is typical practice in those cultures that have engendered these activities, this is not seen as strange but as appropriate and necessary. Writing, for example, attempts to conserve the past for future use. This is based on the belief that memories may be captured, stored and re-presented as authentic ‘originals’ in some future moment, which corresponds to the idea of knowledge as a cumulative a priori category. In a very present-focused, embedded, dynamic context, writing and reading as understood from a linear timeframe would not occupy the same level of
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102 Here I am referring to academic writing, documentaries or ‘realist’ novels. Other more fantasy forms of writing are designed specifically to re-direct one’s attention away from the here and now toward some other imagined place. In both cases the end-result is the same: a lack of focus on the present time-place.
importance, even though both activities may be undertaken from a radically present time-place orientation.\(^{103}\) This distinction may help explain the historical paucity of written texts in the Andean context mentioned under methodological considerations in Chapter 3.\(^{104}\)

How is it then that information is ‘preserved’ for re-use in the future? Rengifo (1998a) responds, “For Andeans what is ‘preserved,’ if one can phrase it that way, is not ideas or representations, but lived experiences or occurrences that are made present when circumstances call for them” (120).\(^{105}\) Knowledge conservation, accumulation and production then are replaced with re-membering, re-applying, re-producing and re-creating. Wisdom and memory can only serve us in the present tense as resources that are re-applied each time to a wholly new set of circumstances. They become regularly re-member-ed through their re-creative re-production.

For these reasons ‘knowing’ is kept through ‘doing’ (ruay) in the present moment, and especially in the activities of the oral tradition, ceremony or ritual. The oral tradition highlights the fact that a story is always a new recounting tailored to the new circumstances and audience. In this way it keeps the knowings alive, each time they are told. The present-tense-oriented knowing that is always anchored to specific spatial circumstances does not foster the same perceived need for writing. Ceremony and rituals provide another means of keeping eternal that which is worth keeping and yet are always pliant to the new emergent circumstances. Lajo (2003) cites the superior Japanese steel production in 800 B.C. as an example of how “secret

\(^{103}\) Historically this attitude of the Andeans benefitted the Spanish and their followers. In light of the predominantly oral tradition, they were able to take it upon themselves to provide the world with the chronicles that recount the Andean way of life from the optic of ontological individualism.

\(^{104}\) Note that ever-greater pressure is being applied within the Western-style academic context for the Andeans themselves to get published, because it demonstrates one’s capacity to contribute to that body of knowledge.

\(^{105}\) Pay close attention to Rengifo’s choice of words here: “Made present” involves much more than just “human memory” at work. The whole ayllu complex in the current time-place ‘transmits’ or (re-)conjures ‘memories’ and even messages from the ancestors, which facilitates our ability to re-member these “lived experiences or occurrences.” Correspondingly, one must “be present” in order to catch what is being “made present.”
societies (elites, first aristocracies, or chosen people)” would keep the knowing in the collective memory through “ritualism, or ceremonies as a series of sequences” (173). In short, this approach to knowing and re-membering does not try to ‘deaden’ reality by archiving it and holding it but actively seeks to honor the aliveness of the process (171-175).

The resources provided by the past serve the active and co-constitutive processes of knowing and re-membering in the present. Their active re-production in the present in turn constitutes what becomes available in the future, although how they constitute that future and what actually becomes afforded there are unknowable in the here and now. The next section addresses these notions.

**No ‘Future,’ Just Nurturing Re-generation through Dynamic Alignment with the Present**

The key to dealing with an unknowable future that we shape through our current doings (actions, thoughts, intentions, visions) according to the Andean cosmovision is to focus on the present time-place. More than this, one needs to keep oneself in dynamic balance to best nurture or generate that unknowable future. This involves remaining firmly planted in the *kay pacha* while ‘flowing’ with the dynamism presented in each new moment, and it requires receptivity, mutual nurturing and intent on engendering balance. None of these is possible however when living according to some hypothetical future.

Much of our behavior in contrast reflects the latter orientation. For evidence, one just needs to look at the popularity of planners, calendars and weather channels. In Cuenca, Ecuador an interesting expression that shapes behavior based on this hypothetical future is “¿qué dirán?” or “what will they say?” This effective discourse keeps people from doing things that would give others fodder for gossip in the future. The considerations made while contemplating this question before acting involve a heavy conservative set of norms and mores. While effective—if
not at keeping the person from doing whatever he wants to do, then at making him go to great lengths to keep his actions from being ‘discovered’—this discourse keeps the person acting according to and expending a great deal of energy toward some imagined future situation. His ability to focus on reading the ‘signs’ being provided in the present time-place regarding the appropriate path of action is not even utilized.

These ways of living in and for the future involve a serious fallacy and have several repercussions. Basing our present actions on a set of ‘what if’ circumstances that has yet to arrive is misleading for two reasons. First, those circumstances will not come exactly as we picture them. Second, when they do come, we will already be in a different moment with different resources at our disposal—another unknown in the present time-place. Operating in this way detracts from our capacity to actually engage those resources either now or in the future, because if we are already not living fully in the present, then we probably will not be either at that future point in time.

The general integrative thrust of Andean philosophy leads to an understanding that the afforded resources are there to help us engage dynamic balance.\textsuperscript{106} If we are not focused on being aware of what is going on in the present, then we may miss a sign that will help us do so.\textsuperscript{107} Moreover, with our attention removed from the here and now, we also miss out on one of the key ways to strengthen our ability to foster balance for those future moments. Instead of taking advantage of the opportunity to integrate the contrasts provided through mutual nurturing in the here and now as discussed above under \textit{ayllu}, these contrasts, when living for some

\textsuperscript{106} In fact, some would argue that these signs are indicative of the generosity of life, that we are constantly inundated with signs to help us balance ourselves and to foster well-being – even those signs that in the Western-style time-spacescape would be considered as ‘bad,’ ‘negative,’ ‘evil,’ ‘unfortunate,’ etc.

\textsuperscript{107} One source of existential relief within this cosmovision is that the arrival of these signs is cyclical, they will be back around in a different form if we do not catch them the first time or the first hundred times. This simply indicates that the process of recognizing and integrating will take longer.
hypothetical future moment, are most typically viewed as mere annoyances or roadblocks on the way to reaching that imagined moment. Furthermore, because we perceive those contrasts as coming from ‘Others,’ we tend to alienate them instead of recognizing them and fostering reciprocity. Additionally, although contemporary society may completely reject this standpoint, the heavy focus on the richly communicative present time-place for this particular cosmovision is absolutely essential for long-term survival on the planet. Quite simply, by focusing on the future (or the past for that matter) is to miss the moment in which we have the most resources at our disposal, the most ‘power’ to dynamically align ourselves with the broader cycles which is absolutely critical for our overall well-being.

These differences in terms of how the future is understood arise from whether time is seen as linear or cyclical, which together constitute another set of disparate fruits borne of irreconcilable ontological lenses. An ontology of separation engenders a linear conceptualization of time that sees the future as the expression of a given trajectory which is how we can imagine tools like planners. (This point is more thoroughly developed in Chapter 10.) In contrast, an ontology of complete interconnectedness—by knowing that energy is what connects and constitutes us all and that this eternal energy is expressed through watasm fosters seeing time in relation to space as a cyclical phenomenon. Furthermore, since there is no getting out of or separating oneself from energy, these watas can be understood as cycles of regeneration, not of linear progression. Rengifo (1998a) elaborates on this idea:

The regeneration in this cycle is not experienced as the qualitative transformation of a moment or circumstance into another considered superior which cancels the ‘old order,’ but rather as a periodic and dynamic actualization of a cyclical renewal in which a circumstance is born from the previous ones, without those being the backward past of superior moments. The other moments ‘live’ in each moment of the cycle (101).
These broader cycles can also be conceived—through the concepts of interpenetrability and shared attributes—as taking place within each being in perfect synchronicity. The only way we can know this though is by being firmly planted in the kay pacha.

In brief, wata and pacha in conjunction with the broad conception of ayllu show us how the collective activities of knowing and re-membering in the here and now integrate wisdom from the past for an alignment with the present so as to be better prepared for the ‘cyclical rides’ of the future. The linear time scheme that would lead one to translate wata as ‘year’ generates the opposite tendency. By placing ontological emphasis instead on the past as a conservable accomplished object and on the future as something that can be shaped/controlled through institutionalization and standardization, it completely undermines our ability to fully embrace the present moment.

Illustrations of Difference

The different conceptualizations of the past, present and future delineated above inform the two cultural manifestations of these differences covered in this section. Illustrating the different fruits generated through these ontological orientations and their corresponding understandings of time, this section describes two dimensions of cultural difference that emerge from these fruits and that illustrate their irreconcilable quality.

In the first case, these logics present very different expectations from life. Through a linear logic of time that is detached from the spatial dimension, the Western-style mind is held captive by an existential mandate to progress through life, and people spend a lot of time and energy demonstrating that this is so. When time is divorced from space, prioritizing the specificity of the emergent moment-place is lost, and generally applicable ‘stages’ as progressive categories can be conjured to serve as guideposts to allow one to evaluate where one stands
according to this progressive view. A classic example of this logic resides in Jean Piaget’s work on the stages of child development. At a wider scale of human existence, Rostow’s stage theory of modernization replicates this same forward-thinking logic.

In the Andean cosmovision, the cyclical present-tense/place orientation of *wata* precludes either a sense of progression or already formed, static categories. In cyclical thought moving through the stages of one’s respective *wata* is inevitable, but this is not a progressive notion. Instead of being headed in a particular direction and having to demonstrate progress on that path, one is supposed to be living fully the precise point of one’s *wata* in which one finds oneself.

So in contrast to created categories and rankings of appropriate child development found in the linear, progressive orientation, each little human moves through the life-cycle phase of childhood in his or her own specific way. Moreover, just because an adult has more experience does not mean that she is superior to a child. Rengifo (1998a) attests, “The child is not considered – for example through arguments about its mental development – to be in an inferior phase in the development of man, but instead to be a way of being typical and specific in the life of a *runa*” (101). Each person from this perspective is afforded the space to experience her or his own respective *wata*. Moreover, from within the concept of complementary contrast as necessary for growth, any child that by Western standards is ‘defective’ or ‘behind’ is embraced for the contrast he or she provides to his or her family and the world. This being’s presence provides a unique set of features for mirroring to others, allowing them to recognize different aspects of oneself and of existence in general.

The *wata* concept can be applied at various scales as well. For example, an *ayllu* can have its own *wata*, but it does not connote progression. In fact, the cyclical nature of *wata* in
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108 As Rengifo (1998a) observes, “the *runas* like to nurture and augment the diversity not only of potatoes and maize but also of human relatives” (91).
conjunction with the configurational time-space specificity so prominent in this logic completely
disallow the cookie-cutter prescriptions for development resulting from the linear
conceptualization of time divorced from space. Furthermore, the accompanying parity principle
means that ‘progress’ sought through development does not and cannot exist in isolation from its
complementary contrast ‘regression’ as an absolutely necessary counterforce. As a result, the
attempt to replicate any experience across unique time-space configurations (as seen in ‘best
practices’ efforts in development today) from within this logic is understood as a specific re-
production of an idea with all kinds of embedded affordances or tastes that will lead to very
different results.

   Conceptualizations of leadership provide another case of contrast. In the Western-style
time-spacescape, leadership in society is executed through pre-determined positions of authority
and power with a specific duration. When viewed in wata terms, leadership and its complement
followership defy pre-conceived notions of appropriate cycle length that arise out of a linear
timeframe. The more robust notion of emergent dynamism results in a life cycle of each
authority position that is specific to and contingent on the emerging circumstances. As such, the
duration or wata of a cargo (position of responsibility) depends on the respective task(s) to be
fulfilled, which have different durations “according to the rhythm of the life of the ayllu.” In this
way, a cargo can last one week, a lunar month, a solar year, and so on (Rengifo 1998a, 116).

   Within a parity-based optic, leadership must always be discussed in direct relation to
followership, and within this cosmovision ‘followership’ includes all relevant beings in the ayllu.
Before carrying out a given task, this ‘followership’ is taken into consideration through “the
conversation between the different collectivities” (Rengifo 1998a, 116). One of the ways in
which non-human beings ‘communicate’ is through their wata. So for example, the ‘altar’ or
mesa, may communicate ‘the cargo,’ or “what has to be done… for a particular set of circumstances” (Rengifo 1998a, 116). However, that task’s implementation needs to be considered in relation to the current constellation of watas in their evolution, so “if the cargo indicates that one has to do the pruning of trees, but the moon indicates that one should not prune, one simply leaves that activity for another time” (116). Here the job or responsibility does not get lost; its execution just needs to be timed according to the emergent context of various watas.

Besides having leadership cycles that last according to the task to be executed in consideration of influential watas, the selection and maintenance of the cargo’s leader are also contingent on the cyclical notion of wata in the emergent moment. Rather than being seen as positions of authority and power, these cargos are seen as roles of responsibility that are fulfilled by those who are contingently most adept at carrying out the task at hand, and in this case those who are most competent can even be huacas (deities) or sallqa (beings from nature). On this point Rengifo (1998a) re-orientst typical interpretations of Andean discourse found in myths, stories, accounts, life experiences, etc. When the Andean speaks of “the mightiest and richest Apu (mountain),” he is not making a teleological, power-oriented observation, but one based on the contingencies of the moment. So the mightiest and richest Apu would, for a particular cargo in a particular moment, have the larger capacity of—and therefore greater responsibility for—regenerating life (95). Again the focus here is on the capacity to be responsible for moving the whole group through a given set of circumstances. Rengifo (1998a) attests, “The authority thus emerges in order to lead the adjustment of each of the collectivities that inhabit the ayllu through the different circumstances of the wata” (116). Authority is a completely emergent phenomenon: “It is an authority without institutionality since the order that appears is only for

109 Here too the notion of camay would be a consideration.
that particular circumstance. Once the drought is gone a new mode of being of life emerges and 
a new authority will rise to correspond to that new mode” (Ortiz Rescaniere 1993 qtd. in Rengifo 
1998a, 116).

In this very alive, dynamic approach to leader-followership, the timing of the completion 
of a needed task and the length of a given leadership term within this approach must be flexible 
to accommodate ever-new emergent circumstances as well as the charge to foster balance. 
While setting a leadership term for an exact duration may help form the illusion of consistency 
on which humans like to count (especially in the face of so much ‘existential uncertainty’ from 
the perspective of the ontology of separation), it also immediately generates disharmony because 
they never coincide exactly with the needs of the present moment (although we try very hard to 
make it seem like they do). In this very contingent approach, institutionalization of anything 
creates crystallization and therefore an inability to deal dynamically with the present moment. In 
this sense, institutionalized or prefigured term-lengths for leadership place immediate emphasis 
on fighting against that which is and takes attention away from our ability to focus on the 
emergent affordances, which are the resources with which one has to operate in the kay pacha. 
Rengifo (1998a) explains:

By definition, an institution is something regulated, normalized and useful for a time 
beyond that of any given circumstance. Institution is part of life in society and becomes a 
means to achieve a given end; for that it has its own activities, personnel and materials 
needed by the people who compose it in order to achieve the prefigured norm (116).

The problem with this is that “nature and huacas”—and I might add present circumstances—
“have no place” (Rengifo 1998a, 116). Unfortunately this makes us even further detached from 
the ability to pay attention to the signs and information offered by the present moment.

This example drives home two aspects of leadership not normally conceived from an 
ontologically individualistic lens: first the starting and end points and duration of a cargo need to
be responsive to the emergent context, and second, ‘followership’ broadly defined is a critical element to successful leadership. Trying to control that which is, as illustrated in our institutionalization of leadership or in stimulating children to stand up to ‘universally accepted’ standards of appropriate development, is only an illusion from the perspective of the Andean cosmovision. They are not ontologically possible within a cultural logic so focused on the dynamic, emergent, specific and contingent present time-space, the *kay pacha*. Taken together, this contrasts between the fruits of ‘time’ and ‘time-space’ and between a linear and cyclical notion of time reiterate the irreconcilable nature of ontological individualism and complete interconnectedness.

This chapter on *wata* started by developing the robust implications of understanding this notion of life cycle within the emergent here and now and as experienced by all members of the *kay pacha*’s ‘social’ dimension. The conjunction of *pacha*, *ayllu* and *wata* in robust form require a new conceptualization of the past and future along with the related concepts of memory and knowledge. From these conceptual tools, we explored two illustrations of cultural difference that derive either from a robustly cyclical understanding of time-place or a linear approach to time.

What we see through the overall content of this chapter is the extent to which translating *wata* solely as year does tremendous injustice to the robustness of the concept itself and of the corresponding ideas that emerge from such a conception. This considerably reductionist translation and its collateral damage can be attributed in part, as discussed under parity, to the error of assuming compatibility across language-games and to the lack of corresponding commonplaces in the new host language-game particularly when it emerges out of a completely distinct shared ontological orientation. The extreme difference between the robust version and the typical translation for *wata*, then, also illustrate some of the risks of assuming compatibility
or of not creating new resources in the new host language to be able to accommodate such conceptual robustness.

The robust version of *wata* has complemented the endeavor to fill out a time-spacescape based on complete interconnectedness in several ways. First, it complements the fluid notion of *ayllu* and the parity-based relation of time-space or *pacha*, by adding another dimension of complexity to the present time-place on which these concepts hinge. The particular life cycles of each being in the *ayllu* move through the only time-space configuration to which each being has access, thereby converging at a ‘simple’ emergent yet anchored point from the perspective of each being. In addition, by illustrating the completely new circumstances available in each moment for each being, this more robust sense of *wata* affirms this ontological orientation’s privileging of dynamism over consistency. Here too we are reminded of the transversal Andean theme of multidimensionality. Even though we only have access to a single point, that point is infused with the movement of larger and smaller cosmic cycles. In this sense this approach emphasizes equanimity and acceptance of the respective mix of cycles and points available to each.

In a world of such emergence where we ‘only’ have access to the present time-place as a single point, the past and future take on new meaning, knowledge becomes knowing, and memory re-member-ing. This point also implies a very different understanding then of how information is sensed and processed from this particular ontological orientation. The next chapter clarifies this more holistic perceptive and digestive system.
CHAPTER 8

THE ROBUST INFORMATION-SENSING-AND-PROCESSING SYSTEM

Since knowledge production as we know it is not the resulting aim of this approach but rather a fully emergent sense of knowing, I take a step back to look at how information sensing and processing varies from that fostered in the Western-style time-spacescape. This latter tradition has centered itself on the analytical mind as the only legitimate place for sensing and processing information for the purpose of generating knowledge. Mental process as something separate and separable is a product of the compartmentalization facilitated by assuming separation and reflected in the supposed existence of a priori categories. As a conceptual fruit of this process, knowledge production is also reinforced by linear time, yet another outcome of this logic. This reductionism of the human faculties for processing information is the product of a long trajectory of historical events from the Judeo-Christian tradition and beyond further explored in Part II.

Complete interconnectedness in contrast results again in a much more robust vision of how information is sensed and processed. ‘Knowing’ is much more than just a mental process. It involves the dynamic integration of information through three sensing and processing centers. Furthermore, knowing is a ‘communicative’ process in the robust energetic sense of the term whereby information moves across various channels among live beings through dynamic, flowing relation. In this sense, ‘knowing’ is a ‘collective’ process that is only accessible in the here and now and that requires acknowledging the active role played by the ‘Other.’ Most importantly, this collective process also permits and encourages that all involved actors engage in dynamic balance.

In light of this very distinct and integrated starting point, I first identify each sensing-and-processing ‘center’ and describe its particular role or features. Then I discuss how the various
distributions of personal ‘strengths’ and ‘weaknesses’ across these centers work in conjunction with the idea of integrating contrasts for balance. Finally I address what it means to use all three centers in dynamic flow. In general, this section solely seeks to delineate this three-part system in contrast to just using the mind and discuss its potential. I do not go into the logistical aspects beyond what is needed to understand the concept of dynamic balance among all three centers. These are covered more fully in the next chapter on harmonizing.

One implication of privileging the relation in complete interconnectedness is that the mind, just like particles, can only be conceived in relation to the other sensing centers in one’s being. In this particular cosmovision, the mind stands in relation to two other spheres. Together all three are understood as an application of the cosmic dynamic model based on three pachas to the body as a more complex approach to conceiving how information is sensed and processed. The change in scale of this re-application is not problematic from this lens due to the multidimensional character of all attributes shared in equivalency—of which time-space is one.

Exemplifying the adage “as above so below, as without so within” that reigns in this completely interconnected ontology, the diagram below depicts how the three pachas are distributed across the human body along with their corresponding activity:

![Diagram](image)

*Figure 7. The time-space system in the human body. Source: Javier Lajo, *Qhapaq Ñan: La ruta Inka de la sabiduría*, (Quito: Abya-Yala, 2003), 158.*
According to this philosophy, all three areas must play their respective part in a balanced way to get to wisdom. I start with the lower portion of the body that symbolizes the *uku pacha*, since this *pacha* represents the source of the cosmos. Without this great (pro-)creative impulse we would not experience material existence or life incarnated in a physical body making it a rather critical starting point for even being able to raise these questions. The sensing/processing activity that corresponds with this feminine element is *munay*, or “the principle of desire, love or of the conscious will” (Lajo 2003, 152). The emotions and instincts indicative of this sphere are sensed through fluids and the space of the void. They are a direct form of communication with the Whole through interpenetrability and not a phenomenon that necessarily gets filtered through the mind.

Reproduced at the other extreme of the body, the *hanan pacha* is linked to *yachay* or knowing. Reflecting the masculine principle and tied to the air element, this sphere is in charge of the analytical and logical processing of information. It is the “source of light” that allows one to separate the trees from the forest and tease out patterns.

In the *kay pacha* both the corresponding activity and its function are distinct. Lajo (2003) elaborates: “the two extreme worlds, *munay* and *yachay*, or feeling and knowing, or emotion and reason…are equipped, aligned or balanced [in the *kay pacha*] through the reality of ‘*ruay*’ or ‘*llankay*,’ that is, the daily doing or the work of every day” (154). Similar to the description of the three *pachas* under time-space, a balanced approach to sensing and processing information that comes from both the *uku* and *hanan pachas* is to integrate it through the here and now, where the masculine and feminine principles come into contact and can be balanced. Whether the daily activity be turning wool into yarn for knitting, working the land, preparing dinner, cleaning the house, driving a car or interacting with a store clerk, all ‘doing’ that takes place in
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110 Thank you Rita Cook for clarifying this relationship and so many more to me.
the human body in the here and now is an opportunity to integrate and proportionize parity-based relations.

The symbolism of the portion of the body that corresponds with *ruay* and *llankay* is not coincidental. “The zone of the stomach (belly button) and of the heart,” Lajo (2003) observes, is that of “the organs that never, or almost never, stop working” (152). What does work mean in the case of our natural ‘timekeeper’ the heart? Always pumping and working in the ‘middle’ ground, the upper two atria expand to receive the de-oxygenated blood and the lower two ventricles contract to send the blood to the lungs or body. Lajo (2003) suggests that this organ reproduces the same oscillating cyclical movement as the *chokoras* across the three time-space conjunctions (183). Its constant and rhythmic expansion and contraction and its simultaneous work to move blood up and down throughout the body re-create continuously the dynamism of life and provide constant opportunity for integration to that being for the duration of her or his *wata*. This same concept then applies to daily activities. Here again, the *interaction* between the elements of the respective *pachas* and not the elements themselves allows for learning and integration.

Nevertheless, when engaging with life, when interacting with all of the beings of the *ayllu*, people tend to favor one sensing and processing center over the others through personal tendencies or particular ‘strengths.’ For example, someone who cultivates his given gift for the occult or the ability “to feel and project the force of *munay*” would be a *munayniyoq*. Specializing in the dimensions represented by the *uku pacha*, the *munayniyoq* “could do magic with his capacity…and would even be able to fly on the wings of organized passion that procreates our culture” (Lajo 2003, 152). Alternatively having an affinity for the ‘light’ of the

---

111 It is with this kind of opportunity that we can begin to see how reading and writing can be an activity of *ruay* in the here and now from which we can still derive wisdom. These activities just have to be approached in a very different manner.
hanan pacha, a yachayniyoq would be one who cultivates the area of the mind, an analytical thinker. She would be “a thinking being, great theoretical decipherer of reasons and words, ‘but nothing else’” (Lajo 2003, 152).

Cultivating the area of doing in the kay pacha to the exclusion of the other areas is also possible (Lajo 2003, 152). A Llankayniyoq would engage in activities without focusing on the energetic flow from the other two spheres. For instance, when a person just “goes through the motions” as fostered by working in an assembly plant or carrying out daily household chores without a focus on gleaning the lessons being offered in every ‘new’ moment, this person would be fostering energetic stagnation instead of flow across these three centers despite constant movement. One can begin to engage the integrative potential of the lessons that are presented through contrast and get out of being a llankayniyoq through deliberate awareness of this possibility. The purpose in this sense is not to focus on just one area but, as seen in the logic of the three pachas above, to foster dynamic balance.

From this perspective that prioritizes balance, these ‘strengths’ may actually be seen as weaknesses because they can contribute to or be evidence of imbalance. Yet, the respective sets of strengths and weaknesses of each being play an important role in the collective balancing process by complementing the incomplete and ‘imbalanced’ character of other Beings through relation. That is, the encounter between respective distributions of sensing strengths/weaknesses is just another reflection of the parity principle. In addition, when we conceive of this interaction as taking place among a robustly conceived set of beings in the ayllu, where all beings (including those that fall within the Western-style category of ‘thing’) are alive and

---

112 Another reflection would be one’s particular distribution of masculine/feminine impulses (conceptualized as also reflecting the uku and hanan pachas). Their interaction and potential integration across, through and within beings is very similar to what I describe here for information sensing and processing.
equally valid sources of wisdom, this dimension of respective sensing distributions makes up part of the fractal, momentary contrasts we provide to each other through co-creative mirroring.

As discussed under *ayllu* these fractalized moments of contrast constitute a central form of mutual nurturing from the Andean perspective. This, for Rengifo (1998b), is the purpose of Andean wisdom in a deeply embedded, interrelated and very present-tense sense:

Wisdom for the Andean people is not associated with an accumulation of knowledge – to know a lot about many things – rather it is associated with the attribute of nurturing, where the sensitivity to know how to nurture is as important as knowing how to allow oneself to be nurtured. This reciprocal nurturing is what recreates life in the Andean world, and not the power-giving knowledge that one can have about others (174).

In contrast to accumulated knowledge then wisdom is more of a tool for engaging with and giving life to life in the emergent present moment and in a reciprocal, nurturing sense.

This wisdom starts with the recognition that a contrast, which is basically noted through the *perception* of difference or friction, points to an imbalance. Once we recognize that this friction represents a learning opportunity for us, we can then tend to the imbalance, learn and grow from it, and foster tools to engage with the next one. In this way we can see this dynamic process as a ‘game’ in which our particular distribution of strengths/weaknesses attracts the opposite from others, which continues to indicate to us those areas where we can grow to foster balance. This is understood as wisdom, because we choose to participate in this game, to see these contrasts as an opportunity to heal, integrate and balance ourselves dynamically in the *kay pacha*. We can also ignore or become annoyed by these contrasts. When we do this, we deny the integrative opportunity to foster balance, which means we will continue to demonstrate a similar ‘profile’ that will continue to attract energetically similar scenarios.

The momentary parity-based ‘completions’ that result through the encounter of two (or more) incomplete beings do not bring long-term ‘wholeness’ per se but provide tools that can be applied to future contrasts for engendering dynamic balance. Never getting over our ‘limited’
perspective through the lens of complete interconnectedness is not cause for either anxiety or anguish. It just simply means that we never get out of learning. The ‘end result’ of completion is never ‘achieved’ in substantive form due to its very contingent and emergent condition. According to the Andean cosmovision, it follows that once we are finished with our learnings from this particular wata, our energy leaves the particular form of life that we have been inhabiting and moves on to another wata of another form of life. Energy does not die; it just gets transformed.113

These tools, this focus on engendering balance across all three sensing and processing centers, and this dedication to integrating the contrasts that present themselves in the emergent kay pacha can result in a more harmonized system that senses and processes information. That is, once a runa is able to flow across all three information-sensing-and-processing spheres in rhythmic balance, she will have accessed the path of the serpent, or Amaru Ñan and become an ‘Amaro Runa.’ Lajo (2003) describes this ideal state: “The ‘Amaro Runa’ are the humans who accomplish cultivation and perfection in the three Pachas. Like the sacred snakes, they freely move among them using the Amaro Ñan.114 They are the amautas115 of the Andean school or Qhapaq Kuna” (152).116 As a result, masculine-feminine, future-present-past, thinking-feeling

---

113 Thank you René Coral, Mónica Malo and Carlitos Ramírez for reinforcing this point.

114 The Amaru Ñan is the path of the serpent.

115 The amauta is a person of great wisdom – more of a pragmatic philosopher than a doctor (not just philosophy but philosophy in doing – the experiential is just as emphasized as the thought process).

116 If Amaro is serpent, then the path of the serpent and the oscillatory moving up into the Hanan Pacha and down into the Uku Pacha can easily be seen as the double movement of Kundalini energy described throughout Central Asia. Through the sacred principle of “as without so within, as above so below,” the kundalini reenacts the sacred serpents’ movement simultaneously into the Earth and up to the divine connection through the human body. To foster internal balance as much emphasis needs to be put on Kundalini grounding as on Kundalini rising. Popular or contemporary portrayals of Kundalini energy in the West often do not capture the wisdom of the principle, but instead reflect the teleological tendencies of a time-spacescape shaped by the ontology of separation by overemphasizing the ‘rising’ aspect into what are considered from that perspective to be ‘the more sublime’ energetic levels (covered in the next chapter).
or any other parity-based relation is integrated and balanced through the oscillating movement of energy across all three spheres representing their corresponding pachas.

To achieve dynamic balance in the emergent present moment-place as in the case of the Amaro Runa, one’s cells, emotions, thoughts and actions all vibrate in alignment with what is. This goal does not require other-worldly spirituality or knowledge; it is a wholly monistic endeavor. Rengifo (1998a) attests: “The notion of runa does not imply a transcendence of that which is not human, a liberation from nature, but rather the most intimate and affectionate shared life between the forms of life of nature and of the huacas in the very internal center of the runa” (95). This intimate relationship is founded on a completely interconnected world in which all beings are alive, in communication and interpenetrable.

Furthermore, this overall purpose places more emphasis on the dynamism of harmonizing than on the idea of achieving or maintaining harmony. For Lajo (2003), “a lot of balance is also harmful’ because it immobilizes” (152). In fact, perceived stability can actually point to energetic stagnation as in the case of the llankayniyoq above. It can also become manifest through the crystallization of patterns and practices out of which beings then find it difficult to break. It can also come simply through the repeated use of harmony or balance as an a priori substantive, which allows for its conceptualization as a projected hypothetical ideal of the future or as a substantive goal toward which we are building and that we will eventually reach as a thoroughly constructed, determined whole. The key difference here is that dynamic balance or harmonizing is “not something given but something constantly in the process of happening,” whereby flowing with the dynamic emergence of the kay pacha is as important as reaching a point of equilibrium because once that point is reached, it will no longer exist in the very next moment (Rengifo 1998a, 116).
This is why the *chokoras*’ spiral, oscillating movement across the three spheres plays such a key role at the level of the body. While allowing cyclical dynamism to flow across all three information-sensing-and-processing spheres, harmonizing implies incorporating and integrating elements from the *uku pacha* and *hanan pacha* within the *kay pacha* in emergent fashion. This implies constantly ‘tuning in’ across all three centers (emotions, activities, thinking) to sense how circumstances are resonating and adjust oneself to that information accordingly.

In this account, then, neither producing ‘knowledge’ through only one sphere to serve some future purpose nor conceptualizing the human being as *homo economicus* makes sense in the Andean world. As Lajo states above, the *runa* that is reduced to being a *yachayniyoc* can be “a great decipherer of reasons and words, but nothing else.” Only focusing on the thinking required for accumulating knowledge negates the integrity of the whole sensing-and-processing system and contributes to imbalance by blocking the flow. Moreover, a significant portion of this blockage comes from the attempt to box life in by creating ever more categories.

As such, the ever-higher levels of intellectual sophistication aspired to in the Western-style academic time-spacescape do not resonate within a time-spacescape that privileges both balance and the ‘collective’ activity of knowing in the here and now for the purpose of *re*-generating life. The conceived potential of the *runa* is much broader and based on a much more comprehensive form of knowing that derives from communicational pathways that are not as readily apparent in the Western-style time-spacescape, because there we have atrophied our faculties by consistently using a reduced and reducing interpretive lens. Knowing how to re-generate life by fostering dynamic balance then, not generating knowledge, is the purpose of information sensing and processing for this very robust version of monism.
This short synopsis of how the information-sensing-and-processing system is conceived from an Andean perspective and where it leads when using the logic of two-in-relation demonstrates the radically different outcomes, goals and desires afforded through this logic in contrast to what is commonly generated and expected from within the Western-style academic time-spacescape. The integrated and integrative logic of complete interconnectedness requires that this conceptualization remain consistent with the principles heretofore discussed. In this sense, the information-sensing-and-processing system continues to privilege the relation and to assume that all is alive and interpenetrable. It also exhibits the transversal themes of multidimensionality and shared attributes by reproducing the cosmic dynamic model of the three pachas at the level of the body. Here too the model insists on the dynamism and specificity of the emergent time-place. The resulting emphasis on dynamic balance and well-being is covered more fully in the next and final chapter on the principles that characterize an ideal-typical time-spacescape built through a shared ontological lens of complete interconnectedness.
CHAPTER 9
HARMONIZING:
A MULTIDIMENSIONAL, CONVERSATIONAL, PARITY-BASED APPROACH
TO DYNAMIC BALANCE

In the ayllu, life is regenerated cyclically and through conversations that nurture harmony which flourish in this field of equivalents that is the chacra. The activity does not arise from arranged contracts, from obligatory arrangements between the members of the human community. What is done is the expression of the participation of all in the regenerating flux of nature.

―Grimaldo Rengifo Vásquez, “The Ayllu”

While the principle of dynamic balance has repeatedly arisen in the last three chapters since it happens to be the overall thrust of the lens of complete interconnectedness, this chapter is dedicated to fleshing out how harmonizing is conceptualized, engendered and facilitated as the centerpiece of Andean philosophy. As the ‘constant’ purpose of life in all relations in the kay pacha, harmonizing is the resulting focus of all of the principles and transversal themes covered to this point. Two parts of the initial leap of faith embraced through a lens of complete interconnectedness demand this ultimate focus on dynamic balance: privileging the relation as the primordial ontological element and recognizing that the wholly interconnected cosmos tends toward equilibrium.\(^{117}\)

Evidence for this general thrust toward balance appears through the regularity of cosmic cycles such as the sun rising and setting every day, the waxing and waning of the moon, the elimination that necessarily follows ingestion for living organisms, etc.\(^{118}\) Synchronicity among all watas is also taken as evidence of this cosmic tendency toward balance. For instance, Rengifo (1998a) observes that the cycles of all of the components of the ayllu are “synchronized

\(^{117}\) This presupposition stands in distinct contrast to the generalized assumption of ‘anarchy’ and chaos generated through an atomistic lens that assumes individuals, things and categories to be existentially separate.

\(^{118}\) That all cells tend toward equilibrium in terms of the concentrations of ions and molecules in the liquid with those of the surrounding fluid continues to demonstrate this greater cosmic thrust toward balance in general.
with the natural movements of expansion and contraction which happen in an ‘annual’ cycle” (89). We see plants mature to fruition according to a certain number of lunar watas, and 13 lunar cycles occur within one solar or ‘annual’ wata. In the same way, the intricacy and ‘perfect’ balance of entire ecosystems are also contingent on being synchronized with these cycles.

The overall balance of the whole is reflected in the ontological privileging of the relation that results in a ‘two-in-one-relation’ logic. Despite the dynamism constantly taking place between the complementary thrusts of the relation, the conjoining of balance and imbalance, or any other parity-based relation, in proportional fashion indicates the equilibrium reflected in wholeness. In fact, as energetic thrusts balance and imbalance are ‘secondary’ to cosmic equilibrium. As part of the juk cycle, imbalance is not denied. Instead, it is embraced as the integral complementary opposite to balance that allows us to recognize balance and that indicates to us those tendencies that require tending. It is an integral phase of the harmonizing process. One central implication that follows from these concepts is that, since all is in relation and interconnected, all that is alive can also tend toward dynamic balance through the conscientious engagement with the parity-based watas of balance and imbalance.

This last point elicits two other aspects critical to this understanding of dynamic balance. First, the friction generated through our energetic imbalances in relation to others’ energetic profiles, which can be perceived as conflict, ‘bad times,’ imbalance or resistance, presents the opportunity to integrate that imbalance, glean tools through the learnings, and become more equipped to engender balance when we choose to do so. That is, as Rengifo (1998a) remarks, “Each living being is a sign for the others,” and so it follows that to harmonize or proportionalize the relations, we need “to follow the signs that other living beings show” (100). In this sense, the imbalance is seen as helping co-creators gauge where they stand and see what requires attention.
in order to re-generate life. Second, because balance and imbalance co-exist as juk-based cyclical phases, both options are equally possible despite the cosmos’ overall thrust, meaning nothing is forcing us to be harmonized. So while the cosmos supports equilibrium and completion, humans get to make a choice in the face of mutual nurturing to align ourselves intentionally or to shun the opportunity in each emergent moment.

In this chapter I aim to walk us through the process of how privileging the emergent, generative relation necessarily prioritizes a general drive toward balance and how imbalance, as the necessary complementary opposite, serves as a guidepost to help foster the former. This will make it easier to show how the unitaristic logic of one-in-separation necessarily engenders imbalance first followed by secondary impulses to engage balance as a remedy to the primary thrust of this logic. To take the logic of two-in-one relation out to its full implications regarding this conceptualization of overall equilibrium and the juk-based cycle of balance/imbalance, this final chapter starts by synthesizing the integral features of the previously developed principles to show how they rely on and support this impulse toward dynamic balance. I then introduce a robust version of the ‘conversational reality’ (that can be likened to a time-spacescape) and contrast it with the one based on human language only to show how they reflect and lead to very different assumptions about the purpose of communication.

Since energetic communication is the basis for this robustly conceived conversational reality, I go into quite a bit of detail about energetic communication and the overall impulse toward dynamic balance within the cosmos to demonstrate the degree to which all of these factors are integrated into the very logic and/or the degree to which the logic arises out of these factors. (These work both ways since they are co-constitutive.) After examining in more detail how the wider conversation serves as the mechanism for balancing and aligning ourselves, I then
proceed to cover each phase of the conversation to bolster our understanding of what this conversation entails and how it is integrated into the overall logic. Some of the points made in these sections may make academics uneasy, but it is important to remember that this contrast is provided so that we can better see our own fishbowl.

The second substantial portion of this chapter illustrates how the cyclical *watas* of balance and imbalance can be engaged through honed communication skills of the wider conversation. Here we glimpse how health and illness—conditions understood through ontological separation as distinct phenomena taking place within the individual—are part of a broader cyclical movement between alignment with what is and imbalance. The insights gleaned from this parity-based cycle of balance and imbalance help us to understand the focus of the third section, the Andean strategy of *tinkuy*, which is utilized to disrupt, de-stabilize or break apart the energetic stagnation resulting from unattended imbalance so that relations may be re-proportionalized. With the final key for unlocking one last illustration of re-interpretive reductionism in hand, the final section examines the case of *Capac Hucha*, or a particular rite of human sacrifice, that illustrates to a strong degree some key consequences of the interaction between two-in-one relation and one-in-separation.

**Review**

Because the drive of this integrated and integrative logic toward dynamic balance emerges out of the interaction of all of the aforementioned concepts, I synthesize their central points here. Under parity we saw that putting the relation first as an initial ontological leap of faith implies that there is no getting out of relation, that the relation is generative, and that the respective components constituted through the relation are incomplete. In this scenario, proportional complementary opposites are understood to maximize the contrasts (and overall
wholeness), which are necessary for pointing out the energetic imbalances that one may seek to integrate.

The next chapter covers how the central Andean parity-based concept of time-space and the cosmic dynamic model of the three *pachas* are conceived. The *kay pacha*, the here and now, symbolizes the *relation* that ties together the *uku* and *hanan pachas*, the parity-based future and past time-space conjunctions. Because the *kay pacha* is ‘relation,’ it is the only means through which the components of any parity-based relation can be integrated and balanced.

In addition, the *kay pacha*, like either of the other two spheres, can be understood multidimensionally. For the wider *ayllu*, the *kay pacha* is the emergent point in time that a network of beings is experiencing over the spatial dimension occupied by that network. Here, the context discussed or pointed to in the emergent moment-place determines the range of beings referred to and as such the implied spatial reach. However, any single being at any one emergent present moment can only physically be in a single spatial point. For this reason, the fact that one’s *kay pacha* point is the only place where one can be, interact, act, integrate and heal is regularly emphasized throughout the principles.

The chapter on *ayllu* then uses the primordial parity-based relation of energy as it passes through space to animate matter, or *Pachacámac* and *Viracocha*, to break through the traditional (re-)interpretation of *ayllu* as just ‘kinship.’ With all beings sharing the attribute of being alive, that is, matter infused with energy via the space that interconnects us all, the ‘social’ dimension or *ayllu* housed within the *pacha* is conformed of all ‘people,’ that is, *runas*, *chakras*, *sallqa* and *huacas*. This robust conceptualization of the network of life requires acknowledging the role that all ‘Others’ with whom we come into contact play in co-creatively mirroring back to us who we are and where we stand. This co-creative mirroring is understood as a collective exercise of
mutual nurturing that provides the opportunity for each being to engender dynamic balance from her or his particular kayak pacha point.

Wata as life cycle in relation to the kay pacha draws our attention to the intimate relationship between cyclical time and the single emergent point of a time-place to which we have access. As discussed in that chapter, contemplating how each being and phenomenon in the web of life is moving through its respective life cycle allows for a much more complex and dynamic conceptualization of the emergent present time-place. Furthermore, wata, ayllu and pacha together facilitate grasping the constant bi-directional oscillation of the chokoras (time) through the three pachas. That is, present action is shaped by the resources made available through a very robustly defined ‘shared background’ and at the same time inspires or gives form to future circumstances by (re-)informing that shared background. So while we never have direct access to either the past or the future, these principles together help us to see how the options available in the here and now reflect our past interactions and how the actions we take impact what becomes afforded to all of us.

One implication of this re-conceptualization of how time-space and the robust ayllu interact—particularly considering the complexity of the emergent moment-place afforded through the wata concept—is that memory and knowledge are redefined as re-member-ing and knowing, and this implies a very different understanding of how humans sense and process information. The first glimpse that we get of this more robust approach to information sensing and processing comes under ayllu, where the interpenetrable character we all share is established through the ether. This detail permits understanding communication as an energetic activity that relies on a much more robust system for sensing and processing information. In this sense, each being’s system is understood to be in constant communication with all that is. Additionally,
because of this orientation’s basic primordial ontological assumption of the relation as primary, the purpose of sensing energetic information at the broadest scale is to re-generate life which happens by fostering dynamic balance through interaction. In Andean tradition, the Amaro Runa is one who has learned to use all three perceptive centers in dynamic and complementary fashion as a skill set that can harmonize all of his or her relations.

The particularly fluid environment in the Andes is a constant reminder of the need to be agile and flexible to accomplish this goal. In comparison to the ‘old, tame’ mountains of Europe, the Andes are rather unruly. They shift on a regular basis and defy commonly taught ideas in engineering and architecture. In this variable context, plants seem to grow overnight, waterways suddenly change their course after a storm, all four seasons occur in one day, and the whole panorama can be transformed instantaneously. A regularly repeated observation in the Andes is that “although we may be in the rainy season, no one knows exactly what will happen tomorrow” (Rengifo 1998a, 105). In other words, it is an “unpredictable and capricious ‘animal world’” and not “one susceptible to being planned for” (Kusch 1962 qtd. in Rengifo 1998a, 105). As a result, the most adequate response for re-generating life in these circumstances is to wholly live in and flow with the current moment-place.

This description could raise the ‘causal’ question of whether this ‘environment’ fostered the perceptive privileging of the emergent relation or if holding this view in collective fashion encouraged the region to become more mercurial. This kind of question and the drive to demonstrate relational/causal significance is generated through an ontology that does not assume that everything is already in relation. When the components are ontologically privileged as categories, this renders the relation secondary and therefore uncertain, which in turn fosters the
need to establish significance. For this reason, people have generated methods and tests for determining a relationship’s degree of significance through a lens of separation. ¹¹⁹

Conversely an approach that assumes that all is already interconnected means that the relation is already ontologically assumed as given and that the co-constitutive, generative nature of all relations makes determining the exact directionality of the causal relationship difficult. Instead emphasis is placed on tending to the proportionality of the components that make up the relation. From this outlook, the very dynamic Andean context can be understood as the co-creative emergent outcome of interaction across the whole ayllu within the kay pacha. This collective co-creation is generated through that interpenetrable space through which all forms of life are connected and in constant energetic communication.

**Dynamic Balance through the Wider Conversation**

In a way, this description recalls a concept proposed within a more anthropocentric relational approach: John Shotter’s (1993a) “conversational reality.” In fact, this metaphor is consistent with Rengifo’s (1998a) insistence on engaging the “wider conversation” throughout his work. The basis for this collective co-creation or conversational reality, though, is constituted by the attributes shared by all forms of life (particles in relation to space through energy). Obviously this conversational reality is different from one delimited by human language in that the material that constitutes the shared background and gives shape to future affordances consists of energetic resources of which human linguistic commonplaces are just a part. The constitution of this conversational reality implies that its most expansive version

¹¹⁹ This drive to establish less uncertainty through these methods also reflects an emotional/energetic ‘need’ spurred through insisting on separation: establishing ‘significance’ allows us to alleviate in part the separation anxiety created through ontological individualism.
encompasses all that exists energetically in contrast to the breadth allotted through human language only, although the scope is not always so far-reaching as described here.

The breadth of both energy-based and language-based conversational realities may vary, but the way in which they vary differs due to the corresponding ontological assumptions. The scope of a language-based conversational reality depends on the size of the network based on human-only nodes that engage in anthropocentric interaction. By anthropocentric I mean seeing interaction with the world as solely occurring through a language-based lens. In an energy-based conversational reality, the nodes consist of robustly conceived beings, such that even a ‘narrowly defined’ energetic conversational reality still includes a robustly defined set of ‘Others’ that are considered to be actual communicative nodes that both speak and listen and fully engaging the energetic conversation.

Additionally, no matter the scope of the conversational reality, an awareness of complete interconnectedness is still at the forefront in any given instant. For example, even when the group of focus is conformed by a particular group of runas that share a given bloodline, all other beings that support that bloodline’s existence are neither forgotten nor denied. Nor is the communicative contribution of these beings denounced. It just so happens that in that use anchored in the specificities of the emergent moment-place, the scope of the ayllu is such that it only includes a kinship line in order to communicate something specifically about that group in that instant. This conception and use of the term ayllu is relational not categorical. Consequently, while the scope of the conversational reality may be equally variable in size depending on the specific parameters of the time-spacescape of interest, the content of the network of relations, that is, the nodes in the network, remain much more robustly conceived.
Energetic Communication

Since these nodes interact via energy and not just human language, the question remains: How can this conversational reality still be conversational when it is based on energetic interaction? From an Andean perspective, “each member of the Pacha is recognized as a sensible organism in constant speech” that employs its respective sensing and processing centers to engage those of others through the ether (Rengifo 1998a, 107). Rengifo (1998a) calls this conversing “a sort of ‘revealing’, of making the life contained in each one of us, whether runas, allpas (a type of soil) or potatoes, issue forth” (90).

While this ‘revealing’ is most definitely a subtler form of communication, it actually shares some parallels with interhuman conversations. Both forms of conversation are two-way: the interlocutors engage in a cycle of give and take or speaking and listening in response to the presence and ongoing contribution of the ‘Other.’ Additionally in both the wider conversation and interhuman communication, it is important to hone one’s conversational skills to be effective. Rengifo (1998a) reflects this impulse when he posits that the wider conversation is “a knowing how to listen and knowing how to say things at the appropriate moment” (107).

The differences between these two forms of conversation stem from disparate ontological presuppositions that lead to very distinct conceptualizations of what is going on during the conversation, why and to what end. Here I start with the conceived purpose so that the conversational mechanics that I elaborate on below make more sense. Inter-human communication is typically seen as a vehicle for making one’s point and for representing a system of commonplaces that allow those who belong to that language-game to share a form of life, while the more robust conversation of complete interconnectedness is seen as “a mode of

---

120 Notice again that Rengifo uses “knowing” instead of having knowledge about listening and speaking appropriately. This sensitivity to the implications of knowing versus knowledge is constant throughout his work.
being in unison with life,” which is what allows for its regeneration (Rengifo 1998a, 107). Here the robust conversation is seen as a medium for gauging the degree to which we are aligned (or not) with the overall thrust of the cosmos toward balance.

For this reason, Rengifo (1998a) insists that it is in this “brotherly [and sisterly] atmosphere of profound equivalency” that the conversations among “the community of humans (runas), the communities of huacas (deities), and the natural communities (sallqa)” take place and give rise to their activity as an ayllu (89). As the collective medium for aligning with cosmic balance and wholeness, the wider conversation gives each being the chance to integrate imbalances and learnings, heal from them and in this way facilitate the ability to be harmonized and to harmonize. This activity, in turn, reflects how the nurturing and the responses to that nurturing play out.

Since this is not a common expectation of a language-based conversation, it is useful to contemplate how one arrives at such an idea. A few assumptions stemming from the lens of complete interconnectedness provide an initial window for viewing how we get from this ontological lens to this fruit. First, the range of beings engaged in the wider conversational reality encompasses the whole social dimension—the whole ayllu—inhabiting the time-space conjunction in question. Second, all beings in that conversational reality are alive, interconnected and communicate via resonance, vibration or frequency. If the overall thrust of the cosmos is toward equilibrium and never-ending energy, then together these assumptions imply that the collective activity of all interconnected beings when attuned can also re-generate life.

121 Remember that Salomon laments the gender-neutral aspect of terms in Quechua, which probably makes this singular use of “brotherly” as in the gender-neutral notion of siblings an oversight either in Rengifo’s familiarity with English or in Rengifo’s translators’ rigor in terms of maintaining conceptual consistency.
Why then is the wider conversation the mode for knowing how to do this? The incomplete yet interconnected character of all forms of life is key here. No being ever has access to the ‘whole picture.’ Instead, each is anchored in that specifically emergent time-place in which one ‘is,’ and this *kay pacha* point is the only window through which one may perceive and act. As such, we can only view our co-creations as they emerge in the here and now, and it is from this same here and now that we may engage them. This is the only compass to which we have access where we may take note of our relative state of being. Furthermore, although each new moment-place in which we can view/respond to our co-creations is fleeting, the emergent *kay pacha* point is our only opportunity to integrate imbalance and foster dynamic balance, making the endeavor of harmonizing an extremely dynamic balancing act.

A critical element of this compass derives from the definition that the *kay pacha* point is relation. For this reason, the only way that we are able to see our co-creations is through the mirroring or nurturing that the ‘Other’ provides. While the only way in which the compass exists is through our “joint action” with ‘Others,’ our ‘job’ is not to work on the ‘Others’ but to focus on our own respective system to encourage dynamic alignment. We have no access to their *kay pacha* points but only to ‘our side’ of the co-creation. When we align our system, we facilitate the flow, and the accompanying integrated lessons will generate different scenarios for different kinds of learning. While each of us acts only from our respective *kay pacha* points, the totality of interaction can be imagined as taking place within the wider conversation composed of completely interconnected nodes.

In conversational terms, we may explain it like this. The holograms that we co-create are always ‘speaking’ to us about where we stand energetically. Just as in inter-human conversation, we as interlocutors have the choice to listen to that speaking—or to even hear it as such in the
first place—and to respond. Central also to this wider conversation is the recognition that, as long as energy flows through us, we too are always speaking, because we are constantly emitting our impulses and intentions through the energy that we emanate. This means that we are always co-creating, whether or not we acknowledge this wider form of communication. Furthermore, because both balance and imbalance are equally possible within the cosmos, every impulse we emit in every fleeting emergent moment-place expresses a ‘charge’ that lends itself either toward the one or the other. When we co-create from a time-place of imbalance, the results only reinforce perceived separation. When we align ourselves with what is, we strengthen our capacity to generate balance and gain confidence in that tight interconnection with All Our Relations.

The Andean parity-based cycle called ayni sustains that if we are always co-creating in interconnected fashion and that interconnectedness is linked to wholeness or balance, then for us to align with that balance we must ‘correspond’ in terms of what we emit in the wider conversation. We may conceive of this ayni cycle as having two main phases. We have already seen the first phase throughout Part II as nurturing. Here the mutual nurturing expressed through interaction provides the friction through which proportionalization, integration and balance become possible. However, we have a choice about how we receive this nurturing and what we do with it. Our choice then determines whether we are engaging in ayni.

If the sign that we receive represents our co-creation in emergent fashion and if it is pointing to our relative state of balance or imbalance, then to fulfill the broader purpose of harmonizing, the response must be one of ‘following.’ That is, to harmonize or engage in ayni, we must accommodate or adjust ourselves to the message. In this way we follow the lead provided by our very own co-creation that is connected to the whole, so that we may become
aware of, integrate and glean tools from this learning opportunity and in turn align with the overall trend toward equilibrium. In this way we allow the cycle of mutual nurturing and mutual following to be completed, and this facilitates the flow of energy so that another cycle may begin.

We can pull ourselves out of engaging in *ayni* during both the listening and response phases. That is, we may not be able to hear or read the signs because we have ‘forgotten’ how to use this communicative skill. We may also decide not to follow a given sign by not identifying the imbalance, integrating the learning and re-aligning our system. In either of these cases, while mutual nurturing is constantly taking place, our response does not ‘correspond’ to that nurturing. As a result, only the first part of the cycle gets played over and over again.

This is where the purpose of language-based communication becomes relevant again. In our ‘common’ understandings of language-based, inter-human interaction in fields such as linguistic philosophy or communication studies, being in unison with life is not a regularly cited purpose even though the ‘signs’ or ‘contrasts’ presented in the wider conversation may certainly be transmitted through human language. Instead, what we normally see is that language-only conversation is portrayed as a mechanism for understanding one another (among humans), for decreasing transaction costs or maintaining a form of life.

The issue again lies in the ontological lens used to conceptualize language. In complete interconnectedness, human language is just one form of energetic communication and this energetic communication reflects an intimate interconnectedness to wholeness/balance. In contrast, human language from an ontological lens of separation is seen as a ‘natural’ dividing line between what is human and all else. When we assume this partition by focusing solely on human language (which is normally accompanied by a plethora of other assumed categorical
phenomena), this artificial, naturalized boundary means that communication is not connected to anything else but itself, which in turn centers the purpose around understanding each other. Human-only conversation is not conceived as a ‘mode of being in unison with life’ because ontologically human language is seen as the only means we have for understanding existence albeit in detached form. Insisting on a separate and separable human-only communication prevents seeing the interconnection of all forms of life and as such denies the possibility that communication could be conceived as the means of communing with the cosmos.

It is easy to see how this overall drive to engage in ayni so as to foster dynamic balance is missing simply through the responses that are considered ‘valid’ within language-based communication. When the goal of communication is to make oneself understood through language, any kind of reaction to an interlocutor’s intervention—as long as it communicates a message that demonstrates comprehension of the message received—can be considered a response that would complete the speaking-listening cycle. Of course the quality of the communication may vary depending on the kind of response provided, and the response itself can even indicate a miscommunication, which would indicate an ‘invalid’ response and incur the beginning of another set of interactions to ensure comprehension.

Within this conceptualization, certain responses would preclude the energy from completing a cycle based on the concept of ayni above. For example, ignoring or disregarding the message would be to drop the cycle in mid-flow. Alternatively damning or getting angry at the message would jam the flow of the cycle with resistance. Without following the message’s lead by adjusting or accommodating oneself, the half cycle continues to repeat itself and imbalance is further reinforced. Overall, this simple contrast between the purposes of
communication gives us glimpse the tight relation between the ontological lens and the fruits it affords.

Of course our ability to engage in any conversation or in ayni does not happen overnight. We have the chance to hone these skills throughout our lives, and fully engaging in the wider conversation through ayni, as Rengifo (1998a) attests, “requires, as everything in life, to be nurtured and stimulated, in order for life to be re-created” (105). However, if this kind of communication requires being able to ‘read’ vibrations, then the faculties that allow us to sense such detectable information currently find themselves in a very atrophied state in the wider population of the Western-style time-spacescape. The existence of these faculties have been rejected and denied for an extremely long period of time due to the exclusive employment of ontological separation. It has been so long that we have forgotten how to use them, and they in turn have atrophied through disuse.

I am not talking here about generating channeling skills or any other ‘other-worldly’ orientation. I am suggesting that we re-focus our sensing attention to a broader range of interlocutors with a keen awareness of the contingency and specificity of the emergent time-place’s afforded circumstances. In this case, we still use our same senses to detect messages within a wholly monistic reality. In fact, Rengifo (1998a) notes that absolutely all “communication takes place through the senses – which are like the ‘windows’ of life. It is through them that one converses with everyone” (107). The sections that follow elaborate on the steps involved in this form of communication as an effort to help us re-member our skills, knowing how to listen in a more robustly conceived conversation would be the most important preliminary task.
On Reading Signs / Listening

Once we open ourselves to ‘hearing’ or ‘reading’ the signs, listening is a critical initial step for engaging in \textit{ayni} in the wider conversation. It is as Rengifo (1998a) asserts: “we all [need to] be disposed to listen perpetually and in each circumstance to the ‘speaking,’ to the sign of each one” in the more robust \textit{ayllu} (105). Essential here is the acknowledgment that the ‘Other’ is speaking, which is a hefty challenge from a realm that only acknowledges communication via human language. Nevertheless we can still glean from lessons regarding language-based communication, even though the call is to converse with a more robust ‘Other.’

For example, communication specialists acknowledge that most of any message is non-verbal in nature. For example, Mehrabian (1998) divides the impact of any human-based communicative message in the following way: Seven percent of the message’s impact is verbal in nature (heard with the ears), while 38 percent is vocal (the intonation also perceived with the ears) and 55 percent is facial or about body language (read with the eyes, smelled with the nose, sensed with the skin, etc.) (23). This supports the more robust notion of communication where ‘listening’ to energetic messages is much less about ‘hearing a comprehensible language’ than about ‘literacy’ skills in reading signs that require using all of one’s senses. Rengifo (1998a) adds, “In a world of sensibilities, conversation makes itself evident also in the wisdom of knowing how to ‘see’, in the sensitivity of touching, of tasting, smelling and hearing the sign of the other (be they members of the community of humans, of the \textit{Apus} or of the \textit{sallqa})” (107).

For the purpose of noticing the conversation, we can heighten our sensibilities by employing all three spheres of the information-sensing-and-processing system reviewed above and re-orienting them to more robustly conceived detectable information. Regarding this information, Rengifo elaborates on the nature of the messages:
The color, the taste, and smell of the wind on a specific afternoon is speaking and alerting us about the weather now and that which is to come. The gestures of a *runa*, the cry of an infant, the cloud formations or the way a fox is howling also tell us something about life now and that is to come (106).

To be able hear what others ‘reveal’ and to process that message, employing abstractive, analytical thought is insufficient in spite of its celebrated position in the Western-style academic time-spacescape. For the wider conversation we must employ all three sensing-and-processing spheres dynamically by tuning into resonations, vibrations and frequencies that pass through us at the level of the ether. We must take note of subtle corporeal reactions and notice what is being presented in this very ephemeral moment-place for, as Rengifo (1998a) has observed, the signs “will not be ‘spoken’ again in the way expressed in a particular moment” (105-106). The highly contingent, specific and embedded nature of the messages implies that they must be received, processed and followed in dynamic fashion. In short, “it is necessary that everyone be attentive to the often unpredictable signs that emanate from all the others” (Rengifo 1998a, 105).

This communicative skill of sensing what is calling our attention right at this moment often requires ‘quieting’ down our (egocentric) mind chatter to engage with other beings at a more permeated and permeable level. At times stopping to ‘think’ through these energetic

---

122 Historically the abstractive, analytical approach has been prized and the more holistic approach described here discounted through simplistic (re-)interpretations afforded through the same reductionist lens that gets us the compartmentalized use of ‘reason’ only. Associative sensing and processing from a lens of ontological separation has repeatedly been taken as evidence of childlike behavior throughout history given that lens’ inability to acknowledge this subtle form of interaction and the same lens’ tendency to generate teleological standards against which that which lands in front of its gaze are judged. This theme continually appears throughout the chronicles recounting the era of colonization in the Andes, the debates on whether the indigenous had souls, and then again in the debates on whether the indigenous could be considered citizens in the new liberal nation-state. (See O’Connor 2007, Sattar 2007, Clark 2007 and Guerrero 2008 as just a few examples.) In addition to providing sufficient reason to justify slavery and colonization of the ‘barbarians,’ this approach continues to be delegitimized in more ‘modern’ times through Piaget’s grand theories on child development and learning by calling it an initial childlike stage of associative thinking and Rostow’s justifications for the need for development.
signs can actually obstruct or throw off the messages as we receive and send them. What is catching our attention right now? If a particular object, flower, bee, bird, cloud, movement, color, pattern, smile or frown catches our attention, it is because it is trying to speak to us. In fact, if we sense it, it is speaking loudly enough to actually catch our attention over every other message also available in the emergent moment-place. Since this unique sign/information presents itself in the *kay pacha*, we can engage with it and receive whatever message it might have – even if its sole point is to make us more aware that other beings and even situations are constantly speaking to us, informing us of where we stand and who we are in each moment.

Often though in spite of these very ‘empirical’ kinds of evidence, we do not make the connections conveyed in the messages. Sometimes the challenge is just getting to a place where one is ready and willing to receive messages particularly from unlikely and normally ‘disdained’ sources (from the perspective of an ontology of separation). In this case we could remind ourselves that our incomplete state means that all ‘Others’ are a source of ‘self’ recognition if we open ourselves to the nurturing they are constantly providing. Another challenging part of being able to ‘see’ the sign, much less ‘read’ it, is our reluctance to recognize that what is being presented to us is our own co-creation. At times it becomes difficult or painful to acknowledge that we have participated in and given form to what is being mirrored to us. As a result, it is much easier to ‘cognitively’ sever ourselves from the messages at hand.

At the most fundamental level, this whole process depends on a trust in our complete interconnectedness and in the more general tendency toward dynamic balance. Both of these are denied in the leaps of faith implied in the ontology of separation. The moment we do not trust

---

123 This is the kind of communication that permits phenomena like dog whisperers, honey collectors who do not need protection and horse trainers that use no ‘extensions’ in addition to healers like the *Poné* described in the first chapter.

124 In a fragmented, abstractive society, though (re-)learning how to see the connections can be a challenge.
that interconnectedness and total support is the moment in which we assume separation. The moment we assume separation is the moment in which a constantly nurtured drive toward balance is lost within the human community. The emotional states that correspond to this assumption, fear or paranoia, engender co-creations that ‘prove’ our assumptions correct. To trust means that when we read the signs, we understand that this phenomenon, Being, event or ‘thing’—and no other—has presented itself in this deeply present moment for a reason.

Here “for a reason” does not have an ‘otherworldly’ connotation but one wholly rooted in a monistic understanding of how co-creation and contingency interact within the broadest possible conceptualization of conversation. That ‘reason’ is that our energetic state has called these circumstances at hand and no other to help us identify our relative balance/imbalance so that we may examine, integrate, heal and glean tools from the learning experience. In this sense, there is no such a thing as coincidence in a completely interconnected cosmos. What we are witnessing instead is an emergence of the energetic ties, conversations and activities that we are all undertaking all of the time in the web of life. Again, the relative energetic profile we emit, whether that be in balance or imbalance, will attract a certain kind of ‘nurturing.’ In this sense, even what are typically viewed as ‘coincidences’ are ‘merely’ co-creations. The energetic mechanics of what is perceived to be a coincidence are the same as for any other encounter that we have, meaning every single thing, event, encounter could also be considered a coincidence. It is just that when the pull is more obvious or striking than it is at other times we want to attribute a special value to it.

As we watch the unfolding of each emergent time-place, we are constantly being given the chance to witness our (im)balance for the purpose of learning and integrating for future moment-places. These co-creations both reflect and shape our options for acting, and constitute
the specific opportunity at hand for learning through contrast in this specific *kay pacha* point. Let’s look at some examples to make these ideas a bit more concrete.

For example, if while driving, we are ‘not wholly present’ (in balance) because we are emotionally distraught and caught up in something that happened in the past, extremely focused on developing some abstract concept, or intent on figuring out how to plan next week, there is nothing like a car accident or close call to bring us right back into the very present moment and remind us of the imbalance we have just generated. If we are willing to see the emergent moment as a co-creation stemming from complete interconnectedness, then the close call or accident is cause for gratitude. We are still here to be reminded and given the chance to practice again being in the here and now. We can also be grateful to the other person or to the bird that flew into the windshield for being willing to play that wake-up role for us. It does not matter whether the other is grateful back to us for playing a mirroring role or is upset with us, since the only point to which we have access is our particular *kay pacha* point and the only thing we can control is how we engage that point. How that person engages his *kay pacha* point is out of our control. However, if we respond to his rage with more anger or resistance, then this only encourages imbalance in our own *kay pacha* point and from that place of imbalance we will be co-creating.

On another occasion we may be in a state of emotional imbalance due to being in an abusive relationship, and a flier for an exercise class happens to catch our attention. If we decide to follow the sign’s lead, then we may begin to exercise. The new kind of movement created through this ‘*ruay*’—or form of doing in the sensing-processing sphere that corresponds with the *kay pacha* in the body—may put us in a position to ‘see’ the relationship differently and come up with strategies to re-engage it. We may even meet someone who studies psychology and
motivates us to apply to enter the program to identify how the dynamics operate. ‘Listening’
then is as ‘easy’ as allowing ourselves to trust what we are perceiving in the emergent, fleeting
moment. It is as easy as honoring that pull toward that flier and stepping into it fully and in
gratitude.

In general these examples demonstrate how the ‘wider’ conversation is contingent on our
receptivity and how we react to the sign. The listening skill needed to conscientiously foster
balance so as to regenerate life definitely requires a radical re-conceptualization of what we are
engaging and how. This skill requires knowing that it is possible to detect a more robust,
monistic reality, but detectability is much less an issue than is how we conceive of our hook-up
to the cosmos, direct our attention, and process the information we receive. Perceiving the
constant ‘revealing’ of the wider conversation demands that we re-focus our attention, center
wholly on and be wholly present in the present time-place, and utilize all three sensing-and-
processing spheres in more holistic fashion. Simultaneously, it is in that same kay pacha point
where we also respond. This means that right here and right now (and every single now) is our
chance to respond in dynamic, reciprocal fashion in such a way so as to engage in ayni.

Responding as Aligning

Just as we choose to acknowledge the more robustly defined ‘Other,’ to see the contrasts
as our co-creations, and to be attentive to the signs as they present themselves, we also choose
how we respond to these signs. In all cases, whatever we choose informs our co-creations and
that which is afforded to us and All Our Relations in the future. So when we assume separation
and ontologically cut ourselves off from this constant flow, we actually provide a response: the
choice to not follow the lead of the flow.\footnote{Many of course would deny that this is actually a choice since we inherit the ontological assumptions that correspond to the time-spacescape that we inhabit. However, re-producing whatever logic we inherit by not questioning it or seeing through it is still a choice. Nevertheless, we may take the highly prevalent application of this lens and its incapacity to foment \textit{ayni} or balance as further evidence that nothing about this game makes aligning a mandate.} If, however, we understand that the contrasts that ‘Others’ provide us about our own energetic profile are there to help us see and integrate the imbalances that we continue to re-produce, then we may engage this contrast to build a toolset to help us foster dynamic balance. This requires accommodating the signs, adjusting ourselves to them and following their lead, and as a result we complete the cycle of \textit{ayni}. Rengifo (1998a) affirms this point: “For regeneration to flow…one has to ‘follow’ what one is being told, advised, as [the ‘Others’] also ‘follow’ what we are telling them” (106). According to this view, then, when we follow we engage the full parity-based cycle of \textit{ayni} by completing both ‘mutual’ components—that of following and of nurturing.

While the purpose of interaction is to harmonize or align oneself with the general thrust toward balance, engaging in \textit{ayni} is not a ‘responsibility.’ In complete interconnection, one knows that this parity-based cycle of \textit{ayni} facilitates the dynamic alignment of all cycles such that the energy flows with ease. The act of aligning oneself in this case is not a compromise, sacrifice or obligation in which the atomized individual must lose her right to freedom, her right to expression, her basic right to live the way she wants, etc. Harmonizing is simply a way to be in the flow of all that is, and one feels better overall by being in alignment. Even synchronicity and serendipity happen more regularly (at least according to what we notice). As these states of being foster trust in the process, they encourage one “constantly to nurture the capacity to attune oneself, to make adjustments, to accompany and understand what each one is saying to us, the sign that each one expresses in a given circumstance – in brief, to converse, that is to share similar ‘verses’ with the others,” by being aligned together in the flow (Rengifo 1998a, 105).
The question remains though: what does it mean to follow the sign’s lead? First, instead of ontologically treating the interlocutors as objects, situations or phenomena (which are all categorical interpretations of reality), we instead need to slow down, acknowledge their existence as interconnected beings, and thank them for their willingness to nurture us. We can then thank the contrast (our co-creation) for reflecting back to us where we stand (and immediately at the same time forgive and thank ourselves for creating the given situation). As part of the process of nurturing balance by reflecting on, growing through and integrating the contrast, we may ask what that co-creation is trying to convey about our current state of (im)balance and what we might do to inculcate ayni and alignment.

Sometimes no ‘thinking’ answers come to us. Sometimes they do. In either case, a more direct route to feeling our way through each emergent time-place is to ‘check in’ with how the situation resonates or vibrates. In this way we avoid energetically quivering with the uncertainty generated by using our mental faculty in isolation from the whole, and instead we constantly allow ourselves to feel the interconnectedness and constant support and move with that. Honoring the first impulse that comes to us, not discarding it because it seems silly or because it does not register within a Western-style ‘logical’ framework, is integral to this process. These are just some of the ways in which the whole helps us to remember this dynamic interconnected system.

The major difference experienced once we (re-)learn how to attune and adjust ourselves to the signs and integrate the contrasts is that life itself flows with much more ease. According to a contemporary adherent to this philosophy, when one is aligned, even “the cattle of the runas…will follow” (Rengifo 1998a, 106). When we align ourselves with what is, we synchronize ourselves with the cosmic cycles to which the other members of the ayllu are also
responding. In this case, the cattle of the runas follow without resistance because their camacs, or those who infuse them with their vital cattle life force, “have also attuned themselves with the life of the communities of the waters, the pasturelands and the weather” (Rengifo 1998a, 106). Again the trick is adapting oneself: “What the human community does is to follow, to join with this circumstance that is telling it the manner of nurturing that has to happen at that moment” (106).

When we as the human community align ourselves to also be with the flow of the cosmic cycles, we do not attract resistance from those who are also in the flow. In contrast to the car crash example above, here the resistance that we face from others is minimized because we have minimized our resistance to all that is. This way the energy is not forced to work its way out through some physical manifestation due to the imbalance generated through having a half-cycle be re-played ad nauseum (as covered below) but rather can move through one’s whole being with ease and allow the cycle to be completed.

Even ideas surrounding reproduction from the Andean perspective (again, not necessarily in contemporary times) followed this logic. First of all, women’s reproductive cycles were much more aligned with the lunar cycle than they are today because this attuning was regularly practiced. Then the act of reproduction itself would also be wholly contingent on the synchronicity of the respective watas in balance. In short, “there is no cyclical regeneration independent from the cyclicity of other forms of life” (Rengifo 1998a, 100). For figuring this out, Rengifo (1998a) explains that the signs for reproduction make themselves available:

In the world of cyclic regeneration there are moments in which the forms of life prepare themselves to generate. These moments are synchronized with the condition of nature in its entirety. There are signs or indicators that tell us about the opportune moment and circumstances, such as the number of eggs a bird lays, or the number of vicuñas there are in a herd, and so on. These signs indicate the moment and likelihood of success for union
and conception. In this fashion the multiplication of forms of life stays in conformity and harmony with the others (99-100).

For this multiplication to stay “in conformity and harmony with the others” the faculties of reading the signs, sensing the resonance and aligning with the flow had to be much more honed than they are today.

In all cases, the signs are wholly contingent, wholly emergent and completely embedded in what is going on in the emergent moment-place. Moreover, each sign nudges us to provide an answer. As Rengifo (1998a) observes, “Each one in every moment is saying something, and one has to converse with this ‘sign’ that indicates something to us and says something at the same time that it invites us to give an answer” (106). The next section addresses how these lessons impact the response we end up giving.

Speaking

Even though our faculties for engaging in robust conversation have been atrophied by reproducing the logic of separation for so long, this is not to say that one is removed from the conversation. As stated earlier, we are always speaking through constant energetic communication. However, the more we learn to listen and sense all of the subtle ways in which we are constantly nurtured and supported, the more acutely aware we become of the reverberating impact of our energetic form of speaking. We realize that we also need to hone our skills of knowing how and when to speak for we begin to see how the intentions and energetic profiles we are emitting have an impact on our intricate energetic connection to the web of life and the outcomes we co-create.

In this phase of the wider conversation we see how three parity-based cycles are at play. First, the major parity-based cycle is ayni, where others mirror to us our co-creations and signal our imbalances and where we, in turn, respond by following the sign’s lead and integrate the
imbalance. Second, our accommodating is at the same time a form of speaking, which makes the provision of contrasts a mutual cycle of nurturing. In the same way, the nurturing we receive is actually the Others’ form of following our lead or responding to the contrasts we provide, which means that following is also mutual, constituting a third cycle of reciprocity.

Here we see that nurturing and following become practically the same thing; as component phases of a *juk* cycle, they become nearly indistinguishable phases of *ayni*. This point is shown in Rengifo’s (1998a) explanation of nurturing: “In Quechua, ‘to nurture’ is *uyway*, and it means the affective attunement achieved between the members of the Andean community…in the regeneration of their *Pacha*” (109). In this rendition, nurturing is attunement or following, such that the constant mirroring or the spiraling cycle of nurturing and following is the generative basis of co-creation. When open and understanding of these principles, embracing the opportunities that present themselves in the emergent moment help us to ‘harmonize,’ and our presence reciprocally does the same for others by mirroring to them. Grillo (1998a) sums up this attitude beautifully:

We, the Andeans, reach the full delight of our lives in contributing to nurture our *ayllu* and in letting ourselves be nurtured by our *ayllu*. We live in symbiosis, that is, facilitating the life of our community brothers and letting them facilitate our lives. Our nurturance consists in the unconditional affirmation of our communitarian life and in the affirmation of our love in our communitarian life. Our manner of living, nurturing – that is, facilitating – our communitarian life, is delightful for those who nurture as well as for those who let themselves be nurtured, a situation where the roles are reversed from moment to moment. This is our way of participating in the wholeness of the daily *fiesta* of our life. This is our attitude in life. Here we know how to enjoy everything a little without attachment, which damages. This exaltation of sensibility opens us to the enjoyment of very diversified pleasures. The communitarian feeling is rooted in the conviction that only in our belonging to the community can we be who we are, feel what we feel, enjoy what we enjoy. In such a world, solitude does not exist. Here we all know each other, we all accompany each other, we always see each other. Here life is only incompleteness on the part of each one, because we well know that our life is only possible inside this energetic flowing of life which is the Andean communitarian world (128-129).
All considerations taken together, the kind of speaking that results from this re-conceptualized conversational reality informed by Andean philosophy is of a completely different nature than that fomented through a lens of separation. When in relation as equivalent and incomplete beings—that is, completely dependent on ‘Others’ to know or be ‘oneself,’ one learns to tend the relation with gratitude, affection, care, tenderness and compassion, because one realizes how critical the Others’ contributions are for being able to understand ourselves. This spiral of affective reciprocity is the basis for re-generating life in the Pacha inhabited by the social dimension.126 Rengifo (1998a) describes how this works:

In re-creating new plants and new animals the chacra “fills” nature with more forms of life and accompanies it in the regeneration of life. In order to make maize grow all the communities have to agree, they have to be in symbiosis, they have to converse harmoniously. The capacity for empathy and symbiosis flowers in the chacra according to the way life is multiplied. In the chacra all speak; the plants tell the runas, speak to the runas all the time, just as the runas speak to the plants (110).

As a result, this philosophy has the potential to engender compassion and love for the ‘Other’ with whom one engages in this dance of aligning and harmonizing. Lajo (2003) attests, “in the Andes in the Quechua, Aymara and Puquina communities a world still exists that is governed by the law of love and human solidarity (the principles of yanapay or yanapacuy), or by the simple respect for pairs or also the world of balance between complementary opposites” (144).

So in the end, starting with a lens of complete interconnectedness leads to using a two-in-one relation or juk logic, to recognizing a broader concept of ‘Other’ and of what is detectable, to exercising in a more holistic fashion one’s sensing-and-processing system, to understanding the need to operate from our particular kay pacha point as the only time-place where we can really operate.

126 Grillo (1998a) reaffirms the key importance of all the members of the ayllu in re-generating life:

In our living Andean world all of us who exist are alive: not only humans, animals and plants but also the stones, the mountains, the rivers, the gorges, the sun, the moon, the stars and so on. In our world we live the equivalence of the diverse, the heterogeneous, because here the mosquito, the frog, the frost, the hail, the fox, the human, the mountain, the river, the stars are all indispensable in the delicate nurturance of our harmony; because only this, our exuberant diversity, knows how to nurture our harmony, the one that belongs here, the one which knows how to nurture us (128).
engage the contingent, embedded, specific and emergent circumstances available to us, and to knowing that what we find in these circumstances are our co-creations. The logic of two-in-one relation also engenders an emphasis on the parity between the incomplete components that conform the relation. Here though the proportionality between the components is understood to be dynamic and to oscillate cyclically. We as ‘components’ (as well as all of our integrated and incomplete parts) also oscillate, fluctuating cyclically between balance and imbalance.

However, because of the general thrust of the cosmos toward balance and our complete interconnection with it, we are able to use the always emergent co-creations that present themselves through all of our interactions (robustly defined) as a ‘compass’ that signals our relative ‘proportionality’ or balance. When we understand that the ‘Others’ generously ‘agree’ to be our mirrors and that the signs they provide are actually the form of nurturing that we need in that moment to help us align with the general flow of the cosmos, being grateful for and following their lead are a much easier venture. Another aspect of switching back and forth between reading the signs and following their lead is an ever-clearer understanding of the degree to which we participate in generating our co-creations and a keener awareness of what we emit energetically. Understanding that we all have a limited picture and that we are all taking in the signs to ‘find our way about’ can lead to a gentler, more compassionate relational approach to speaking that can inculcate balance and alignment in general. Here it is understood that “life in common” is actually a “symbiosis” whereby “each one is enriched by the life of the others” (Rengifo 1998a, 107).

Up to this point I have been describing the process of deliberately engaging in ayni by embracing the purpose of the wider conversation, that is, to align oneself with the general thrust of the cosmos toward equilibrium. However, as described earlier, not aligning is an equally
possible choice in the moment of responding to the signs. At the same time, we still encounter moments of imbalance during the wider conversation even when we are aligned due to its co-created nature and the constant emergence of distinct points among interconnected watas. From this perspective these moments constitute the integral complementary opposite to balance and allow us to know what balance is. They are the source of friction that generates learnings and equips us to foster balance in the future. If we want to align ourselves then we must choose to listen and follow these signs; we must always (re-)adjust ourselves toward alignment.

The next section explores this cycle a little more closely in order to better understand energetic stagnation and its prescribed remedy. Here we discuss the parity-based cycle of balance and imbalance in terms of health and illness to get a better idea of how ayni operates in relation to this dynamic cycle. This discussion also illustrates how the relation can be conceived as the generative means of co-creation as well as provides a more in-depth development of the two-in-one-relation logic. As part of this endeavor it also touches on the repercussions of co-creating from a place of imbalance.

**Sumak Kawsay – Llaki Kawsay**

This parity-based cycle of balance and imbalance that supports us by pointing toward how to be in alignment with what is can be described in Quechua as sumak kawsay or alli kawsay (living beautifully or well) and llaki kawsay (living sadly or in pain). In the most general terms sumak kawsay describes the state of being in unison with life. In this phase life flows. Llaki kawsay results from not listening, not attuning, and here the sad life is when the energy is blocked and life is not re-generated. These concepts can be readily illustrated through the

---

127 The skill for accommodating these moments and adjusting to them is what Grillo has called “Andean organicity (and not social organization).” He explains that it “is that capacity of the living Andean world to converse with the peculiarities of the wata and of periods of watas, in such a way that the life of the ayllu does not suffer impairment” (Grillo qtd. in Rengifo 1998a, 104). (Rengifo notes that it was Grillo’s intervention during the first unit of the 7th course of Formation in Andean Agriculture in Lima, Peru in April 1996.)
Western-style notions of health and illness at the level of the person. I say Western-style because the expression of these concepts in a time-spacescape of complete interconnectedness is not limited to how we deal with health and illness but involves a vast range of states of being.

Nevertheless, besides the fact that most people can relate to the states of well-being and sickness, this topic allows us to contrast the logics of one-in-separation and two-in-one relation. For instance, from the perspective of two-in-one relation, health and illness constitute a parity-based cycle. Health is to be in alignment with one’s surroundings, to be flowing in dynamic balance, and illness in turn is the physical manifestation of energetic blockages or imbalances that are embraced and reproduced. In the Western-style time-spacescape, in contrast, they are understood as elements of a dualism, as separate categories whose relationship is secondary to their ontological autonomy. Well-being and sickness do not constitute a parity-based relation. This categorical logic also means that illness is conceived of as one thing, injury as another, and a broken chair as something completely unrelated and separate. Even the involved person seems to be separate from all of these cases. We witness this generally shared attitude in the Western-style medical approach of solely dealing with the issue at hand—be it a broken arm or stomach cancer—and not the whole picture.

The categorical approach to health and illness has several important ramifications. First, future doctors are taught to see illness or injury as an abnormality or form of degeneration that requires intervention. They are not trained to deal with the ‘whole picture’ and as a result do not prod patients to see this state of affairs as a contrast that represents their own co-creation. In fact, when we perceive the illness or injury as a separate phenomenon from ourselves as patients, then the ailment becomes something to extract, kill off, fight off, remove, get over, etc. Once ‘gone,’ we are relieved of our ‘victimizer.’ Neither from the perspective of the doctor nor of the
patient are these states of being understood as co-creations that are intimately related to the affected being’s respective energetic profile in conjunction with the harmonizing tendency of the cosmos. In fact, because the logic of one-in-separation does not require, encourage or even admit interconnection as a generative principle, this reductionist approach denies our role in creating those conditions and therefore seeing these contrasts as forms of nourishment meant to help us grow and learn how to better keep our balance. From the perspective of complete interconnectedness, health and illness are states of being intricately embedded within the broader tendencies of balance and imbalance. Rather than conceiving of health and illness in categorical terms, the lens of complete interconnectedness sees well-being as linked to harmony and illness to disharmony in emergent, relational and cyclical terms. In fact, illness here is even taken as an expression of cosmic wisdom at the level of the physical body. In this case, the energetic blockages that are left unattended must be transmuted through the physical level, which again reflects the general cosmic penchant toward equilibrium. When the physical manifestations arise they obviously need attention even from this orientation, but more important is the affected person’s tending to the energetic imbalance that led to the physical manifestation in the first place. Here it becomes immediately clear that when health and illness represent our respective states of being or energetic profiles, we play a more active role in generating the co-creation as well as in resolving the patterns that afforded the outcome.

This orientation has two critical implications. First, because the generative aspect of the relation can become manifest in a variety of forms, we can understand both wellness and illness in terms of relative ‘gradients.’ This great variety of ‘gradations’ between ‘balance’ and ‘imbalance’ is not a teleological notion but a fluid, relational one. Second, because illness and health are now conceived relationally through energy as forms of (im)balance, an illness, injury,
broken vase, or even ‘kinks’ in the flow of the day are all considered to be physical manifestations of varying degrees of imbalance tied intimately to one’s energetic state.

As physical manifestations of imbalanced energy, they all constitute contrasts or signs in communicational terms. So almost cutting your finger, bumping into a corner and bruising your leg, spraining an ankle, getting into a car accident, ‘falling prey’ to a terminal disease, dropping a glass, locking yourself out of your house or car, and losing your luggage on a flight are all contrasts of varying gradations that serve as gentle or abrupt reminders—that is, as forms of nurturing—that point to the degree and type of imbalance that we have generated and that require attention. These physical manifestations of imbalance make us more readily aware that we have something to ‘work’ on so that we may become re-aligned with what is.

Despite the cosmos’ penchant toward wholeness and balance, its infinite ‘generosity’ allows sufficient amplitude for the co-existence of imbalance. So, when we choose not to read the illness or bruise as a sign, when we do not make connections, when we do not engage these contrasts as opportunities to recalibrate ourselves and the particular energetic pattern that led to the co-creation, our particular perceptive patterns and energetic profile will continue to be similar. This means that we continue to feed the imbalance that led to the physical manifestation and subsequently attract similar scenarios of contrast. In one sense this means that we get to try again albeit in totally new, contingent circumstances, and in another, we have lost out on the specific learnings that just passed. In addition to missing out on the lessons, continuing to co-create from a place of imbalance precludes us from proportionalizing relations between parity-based components, and this, in turn, creates the conditions for falling further and further out of alignment with what is. In the end, this hurts one’s ‘self’ by fostering imbalance and enhancing existential ‘separation anxiety.’
Yet illness in this model does not signify ‘failure’ for two reasons. First, because health and illness are not categories at a definitional level, they are not substantives that can be achieved or completed. Moreover, the fact that imbalance is the critical ‘other half’ of balance means that its *raison d’être* is to help us see how to be in balance, how to recognize harmony and well-being. As we saw under the parity principle, the bigger contrasts have greater potential for learning, integration and healing. In this sense, illness need not be feared because it is the opportunity to strengthen key abilities or to garner critical tools for weathering mercurial conditions more effectively throughout life. When we embrace the cyclical movement between balance and imbalance, we actually open ourselves up to receive the wisdom that comes from the concept of *juk*, that which derives from the interactive relation between complementary components. This wisdom strengthens our ability to engender dynamic balance and re-generate life. Eduardo Grillo (1998a) echoes these lessons:

> The harmony that fits best our plenitude is the one that allows our health to flourish; the alteration of this harmony, which our body experiences like disharmony, is what makes us ill. But here, in the living Andean world, in contrast to what occurs in the modern Western world, health and illness are not opposed to each other, rather they complement each other in the nurturance of life. When we have cured ourselves of a disease, our life becomes richer – becomes stronger out of that lived experience. This is because, with the help of our community, we have been capable of re-establishing within ourselves the harmony and now we know how to nurture it better, both for our own benefit and for that of our community (130).

In this sense, an illness is not something to be estranged but a process of nurturing and following with which one can engage and learn. It is a phase in dynamic balance, a phase that allows our bodies, minds and emotional orientations to become stronger through healing and the integration of new learnings. In addition to confirming the points made above, it also recalls an extremely important dimension of this cosmovision: whether healthy or sick, we are not healthy or sick alone. Here all the beings of the *ayllu* play a supportive role to help us grow through our imbalance, and our healing also benefits the community.
Now, because these concepts derive from an ontology that assumes complete interconnectedness, it behooves us to explore how the flowing back and forth between harmony and disharmony at the level of the person interacts with All Our Relations. As wholly interconnected and interpenetrable beings, we emanate our relative states of being into the web of life affecting All Our Relations of the more robust ayllu and the time-spacescape in which they are found. So when we are dynamically aligned with the cosmic cycles, Rengifo (1998a) observes, “there is attunement [and] life ‘runs’ and flows” (106). In another instance he attests, “If each one listens and converses, ‘follows’ what the signs in that circumstance are saying, life continues its regenerative course” (106). Choosing to foster balance not only allows us to align with the general tendency of the cosmos, but it also benefits All Our Relations including future generations. As we become Amaro Runa, able to dynamically generate balance across all three information-sensing-and-processing spheres through an ever-emergent process of honing our communicative skills as well as becoming more adept at acting and being within our respective kay pacha points, listening and following are activities that inform our ability to emanate, reinforce and foster dynamic balance in the face of new contrasts.

Likewise, our imbalances also affect All Our Relations. When we are out of balance, we are disproportionately reliant on others on the energetic plane. That is, we require greater support from others and energetically drain them until we can regain balance. In this sense, being ill or out of balance actually does ‘place an energetic burden’ on the other. Nevertheless, an illness can be beneficial in the sense that it forces us to recognize our limited and interdependent nature. It also engenders learnings on give and take, teaching us how to receive in more explicit fashion and teaching others how to give while managing their own balance at the same time. Even our experience with the illness can serve as a lesson for others.
Another issue of fostering dynamic imbalance ‘within’ one’s system is that it emits a vibration that is out of step with the cosmic cycles, and this is shared among the members of the *ayllu* through the energy network. These imbalances affect our co-creations and what we generate as affordances because they, as actions in the present, re-inform the shared background and give shape to what is afforded in the future. Since all is co-creation, we can even collectively feed off of each other’s imbalances. Collectively choosing to foster imbalance instead of alignment can create an imbalanced state that becomes so commonplace that we take it as the appropriate or only strategy for living.

We can even collectively engender imbalance to the point where the energy gets ‘stuck,’ in the same way that the energy can become blocked at the level of a single person. Getting to this point is fairly simple, Rengifo (1998a) explains, “if one wants to contradict the life signs, regeneration does not follow – it gets stuck.” Put another way, “if the listeners are not alert and the conversation becomes a monologue, it does not flow” (106). However, it is important to note that even when one is engaging in *ayni*, the dynamic emergence of new circumstances can pose obstacles, creating “disorders in the harmony, moments of conflicts and disequilibrium in the conversation between the members of the *Pacha*” (116). In all of these cases however, the flow “is interrupted” and this produces “obstructions, anger, restrictions, accumulations, which prevent and make difficult the regeneration of life” (106-7).

Again, as co-created phenomena, energetic imbalances are equally possible at the individual and collective levels. At the level of the person, the flow can be ‘deadened’ by not being ‘present,’ by insisting on living for the future, by only relying on the faculty of thinking, by employing an anthropocentric orientation that does not recognize the very robust definition of ‘Other,’ by creating routines or recurring thought patterns that become ‘crystalized,’ or by going
through the motions without contemplating the potential for learning. Collectively this can happen by cutting down too many trees without replanting, extracting too many resources at an accelerated pace, contaminating the waters, attempting to impose order on entropy, institutionalizing ‘cycles,’ creating the conditions for the loss of a species in an ecosystem, fostering monocropping, promoting genetically modified organisms, encouraging consumerism, etc. Imbalance in both of these cases is as much of an option as balance. In neither case is there anything that stops us from continuing to create such lack of synchronicity, because imbalance is already an integral component of the cosmos. The only thing that can happen is energetic stagnation because that too is allotted within the cosmic realm of possibilities.

**Tinkuy: Disrupting Blocked Energetic Flow**

When energetic stagnation results, the Andeans have a strategy for breaking apart that co-created blocked flow.128 Rengifo (1998a) asserts, “ritual encounters or tinkuy … dissolve [blockages] so that life can once again follow its course” (107). Later, he elaborates more specifically on how tinkuy serves to disrupt these co-created forms of stagnation:

It is then necessary to re-establish conversation and harmony through ceremonies of tinkuy or encounters between collectivities which want to remake their relationships of conversation and thus allow life to flow. These ceremonies to untie the knots of disequilibrium can take violent forms of punishment and fights among those who have not known how to converse. One can even punish not only the runas but also the huacas who have not known how to carry out their tasks. After the ceremony of tinkuy, everything regains its equilibrium until a new set of circumstances obliges one to do it again (116-117).

In these instances, tinkuy is a way of intervening on the circumstances so that the conversation may be re-established. Yet it is important to note that here again, imbalance and stagnation are treated as normal, integral aspects of life. However, when imbalance translates into stagnation,

---

128 All forms of energetic stagnation, whether at the level of just one being or the entire robust ayllu, are all collective co-creations due to the principles reviewed under robust communication.
these co-created contrasts require significant disruption so that harmonizing—the prioritized goal from this lens—can occur again in fluid fashion.

Ceremonies directed at activating tinkuy are presided over by Andean ‘priests’ (paqos or yatiris), “because, due to their capacity to ‘see’, they are able to fathom the intimacy of the instable Andean order and to know the way to reestablish harmony so that life regains its flow.” With the intent of “untying the knots of disequilibrium” so as to be able to (re-)foster balance, they do not look at the disharmony “analytically as if it were only a matter of a difficulty with a diseased organ.” Rather they examine “the totality of the local order within which the organ lives,” because it is important to restore harmony both within the organ as well as within the affected Pacha. The cures generated by the paqos are seen as “part of the ceremony of conversation with all the huacas of the different collectivities that are in charge of the cargo” of the imbalance at hand (Rengifo 1998a, 117). In all of its forms, tinkuy is intended to break up the energetic stagnation to allow the space to re-inspire harmony into and through the relations.

This metaphor of the diseased organ and how it is treated is fitting for what we saw under sumak kawsay / llaki kawsay in a few ways. Here again we see that a diseased organ is considered to be just one type of physical manifestation of blocked energy, which can vary both in form and dimension. They can take place in the body or out, and they can be ‘personal’ or ‘public’ in nature. That is, it may be an injury, a breakout of pests on a crop, a drought, a hailstorm or an invasion. Second, the diseased organ, just like all of the other cases mentioned here, is completely embedded in the web of life. It is not an isolated phenomenon. Consequently all of the relations that fed into the diseased organ must also be harmonized. Third, if we take the diseased organ literally and not metaphorically, we can even see how tinkuy adds a key consideration for health and healing, harmony and disharmony from this perspective.
In addition to being a metaphorical description of a collective state of affairs, a diseased organ can be the target of a tinkuy ceremony. Before discussing what this kind of work implies for healing the sick person, her relations and the affected pacha, it is important to clarify that any manifestation of imbalance at the level of physicality, whether found in one’s body or in an almost-accident, is understood to be a natural form of tinkuy. That is, the blockage nourished or fostered on the energetic plane must find an ‘out’ on the physical plane. In this way, the physical manifestation is just another form of ‘contrast’ that ‘speaks’ to us about our imbalances and provides the opportunity to integrate the lesson that led to the blockage. Even the specific location and form of the physical manifestation are not random. They constitute windows into the nature of the blockage and the particular vibrational profile that led to the imbalance. In this way these signs support us in the process of healing and re-balancing.

This ‘natural tinkuy’ not only demonstrates again the cosmos’ tendency toward equilibrium but it also points to the body’s intricate connectedness to this tendency and the great ‘wisdom’ that is already housed in one’s being. At the same time it indicates the need to engage in ayni, to harmonize, if one desires to stop creating the conditions for such physical manifestations. Once we start to understand that this is how we can play the game of life for the sake of re-generating it, the physical manifestation too can be thanked and integrated, and dynamic balance can be fostered once again.\(^{129}\)

In an ‘exemplary’ process, the illness or injury points to the imbalance, temporarily releases the energetic blockage and allows for a new space to re-start the flow. As stated under sumak kawsay / llaki kawsay, this natural form of tinkuy—when the focus is placed on integrating the lesson from the imbalance that we co-created—helps us to re-harmonize and

\(^{129}\) The corresponding physical manifestation is usually seen as cause for gratitude from this perspective because it means that the blockage has been released, which means that we may start integrating the lessons with less ‘pressure’ already built up through past interactions.
makes us stronger in the sense of updating our toolbox for fostering balance in the future. The supportive tendencies of these basic energetic principles make our choice/‘freedom’ as co-creators even clearer: we either choose to intend to align ourselves, to dynamically accommodate the emergent circumstances or we choose to hold onto imbalance, because it is what we know, because it serves other purposes, etc.

In fact, holding on to imbalance is quite easy to do. Insisting on ontological separation allows us to see ourselves as the victims of a car crash, a broken computer or illness. As victim, we may blame the ‘Other’ and free ourselves of any ‘responsibility’ for the current condition. In this way we can avoid seeing the physical manifestation as directly related to our emotional/thought state, which means that we do not have to interpret the initial ‘natural’ tinkuy provided as a contrast in the form of a physical manifestation as an opportunity to integrate, heal and balance. This, in turn, allows the speaking/nurturing to continue without us completing the cycle of ayni and for imbalance to be maintained.

Even when we play the game according to a lens of complete interconnectedness, it is possible for us not to ‘see’ and integrate all of the piece(s) that led to the physical manifestation. For example, in the case of a ‘chronic’ or recurring illness, injury or tendency, we are reproducing energetic patterns that are so engrained that it is difficult to see all of them.\textsuperscript{130} At times we have to engage in other learnings before we can let go of the various sources of the blockage, and this makes integration and engaging dynamic balance an ever-emergent process. At other times we may generate a physical manifestation that is simply the final release of the

\textsuperscript{130}In contemplating these patterns, we need to consider the influence of our personality, our point in our respective wata, our perceptive preferences, thought patterns, cultural programming, behavior patterns, emotional charges, among many other dimensions that may be relevant given the circumstances.
build-up of energy that resulted from a particular pattern that we have already managed to integrate.\(^{131}\)

In those moments when we cannot overcome the illness, whether we are playing the game of complete interconnectedness or that of separation, we may need a ceremonial form of tinkuy facilitated by a healer. In this case, the healer adds to the natural form of tinkuy already happening to disrupt the blockage and to create the space for flow. Then he re-harmonizes the affected organ, the person, that person’s relations, and the pacha that those relations are occupying. To be effective at this task, the amauta must be able to ‘see’ the blockage across all involved relations, which requires a more robust sensing capacity. Lajo (2003) elaborates, “The high priest’s force will be given through his ability to understand what part of the sick person is out of balance in itself or ‘does not vibrate to the beat of the kay pacha’” (154). For this reason, the Andean priests “who ‘see’ and ‘touch’ best are those that are in the best conditions to attune themselves, to converse with the other” (Rengifo 1998a, 107). As Lajo observes, “to return the sick to the Andean order or natural order” the healer will re-align them, their relations and affected pacha through a more developed set of sensing and balancing tools. The “multiple techniques for restoring this ‘Andean order’” can vary widely depending on the particular set of gifts, ‘support team’ and experiences of the healer (154).

Nevertheless, effective tinkuy and rebalancing are more a matter of following the principles than of a particular method. According to the parity principle, the relations must be “proportionalized” to re-establish balance with the whole. In fact Lajo (2003) explains that when we use a wholly relational logic, “the only solution of relation that we have is that of the proportionality of both [interrelated and incomplete components]” (168). The first step in this

\(^{131}\) In yet other instances, people are born with certain conditions, like Down Syndrome. We can understand this case as simply the ‘package deal’ with which the being arrives and in turn offers as an energetic mirror to those involved in that person’s life to help them learn and integrate their contrasts.
process—a fundamental starting point of Andean thought—is to find “the pairs in things” (144).

In this context, Lajo explains that to do so is to:

find its complement or the reason behind its complementariness and how a proportionality between the two can be established, that is the reason for its balance and also for its imbalance: of how the complementary pairs find a proportionality between themselves and how and why in determined circumstances they get out of proportion, losing their balance to become more complex structures (144).

This can be done because absolutely every being or phenomenon emanates or holds a vibration or frequency that necessarily has its relational complementary opposite. This parity-based system of thought as described here results in an epistemological process that focuses both on the relationship and on the balance between the related elements.

According to these principles, then, if the illness exists, then something must also exist to counterbalance it and a particular proportion of that component must exist to neutralize it. Once the pair is identified and/or the imbalance located, the tinkuy that the healer incites then allows for those proportions to be rebalanced by disrupting that which became stagnant or too dense. This approach to knowing recalls the story of the Poné described in Chapter 2. In identifying and reading the frequency of the illness and that of the plant and in measuring their respective vibrational strengths, the Poné was able to re-balance the relation.

The healer may officially unblock the energy and may re-set the balance in the relations, but it is important to remember that in this moment, just like in any other, balance is temporary. For this reason, in the end, one’s own well-being is up to one’s attentiveness toward inculcating balance. In this very monistic, relational approach, the healer is not ‘in charge’ of the person’s well-being but rather a facilitator. In other words, the person who is getting ‘healed’ needs to maintain the balance facilitated through the healer by integrating the learnings through the experience, and this often requires, especially in more serious or persistent cases, serious changes to one’s emotional, thought and energetic patterns so that the flow can be maintained.
Of course, when playing the game of ontological separation, these are not critical considerations. In this game, when one is ill, one most often places one’s healing ‘destiny’ into the hands of the doctor/healer without seeing the experience as part of the deeper process of integrating the contrast. In this case Western-style doctors are effective healers in that they still facilitate tinkuy in terms of the energetic stagnation or the ‘remains’ after its blowout (as in the case of a car accident or broken leg). In this way, they still make the space for energy to flow again by removing, extracting, killing off, resetting, replacing, etc.

However, because this action is normally not conceived of in terms of parity, juk or cycles, very little attention is drawn to completing the cycle by engaging the learning phase presented by the contrast. In addition to detracting from the sick person’s awareness of her intimate relation to her co-creation as seen in the last section, ignoring the second part of the disrupt/re-balance cycle also means that many of the treatments generated through this system of thought actually either engender greater energetic imbalance or weaken the physical system’s ability to get stronger by moving through the process itself. These are often labeled ‘secondary effects’ which are the ‘costs’ for being able to enjoy immediate relief from the ‘perceived antagonist.’

In any case, whether the ‘patient’ uses an Andean healer or Western-style doctor, he can still use these principles to grow from the experience and be more equipped to face future disruptions.

Once one understands these principles and knows how to use this system of perceiving and processing, one is better able to take advantage of the ample opportunities that present

---

132 This indicates the costs and effects of this approach. While focusing on the extracting, removing, resetting and replacing aspect of the healing cycle, Western-style medicine has been able to make great advances in techniques and knowledge about those techniques. Yet at the same time, because the ontological lens used in this endeavor wholly divorces the person using the lens from the whole and from the cyclical nature of the whole, these advances are almost always accompanied by subtle costs that are not even contemplated or imagined from within an ontology of separation.
themselves over the course of one’s life cycle. With each new contrast, one can conscientiously
glean new tools to engender dynamic balance, which means that one can take better care of
oneself and as such of All Our Relations.\textsuperscript{133} In this sense, knowingly engaging in \textit{ayni} is like a
spiral not only for the continuous completion of the reciprocal cycle of nurturing and following
but that in each turn of the spiral another set of tools is made available for fostering balance. All
of these skills translate into both personal and collective benefits, which can become a bigger
motivation than any other to align oneself, to facilitate the flow.\textsuperscript{134}

After exploring how \textit{sumak kawsay} and \textit{llaki kawsay} work together as a parity-based
cycle reflecting dynamic balance and imbalance and how \textit{tinkuy} may be applied to create the
space for re-alignment with the cosmic thrust toward equilibrium, we might say that starting with
the primordial assumption of complete interconnectedness leads to a very different and equally
valid kind of knowing. First, instead of relying solely on reason, this approach to knowing
depends on the employment of a whole sensing-and-processing system to detect the information
being shared in a more robustly conceived realm. Breaking up the energetic stagnation and
fostering energetic balance relies on being able to attune to and calibrate with All Our Relations,
which is only possible through this more robust system.

Re-aligning the relations ‘to the beat of the \textit{Pacha}’ also requires embracing very different
conceptualizations of how a whole host of factors is related. At an initial level, as seen here, the

\textsuperscript{133} This does not mean however that even the healer her or himself will not require help at some point in time.
She/he is constantly checking in with the spirit, animal and plant worlds and receiving support there, but at the same
time disrupting others’ energetic stagnation requires transmuting the blockage. This means that the healer must be
able to play the role of energetic ‘conductor’ (more in the sense of leading an orchestra). Over time residuals from
the transmutations in conjunction with one’s own untreated patterns can accumulate in a system’s ‘weak spot’ which
can eventually require getting attention from another healer.

\textsuperscript{134} Gleaning tools from opportunities provided through mutual nurturing is even more critical for the healer. They
require more tools to maintain their balance while engaging others’ imbalances. They also need to be able to disrupt
so as to re-foster balance. The Heyoka in Native American Indian traditions for example play this very important role.
relationship between the healer and her information-sensing-and-processing system is understood in much more holistic terms. Then the healer, the affected person and the supporting beings are much more permeable and more intimately interconnected among themselves and to the cosmos. Furthermore, this healing process implies a very different role for the healer than for Western-style doctors due to the generative aspect of relation. In this case the person to be healed intimately participates in the process of both getting sick and healing through this principle of co-creation. Instead of detracting from the importance of the healer’s contribution, this changes the nature of what the healer is there to do, especially since the illness is taken as being integral to one’s life lessons, not something to just ‘get over.’ Certainly, the healer’s ability to sense the imbalances, identify the counterbalances and re-align relations is critical. Furthermore, her attention on encouraging all cycles to flow through to completion and re-initiation, instead of just creating the space through tinkuy, is also central to this process. Yet, in the end, the healing process is seen as sitting in the hands of the person who ‘falls ill.’

As a matter of fact, this set of distinct ontological fruit does not require less ‘rigor’ or ‘discipline.’ They are just exercised in a very different fashion for a very distinct purpose borne out of the respective initial ontological leap of faith. Even though Western-style ‘science’ does not acknowledge approaches stemming from complete interconnectedness to be ‘scientific’ due to their less ‘empirical’ approach (when employing less developed faculties), the validity of this kind of knowing is demonstrated through multinational pharmaceutical companies’ involvement in the contemporary practice of ‘bioprospecting.’ In this case the private sector is much less concerned about the ‘validity’ debate about academic standards than about efficiency and making a profit.

---

135 See Shiva (1999) for an account of the alternative term “biopiracy” applied to this same practice.
This practice of ‘discovering’ the plants used in indigenous communities so to identify the respective active ingredient through biochemical applications has had lucrative results. For example, in 2004, it was estimated that “approximately 25% of the worlds [sic] pharmaceutical products [found] a significant degree of origin in Indigenous communities. This represents more than a 200-billion-dollar share of the global market.”

Here tapping into the more direct form of energetic communication practiced through a lens of complete interconnectedness has resulted in great savings in research and development and significant profits for this sector. For this reason and more, Lajo (2003) can assert the following about the Andean context: “In our culture and our languages, we find sufficient reasons so as to be able to catalogue the Andean science as ‘a science that makes use of the proportions of two measurements that complement each other’” (168). In this sense, at least two forms of science are possible simply through the change of ontological lens.

**The Case of Capac Hucha: Another Illustration of Reductionism**

With the more robust tools provided through this review of some central Andean principles, including parity, *pacha, ayllu, wata, ayni, sumak kawsay/llaki kawsay* and *tinkuy* in addition to the transversal themes of shared attributes, equivalency and multidimensionality, I would like to propose one final illustration of reductionism that will make much more sense when read from the logic of ‘two-in-one relation.’ I turn once again to Salomon and Urioste’s translation of the *Huarochiri Manuscript* from the original Quechua into English. In this case the manuscript is dealing with a ceremony of human ‘sacrifice’ called *Capac Hucha.*

---

Besides highlighting how the heretofore-mentioned principles can work together in conjunction with the *juk* logic to elucidate a few lines describing a ceremony, the most important point of this illustration on the most general level is that it provides a window into understanding the link between the employed ontological lens and how that shapes what becomes afforded. Specifically it shows first how grasping the robustly relational principles of complete interconnectedness allows us to re-generate, re-expand the conceptual potential of what is now a fragment. In this way it shows that when we know how to employ this other lens, we can get a completely different—and I would argue more coherent—(re-)interpretation of the traces left behind.

Second, even though Salomon and Urioste (1991) are not here to provide an explanation or analysis of this ceremony, here we can see how the translation they get through their (re-)interpretive lens of separation is actually conducive to reductionism at many levels. What becomes fairly evident is how this lens is incapable of seeing the whole integrated and integrative picture and how this fact of ontological reductionism disallows the generation of a comprehensive, integrated, holistic, cyclical and emergent account that highlights the value placed on dynamic balance.

Consequently this final case of reductionism is rather telling for my argument about international relations. This illustration brings to the fore some of the most central tendencies of the logic of one-in-separation, such as its ability to completely unravel the integrated quality of two-in-one relation or how its penchant for the categorical encompasses, encloses and reduces in ever expansive fashion. It even indicates how the existential fear inculcated through this lens encourages and reinforces teleological thinking. As we bring to a close the discussion of the
time-spacescape based on complete interconnectedness, these insights will be quite useful for addressing the features emerging from a logic of separation.

Below I first present the text as it has been translated and then highlight one preliminary issue with the translation. This allows me—by using the logic of juk—to show how this ceremony was conceptualized, for what reasons, toward what ends, and with what tools. With a tightly knit, more coherent explanation of this ceremony, we may then identify other problematic translation choices and examine the repercussions of using such a reductionist approach for the translation. Before citing the text, however, some relevant lessons from the points made to date will help prepare the reader for the juk-based (re-)interpretation that I propose here. First parity-based relations are key in terms of re-aligning with ‘what is.’ Second wata is a life cycle and not a year. Third death is not seen as the end of life but the other integral phase of a parity-based spiraling cycle between these two elements. Fourth tinkuy is an Andean strategy for intentionally breaking up energetic stagnation or imbalance to re-start the flow, (re-)foster balance and re-generate life. Fifth one characteristic of an integrative and integrated logic such as the one developed here is that nothing can be left ‘loose,’ hanging or dangling. Absolutely everything has its reason within this ceremony, and we can make sense of all of them simply by re-employing the logic of two-in-one relation.\footnote{\footnotesize It may be pertinent to mention here that my development of this more robust explanation of the ceremony does not derive from consulting any other texts on this event. It comes solely from applying the logic of two-in-one relation and related Andean principles to the traces provided in this text and the translators’ notes.} In the case of this Capac Hucha ceremony, all elements are directed at disrupting the manifested stagnant imbalance and injecting it with the opportunity to (re-)proportionalize the masculine and feminine elements.

The following text includes the original indications of translators’ notes, because they are central for picking up on some of the problematic issues presented in the translation and for
providing clues as to the continuity of the integrative logic of juk. Here is Salomon and Urioste’s (1991) translation of the Huarochirí description of this ceremony:

Reportedly they gave Pacha Camac each year[556] what’s called a Capac Hucha,[557] namely, human beings[558] both female and male, from Tauantin Suyo, the four quarters of the world.

Arriving at Pacha Camac [an actual physical location on the coast], and saying to Pacha[559], “Here they are. We offer them to you, father!” they’d bury the Capac Hucha alive, along with gold and silver. And according to the cycles of the full and waning moon, they fed him llamas and served him drinks without pause (112).138

Before launching into my contestation, I would like to acknowledge that Salomon openly states that his goal is not to be true to the morphemes encountered within the original text, but to provide an intelligible account in English. Salomon (1991) explains his and Urioste’s reasoning:

“This book does not aspire to morpheme-by-morpheme translation. ... Rendering an agglutinative language morpheme-by-morpheme (to the degree that it is possible at all) yields verbose, obscure formulations” (Salomon 1991, 36).139 This objective is quite important, because it allows us to at least get a glimpse of understanding of the text. However, without acknowledging the role of the ontological lens employed to do the translating, this reluctance to adequately unpack the concepts with potentially more verbose renditions can also lead into some dangerous waters. As I delineate the risky implications of using a reductionist lens below, I am
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138 The Quechua transcription reads as follows: “chaymantas canan tauantin suyo runacunacta capac hucha ñiscactapas huarmicta caricta huatanpi corcan cay ca pac hucha ñiscanchitas ña pacha camacman chayaptinsi yna causacllacta pachaman cay mi coyqui yaya ñispa pampac carcan ynatac coric tapas colloquiactapas llamacunactari purapi quillapi mana ancochaspa opiachircan mi cochircan” (Salomon and Urioste 1991, 211).

139 Salomon continues with the following example to demonstrate just how convoluted a morpheme-by-morpheme translation could be in English:

The following example of a translation processes uses the slash (/) to signal morpheme boundaries and suggests the sort of problems that occur within a single random and typical clause. The original is ña chori/h/cuna/pas/colo/pit/n/rac/si ... Analyzed using Urioste’s terminology, this clause consists of three roots (italicized), each with additional morphemes: already child/(3d person)/(plural)/(additive) perish/(contrastive adverbial)/(third person)/(continuative)/(reportive validator)... This could be rendered, forcing a morpheme-by-morpheme translation, as: already child/his/(plural)/even perish/(verb with different subject to follow)/they/first/it’s said... To make intelligible English one must drop a morpheme (-pit) that has and needs no English analogue and make choices whether to translate –pas, -raq, and –si explicitly. We chose not to translate most –si reportive validators, and the remaining content can be made clear by implication in a simple English form: “When his children had already perished” (Urioste 1973, chap. 19, sec. 233 qtd. in Salomon 1991, 36).
grateful to Salomon for this explicit articulation and for the opportunity to clearly show how this lens and its corresponding logic generate issues like the ones profiled here.

The first concern that stands out in this translation is the use of “year” to signify the “huata” (another spelling of wata) that appears in the Quechua version as part of the multi-morpheme expression “huatanpi.” While at the level of basic comprehension this does not appear to be a problematic translation, it gives the incorrect illusion that this ceremony was an annual event and detracts from the reader’s ability to grasp the contingency of such a ceremony on moments of vast and deep energetic imbalance to which it was supposed to respond. In this case, a wata could also signify the parity-based cycle between sumak kawsay and llaki kawsay, and so the ceremony might happen every time the cycle moved into deep llaki kawsay or imbalance. Even the translators’ note belies the gap created by using “year” instead of life cycle. In note 556 that corresponds to this term, for example, Salomon and Urioste (1991) write: “In most other sources about capac hucha, the rite is described not as annual but as a crisis rite called on such occasions as plague, royal succession, or defeat” (Duviols 1976 qtd. in Salomon and Urioste 1991, 112). This is not surprising, since, as we have already seen, royal leadership and general well-being have a corresponding life cycle or wata just like everything else.

An ‘end’ to general well-being, as expressed through an infestation of ‘pests’ on crops or through the falling out of the position of being the most appropriate, adequate or prepared leader, affects large portions of the broader ayllu and often requires an effort to collectively ‘re-start’ the flow of energy, to break up that which has become stagnant. In fact, note 557 emphasizes the very broad intended reach of this ceremony through its further specification by observing:

*Capac Hucha* ‘opulent prestation’: an all-empire sacrificial and redistributive cycle, in which offerings from all the empire’s peoples were collected at Cuzco and then redistributed outward to all the empire’s shrines and borders. It heavily emphasized

The empire-wide breadth of the ceremony implies that the crisis was so far-reaching that it merited sacrifices and (energetic) redistribution of resources throughout the entire Incan empire. Linking the cyclical aspect of the ceremony to a crisis and considering the strategies employed to resolve the crisis bring the purpose of the ceremony into much clearer view. Simply using ‘life cycle’ instead of “each year” with just a few more indicators would offer a much subtler comprehension of this ceremony and its raison d’être.

Even without these translators’ notes that attempt to fill the gaps, the name of the ceremony provides clues as to the kind of circumstances to which it was applied. The terms “Capac Hucha” could be understood as ‘Lord of the dense matter.’ In this case, hucha, or dense matter, results from imbalance, and its density disallows the continued flow of energy through it. In this case, the corresponding ‘lords’ or capacs of this condition would have the cargo or ‘job’ to ‘create space’ in this dense matter and provide the ‘spark’ to re-start the flow of energy through it.

Before examining these jobs more closely though, we look first to the potential sources of energetic stagnation that result in ‘dense matter.’ Here I re-use the types of imbalance reviewed under information sensing and processing although at a much greater scale than just a single being’s body. As Lajo explains in that section, imbalance may come from too much attention on the middle section of the body, on work, or on the kay pacha. In this case, collectively going through the motions with no attention to dynamic balance can lead to too much stability and as such a generalized imbalance. In the realm of the uku pacha, matter may become dense through too much magnetic, integrative force without a corresponding proportional complement of the electric, abstractive force. In this case, the energy would move more and more slowly as matter
‘collapses’ upon itself. In contrast when too much emphasis is placed on the particles, on the structural aspect of matter, on light, air or thinking, the realm of the hanan pacha has been overly favored. An overemphasis on the electric force also feeds stagnation, because it signifies a lack of presence in the kay pacha. Quite simply, when beings are not fully ‘present’ in their bodies, energy cannot flow as easily through that matter either. This can be a collectively encouraged form of imbalance that still calls for grounding.

These tendencies toward imbalance can also be expressed in terms of the feminine and masculine elements. For example, the source of stagnation stemming from the uku pacha comes from too much of the feminine principle and that of the hanan pacha from too much of the masculine principle. Imbalance in the third sphere, or kay pacha, does not even allow for the consideration or integration of either. In all three cases, hucha arises as a result of imbalance. The energy slows down when the blockage becomes too dense to allow for flow. When the energy can no longer flow, one can also say that the camay flowing from/as Pachacámac is no longer evident, and this renders integrating and balancing parity-based relations impossible. So, no matter the source or type of stagnation, hucha still requires tinkuy to provide the space so that energy may flow again.

If we understand that a crisis is a physical manifestation of imbalance and that the purpose of the Capac Hucha ceremony is to serve as an act of tinkuy, then a far-reaching tinkuy ceremony such as the one described here would be responding to broadly co-created manifestations of imbalance, such as drought, plague, colonization or a change in an empire-wide leadership role. That there be ‘lords’ that enact this tinkuy represents the magnitude of the disruption required to realign the whole ayllu across the four corners or Tauantin Suyo (the
pacha) with the cosmic cycles and, as a result, the strength and preparation required of the runas who were to be buried alive to carry out this job.

In the text, the disruptive element of tinkuy presents itself in three main ways. Redistributing or moving energy across the tauantin suyo is a first instance, and a second is the breaking up of the earth itself. Then, putting live humans underground in the uku pacha, which is not where they are normally encountered, is a third. This final instance is an act of pachacutic that, by turning the pachas upside down, also disrupts the regular order of things.

In addition to breaking up the dense matter, however, to start a new life cycle or re-initiate the energy flow itself requires a ‘conception.’ Conceiving, though, involves a ‘spark’ that occurs between two complementary opposites that are in balance when the timing is right. For this to be the case, the parity principle needs to be fulfilled and the respective cosmic cycles need to be appropriately aligned for life to be re-generated. So if stagnation in that time period meant ‘crystalized’ or solidified imbalance, presenting the male and female as completely proportionalized complementary opposites would inject dynamic balance by providing the most ‘complete’ form of juk. This balance in turn would help disrupt the imbalance. At the same time, the contrast between conjoined incomplete parts is the key for creating the ‘spark’ needed to re-generate life.

The couples who were buried alive would, according to this logic, have to in some way demonstrate the ‘extremes’ of masculine qualities in the male and of feminine qualities in the female, howsoever defined.\textsuperscript{140} This idea is corroborated in the translators’ note 558 when Hernández Príncipe calls them ‘spotless’ and Betanzos then explains that they were ‘married’ (Hernández Príncipe [1622] 1923, 60 and Betanzos [1551] 1987, 142 both qtd. in Salomon and

\textsuperscript{140} The masculine and feminine elements are neither essentialist nor essentializing conceptualizations. There is nothing categorical about this relational conception of energetic principles. The important aspect here is the ‘wholeness’ derived from conjoining two complementary opposites.
By being virgins before this act of conception through “marriage,” they were considered to have maximally stored up sexual energy, which would provide the greatest complement and at the same time the best chances that an actual conception or spark at the level of the *runas* be created in the *juk* moment of their joining.

Now if these couples were just joined to conceive between them, there would not be much difference between this act and ‘life as usual,’ but ‘life as usual’ is what engendered the imbalance. Since these were times of vast crisis, those living through it were not looking to (re-)generate human life but a new life cycle of cosmic proportions. Following the same reproductive principles as found in the plant, animal and human realms, this cosmic conception involved a human female as an egg and a human male as a spermatozoid that were placed in the womb of Mother Earth when conceived multidimensionally. In light of the generalized and significant co-created imbalance, this was considered to be an act of *ayni*, of nurturing/following of the highest quality offering. The *capacs*’ ‘death’ as egg and sperm was seen as giving birth to a whole new life that would be much bigger than either of them separately. (In fact, the simple life span of any egg or sperm without ‘dying’ through conception only to live again in another life form is of much smaller dimensions than if together they feed into a new life.)

To reinforce the probability of a cosmic conception, the parity-based complementarity of the *capacs* would also have to be re-produced at many other levels. We can first look to the energetic principles involved in the ceremony. The very acts of *tinkuy* listed above represent the masculine principle. Digging or breaking up the earth, a symbolic act of penetration into the
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141 In the translators’ note, Hernández Principe calls them “spotless children” but for this logic to be fully integrative and integrated and for *tinkuy* and the re-generation of a new life cycle to happen at several levels at once, the *capacs* must have been at least of reproductive age.
feminine element, prepares the ground and opens a space for conception. Then, after preparing the *uku pacha*/Mother Earth, the live egg and spermatozoid would be placed in the womb. Then, the magnetic pull of gravity that characterizes Mother Earth, as a constant expression of the feminine element, would spur conception between the attracted complementary opposites. This magnetic underground womb, representing the realm of *Pachacámac*, is the source and dark void where the spark of conception takes place and where a new life cycle is nurtured.

Now what is interesting here is that while the ceremony focuses on the complementary balance between the masculine and feminine needed for conception, it is also very much directed toward the Mother, *Pachacámac*. As stated above, when the *camay* no longer flows, then one needs to refer to the source of that flow to (re-)start a new cycle of life. Moreover, as the carrier and nurturer of that new life, supporting, honoring and caring for her womb would be central. At the same time however a simple unitaristic focus on *Pachacámac* is not going to re-facilitate the flow. Energy cannot flow through the ether without at the same time ‘animating’ and being expressed through the ether’s mirror, matter. So while the *chokoras*’ life cycle is seen as starting in the *uku pacha* or the realm of the *Pachacámac*, it is their oscillating movement across all three *pachas* that generates the energy of life. This movement simultaneously allows for the integration and proportionalization of parity-based elements, such as the *uku* and *hanan pachas*, of the feminine and masculine elements to take place in the *kay pacha*. So while conception and gestation happen in the womb, they are only possible through the conjoining of complementary opposites and their life force must be bolstered by fomenting the dynamic interaction between

---

142 For this reason, tilling the land has traditionally been conceptualized as a man-only activity. Otherwise, the seed may not sprout with feminine-only energy between the women who till and the feminine Earth that gets tilled.
the parity-based complementary opposites of feminine and masculine, of the *uku* and *hanan pachas*, of both *Pachacámac* and *Viracocha*.

The geographic location of the ceremony plays on both aspects. First, being called Pacha Camac itself, having the ceremony there highlights the emphasis directed toward the Mother. At the same time, though, the way in which the place got its name is through relation with and to the *hanan pacha*. That is, the ceremonial site, located on the coast in the lowlands, can only get the name Pacha Camac by being in a position that is ‘lower’ relative to another that sits above it, in this case, the highlands.\footnote{According to the parity principle, you could find a place called Pacha Camac in the highlands, but again only when in relatively lower position than a place considered to be higher.} This site represents the *uku pacha*, and the highlands along with the sun and sky symbolize the *hanan pacha*, or the domain of *Viracocha*. So in multidimensional fashion, the location also reflects the preferential focus on the source of the next life cycle while at the same time always taking into consideration that which allows for its expression. This integrated framework then sets the stage for when the new life cycle is born, so that it may oscillate vibrationally across *pachas* for the duration of its given *wata*.

Another aspect that multidimensionally supports a cosmic conception is the parity-based relation between silver and gold. These elements symbolize the feminine-masculine parity-based relations of the moon and sun, night and day, *Pachacámac* and *Viracocha*. When both of these elements were introduced with the egg and spermatozoid, they were to augment the chances of a parity-based ‘spark’ by supporting alignment with the correlating cosmic cycles.

In addition, given the nature of the crisis representing the end of an important *wata*, the exact timing of the ceremony in terms of aligning all relevant *watas* would be critical to the appearance of the spark. Various *watas* would have to be taken into consideration here. For example, the moon (feminine energy) would have to be equally ‘full’ to the sun (masculine
energy) to ensure appropriate proportion between the parity-based feminine and masculine elements so that conception could be strong and in balance. Furthermore, since conception takes place within the dark void of the womb, here again the ceremony would most likely be held at night so that the full force of the *uku pacha* would at once infuse the dense matter, the blocked energy with ‘space’ and facilitate the ‘spark’ of life that is only possible through parity between the feminine and masculine elements. Obviously here too the *runa* woman’s menstruation cycle would have to be completely aligned with the lunar *watas* to increase the chances of conception at the human level too. Her alignment with the most central *watas* would also demonstrate her level of preparedness as a *capac*, and in this way her representation of the feminine principle would provide the strong contrast necessary to engage the masculine element.

Ensuring that all of the parity-based elements be in proportion and aligning the relevant cycles in this responsive conversation may have been sufficient for a successful conception—that is, a successful disruption followed by a successful synergistic spark that makes re-starting a new energetic life cycle possible. However, conscientious reinforcement of the parity principle and alignment of *watas* for the conception would not be enough to ensure a new life cycle. The new life cycle’s gestation period would also require continued attentiveness, which is expressed when the text states, “And according to the cycles of the full and waning moon, they fed him llamas and served him drinks without pause” (Salomon and Urioste 1991, 112). Here the drinks symbolize the fluidity of the feminine principle, and the masculine is represented in the proteins from the llama meat, or the ‘material structure’ that allowed for the existence of the llama. That this nourishing act happened “without pause” as a constant form of proportionalization and in accordance with the corresponding moon cycles reflects the emphasis placed on alignment. This
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144 Thank you Mónica Malo and Alejo Valdivieso for teaching me the importance of having a full moon in ceremonies requiring parity between the masculine and the feminine elements, and thank you Andrés Abad for putting me in the position of getting to learn these things.
parity-based combination would allow the Mother to continue nourishing the spark that gave life in the womb for the specific number of moon *watas* that would constitute the duration of the gestation period.\(^{145}\) In this way we see how re-generating life could be seen to take place through a similar conception-gestation-birth period.

This ceremony, its context and the corresponding strategies employed within it highlight a number of assumptions based on complete interconnectedness. First, balance and imbalance, harmony and disharmony, health and illness, life and death are all parity-based cycles in which both components need each other to exist and make sense. Yet the way in which these cycles play themselves out as complete *jucks* reflects the cosmos’ overall thrust toward equilibrium. Second, *runas* are integrally related to the whole and are incomplete. Since this whole tends overall toward balance, ‘completion’ and therefore balance become possible through relation. For this reason, *runas* place mindful attention on tending and nurturing the relation and therefore on the proportional quality of its components.\(^{146}\)

From this view nurturing this relation in a deeply reciprocal sense would only be possible through the wider conversation. So the presentation of widespread stagnation as in the context of this ceremony would imply a serious lack of having engaged that conversation. Given the severity of the circumstances, the strategy of *tinkuy* and subsequent form of ‘following’ employed to remedy the situation would have to correspond to the principles of the wider

---

\(^{145}\) In the case of human beings, a woman’s expected due date is exactly 9 moons after the date of conception. So one can simply take the exact place of the moon in its cycle and count nine moons again in the exact same position, and that will be the same due date, give or take a day or two, that the Western-medicine doctor will provide after engaging in an elaborate formula based on the first day of one’s last period. Of course, the former requires knowing exactly when one conceives, which, when women were much more in touch with how their body aligned with broader cosmic cycles, was much more obvious than today. The variation in result is due to the assumption in the Western-style formula that women take exactly 14 days to ovulate after the start of one’s period, when women today actually vary quite a bit. Both then and now, while the ideal date of birth was nine moons later, the gestation period does not always heed these cycles.

\(^{146}\) I use ‘mindful’ not to put singular emphasis on the mind, but as a way of re-focusing one’s attention onto the flow, onto how we are engaging the wider conversation.
conversation. A response of great proportions would be required to rectify the situation. The use of runas as Capac Hucha—while reflecting a strong conviction of the equivalency of all linked components of the cosmos—constituted a significant gesture of human nurturing that was seen as corresponding to the gravity of the crisis. In these circumstances, the ‘job’ of the runas was to cajole or convince a whole time-space conjunction to conceive, gestate and give birth to a new cycle of life. This task first involved injecting the stagnation with a form of tinkuy and then demanded the presentation of proportionalized parity-based relations in various expressions right when critical key watas were aligned to ensure the most propitious circumstances for this conception of cosmic proportion. As we can see in this short synopsis the purpose and reasoning of the ceremony become readily apparent by employing a lens based on complete interconnectedness to (re-)interpret these brief lines.

Translation Issues

Nevertheless, this (re-)interpretation of the ceremony through a lens of two-in-one relation point to two other critical translation issues that preclude arriving at this more robust and integrated comprehension of the ceremony. I re-cite the text here so that they might be better identified:

Reportedly they gave Pacha Camac each year[556] what’s called a Capac Hucha,[557] namely, human beings[558] both female and male, from Tauantin Suyo, the four quarters of the world.

Arriving at Pacha Camac [an actual physical location on the coast], and saying to Pacha[559], “Here they are. We offer them to you, father!” they’d bury the Capac Hucha alive, along with gold and silver. And according to the cycles of the full and waning moon, they fed him llamas and served him drinks without pause (Salomon and Urioste 1991, 112).

The first instance that detracts from a more integrated understanding of the ceremony is found in note 559 corresponding to the term pacha. If Salomon and Urioste (1991) would have left this term as pacha without a translators’ note, then the reader would have had to rely on the
explanation of this term provided in Salomon’s introductory essay. At least in that case she could have been reminded of the complexity of this *juk* expression of time-space. Simply employing *pacha* then would provide the necessary amplitude so to be able to attribute the parity-based relation of time-space to the term. Instead, however, Salomon and Urioste enclose this term into a much reduced corral through their translators’ note, which states, “*pachaman* ‘to *Pacha*’: alternative translations, none certain, are ‘to the earth,’ ‘to the world,’ or ‘to *Pacha*’ (i.e. the first part of the *huaca*’s name)” (112). While leaving room for uncertainty, the rather conspicuous absence of the integral element of time in this explanation both reflects and reinforces an interpretive lens based on one in separation.

Instead of contradicting the first translation issue of using year for *wata* as a linear notion of time divorced from spatial/contextual considerations, this spatial emphasis lent to *pacha* actually complements this move. While the robust notion of *wata* expresses the cyclical aspect of time as it oscillates across the three *pachas* of the cosmic dynamic model, *wata* translated as solar year derives from a linear notion of time that is separate and separable from space. Similarly, portraying *pacha* as a space-only concept generates no critical contemplation of the contingencies of time. The regular depiction of space and time as divorced from one another as existentially autonomous categories in various instances demonstrates how the logic of separation engenders ontologically consistent fruit.

In addition to reinforcing the ‘natural’ acceptance of a lens of separation, conceiving of time and space as autonomous dimensions incurs another major consequence for our understanding of this ceremony. This maneuver disallows recalling the cosmic dynamic model, which happens to be the basis for understanding energetic stagnation and its ‘remedy.’ As such we lose the ability to grasp the whole sense of the ceremony. This sleight of understanding
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147 The points Salomon makes in that essay are reviewed in Chapter 5 on *Pacha*. 256
implies losing reference to the critical conditions in which people were living that would even justify such a ceremony, and it effaces the critical focus on aligning and integrating all three time-space conjunctions through the dynamism only allotted by time in relation to space. For these reasons we might say that the translators’ note is misleading.

A second instance that completely obscures the integrative and integrated logic of the ceremony is the continued translation of *Pachacámac* as “Father” and referral to “him” as “he.” This practice gives us a doubly androcentric depiction of *Pachacámac* and *Viracocha*, which for many throughout history does not seem to be an issue, but, from the logic of two-in-one relation, makes no sense. While the gender ambiguity inherent in the Quechua language may be to blame for not being ‘explicit enough’ for native speakers of Spanish and English to determine how this ‘deity’ was conceived in terms of gender, I would argue that this is less a matter of actual words than one of applied ontological lens.\(^\text{148}\) Quite simply, one in separation does not engender relational fruits like the lens of complete interconnectedness. Through this lens complementariness is not even a necessary consideration, much less the medium through which one can best foster dynamic balance in order to re-generate life. The thrust toward balance is not even ontologically afforded through this unitaristic lens. So from this perspective there is no conspicuous and necessary reason why *Viracocha* and *Pachacámac* should have to be proportional complementary opposites.

However, after showing how tightly woven the conception of the ceremony can be from a lens of two-in-one relation, this doubly androcentric rendition permits little coherence. For example, why would the generator of life whose act relies on an emphasis on the feminine principle (magnetism for conception) and which happens in a hole in the ground conceived of as a womb be called a “father”? In addition, why would they offer up both female and male human

\(^{148}\) As a matter of reference, no term of “Father” is included in the original Quechua text.
beings to a masculine-masculine conjunction of huacas? Nor would those reading this translation be able to explain why the humans were buried alive or even why they would need to be “married” as a symbolic act of energetic conception. In this case the inclusion of silver and gold might only be ‘typically’ understood as an offering of riches to the ‘gods,’ not as an energetic form of parity that would support cosmic conception. Additionally the actual timing of the ceremony and alignment among all relevant watas would not even be contemplated except for when the reader is left wondering about why the cycles of the full and waning moon that oversee the constant nourishing of a male deity would happen for a particular period of time after the ceremony. In short, a male/masculine Pachacámac in relation with another masculine Viracocha could not conjure a cosmic form of pro-creation that relies on proportionalized parity of complementary opposites. Quite simply the notions of conception, gestation and birth of a new life cycle would have no place in a rendition based on ontological individualism.

Even though Salomon and Urioste’s job was to translate what they found in the original text and their articulated goal was simplicity of reading, they make three translation choices that, due to their embraced ontological lens, preclude a more robust and integrated understanding of the ceremony. In fact, as we can see in these few short lines, privileging the categorical for (re-)interpreting this account of the ceremony of Capac Hucha generates a few key repercussions.

Repercussions

As we have seen throughout this dissertation, singular or categorical depictions of these juk-based expressions wipe out the possibility of a more robust conceptualization of the matter at hand—in this case, the ceremony, its purpose, corresponding principles and logic. The unarticulated yet detectable use of an interpretive lens based on one in separation forces a reduced ‘comprehension’ that involves no notion of the relation as generative, juk, parity,
complementariness, or proportionalization. This lens simply does not allow one to see these dimensions, much less understand or tend to them. Moreover, using this reductionist lens also affects what the translators are able to convey to the reader. For example, the reductionist rendition of this ceremony can only reinforce and encourage further reductionism.

Furthermore, this reduced rendition runs the risk of encouraging the use of teleological standards—another fruit of the logic of separation—to the content. This particular case highlights three teleological notions that can justify condemning those who engaged in this practice. First, when life and death are understood as a linear timeline, death seems to be a necessary ‘evil’ as the end to life. In this conceptualization there is no cyclical re-generation of life through death in a cosmos where energy cannot and does not die but is simply transformed. When one employs atrophied faculties to perceive a reduced detectable world along with a linear time-scheme that has no regard for the cyclical, it makes the ‘end’ of life a much scarier concept and renders this ceremony a horrific act of human ‘sacrifice.’

Another teleological notion stemming from this lens is that we are in a hierarchical world of non-equivalents, which lends further consternation over the sacrifice of humans as opposed to, say, a lamb. The complementary third teleological continuum extending from savagery to civilization further encourages a negative indictment over the employed strategy of Capac Hucha. While it may be that neither Salomon nor Urioste believe that the Andeans were savages given that they have focused their life force on Andean ways of life, the reductionist lens through which this ceremony is conveyed and the lack of ‘logical’ coherence it provides (according to two-in-one relation) can quite easily reinforce the idea that this ceremony is proof of barbarism. None of the three translation choices alleviates the drive to interpret this case of human sacrifice

149 For this reason the strongest and most prepared representatives of the masculine and feminine principles were selected for the ‘following’ phase of ayni and to re-generate another life-death cycle of cosmic proportions.
with horror or to judge those who engaged in this activity. Instead as an effect of binary teleological (not cyclical) thinking (reviewed more closely in Part III), constituting the ‘Other’ as ‘savage’ permits making oneself more ‘civilized.’

While this scenario may conjure images of horror and distress (surely though the circumstances being lived in order for this ceremony to even become a possibility were even more distressing), I must repeat that this solemn act was probably not understood as a tortuous ‘sacrifice’ as is contemporarily connoted. Instead of being seen as ‘poor victims’ as the lens of separation would suggest, the capacs, according to a logic of complete interconnectedness, would have to be honored and venerated for representing the complementary elements of the highest vibration possible so as to be ‘married’ underground as part of a much greater cause. While surely a serious and sad moment, the capacs’ death, as part of a bigger cycle of balance-imbalance, of life-death, would serve as the basis for a cosmic conception and new life cycle.

In the end, the lens of separation generates a rendition of this ceremony that sits far away from the understanding that may be generated through a lens of complete interconnectedness. In fact, when we compare Salomon and Urioste’s translated rendition of these traces with their translators’ notes to that produced simply by (re-)applying a lens of complete interconnectedness, the two (re-)interpretations become almost unrecognizable to each other. Neither the conceived purpose nor the respective conceptualizations of time(-space) correspond. In addition, each lens generates a distinct appreciation of who was involved, how and why. Finally, the general impressions left by each reading are almost contradictory: What could be an extremely sacred moment of communing with All Our Relations, of re-affirming and honoring complete interconnectedness is instead depicted in such a way as to open the door to visions of horror, barbarism and a reaffirmed sensation of ‘civilizational’ superiority. Unfortunately
though the biggest casualty of this reductionist illustration, similarly to all that have been reviewed to this point, is the ontological, conceptual and logical basis for emphasizing dynamic balance and the re-generation of life.

Throughout this chapter on harmonizing we have seen how the fundamental leaps of faith undergirding complete interconnectedness—that the cosmos tends toward equilibrium, that we are all interconnected, and that privileging the relation necessarily means that all components of any relation are incomplete—inform the Andean principle of harmonizing. This harmonizing rests on the interaction between two key ideas reflecting these leaps of faith. First, balance and imbalance are the incomplete components of a parity-based cycle. Together they constitute a *juk*. These components interact back and forth to generate the friction that allows for harmonizing to become a possible activity, and their resulting spiraling movement reflects the equilibrium of the cosmos.

Two key ways of describing the means through which the constant potential for balance is expressed and supported are the wider conversation and *ayni*. These activities are based on a few central presuppositions. First, if all beings are incomplete ‘on their own,’ then their interconnection with each other and to the whole is the only medium for learning how to be in alignment with the whole. Since we totally rely on each other for constant emergent ‘guidance’ as a compass, our interactions then are the immediate, always emergent, signposts for getting our bearings and engendering balance. Second, since balance is not a final end-state, a category to be achieved, but instead consists of emergent, contingent moments expressed through relation, engaging dynamic balance takes a conversational attitude and a focus on the emergent moment-place to discover what parts of our particular configuration of characteristics (personality, point in *wata*, perceptive preferences, cultural programming, behavior patterns, etc.) we need to pay
attention to, heal, integrate, strengthen and balance one step at a time. It is in this sense that both well-being and illness can be seen as emergent, relational processes. Third, one’s *kay pacha* point is critical here. This is the only time-space point at which we may read signs and follow them. Trying to be anywhere else is not only impossible, but it also generates imbalance.

Together these assumptions mean that all parity-based relations, such as above/below, left/right, feminine/masculine, north/south, can only be harmonized in the here and now through their existential tethering. They also demonstrate the degree to which harmonizing is afforded as the ‘logical centerpiece’ of this lens. In addition, they reflect the extent to which all principles are founded on a robustly monistic view of the realm in which we operate. In this sense, energetic communication is not an other-worldly endeavor but one wholly accessible through robustly conceived complete interconnectedness.

Taking the conversational route provides conceptual tools for understanding the mechanics of engaging in the wider conversation. Communicating energetically, like interhuman language-based communication, comprises the phases of speaking-listening-responding. However, since the purpose of this wider conversation is to facilitate identifying and integrating imbalances so as to nurture alignment, the phases ‘start’ with being able to listen, that is, to sense the signs in their speaking. Responding too is ‘conditioned’ by this purpose in that to fully engage this conversation, we respond by adjusting ourselves to the presented contrast that reflects our co-creation and informs us about our current energetic configuration. Then, when we practice these two phases and become aware of the impact we have on our co-creations through the generative aspect of the relation, we realize how critical our approach to speaking is.

These phases of the wider conversation are a way of describing the parity-based phases of mutual nurturing and mutual following that constitute *ayni*. This principle emphasizes the choice
of completing the cycle or of letting it spiral and flow. Besides emphasizing that one needs to opt into engaging in the wider conversation to complete the cycle, ayni also highlights the fact that even when we choose not to follow, ‘Others’ still reflect back to us constantly what we are ‘speaking.’ Even if we do not follow, we are still always emitting energy—and a specific configuration of energetic vibrations at that.

When we fully engage the cycle of ayni we learn how to better foster balance in future emergent circumstances with each turn of the cycle. That is, catching and adjusting ourselves to the specific signs of the specific moment provides particular tools that may be re-member-ed and re-applied to other circumstances. Actively engaging the opportunities at hand through the wider conversation or ayni, we improve our conversational skills of knowing how to listen, follow and speak. Furthermore, the more we engage in these phases of nurturing/following and speaking/listening, the lines start to blur between phases and between live beings. Additionally, we develop agility in engaging with the parity-based cycle of balance and imbalance, of sumak kawsay and llaki kawsay, and as such learn how to be in balance and to flow through more difficult times. Most importantly as we begin to know what it means to be in alignment, we learn to trust in the process.

The rest of the chapter bolsters our understanding of the mechanics of the wider conversation and ayllu by examining specifically the cases of sumak kawsay/llaki kawsay as health/illness and tinkuy as a strategy for breaking up unattended imbalance. These instances further elaborate on how the more ‘minor’ parity-based cycle of balance and imbalance relates to the overall thrust of the cosmos toward wholeness and equilibrium. Moreover, both sections further illustrate what it means when one does not actively engage in this ongoing conversation, how this is still part of a co-creative process, and how our state of being still affects others.
In any case, these principles, as fruits of the lens of complete interconnectedness, come together to provide a very different conceptualization of our hook-up to the cosmos, the possibilities afforded therein, and how to go about engaging that constantly interconnected state. Nothing here is singular, categorical, discrete or linear. The approach to harmonizing generated through this lens relies on a radically relational, holistic, cyclical understanding of life that denies the possibility of separation.

The previous six chapters aimed to accomplish two tasks. The first charge was to fill out the Andean-style time-spacescape with robustly conceived principles, but doing so required the second parallel activity of identifying and remedying the degree to which these concepts have been reduced by being (re-)interpreted through an ontological lens based on separation. From the first task we learned that this wholly monistic philosophical ontology privileges relationality over separation, understands the limited character of each component to be a necessary feature for complementariness, sees everything as alive, understands all activity to be ‘intersubjective’ in a much broader understanding of ‘subject,’ insists that the only moment-place in which we can operate is the emergent present point, and demands that we use more of our perceptive faculties to fully sense and process information. Together these principles generate the overall purpose of all activity, which is fostering dynamic balance and re-generating life. Allotted through the initial leaps of faith, this emphasis on harmonizing is also supported by the accompanying transversal themes and is guided in this case through the particular principles of Andean philosophy.

A recurring theme throughout the elaboration of this particular set of Andean-style fruits afforded through the ontological lens of complete interconnectedness is that adopting this lens or
any other is a choice. Even when we choose to embrace this lens, though, dynamic balance does not just ‘happen.’ We must hold dynamic aligning as our constant intention as we engage the process of learning, integrating imbalances and gleaning tools. And throughout this process we constantly make choices as to how to engage the generative relation. We choose to be present. We choose to pay mindful attention to the signs and our speaking in each emergent moment-place. We choose to foster the proportionalization of the components and to nurture balance or imbalance.

Arriving at the wisdom afforded through this lens demands that relationality must extend all the way out and all the way in, all the way up and all the way down. No separation is allowed in such a form of monism, and so when we choose to re-produce a division of any kind based on categorical assumptions, we lose the wisdom that derives from the generative interaction among incomplete components in a robustly monistic realm. In fact, I was only able to give sense to the fragmented accounts above by removing the partitions and re-asserting the integrated and integrative logic of two-in-one relation. Through this ‘opposite’ lens that privileges the relation, all that the categorical lens cannot ‘get’ becomes extremely lucid, and we begin to see how this becomes a matter of knowing the limitations/applications of each lens and when each one needs to be applied.

While I have tried to convey the conceptual potential implied when using an ontological lens based on complete interconnectedness and show what happens to this potential when these concepts are (re-)interpreted through an ontologically individualistic lens, I am quite certain that I have still unintentionally reduced the robustness harbored in these principles due to the challenge of trying to articulate that quality in a language-game built off a shared lens of separation. For this reason, the second task for these chapters was so critical. The exercise of
(re-)broadening the conceptual space for these principles indicated the tremendous conceptual gap conjured between the two lenses and provided several windows for viewing how a lens of ontological separation operates. Since the next chapter centers on the characteristic features of the ontology of separation, reviewing the lessons culled from (re-)amplifying the concepts above may be useful here.

The parity chapter was critical for several reasons. In addition to outlining the basic precepts of the ontology of separation, I established how this lens can only afford dualism and cannot ontologically get to a robust concept like parity. The dualism of ‘two’ is derived through separation. Here the existentially autonomous categories may be related, but since their relation is secondary we must demonstrate its significance. Another insight from this chapter is that when we lose the view of the relation as generative or primordial, we cannot ‘see’ how much we rely on the ‘Other’ to understand ourselves. Being blind to the co-constitutive aspect of the relation also results in not seeing the wisdom emerging from the generative relation as seen in the case of sacred geometry, where the elements themselves are not the source but how the circle and square interact that generates the key points of wisdom. Finally this chapter also called attention to the inability of seeing, comprehending or contemplating the need for complementary opposites, parity or proportion so as to constitute a juk when these existentially autonomous units are separated by an unbridgeable gap. This point became evident in the discussion of Garcilaso de la Vega’s doubly androcentric maneuver.

All of these initial observations about using an ontologically individualistic lens for understanding the fruits of a predominantly shared ontology of complete interconnectedness are equally valid for the parity-based relation expressed through the term pacha, or time-space. However, that chapter provided its own insights as well. For example, when one’s language-
game has no capacity to express juk-based relations in a single word (and have it make sense contextually in a very disparate language-game), one is caught having to privilege one element over the other in translation. This ‘alternative’ precludes focusing on the relation itself as an ontological first step, which is the source of the wisdom generated through this lens. So in the case of time-space we miss grasping the wholly integrated and integrative sense of the cosmic dynamic model of the three pachas and its corresponding principles. Moreover, because we cannot see the intimate co-constitutive relation between time and space, we lose the radical anchoring in the present time-place. The reasoning for so much emphasis on the kay pacha point and for the need to re-articulate activities in the form of a gerund (as in the case of memory and knowledge) also fall out of reach.

The pacha chapter also brings to the fore the degree to which language reflects the predominantly shared ontological orientation of those who practice it. When trying to translate across ontological orientations, acknowledging this becomes crucial. The immediate limitations created first by the disparate affordances of each lens and then by the common lack of acknowledgment that this is the case also produce ripple effects in the sense that the reduced concepts generated through this lack of acknowledgment can only engender other reduced notions, which precludes understanding the principles in the first place.

Even though in the text I covered ayllu first so as to be able to discuss who were involved in the concept of wata, the final case of reductionism points directly to the ontological ‘compatibility’ between a reduced space-based (re-)interpretation of pacha and a linear-time-based (re-)interpretation of wata. Together these concepts give the impression of being consistent and that the time-spacescape of complete interconnectedness is even potentially similar ontologically to that based on one-in-separation. Consistently re-defining wata as year
has other ramifications too. By conjuring a linear, singular, universally applicable approach to time, the reduced approach to wata detracts from the cyclical quality of the solar wata itself and of cyclical time in general. Ontologically divorcing time from space means that seeing the kay pacha point as one single juncture of time and space together is not produced through a lens of separation and even less the concept of wata as the cycle of life of a single Being as she moves through her respective set of kay pacha points. In this way we lose both the deeply present-time-place focus and the relational complexity available for understanding emergence within that kay pacha point.

Another problematic case of assuming compatibility of terms across distinct time-spacescapes is the ayllu. Portraying ayllu as kinship only is perhaps the starkest case illustrating how the contingency of the use of the term gets lost through a reductionist lens, and this concept in particular generates some key observations. First, we saw that reductionism occurs at various levels of magnitude when trying to discern the categorical boundaries of this commonplace. For instance, Salomon’s initial strategy for tackling the idea of ayllu attests to the most drastic (and historically re-produced) version of reductionism, while his citing of Spalding’s argument is closer to a ‘relation-based’ version of ontological individualism (This approach is covered in greater detail in Chapters 10 and 11). Even though this more ‘relational’ approach can present a much subtler picture of the concept, it cannot contribute toward categorical clarity. In a similar vein, while the linguistic turn could have told us that using relational concepts or techniques to better determine the parameters of an a priori category is not possible, the anthropocentric nature of this philosophical turn precludes us from realizing just how robust the term ayllu may be. This example shows us how the linguistic turn itself can ‘get’ the relational logic and its
implications to a point but cannot fathom a more robustly defined monistic realm or the principles that may be derived from that realm.

This general synthesis of repercussions points to an unexpected observation. When commonplaces are already employed within a predominantly shared lens based on separation, most are already conceived as being categorical, so they do not share the same relational ‘spirit’ as *juk, pacha* or *ayllu*. This is what makes pointing out the relational character of commonplaces employed in a language-game based on ontological separation so much more difficult. Wittgenstein, Foucault, Bakhtin and Shotter among others must be applauded for their critical efforts in this task. However, when commonplaces are shared in a language-game based on a lens of complete interconnectedness all of the relational insights from the linguistic turn are already assumed in their very conceptualization. Here there is no need to point out the obvious of how the use of a term is completely contingent on the emergent circumstances.

In the chapter on the information-sensing-and-processing system, we witnessed how understanding this system was wholly contingent on a full grasp of *pacha* and the cosmic dynamic model. The move to ontologically separate time and space incurs yet another ‘ripple-effect’ casualty: the reasonings behind this whole approach to sensing and processing information have not even been afforded, which makes explaining the approach in a robust sense and for robust reasons a serious challenge. In a sensing-and-processing system totally based on the cosmic dynamic model, not ‘getting’ *pacha* means that we cannot ‘get’ the need to integrate/proportionalize the *hanan* and *uku pachas*, the masculine and feminine elements or any other parity-based relation in the *kay pacha*. As a result harmonizing through this process is also not ontologically afforded. Furthermore, insisting on being able to use the mind as divorced
from the rest of the system only reinforces the atrophied aspect of our faculties needed to engage the wider conversation.

Finally, as we saw in the harmonizing chapter, any degree of privileging the categorical denies the basis for fostering balance and for engaging the present moment. The long list of ceremonial features of *Capac Hucha* that are unexplainable through a unitaristic reading of the ceremony included at the end of the chapter review most of the other gaps afforded through a reductionist lens.

Overall, while the work in the previous chapters may seem to be more of an indictment of efforts that employ an incommensurate ontological lens in anthropology, archaeology, astronomy or area studies to understand the Andean region, this exercise has had the more critical job of providing the necessary fodder for being able to comment on the prospects of ‘making progress’ toward the purported goals of the field of international relations. It was my encounter with an adequate mirror, not the fact that that mirror’s content is normally attributed to disciplines outside of IR, that drove me to focus on this content to reflect back to this discipline what it is generating and in contrast to what. In this sense, the mirror has been most important, not the content per se, even though the content has played a key role in letting us witness how two distinct ontological lenses generate very different fruits.

In a sense, the last six chapters have constituted a simultaneous exercise of demonstrating what can be afforded through a predominantly shared lens of complete interconnectedness and what is not permitted through a lens based on separation. This painstaking process has been critical for insights about each lens and about the ways in which they depend on each other (much like *Pachacámac* and *Viracocha*). Most importantly, their contrast has been critical for clarifying what kind of juice we can expect to squeeze out of the fruits of the one versus from the
fruits of the other, and how we cannot use one tree to engender fruits similar to the other tree. While this in the end may be taken as an incriminating statement of all approaches (and it may certainly be taken that way by those who have invested so much of their lives to the lens of separation), my goal simply is to show that we cannot get apple juice (balance) from an orange tree (the ontology of separation). In other words, the ontology of separation does not and cannot encourage fostering balance as a primordial purpose, and this would be the basis for counterbalancing the imbalances/conflicts of concern within the field of IR. As such, efforts to produce (a substantive notion of) knowledge about IR will not ever be able to prioritize balance first and such harmonizing through the problem will always be relegated to the status of a ‘band-aid’ afterthought. This is hardly what is needed in a field so focused on apparent imbalances.

Through the last six chapters, I have carried the central dimensions of this two-in-one-relation logic all the way out to their implications regarding balance and imbalance to be able to point to the ways in which the logic of one-in-separation is unable to reach these principles of wisdom about living wholly in relation. Now it is time to make the ontology of separation the center of attention. The next chapter reviews just how the logic of one in separation necessarily engenders imbalance first by elaborating on the characteristics afforded through such a logic. This means that if a field of study like IR is based on a predominantly shared lens of ontological individualism, imbalance will be the primary thrust of all ‘knowledge’ and conceptual products afforded through that lens. The second chapter of Part III addresses both how the whole Western-style academic time-spacescape, which comprehends IR, is based on this shared lens and how the monistic approaches within this time-spacescape actually adhere to certain pillars derived from ontological individualism, which means that the wisdom provided through
complete interconnectedness is still significantly curtailed. These two chapters constitute
necessary steps for arriving at the final chapter in which the mirrored lessons are synthesized.
PART III

THE FRUITS OF AN ONTOLOGY OF SEPARATION: THE CASE OF THREE WESTERN-STYLE SEPARATION-BASED TIME-SPACESCAPES

Now that we have a fuller picture of the contrasting time-spacescape based on complete interconnectedness and have begun the process of showing how the two logics bear irreconcilable fruits, we now turn to the third part of this dissertation. Three primary tasks remain to substantiate my argument that the ontology of separation cannot bear fruits that can counteract the imbalances already created through an ontology of separation, which within IR we define as conflict, war, colonialism, imperialism, genocide, etc. First I need to show how the ontology of separation privileges imbalance before balance and how this necessarily precludes engendering fruits that can serve as an antidote to the constant threat of conflict throughout the world. Then, once this point is established, I must demonstrate how the Western-style academic time-spacescape, to which the field of IR belongs, has taken form through the fruits of ontological separation. Based on this panorama I can then indicate how the methodological approaches that have attempted to get out of the effects of ontological individualism still privilege the categorical first and the relational second. With these steps, I should be able to show that all methodological approaches within the field of international relations necessarily suffer from the limited affordances stemming from ontological separation and as such will be incapable of fostering the balance they seek to contribute to the field.

Chapter 10 executes the first task through three main steps. The first step recalls how privileging ontological separation leads to seeing each side of the separation as “existentially autonomous,” which encourages assuming the existence of \textit{a priori} categories. The second section addresses how this insistence on the possibility of a timeless, discrete category engenders prolific ontological fragmentation, which in turn generates three key products for the centerpiece
tool of the ontology of separation: teleological measuring sticks. Fragmented sensing, linear
time and linear thought are then reviewed before exploring the final step of how a teleological
framework arises from holding such a lens and the imbalancing role it plays in the fruits that are
coa-created through this lens.

Since these characteristics result directly from the initial leaps of faith of the ontology of
separation, these very primary resources are generally shared across all time-spacescapes shaped
through this logic, and, in the specific case of this dissertation, across the Western-style time-
spacescape, the Western-style academic time-spacescape and the field of IR. Chapter 11 in turn
addresses the specific partitions of the Western-style academic time-spacescape in particular as
fruit of the penchant toward categorical fragmentation. Next this chapter examines how the main
methodological thrusts of the more specific time-spacescape of international relations have
engaged these partitions.

This analysis then allows us to discern how the ‘limits’ of the monistic realm embraced
within the academic enterprise are defined through and re-produce certain categories and
preclude arriving at any of the contributions of an ontological lens of complete
interconnectedness, including the primordial emphasis on balance. In this way we will be able to
see how relational approaches—when they are subsumed to the principles of a time-spacescape
predominantly shaped through ontological individualism—cannot bear the full fruits of
relationality and instead reinforce the reasoning for insisting on separation.
CHAPTER 10

UNEVEN UNITARISM: FROM SEPARATION TO IMBALANCE

Throughout the last six chapters, we saw that ontologically privileging the completely interconnected relation bore the principal fruit of an overall drive toward harmonizing and being in alignment. This chapter discusses how the resulting focus of ontological separation on the existentially autonomous unit necessarily generates ontological unevenness. My assertion is that if imbalance is ontologically privileged in unitarism, then its primary fruits must also be imbalanced, and, in fact, throughout this chapter, we see how the characteristic features of unitarism generate first ontological imbalance and then energetic, conceptual and practical imbalance. I will use these points in the final analysis to argue that while those who study IR may seek to inculcate balance, peace and harmony across the globe, if the basis of the whole field rests on the ontological pillars of uneven unitarism, then none of the methodological efforts emerging from this time-spacescape will be able to generate this desired outcome.

Toward the objective of fully developing those features of the ontology of separation that help us see how this lens privileges imbalance, this chapter elaborates on the necessarily uneven character of unitarism through three principle sections. In the first part, we briefly review the epistemological order in which phenomena appear according to the initial leap of faith assumed by the lens of separation to recall how we arrive at a singular unit whose existential autonomy is privileged over the relation. Among certain critical implications, we find that starting with one as a stand-alone individual unit is the primordial basis for the subsequent manifestations of unevenness and imbalance for it ontologically eradicates the means through which balance can be fostered: the compass. In this same section, we also review the methodological thrusts afforded through this lens and the kinds of issues they engender.
For example, disallowing the ability to privilege the relation fosters prolific ontological fragmentation, a second-generation fruit, whereby starting with an emphasis on the ‘complete’ category necessarily requires the replication of this assumption in everything that we encounter, which can range from things and beings to phenomena and situations. This tendency engenders three other fruits rudimentary for constituting the final characteristic feature of the lens of separation. We pause there to elaborate on what happens when we approach sensing, understanding time and thinking in a segmented, linear fashion to set up the basis for the final fruit of this chapter: teleological measuring sticks. Before delving into the functions and consequences of employing such a teleological framework, however, we look at another critical element that encourages and justifies using such a framework, what I call the epistemological demand of unitarism, whereby assuming the ontological autonomy of the unit demands that we attempt to discern the contours of that unit that allow for its supposed independent state. This demand in conjunction with the absence of a compass is what has generated the prevalent use of teleological tools to feel our way about. In that section I first review the primary characteristics of these measuring sticks and then outline the consequences of using these tools that most contribute to ontological imbalance.

Before delving into the first section of this chapter, one caveat must be articulated. I am indebted to the forgers and promoters of the linguistic turn (particularly Foucault, Shotter, Nietzsche and Jackson) for helping me to realize the existence (and my constant re-production) of *a priori* categories. At the same time my understanding of the implications of these categories has come through Lajo, Hall, my lived experiences and support team. So while surely some of these points derive in part from the original sources, what I present here is more of a synthesized product of how these prior readings informed and merged with my specific lived experiences that
in turn generated this applied understanding. With this in mind I turn to the ontological lens that insists on separation first and its consequences.

The Ontologically Autonomous Unit

The initial leap of faith of ontological individualism is primordial separation, which means that the unit is fundamentally isolated from all other units through an unbridgeable gap, as we saw in the chapter on parity. Because separation trumps relation in this lens, the ontological autonomy of the isolated units must also be pre-supposed. This ultimate insistence on the categorical necessarily disallows acknowledging any being, entity, emotion or phenomenon as ‘merely’ a component of a relation.\(^{150}\) The existentially autonomous category constitutes then what we may consider to be the direct, or first-order, fruit of an ontology of separation. Said another way, (uneven) unitarism is the direct outcome of assuming separation first. In this sense, uneven unitarism is to ontological separation as focusing on the generative, parity-based, co-constitutive relation is to complete interconnectedness.

In both cases these initially afforded fruits have a significant impact on what each lens may generate as second-order fruits. For example, the ‘unitarism’ generated through ontological separation describes the focus on ‘one thing in separation’ and on one unit at a time, not on both elements of a relation always together and in proportion (Lajo 2003, 145). This necessarily means that the relation is epistemologically secondary from this perspective, which is what forces the concept of dualism to be a second-order fruit of the ontology of separation. Here each unit’s constitution as a timeless, ‘complete’ category comes first, then they are joined. This

\(^{150}\) This definition of interdependent component as being inferior to complete category is itself a product of teleological thinking. Surely it is ‘better’ to be complete on an ontological plane than incomplete. We will see how this logic plays itself out throughout the chapter.
scenario renders the singular ‘one in separation’ the norm, and the couple becomes a temporary/transitory status whose relational significance would always have to be determined.

In contrast, from the perspective of complete interconnectedness, the relation between two components comes first, because that is how they can exist. In this case singularity exists only in appearance; it merely indicates that we have yet to apprehend its complement. At one point Lajo (2003), in contrasting the Andean approach with the uneven character of ‘Western logic,’ clarifies, “in the Andean world, everything is even or is given through pairs; that which is presented as uneven (or ch’ulla in Puquina) only exists transitorily according to our way of seeing it” (96).

Because the singular one of ontological individualism does not figure ontologically as a ‘real’ possibility through a lens of complete interconnectedness, we may say that singularity is not a second-order fruit of this lens. Instead, ‘one’ remains a first-order fruit, because that ‘one’ or juk signifies something else in this logic. From this lens the ‘real’ ‘one’ is the ‘one’ relation that connects incomplete components, and this ‘one,’ by reflecting the wholeness of all, reinforces insistence on balance. As we saw in the Puquina idol in Chapter 4, the couple together, the relationship between them, is what constitutes ‘one,’ and this ontological emphasis precludes considering the ‘individual’ parts of the couple separately (Rengifo 1998a, 100). So ‘one’ in this case still reflects the primordial center of attention of this ontological lens.

Implications

These first- and second-order fruits have several implications in terms of what practices and concepts can then emerge. Since the last six chapters reviewed those of complete interconnectedness, here we focus solely on what is generated through ontological separation.

151 While ‘juk’ can be used in Quechua as an ordinal number when counting apples, this is considered to be ‘one’ of an already interconnected group, not atomistically separate units.
First, I will center on what is afforded conceptually before exploring what these affordances imply in terms of the available methodological strategies for knowing about our ‘world.’

An immediate consequence of a unit having ontological autonomy is that the relation is no longer generative or emergent, and this, in turn, affords two important dimensions of the ontology of separation. First, because the generative aspect of the relation is not recognized, there is no need to acknowledge, much less be grateful for, the critical, co-constitutive role played by the ‘Other’ (either in human or more robust form) to help us understand or see ourselves. In addition, not acknowledging the generative aspect of the relation and insisting on the ontological autonomy of the unit engender a ‘lifeless,’ timeless notion of the category. Here, in contrast to the indicative fruits of an ontology of complete interconnectedness, such as the generative relation, the emergent moment-place or the gerund/verb—which all allow the vibration of life to surge through them—the unit must have consistent ‘categorical integrity’ so that we may methodologically go about identifying and knowing more about it. This implies an unchanging essence that annihilates the possibility of celebrating the generative power of life.

Both of these attributed consequences complement a third second-order tendency borne by assuming categorical autonomy, which is the mental practice of aggregating and disaggregating atomistic units. Because this mental maneuver relies on the ability to extract a thing, phenomenon or person from its context, it consequently conjures universality, whether that be a universally whole/complete ‘essence’ of the categorical or universally applicable standards.

More importantly, emphasis on the unitary completely wipes out attention to balance in two interrelated ways. First, the detached character of the units does not afford balance as an initial ontological consideration. Instead, privileging separation prioritizes the categorical which ends up emphasizing one unit at a time. Because this emphasis conjures no barbell metaphor,
unitarism necessarily engenders unevenness because neither the relation nor the counterpart is immediately elicited as a key consideration (in contrast to their immediate and critical ontological contemplation through a robustly relational lens). Therefore the quality or proportion of the unit in relation to its correspondent is not even conjured as a concern at the primordial ontological level. By generating a ‘configuration’ consisting of a singular category and not a relation of two components, this lens starts out uneven and everything it engenders must also be uneven (Lajo 2003, 145). Given what we witnessed in Part II, this observation makes one realize that fostering ‘evenness’ can only be afforded when we ontologically start with the relation itself.

The effects of this reductionist tendency are seen over and over again throughout the illustrations of Part II. For example, the immediately conjured unevenness is witnessed in the space-biased translation of pacha, in the linear-time-biased conceptualization of wata and in the (re-)interpretation of Viracocha and Pachacámac as singular, separate divinities. In this final case, we even saw how this unevenness begat imbalance when these ‘gods’ (a.k.a. complementary principles of physics) were re-presented in doubly androcentric fashion potentially first among the Incans, then cited as such in Garcilaso de la Vega’s [1609] chronicle, and again in the Salomon and Urioste’s (1991) translation of the Huarochiri Manuscript.

Second, in addition to driving uneven unitarism by ontologically denying the reason for engendering balance, the ontology of separation also obliterates the means for doing so. In Chapter 9, we saw that in order to calibrate ourselves with the whole or to engage in ayni, we have to rely on that which is being communicated to us through our kay pacha point in

---

152 From the lens of separation it makes sense to say “uni’verse” as if there is only one space out there. When one is conceived of as juk, the whole that is derived from the tethered relation between two complementary opposites, then the regularly connoted notion of ‘uni’verse is a bit like trying to always stand and walk on one leg instead of two (Lajo 2003, 145, 150, 163-4).
conjunction with the ‘Others’ in our presence, because it is the only channel we have to our primordial interconnection. This relational compass, which only becomes available to be read when we are firmly anchored our respective *kay pacha* point, is critical for giving sense to what is being presented, why and how to engage it. As such, when we remove from view the primordial generative nature of the relation, we decisively sever ourselves from the constant guidance proffered by the compass available only in the contingent, emergent moment-place.

This loss of the compass constitutes the central existential quandary generated through this lens for it cuts us off from the wider conversation. Moreover, losing a sense of our complete interconnectedness and losing our ability to rely on our compass—both consequences of the predominant ontological lens and the corresponding atrophying of our perceptive faculties—result in serious existential anxiety, because we lose the sense of life. When ‘reality’ is perceived to be so uncertain in light of no connectedness and when we are filled with anxiety because of it, decreasing that uncertainty becomes the principle existential drive. To do this, however, we have historically employed the same ontological lens that brings us the anxiety to generate methodological strategies that will permit us to learn more about that uncertain reality and therefore, as the story goes, decrease that uncertainty.\(^\text{153}\) The next section reviews how the ontological lens of separation informs the pertaining methodological strategies.

Methodological Thrusts

When we combine an insistence on separation and on the ontological autonomy of the unit with our incomplete condition, we get the impression that some whole, complete being, elephant or category exists and stands in common relation to us all just beyond our reach. This currently unreachable complete category is often attributed to having a pure, real, and timeless

\(^{153}\) Descartes’ *Discourse on Method* is a great example of how this works.
essence. This emphasis on the unit, whose autonomous, complete character currently sits outside our reach, spurs two methodological tendencies: the drive to define the parameters of the category and then secondarily to determine the significance of its respective relations.

Defining the parameters of the category is a particularly strong drive given the anxiety incurred by finding oneself ontologically and therefore existentially disconnected from one’s compass. The category’s supposedly complete and therefore sturdy and timeless nature is most attractive in that it promises a ‘more valid’ or ‘more certain’ knowledge that may alleviate the angst we feel. This assumed possibility of putting the pieces together to define categorical boundaries, driven directly through the fact that we are incomplete and see ourselves as being separate, is our only option for understanding existence from the lens of ontological separation.

In Part II, the case of reductionism of ayllu is particularly illustrative of this drive to define categories and demonstrates well the repercussions of this maneuver. In the desperate attempt to enclose the components (that are in constantly emergent relation) into definable categories, we are forever missing the generative relation, which means that we are never able to diminish the angst. In other words, because this very ontological lens is predicated on separation, it totally loses out on relational logic and as such cannot respond resolutely to the angst generated through the lens itself. Another consequence of this strategy is that focusing on the category and its timelessness pulls us physically, mentally and emotionally out of the kay pacha point, which makes us forego a focus on the emergent moment, relation and proportional balance between components. That is, this logic distracts us away from the only moment-place where we can actually do anything about balance.

Once out of time and out of relation, a secondary methodological thrust is to ascertain the significance of the category’s respective relations and the conditions under which this
significance holds. When the category comes first, the status of the relation becomes secondary and uncertain. This leaves one having to demonstrate that relation by determining its significance. Ironically this exercise is seen as a means toward identifying critical parts of the category (instead of observing how generative the relation is for example) and in this way serves to decrease the uncertainty of the ‘unknown.’ Nevertheless, looking for the boundaries of the categories as the primary methodological thrust through this lens makes the endeavor of discerning the relation that allows for that category’s existence and the proportional quality of the components that comprise that relation one that necessarily responds or contributes to this initial methodological task. That is, examining the relation feeds our understanding of the category and does not act as the generative vehicle for fostering balance.

Furthermore, because dealing with things epistemologically in this order engenders a unitarism that is uneven, imbalance becomes privileged and balance is relegated to the status of band-aid. That is, the latter is engaged as a remedy to the effects of the primary thrust of this logic. Just as the relation is ‘disabled’ by being stripped of its generative qualities by privileging the categorical, the same ontologically afforded scenario does not ‘equip’ balance so that efforts toward it may make a difference against the effects produced through the broader thrust of one in separation.

**Prolific Ontological Fragmentation**

The thrust toward defining the categorical as the afforded methodological task actually spurs prolific ontological fragmentation in various ways. First, when we start by ontologically assuming the existential autonomy of the category, defining the parameters of that category requires generating more categories to describe it. Next, in trying to ascertain the category’s essential features, we always encounter exceptions to the ‘timeless rules’ that we are trying to
impose. This happens because the generative character of the relation, which we cannot
acknowledge from this orientation, is forever presenting us with new circumstances out of which
the exceptions to the ‘rule’ are constantly arising. Instead of acknowledging this generative
relation, however, the logic of one in separation mandates that we segment the category further
in response to this situation. The assumption is that in this way we will be able to be more
specific about the nature of these categories and about the circumstances under which the
exception appears. However, because so many exceptions to the ‘rule’ constantly surge before
us, we are thrown onto a course of forever fragmenting the components into smaller, supposedly
more discrete, categories.\textsuperscript{154}

Another phenomenon encouraging ontological fragmentation is the contradiction, which
may be a certain type of exception to the singular rule of ontological individualism. From a lens
of separation encountering a contradiction indicates to us that we are not on a singular path
towards ‘one’ unit. That is, if an ontological lens’ primordial perception insists on a singular
‘one in separation,’ then, as Lajo (2003) indicates, “there cannot be a contradiction” (145). In
response, the fragmentative aspect of this lens allows for dealing with the opposing elements of
the contradiction separately by siphoning them off from one another. In this way we can avoid
the tensions created through the contradictions from within this lens by treating one component
at a time (as separate categories) while simultaneously remaining consistent with the logic.

Nevertheless, this approach has a key limitation. Hall (1977) asserts that
compartmentalizing contradictions through limitless categorizations leads to the paradox of

\textsuperscript{154} The exceptions to the rule surge because trying to delineate the rule does not coincide with the circumstances in the first place. The prolific ontological fragmentation that ensues the appearance of so many exceptions just indicates the inadequacy of our ontological approach not of the rule. We are never going to get to the rule, but we continue to search for the rule due to the drive to get out of not-enoughness. While there is no getting out of our incomplete character, we can get out of the egocentric game of (re-)interpreting the circumstances presented to us through a lens of separation.
culture. He writes, “In his strivings for order, Western man has created chaos by denying that part of his self that integrates while enshrining the parts that fragment experience” (9). The greater paradox here however is that this prolific ontological fragmentation and its concomitant presentation of exceptions or contradictions only re-affirms ‘to infinity’ an insistence on seeing separation first, which, in turn, begets more of the same. This generates another important consequence: In addition to living “fragmented, compartmentalized lives in which contradictions are carefully sealed off from each other,” Hall observes, we also become “alienated from ourselves and from nature” (11).

From the perspective of the ontology of complete interconnectedness, the ‘rule’ does not exist due this lens’ focus on the emergent moment-place and therefore is not sought. Whether an exception to the rule or a contradiction, that which is perceived as a ‘rupture’ from the lens of separation, is, from the lens of complete interconnectedness, a sign or co-creation that emerges from our inter-connectedness and requires our nurturing attention. When we see the rupture as being embedded within a wholly interconnected reality, it ‘simply’ indicates the generative outcome of the relation. As such, this emergent co-creation would be attributed to the dynamic of energetic profiles or to the particular emergence of watas in the particular kay pacha point in question. In all cases however a rupture represents a contrast that speaks in a specific moment-place to a particular configuration of beings. In this way the rupture is a secondary mechanism, just like imbalance is a secondary, albeit essential, element of the primary balanced whole called juk. In parity-based terms, the rupture itself indicates the release of an imbalance, and this perceptive switch affords very different possibilities and outcomes, such as healing, integration and facilitating balance.

155 This point is more thoroughly elaborated under the discussion about institutions in the wata chapter.
Characteristic Fruits of Ontological Fragmentation

The tendency toward ontological segmentation has borne three characteristic fruits of the Western-style time-spacescape: an almost singular reliance on the mind/reason for sensing and processing information, a linear concept of time along with the supposed possibility of timelessness, and a resulting pressure to engage in linear logic. Due to the supportive role they play in teleological thinking, we review them here.

In the first case, being able to segment one’s information-sensing-and-processing system has translated into a compartmentalized and prioritized use of one’s head, of one’s mental processes over honoring the messages passing through other sensing centers. From the segmented perspective, this is the only portion of one’s system that one can count on to rid oneself and others in valid fashion of uncertainty. Primarily using the mental sphere only to sense and process information presents an important challenge however. Using only one sphere, as opposed to the whole system, creates a sensing-and-processing ‘bottleneck’ where perceptions must be filtered, decisions for action made and ‘instructions’ emitted all from a single center. Given what we saw in Chapter 8, this pattern can result in a yachayniyoq, or “a thinking being, great theoretical decipherer of reasons and words, ‘but nothing else,’” but even in this ‘best’ of cases, hucha, or energetic blockage, results because two central parts of the system are denied (Lajo 2003, 152).

In addition to a reduced approach to sensing and processing, the ontology of separation affects the conceptualization of time by creating the possibility of timelessness and by encouraging a primary interpretation of time as a linear concept. As we have repeatedly seen from this ontological perspective, time and space are typically divorced concepts. Because this maneuver immediately removes emphasis from the time-place juncture, the emergent, present moment-place is no longer regarded for its generative qualities and categories themselves take on
a timeless quality. Through separation these categories are assumed to be complete on some plane in the past, present and future.

Also when time is divorced from space, it can be broken down into measurable segments. Ontologically tethering time and space together anchors the focus firmly on the present time-place, whereas pulling them apart allows time to become a continuum of moments with the present just constituting one moment along a line of already known and to-be-predicted moments. In this way, time is no longer a specifically known fixed point in time-space (the here and now) but instead stretches out over a timeline extending from the past into the future. This, in fact, is a critical step in creating a universally applicable sense of time, which renders it more tangible and capable of being manipulated. This linear system allows us to accumulate useful history and to verify in the present moment whether predictions happen the way we forecasted.

In *Beyond Culture* Edward T. Hall calls this approach monochronic, or linear, segmented time and describes it as emphasizing “schedules, segmentation, and promptness” (17). By tangibly breaking time into segments, we are better able to schedule, compartmentalize and concentrate on one thing at a time, which, in turn, permits us to ‘order life’ and become more efficient (18). In terms of its costs, however, Hall (1977) asserts that a linear approach can “deny us the experience of context in the wider sense” (20). Monochronic time, he explains, “narrows one’s view of events in much the same way as looking through a cardboard tube narrows vision, and it influences subtly and in depth how we think—in segmented compartments” (20-21). In this way our approach to time itself is reductionist. Hall posits:

Since scheduling by its very nature selects what will and will not be perceived and attended and permits only a limited number of events within a given period, what gets scheduled in or out constitutes a system for setting priorities for both people and

---

156 The other time system against which Hall spends a significant portion of text contrasting with monochronic time is called polychronic (comprehensive, specific) time (17-20, 124-125, 150-151). This other form captures many of the presuppositions about time expressed as a point and in cycles under Part II.
functions. Important things are taken up first and allotted the most time; unimportant things are left to last or omitted if time runs out (18).

Another way of articulating this process is that this segmented, linear approach to time facilitates not being ‘present’ in one’s kay pacha point, especially when combined with the tendency to compartmentalize reality and an insistence on categorical timelessness. (In this case, we could even say that being focused on the emergent moment-place or on the signs that it offers are not even afforded). With the possibility of fostering balance already pre-empted, the absence of the generative compass leaves us trying to find sturdy ground on which to stand, which in turn pushes the methodological focus on defining categorical parameters. When coupled with the ability to leave the present time-place, this thrust leads us to try to control the future or at least make it less uncertain. Interestingly though focusing more on the future gets us even further out of our bodies, out of context and into some hypothetical world created in our mind’s eye. As such, it does not allow us to be aware of what is going on ‘right now,’ which confirms Hall’s point that “scheduling…selects what will and will not be perceived and attended.”

So a first consequence of this strategy then is that we cannot pay attention to the signs or engage the wider conversation, which means that we miss critical insights for being in balance. Furthermore, the less we engage the very constantly present signs, the more our co-creations are shaped through an imbalanced energetic profile. The pain these imbalanced co-creations incur actually reinforces the desire to not be right here and now and as such discourages being present for engaging dynamic balance. As can easily be imagined, this process turns into a vicious cycle in which we further reduce our sensing faculties and continue to respond from a place that insists on separation.

---

157 Chapter 9 (on harmonizing) explained how not actively engaging in ayni leads to imbalanced co-creations.

158 Even Hall (1977) observes that, in addition to compartmentalizing, “M-time can alienate us from ourselves” (20).
Projection, planning or being future-oriented is also counter-productive in that it diminishes our capacity to have full energy or force to face the here and now. When we do not fully show up, we cannot fully respond to the circumstances at hand, and this leaves a lingering taste of always being able to do better than we did. This, as we will see below, is actually a source of pain that further drives not wanting to be fully present, even though it is our lack of presence that actually elicits the sensation in the first place. By begetting imbalanced co-creations, further inciting reasons for existential fear, and continuing to use strategies founded on ontological separation, we ourselves feed a general distrust in the process. Moreover, since this lens responsible for affording the spiraling cycle becomes engrained through generations of cultural programming, the more we re-produce the programming, the more we re-produce that distrust.

These first two characteristics of ontological fragmentation combine neatly into a third called linear thought. Separating mind from the rest of the body and segmenting time into measurable, linear components together tend to generate a similar linearity in our thought processes. Moreover, in complementary co-constitutive fashion, the language-games corresponding to time-spacescapes based on separation also reflect this demanded quality.

Compartmentalizing one part of our being and employing its particular drive to analyze and abstract out so as to explain reality has allowed us to engage with the elements of the world in terms of ‘logic’ only, or, as Hall (1977) has observed, has promoted “a linear over a comprehensive approach to thinking” (11-12). In contrast to the comprehensive approach outlined in Part II, the linear approach requires using “only a small fraction of [our] mental capabilities.” Out of the “many different and legitimate ways of thinking,” Hall explains, as
participants in the Western-style time-spacescape, we “value one of these ways above all others – the one we call ‘logic’” (9).

Despite this nominal appropriation of the term, this does not mean that other ‘logics’ may not exist or that our approach is ‘rational’ and others ‘irrational.’ The linear approach engenders one kind of logic and the comprehensive another, each reflecting a distinct approach to knowing as Hall indicates in the following passage:

Sequential, or linear statements are suited to solving certain kinds of problems, whereas comprehensive processes are better adapted to other kinds. What is irrational is using one where the other is required, just as it is irrational to use a sports car to pull a ploy or a tractor to race with. You can do both, but it doesn’t make sense (243).

Here we can apply another lesson from Chapter 8 to clarify this point. As stated there, anyone can specialize in any area of information sensing and processing, but knowing how and when to use each area in balance is the central challenge for becoming an Amaru Runa, a person who can dynamically engage balance and integrate lessons across all three spheres. Constantly privileging the head/mind over the other parts denies flexibility in responding to the circumstances at hand. No matter the origin of the data, it gets processed through a linearly trained mind, which generates a certain ‘directionality’ when engaging that information. This singular directionality is the concern that Hall expresses above: It is ‘irrational’ to use the same approach to logic for all circumstances. When we do this, we foster rigidity in our way of responding to emergence, atrophy our other faculties to the point where we ‘think’ that there is no other way to engage with life, and subsequently engender hucha – a density that denies life itself.

**Teleology: The Epitomic End-product of this Logic**

All of this linearity creates a rich breeding ground for applying a teleological framework to life. Before engaging this way of thinking though I would first like to review how these
measuring sticks emerge out of a combination of ontologically losing the compass, ontologically insisting on the possibility of unitary ‘wholeness,’ and epistemologically demanding progress toward defining the characteristics and parameters of that complete category.

As we saw earlier, assuming separation is to deny interconnection as the primordial state of being, which means that we ontologically lose the compass. Without a compass, total existential uncertainty reigns; we feel helpless because we do not ‘really’ know where we are going or why. Interestingly though the impulse to feel that we are heading in a particular direction is a direct product of using the lens that creates this existential quandary. Perceiving objects and beings as separate phenomena in the world leads us to assume that they exist separately from us as ontologically autonomous units. This presupposition requires that we also assume that the unit then is whole, complete and ‘perfect’ on some plane to which we do not currently have access.

Epistemologically and methodologically then, as we saw under methodological thrusts, this ontologically afforded scenario demands that we approximate that assumed pure, complete or perfect character of the unit by progressively identifying or defining the characteristics of those autonomous categories. When we perceive an abyss of uncertainty by insisting on separation, our ‘incomplete’ nature makes us desperately desire to get closer to ‘complete.’ As such, we think that ‘progress’ in responding to this epistemological demand will alleviate the constant, nagging uncertainty that surrounds us. As part of this drive, we seek tools that can gauge that progress.

\[159\] It is at this point epistemologically that we witness that the relation and the corresponding proportionality of the tethered components do not even arise as a consideration. Instead this is more about drawing linear trajectories toward imagined-to-be-complete categories.
The Tool

When, in the face of so much perceived existential uncertainty, we focus on approximating an existentially autonomous category that is not primordially connected to anything, we need heuristic devices to indicate whether we are on the ‘right track.’ Consequently we bridge the gap between our incomplete state and the imagined complete character of the category in question by drawing an imaginary line, or teleological measuring stick, from ‘incomplete’ to ‘complete.’\textsuperscript{160} Despite their artificial, imaginary character, it is their linear aspect that gives us the impression that we can use them to estimate ‘progress.’\textsuperscript{161} Furthermore, while the perceived goals of any teleological framework are completely arbitrary—since they are guesses at what is outside our reach—they all share the fact that they are responding to the ‘epistemological demand’ of unitarism. By giving the impression that we may measure progress toward these categories by erecting a bridge over the gap in an ontologically consistent way, these teleological measuring sticks become extremely critical to any approach based on an ontology of separation and, as such, act as a ‘substitute’ for the generative, emergent compass so central to complete interconnectedness.

Several key features characterize this tool. First, a teleological measuring stick may be defined as a segmented straight line connecting two ontologically distinct, but related, imagined-to-be-complete categories. Because the separate ends of these continua are usually seen as being opposite one another (as dualisms and not parity-based relations), one end is usually the desired outcome and the other, the feared, rejected or undesired one (e.g. good/bad, modern/traditional, developed/underdeveloped, success/failure, heaven/hell, educated/ignorant). We usually

\textsuperscript{160} In this case, ‘incomplete’ is just the contrasting category of ‘complete.’

\textsuperscript{161} In fact, whether we progress or digress along these lines does not really matter. Having a linear tool that allows us to see whether we are moving up or down is what is really important here because that seems to alleviate the loss of the emergent compass.
imagine ourselves to be at some point between the two impossible-to-reach complete categories and estimate our progress toward the coveted point through the various segmented categories that extend along the imagined line from one ontologically autonomous category to another. In this way, each step/segment also constitutes its own category that stands for a particular ranking between the ends of the continuum. Furthermore, the linear quality of the stick also lends itself to the particular language used to describe our positions relative to each end. Both comparative language (e.g. more/less, closer to/further away from, better/worse) and superlative language (e.g. most/least, closest to/furthest away from, and best/worst) are employed to this end. We do not only use these teleological measuring sticks to gauge where we stand between two possible categorical outcomes. We similarly apply them to other humans, situations, phenomena, and things.

Nevertheless, whether the situation be about taking stock of where one stands between two opposite possibilities, evaluating one’s ‘progress’ through time, comparing another’s positioning to that of one’s own, or contrasting the positions of two other beings, things or phenomena such as nation-states, they all reflect another aspect of ontological separation that is critical for the constitution of these sticks: In order to compare or gauge progress, the categories must be timeless and universal. This becomes possible because the unitaristic aspect of this ontological lens drives an unbridgeable wedge between time and space and therefore ‘frees’ us from having to take our kay pacha point into constant consideration. By uniformly wiping out embedded specificity, the possibility of timelessness afforded by ontological separation is key to the universalization and universal applicability of any concept/idea. In this case, both the teleological measuring sticks and their corresponding categories as rankings are timeless and the anchored specificity of each emergent moment-place is dislodged to allow for comparison either
‘through time’ or between objects, beings or phenomena. Also supporting this mirage of comparability is the apparent ability to disaggregate and aggregate autonomous units with ease, which is also afforded through this lens.\textsuperscript{162}

Because we are ontologically ‘disconnected’ and we perceive these tools to be universally applicable, it is common to witness two principle practices with these teleological measuring sticks. First, we assume that if most or many people are following a particular path, then there must be something ‘right’ about it. As such it just becomes a matter of seeing how or where we ‘fit in,’ and consequently we start comparing ourselves to others or ourselves against an ‘ideal’ which also comes through others. Latching onto a conceptual structure that provides directional guidance as to where we should direct our life force seems to quell the separation anxiety that constantly gnaws at us.

Second, we also attempt to win others over to our particular measuring stick. Since we do not fundamentally know from this lens that we are interconnected to a whole that is balanced and since the teleological measuring sticks are completely arbitrary, one of the major ways in which we measure whether the stick we have chosen to adhere to is the correct one is through its proselytization. When adherence to the stick grows, it gives the impression that we are closer to a ‘truer’ sense of reality than the others because we have landed on something that resonates with more people so therefore must be closer to the truth. If this is not the case, then at least the adherence of others to our selected stick helps alleviate momentarily the ‘not enoughness’ created through separation.

Generally then teleological measuring sticks are useful tools for giving us a plan and a sense of direction in light of existential uncertainty. They fill the role played by the emergent,

\textsuperscript{162} In addition to reinforcing the perception of the universal applicability of these measures, this atomistic rendition of reality provides the added benefit of allowing for individuals to move up and down teleological ladders without necessarily directly impacting all of his or her relations.
relational compass within the ontology of complete interconnectedness. Nevertheless, using a teleological approach as a way of conceiving and therefore perceiving and interacting with reality as a ‘single’ person and as a shared strategy en masse generates several consequences that normally have quite a bit of impact on people, society and nature. The next section is dedicated to exploring these repercussions at the level of the person and of the collectivity within a time-spacescape based on separation. These fruits together make the overall thrust of the lens of separation toward imbalance more evident.

Consequences

To address the consequences of these teleological measuring sticks, I must re-produce the logic of separation here to show how these holograms rely on each other in multiplicitous fashion to build a separation-based conceptualization of reality. For example, in a time-spacescape built through a generally shared lens of separation, each person is considered separate first and in relation second. This is how we can get to the simultaneous scenario in which the compass is absent and socially shared phenomena like teleological measuring sticks reign.\textsuperscript{163} This situation allows us to talk about applying these socially constructed standards to beings, things or scenarios or about comparing progress along these lines in terms of self against self, self against other, or other against other. In each case we are using arbitrary criteria whose roots are supposed to be just beyond everyone’s reach, and because we assume separation among the compared actors as well as separation from the standards’ essence, we build on and re-produce that existential isolation by using these measuring sticks. To show how the application of these teleological tools affects us as we stand in an already ontologically fragmented world (due to

\textsuperscript{163} In the ontology of separation, one cannot see oneself in the ‘Other’ as when the relation is primary. However, even though the relation is secondary in a world based on separation, one paradoxically still has to look to the ‘Other’ to understand and see how one is ‘faring in life.’ Doing this exercise requires socially shared phenomena like teleological standards so that one may pit oneself against oneself and against the other.
first-level holograms based on separation, i.e. all humans are atomistic individual actors), I discuss below the consequences of using such arbitrary sticks first at the level of the person and then at the level of the collectivity.

‘Personal’ Effects

To identify how the ‘individual’ engages these teleological measuring sticks, we should briefly review how the ontology of separation and the ontology of complete interconnectedness deal with particular energetic conditions of reality. This contrast, in the end, will also help us better understand how the following consequences are fruits borne of the logic of one in separation and how they privilege imbalance over balance.

Assuming complete interconnectedness, as we have seen, leads to a primordial focus on the present moment-place, on the generative relation and on the limited nature of the components in that relation. Being in relation requires that the components never be ‘complete.’ For this reason, our limited nature in the face of being robustly interconnected is actually reason for gratitude toward ‘Others,’ who present us with the means through which we may know who we are, where we stand, what imbalances we are emitting, and how to integrate them. In this case, ‘completion’ can only occur at the level of the parity-based relation and is constantly contingent and fleeting. In this way we may see how the ‘Other’ is the self and therefore understood as one’s mirror.

Insisting on ontological isolation first, in contrast, expunges the ability to acknowledge that mirror and the compass that it implies. Once the generative relation that acts as a compass pointing to where one may focus for realignment is removed from sight, our incomplete character becomes a constant reminder of overwhelming existential uncertainty. Instead of being reason to rejoice in the interdependence of life, our incomplete state is a source of extreme
anxiety that constantly points to our incapacity to ‘make sense of it all.’ As seen above the most readily available option for alleviating that anxiety is to grab onto a teleological framework, because these measuring sticks seem to provide guidance and direction when we assume the existence of complete categories.

These contrasting assumptions make us understand our condition of being incomplete in the cosmos in very different terms. When we assume that a complete state occurs at the level of the unit and not the relation, the option we give ourselves is to look to imagined categories for clues about that which we do not and cannot know. A range of categorical rankings that extends from least to most desired or even from the past to the future in teleological frameworks is most useful in this sense, because the intermediary rankings point to how far we are from the ultimate supposed goal. However, because the road toward some socially shared notion of ‘perfection’—whether that be development, nirvana, civilization, enlightenment, truth, etc.—is only made possible by being counterbalanced through that notion’s opposite, that is, underdevelopment, unenlightenment, savagery, falsehood, etc., we are constantly threatened with the possibility of regressing or falling behind. As a result, when a teleological framework extends between two dualistically contrived complete categories (which is always), making progress toward the one deemed to be superior is emphasized, yet this drive is always complemented by the threat of moving toward its opposite.¹⁶⁴

In addition not having access to the assumed-to-be-complete categories at either end drives us to assume that our incomplete state is clearly indicative of the least desired direction. This is particularly the case when we assume that the complete ideal is perfect, which signifies

¹⁶⁴ This is a clear illustration of the ontological effects implied by assuming a dualism in contrast to a parity-based cycle. When progression/regression are seen as a dualism, progress is sought out to the exclusion of regression. In a parity-based cycle, the one component is not dealt with in fear but with an emphasis of fully experiencing the whole cycle.
that our incomplete character makes us imperfect. This perennially incomplete condition, though, necessarily sets us up for constant failure in our ability to respond to the epistemological demand of this lens—the drive toward completing the category. Even though cosmic energetic principles make categorical completion an impossible task, we take our inability to reach this separation-allowed goal as (constant) evidence of our failure, of our ‘not-enoughness.’ In short, this energetic requirement of having the component be limited due to being always in relation in the Andean cosmopis is quickly and easily slips into imperfection and not-enoughness when conceived through separation due to the ontological loss of the generative capacity of the relation to continually ‘constitute’ the components.

This process is clearly illustrated in the Judeo-Christian concept of sin. The definition of sin as ‘missing the mark’ encapsulates this idea: The mark, or perfection, is only able to be assumed because it is separate from us (a perspective arising out of our incomplete character to begin with) and then we ‘miss’ it clearly making us not perfect. This creates a scenario where, to remain ontologically consistent, we must refer to an external, perfect divinity to ask that it forgive us our sins. That is, we must ask it to forgive us for a condition that is simply part of participating in this reality and about which we can do absolutely nothing (except choose how we respond to it and our attitude toward it). Since we never get out of our incomplete character, we never get out of ‘sinning’ when in reference to some imagined perfection, a fruit that is singularly tied to the lens of separation. At some point, this becomes cause for constant self-flagellation on an energetic plane and further fosters anxiety and anger about this state of affairs.\footnote{From the perspective of complete interconnectedness, in contrast, this ‘state of affairs’ is merely a set of holograms that we have co-created and maintain by insisting on our separation from it.}
The effects of anger and anxiety spurred by this ontological panorama generated through a lens of separation are then, in the case of religion, ‘refereed’ through even more external, arbitrary, teleological standards that together are called ‘morality.’\textsuperscript{166} In the face of a condition that will not change, these externally conjured standards needlessly riddle us with guilt, helplessness, shame, not-enoughness and fear of being judged in addition to increasing further the burden of perpetually judging ourselves for reacting this way toward our unchanging condition of ‘incompletedness’ (through self-flagellation, anger toward others, etc.). However, because the ontological lens is not just predominantly shared among the believers of a religion but all the way through the corresponding time-spacescape, this same panorama also behooves a ‘secular’ response to rampant imperfection to ensure order.\textsuperscript{167} In this case, law plays the same function as morality on a secular plane based on different, albeit related, teleological standards for ‘appropriate’ social behavior.\textsuperscript{168}

The incompletedness interpreted as imperfection constantly observed in ourselves and others stands in constant contrast to the completed-ness taken as perfection that we imagine, and this reinforces our existential anxiety. With this burning sensation of not knowing our way about, we are motivated to come up with and/or adhere to artificial teleological continua to help us situate or find ourselves in relation to others who are trying to do the same. Since the particular stick we apply is predicated on separation, it is cause, not for seeking out the ‘Others’ due to the relational completion that they constantly provide, but for demonstrating to oneself that one is more (or less) of some characteristic over them. Even though we may show ourselves

\textsuperscript{166} This is part of the multiplicitious build-up of the separation-based concepts to which I referred earlier.

\textsuperscript{167} We may even look to Rousseau’s \textit{Social Contract} to apprehend an example of this logic.

\textsuperscript{168} In this case, the fruits of complete interconnectedness are completely different: Incompletion is not a reason for perpetual self-flagellation or for imposing law and order. Rather the products that are co-created through the relation that hinges on our incomplete character are all seen as simple reminders of the need to tend and nurture our generative relations.
to be superior to the others according to the sticks we choose to employ, the fact of the matter is, though, that we are never going to get out of our incomplete state (and therefore will never reach the goal of perfection) for this is a matter of energetic principles. In fact, instead of focusing on how the relation can become fully ‘one’ through two incomplete, complementary components, or even knowing how to do this (or that we even can), this set of ontological fruits becomes a spiraling vicious cycle that constantly generates separation anxiety, which therefore constitutes cause for the continued use of the lens and its corresponding tools.

In these circumstances the question remains: why do we continue to use the same lens that spurs the anxiety, especially if our incomplete state never goes away? That answer is related to the way this lens and its corresponding game are set up in relation to cosmic energetic principles. Instead of seeing that each new moment-place is emergent, that the relation is always generative, and that we are always co-creating in the wider conversation, we take what each new generative, emergent moment affords as bits of evidence that we are uncovering more and more aspects of ourselves and others with each passing moment, that is, that we are getting closer and closer to those assumed complete categories. This approach gives us the impression that it is just a matter of time before we get to glimpse our true categorical essence. So these ever-emergent glimmers of hope, these miniscule steps ‘forward’ in light of these imagined teleological measuring sticks, are just enough for us to not realize that with each moment we also find ourselves as still ‘incomplete’ in each and every single moment. Somehow the hope fueled through the moments of insight that seem to respond to the epistemological demand of this lens keeps blinding us to the fact that our incomplete character is a constant condition that abides by energetic principles, and for this reason we keep employing the same lens for engaging reality.
‘Collective’ Effects

In a time-spacescape based on separation where the primary fruits generated include the loss of the emergent compass, ontological emphasis on a singular unit, a linear sense of time, and teleological trajectories, everyone is looking to the other for clues and grabbing onto these socially shared teleological constructs to help them find their bearings from their respective place of ontological autonomy. As we all engage these practices together we co-create collective effects in addition to the personal ones reviewed above. The most prominent consequences include competition, judgment and domination, which, together in turn, further justify the use of these frameworks.

Competition

In a world where separation reigns and where hierarchical teleological measuring sticks become the means for gauging where we stand, this world necessarily engenders competition. Because unitarism (a) fosters assuming *a priori* categories, (b) only allows for one ‘real’ category to exist for each prototypical set of circumstances, and (c) gives the impression that one path to that category must be superior, competition arises in light of this ontologically afforded scenario. Here the drive to determine who or which is superior is much stronger than the impulse to proportionalize the components of a relation.

In addition, the way time is engaged (or not) complements the tendency toward a competitive environment. First, the timelessness of the category is key for being able to imagine a competitive path toward a common, singular category. Then, the ability to get out of one’s *kay pacha* point is critical for engaging that path from this ontological lens. For example, once on the teleological path, the constant sensation of not-enoughness drives us to try to define categorically the next ‘ranking’ on the teleological ladder and to generate a plan for getting there.
This whole process relies on and reinforces an ability to get out of one’s kay pacha point, that is, to live in and for some hypothetical future time period. By doing this we think that we will improve our chances at being competitive. By determining whether we are superior or inferior to others, we also think that this will show us where we need to dedicate our time and energy to improve our standing.

While the competition may even be against one’s ‘self’ over time, this singular line does not have to be a solitary route. Surely, it is ‘strongest’ when many ascribe to the ideal represented therein because this seems to give credence to the apparent legitimacy of that particular teleological standard. In other words, when ‘individuals’ are aggregated to the ‘cause’ of the teleology at hand, this appears to lend weight to the validity of the sought-after category and bolsters in-group/out-group distinctions by pitting a ‘we’ against a ‘they’ along a singular teleological path. This scenario then reinforces the perception of being in a competitive context and the tendency to respond in kind.

Besides apparently validating the category, aggregating other individuals to the in-group seems to provide temporary alleviation from the alienation and imperfection to which we constantly subject ourselves when we employ this ontological lens.\(^\text{169}\) All of these efforts are driven by the desire to get rid of the burden of having to find ourselves as constantly imperfect. Nevertheless, as shown above, aggregating separate units to a teleological framework only increases the number of people who are constantly proving to themselves that they have yet to reach ‘completion’ or ‘perfection’ and therefore are constantly reacting to this pain with strategies conjured through the same lens that brings them the pain.

We witness this competitive spirit through teleological discourse constantly expressed throughout society. For example, the social centrality of sports promotes the drive within

\(^{169}\) Again, it is our choice to employ this, or any other, ontological lens.
athletes to always push their physical limits by having the mind dominate the body. Sports also
generate commonly shared notions of we/they groups for rallying behind one’s team or nation.
In schools, the students’ grade point average seems to take on a life of its own in terms of its
capacity to shape how students identify themselves. In religion, the competitive ‘spirit’ extant in
Christianity derives from there being supposedly one ‘best’ road leading to a single God. As a
result, we see the proliferation of varying interpretations and their eventual formation and
separation into distinct denominations. This tendency extends the we/they division between ‘we’
Christians and the rest of the ‘non-believers’ to apply also within the Christian realm itself,
subdividing the competing approaches for getting ‘closer’ to a singular (Judeo-)Christian God.
Capitalism, in turn, is a rather straightforward manifestation of this logic: the participants are
perceived as autonomous individual agents who operate in this competitive system to innovate
and create so as to abide by the teleological mandate to always accumulate (i.e. approximate
‘success’) in order to avoid falling behind or losing out in the system.

Even democracy abides by the tenets of ontological separation. Again, atomistic actors
get the chance to cast their vote in a fundamentally competitive system, and those belonging to a
political, social or ethnic minority lose, through majority-rule, the opportunity to have their
perspective incorporated into legislation. This political system’s necessarily exclusive nature—
founded on the ontological primacy of the category—is simply considered to be a ‘slight
oversight’ of the ‘best’ modern-day form of governance. Still, addressing democracy as the
‘best’ type of political system appears much later than certain separation-based ideas about the
polity that allow for this claim to be made. When the polity is conceived as being constituted by
a group of atomistic individuals where the group is secondary to each one’s ontological
autonomy, the same gap that separates the units also represents the source of the threat of chaos
and anarchy. It is from this ontologically afforded scenario that products like the social contract and the Leviathan emerge. They are both strategies for summoning order within a given territory in the face of this constant threat spurred by the absence of the compass.

Since the imagined need for order derives directly from assuming ontological separation, the tools applied to foster that ‘order’ are not informed through a shared connection with the whole. Instead, the system of governance, its ‘laws,’ and supporting norms of ‘morality’ that are all supposed to engender order are ‘artificially’ conceived, that is, their related concepts do not emerge from assuming primordial interconnection. For this system to work then, the governmental system in question must have a way to engage a ‘sufficient’ amount of ‘buy-in’ factor. That is, at least a majority is needed to ‘buy in’ to the given set of arbitrary criteria about how that order should be executed. So yes, in this context afforded by ontologically assuming separation, one might be able to argue that democracy is, in fact, the best political system. When we change the ontological lens, however, we can begin to observe the fissures in the foundation of this logic.

Judging

Another fundamental practice that is part and parcel of this competitive drive and all of its accompanying ontologically afforded circumstances is the mandate to judge ourselves and others. The two primary fruits of ontological separation that drive this practice are the constant anxiety of not really knowing where we stand and the fact that we see other human beings as separate from us and yet in the same existential quandary as ourselves. Consequently we use these ‘universally applicable’ teleological measuring sticks—since they are the only replacement tool that we ‘think’ we have for a compass—to see how we ‘measure up’ in comparison. Instead of reflecting our energetic co-creations back to us, these holograms are assumed to indicate
where people stand in relation to the stick and to each other and, as such, point to where they are supposed to be headed. Furthermore, since they represent the path toward some ideal, we fall into judging ourselves and others in relation to this imaginary line. In this case as well we keep holding onto the everlasting hope that at some point, we will overcome the ‘hump’ of not knowing, that we will find the ‘right’ path or that we will diminish uncertainty.

It is important to note however that even though the criteria of a given teleological measuring stick are understood to be ‘socially shared,’ the grounds a person uses for judging others are actually wholly related to the experiences she has had through her particular series of kay pacha points. In this way, the criteria are hardly universal and hardly applicable to others in their respective accumulation of lived kay pacha points. Nevertheless these criteria prove to be extremely convenient because they often place us in a higher or better ranking than others (an unsurprising outcome when one understands how the fruits of separation operate and why). In all cases though, judging others and ourselves according to these criteria cannot and does not alleviate the burning sensation created when we perceive our ‘limited’ condition as imperfection, because the criteria, the activities of comparing and judging, and the (mis)interpretation of our incomplete character as being imperfect are all fruits of the ontological lens that assumes the primordial reason for the anxiety.

Domination

The pieces on competition and judging above make it easier to see how the drive to dominate through a lens of separation becomes not just possible but necessary. This ‘mandated’ thrust is easiest to illustrate graphically. In the first picture below I depict how, from a lens of complete interconnectedness, the relation between two (complementary opposite) components is conceived as a juk-based whole. Then the second scenario displays what happens when a wedge
of ontological separation is driven between the units, turning these components into existentially autonomous categories. However, since this second scenario also forces the loss of the compass, the way in which we ‘find’ ourselves is through a teleological framework. So the third image shows what happens ontologically when we apply this framework to two separate, opposite categories (now considered dualisms instead of a parity-based relation). In this set-up the socially deemed ‘desired,’ ‘respected,’ ‘superior’ category occupies the coveted position, and its shunned counterpart occupies the position away from which people are trying to escape.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robust Monism</th>
<th>From Ontological Separation to Domination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
<td>[Diagram]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andean <em>juk</em>-based relation</td>
<td>First step of ontological separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No compass (\rightarrow) Superior-inferior maneuver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 8.* The progression from robust monism to the teleological drive to dominate.

A power play to see who dominates practically becomes a necessity in this ontologically afforded scenario. To show how this is the case, I would like to apply this progression to the notions of ‘good’ and ‘evil.’ In the first scenario good and evil constitute a parity-based *juk* relation. That is, each is absolutely necessary for the constitution of its opposite. The goal in this case would be to ‘proportionalize’ the relation and to know that if something perceived to be ‘evil’ appears it indicates co-created imbalance and therefore needs attention. Here the strong connotations of these two terms are very much diminished, since all is seen as being necessary for understanding ourselves and for re-generating life. Moreover both are treated in a much more nurturing fashion since the contrasts we witness are understood as our co-creations. As such, neither extreme as *a priori* category is exaggeratedly sought or rejected. Through this lens these do not exist and the priority is on the relation.
Once ‘good’ and ‘evil’ are conceived as separate entities or perfect categories, as in the second scenario, then they neatly slide into the two extremes of a teleological trajectory with good ‘obviously’ being the one to go on top and toward which we ‘should’ direct our actions.\(^{170}\)

Once we ontologically set up the case of good and evil as seen in the third picture in Figure 8, we soon realize that our own incomplete state prevents us from getting to the perfectly complete category of good. Because our state does not change, it constantly haunts us for we read our situation in this teleological ordering as imperfection, not-enoughness, a failure.

In *Genealogy of Morals* Nietzsche calls this contradiction ‘decisive,’ and he suggests that the only option that we have left when embracing this dichotomous teleological framework is to fight off evil. Within the Judeo-Christian tradition he takes “the overestimation of goodness and benevolence on a large scale for a consequence of decadence, for a symptom of weakness, irreconcilable with an ascending, Yes-saying life.” He concludes that in fact “negating and destroying are conditions of saying Yes” (328).\(^{171}\) Lajo (2003) corroborates this paradox when he asserts that the monotheistic Judeo-Christian tradition—a scenario that can only be afforded through uneven unitarism—drives an inability to deal with difference by creating a scenario that allows for only one ‘perfect’ or ‘right’ option. This is the same logical maneuver that does not permit the existence of contradictions as described above.\(^{172}\)

In fact, we find evidence for this intolerance for difference throughout contemporary society. For example, the category of ‘evil’ is constantly re-produced and re-viled through the...
marginalization of those deemed to fall on the purportedly other end of this teleological scale.\textsuperscript{173} While those reviled may include women who have committed abortion, homosexuals, or rogue nations, the (post-)colonial encounter provides a well-studied and particularly fertile ground for observing this maneuver and its paradoxes.\textsuperscript{174} Here the socially shared teleological notions of good and evil have historically been combined with notions of race to set up a doubly teleological framework. Through an ontological lens that privileges separation, the colonizers were able to conceptualize good/evil in terms of light/dark whereby the lighter-skinned colonizers would be teleologically closer to the Supreme Perfect Unit (the Judeo-Christian God).\textsuperscript{175} This whole maneuver becomes possible when the adopted ontological lens disallows the acknowledgment of the compass.

I would like to review how the loss of the compass would engender certain affordances that promote this maneuver in the colonial context. As seen above, when one takes on

\textsuperscript{173} The Latin roots of ‘reviled’ are particularly intriguing here: re-vile – to make something evil over and over again. This highlights that it is an act or a choice of having to make something or someone evil. As such, to be maintained, this condition or hologram must be constantly re-made. At the same time though, we need this hologram to show us what good is, and so therefore we can never get rid of it, only re-produce it by ‘re-viling’ it.

\textsuperscript{174} The works that have been generally integral and informative to the conceptual development made here include Fanon (1952), Bhabha (1994), Guillemot (2003), Shohat and Stam (1994), Nandy (2013), Said (1979), and Spivak (1993).

\textsuperscript{175} That I claim that the colonizers were employing a lens of separation to understand their connection to the cosmos can be stated with considerable confidence once one understands how this logic works. To make this claim one does not have to study colonization at exhaustive length or assume that one can go back that far in time. The very simple historical information available to us and their palpable contemporary effects bear the mark of this lens. The following points are just a few of these references: (1) The Spanish arrived to what is called today Latin America, and most of Latin America today speaks Spanish. (2) Many, if not all, of the colonizers came from a time-spacescape that was dominated by the Catholic religion. (3) Great swaths of the indigenous population died upon arrival of the Spanish. (4) The indigenous were turned into slaves, and their load was shared by slaves of African descent. (5) Great churches were built on top of native sacred spots in each location. (6) According to the Holy Office of the Inquisition, ‘idolatry’ was to be sought out and destroyed. (7) Indigenous men were treated (and still are) as effeminate, childlike, immature and unenlightened. (8) The chroniclers provide all kinds of evidence of the use of the lens of separation in terms of their interpretations of what they were seeing and living. (What is not certain however is the degree to which the Incans themselves had already been ascribing to ontological separation.) Together these historical ‘facts’ allow me to state rather confidently that the colonizers were fully utilizing a lens of separation, which means that they subjected themselves to the implications of losing their compass as described here. Moreover, the continually reproduced effects of the \textit{chuchaki colonial} (the colonial hangover) demonstrate that this lens is still the generally shared lens of preference.
teleological standards to replace the compass, one’s incomplete character is transformed into or reinterpreted as imperfection. To distract oneself away from the constant disappointment of one’s own imperfection and the concomitant urge to denigrate oneself made possible by using this lens, one might turn to observe others’ extensive imperfections in the face of one’s selected ‘universally applicable’ teleological measuring stick(s) that show the road to what is ‘right and good.’ As Nietzsche and Lajo have observed above, anything that deviates from the particularistically understood teleological measuring stick, that is, any form of difference, is cause for negation and destruction. Consequently, as the only ontological option afforded in this “Yes-saying” situation, the colonial encounter, particularly with the colossal differences faced by the colonizers, became a topos where evil or the devil in the ‘savage’ world necessarily had to be destroyed and widespread domination and social transformation was justified.¹⁷⁶

Guillemot (2003) has already described this particular (post-)colonial situation as the “vampire’s mirror” (30). Because the (post-)colonial subject does not see himself reflected in the “mirror” (the ‘Other’), this person is driven to annihilate that (non-)reflection. To understand how this scenario comes to be, however, we must answer the following questions: How does the (post-)colonial subject conceive of the mirror? Why does he expect to see his image, that is, similarity, reflected in that mirror? How did that expectation get there?

Based on the ontological mechanisms reviewed above, the drive to see similarity comes directly from the fruits of the lens of separation. First, unitarism implies only one ‘correct’ path, which means that if we are on the ‘right’ path, we should not encounter difference. Then, we take stabs at that correct path through teleological measuring sticks. However, because these sticks are arbitrary, that is, because the assumption of separation plus our incomplete state

¹⁷⁶ That this was the only ontological option afforded to the colonizers is in no way meant to relieve the colonizers and their descendents of their historical, psycho-social burden. This may have been the only ontologically afforded option, but they chose and still choose to use this very same lens that leads to this afforded option.
renders all of these tools mere conjectures, perceived similarity and difference actually play a critical role in this game.\textsuperscript{177} For example, seeing others adhere to a stick that is similar to ours is soothing to us at an existential level, because it appears to lend weight to our selection of standards. Difference, like dissonance, in contrast, is jarring on two levels. First, when we employ a given teleological measuring stick, difference detracts from our momentary state of diminished uncertainty, because what we see does not confirm that we are on the ‘right’ track. Second, difference, in this case, points directly back to our limited-read-as-imperfect state.

In short, difference indicates evidence that something or somebody is essentially wrong, and often it is much easier to judge, change or punish those who do not reflect similarity than to question one’s embraced teleological projection. Now, as we have seen before, this idea of judging, changing or punishing the ‘Other’ requires—according to the logic that promotes using these teleological tools—that the ‘Other’ (the mirror) be seen as separate from oneself and as typically inferior to oneself according to the employed scale.\textsuperscript{178} In both cases, the violence is thereby justified and compartmentalized away from oneself. Moreover, because those who use

\textsuperscript{177} In the infinity of the cosmos these measuring sticks are like little straws pointing in random directions and not tied to anything, for they arise as products of assumed ontological separation. Here I would like to refer to a product of continued (post-)colonial relations—in the sense of a teleology that situates Western-style logic over any other—to illustrate their arbitrary character: the case of the modernization myth coupled with ‘development efforts.’ As it has been commonly indicated across the post-development and dependency theory literatures, the strategies for ‘modernizing the “Third World”’ hardly resemble the historical paths followed by those countries that consider themselves to be ‘modern’ today. Besides the fact that no more places are available for those ‘Third World’ countries to colonize and pillage, this discontinuity between the supposed stages of modernization and the particular strategies used by each ‘modern’ country to get to its contemporary position demonstrates just how arbitrary these measuring sticks can be. (For more on the historical emergence of ‘development’ as a stage-based strategy for fomenting modernization, see Escobar (1995, 22-53).) For insights into the conceptual architecture of the modernization discourse, review Rostow (1990 [1960]) and Lerner (1958). For similar teleological parallels within psychology that discursively complemented these efforts, refer to Maslow (1943, 1954 & 1962) and Piaget (1936, 1945 & 1978). Escobar’s work is also insightful in that it shows how ‘development’ was originally proposed in the mid-twentieth century as a plan to ward off the ‘evil’ of poverty, which was seen as a serious security threat in light of the Cold War and the wave of decolonization in the wake of World War II. This discursive maneuver then justified efforts at its eradication and what has been called the “right to intervene” in the ‘Third World’ (Orduna 2005, 99-114.).

\textsuperscript{178} Otherwise these practices do not make much sense when the ‘Other’ is understood to be wholly connected to oneself.
teleological measuring sticks perceive them to be socially shared (despite the fact that they are understood in particularistic fashion), the perceived social weight of these conceptions aids in justifying punishment against those who do not seem to follow that path. In general, these are the factors that most explain how, through the lens of separation, difference calls for violence and domination.

It may be useful to pause and contrast this process with how difference is conceptualized from within the lens of complete interconnectedness to see how these particular consequences of further ontological compartmentalization, negation, subjugation, violence and destruction are direct fruits of the lens used to perceive that difference. From the lens of complete interconnectedness, the very logic of parity makes difference reason for gratitude and celebrating life. When we are conceived as being completely interconnected and therefore as always-emergent components, contrast becomes the mechanism through which we may grow, integrate, heal and be part of the temporary ‘completion’ of a juk-like relation. Difference is wholly embraced because it allows for a more robustly contrasting juk whole.

According to this logic, difference also signifies greater collective knowing. Because each lived kay pacha point is understood to be anchored, unique and specific, each member’s respective series of kay pacha points that constitute the collective experiences of the ayllu are valued, honored and shared.179 The diversity in this collective set of pacha paths is considered to be the source of the richness of life, especially when the experiences through each one’s interconnected, emergent kay pacha point are engaged with a knowing of one’s interconnectedness, of how to use that compass, and how to nurture those relations that present

---

179 With this observation it is possible to see how not only each being, but each instance of life specifically anchored to a time-place is treated in multidimensional fashion according to a perspective that arises out of an interconnected, interdependent whole: Absolutely everyone (and every emergent moment-place) is necessary and no one (and no one moment-place) is dispensable.
themselves (never coincidentally) through life. In this way each particular set of experiences contributes to yuyay, or collective knowing, by making more tools available to the whole for each new emergent moment-place.

Through the lens of complete interconnectedness, these tools are not seen in the economistic language of resources. Instead when complete interconnectedness is embraced as a shared ontological lens, all related beings also share a total trust in the process and in the compass as a window to that process. When this lens is commonly shared, it is understood that each moment-place presents itself in its particular way to each being of the ayllu for a reason. In the same way, it is understood that future circumstances will also not be coincidental, and the ayllu members will rely on the fomented yuyay to discern those responses to the signs that will contribute to ayni. From this lens diversity is seen as a more robust reflection of life itself, of dynamic harmony.180

Through this brief contrast, it is amazing to see how the fruits of each lens lead to such disparate interpretations of the phenomenon of ‘difference.’ Where difference through a lens of separation is deemed as a threat that must be eradicated, it is embraced as a valued contribution to the collective through a lens of complete interconnectedness.

180 This approach to life applies equally to encounters with non-humans from this cosmovision. Rengifo (1998a) discusses this difference in terms of how potato production may be interpreted differently through these two lenses: Each form of life has a great diversity, for example, there are more than 3,000 varieties of potatoes alone. The [Andean] cultivators of potatoes do not exclude the old potatoes, the parent generation, in order to retain only the new ones. In a progressivist and evolutionist world—such as the modern West—the new is considered to be superior due to some particular characteristic and it is the one that survives while the previous forms are eliminated. What is advanced and modern replaces and eliminates what is considered backward and traditional; it does not contain it or add to it. From this it follows that the range of variability in the West becomes increasingly narrow. In contrast, the Andes harbor one of the greatest levels of biodiversity on the planet. We are dealing with a complicated world: incommensurable life forms exist together, precisely because each form of life that is born does not erase the previous ones (103). Even in terms of something as ‘mundane’ as a philosophy toward cultivating potatoes, Rengifo is able to contrast vividly another set of irreconcilable fruits of these two lenses. Moreover, he explicitly addresses how the logic of one in separation and its accompanying progressive mental framework continues to insist on killing that which is conceived as being less than another, even in terms of potatoes.
This juxtaposition also points to one small issue that gets overlooked through the lens of separation. Even though the lens that the colonizers and (post-)colonial subjects have used insists on the possibility of separation, the ‘cosmic energetic principles’ embraced through a lens of complete interconnectedness trump this supposition before, during and after the corresponding acts of (epistemic) violence. That is, because ‘yes’ needs ‘no,’ ‘good’ needs ‘evil’ and ‘light’ needs ‘dark’ to exist—no matter how much insistence is placed on their separate and separable character—that which falls on the ‘less desirable’ end of the teleology and against which efforts are exerted to negate, eradicate and destroy will never go away. These concepts are energetically tethered to each other. So while a person or a people may be killed off or subjugated, the ‘evil’ characteristic attributed to them does not disappear. In fact, through the generative relation, the more this undesirable characteristic is actively eschewed, the more tightly it follows along. In fact, this would be why in the (post-)colonial encounter today, the (post-)colonial subject still finds a need to root evil and the devil out the ‘savage’ world.

In this sense, the colonizers (and their descendants), in their attempt to exclude, deny and eradicate the ‘Other,’ have been dragging the ‘Other’ along with them this whole time. Bhabha (1994) addresses the consequences of this paradox in the (post-) colonial world:

The representative figure of such a perversion, I want to suggest, is the image of post-Enlightenment man tethered to, not confronted by, his dark reflection, the shadow of colonized man, that splits his presence, distorts his outline, breaches his boundaries, repeats his action at a distance, disturbs and divides the very time of his being (62).

Here Bhabha is describing the jarring effects of difference particularly when conceived within a teleological framework. These effects make it easier to see how the persistence of the shadow, translated as failed efforts to annihilate that difference, only makes the executor of these efforts more acutely aware of his limited-read-imperfect character. Paradoxically, since this scenario

---

I take this as the reason why complete interconnectedness precedes the ontology of separation, and this is how and why I am able to speak of the lens of separation as a form of ontological slippage.
does not relieve any of the existential angst, “post-Enlightenment man” is further driven to rely on teleological measuring sticks, which continue to give the impression that eradicating the perceived threat is not only possible but imperative, thereby increasing the drive to dominate.

Today throughout the contemporary Western-style time-spacescape we continue to reproduce this same ontologically afforded scenario, the same dead-end that drives us to negate and destroy difference in a Yes-saying world. Examples are profuse. For instance, our cultural fascination with superheroes and Hollywood’s reproduction of storylines that always have good or light win out over evil or dark repeat this same maneuver over and over again. Our hefty penitentiary system too stands as a stalwart to lock up evil behind closed doors. We can also see this re-produced scenario in our ‘missionary’ foreign policy, the ever-expansive drive to democratize the world and create ‘new markets,’ and the impulse to intervene in other contexts through a practice called ‘development.’ In all of these cases, that which does not coincide with our particular set of teleological measuring sticks, with our particular idea of the ideal toward which we are aiming, is cause for negation and annihilation—be it through cultural assimilation, foreign aid, evangelical missions, the media, or more direct routes such as continued imperialism and war. That is, in all cases, difference continues to be perceived as a threat to the precarious (disconnected) set of random teleological measuring sticks that are employed to understand who we are and where we stand and to justify our actions in life.

What we do not see, however, thanks to the ontological lens that brought us to this place, is that all that we perceive to be ‘evil’ is our co-creation. We do not see that the evidence of

---

182 We even see it in the ‘annihilation’ of fat from ‘natural’ foods since this ‘evil’ element has been determined to cause the less-than-desirable obesity running rampant through our culture. If we get rid of the ‘evil’ component, then we will not be threatened by obesity. In a similar vein, we even have to shrink the capacity of the corresponding ‘evil’ organ that is driving us to crave more food and making us ‘fat’ through laparoscopic gastric banding. Another extremely prevalent case of this drive to eradicate evil is in extensive use of antibiotics, antibiotic soap and antibiotic wipes. As their name reveals, they fight against the ‘evil’ of bacteria, the supposed source of most of our illnesses. Again, instead of understanding, respecting and working with how the laws of energetic balance and co-creation function, we have sought to ‘kill’ bacteria only to create ever-stronger superbugs.
these purportedly undesirable states does not go away, because we are constantly re-creating it through the generative relation by denying these states’ completely interconnected nature to that which is ‘desirable’ on an energetic plane. In this case, the logic of *ayni* would sustain that these contrasts continue to present themselves because we have yet to see them as ‘signs’ that require us to nurture and harmonize our relations by integrating them. Instead we simply deny its connectedness to our current state and keep having to face it as a result.

This, however, is indicative of being completely immersed in a vicious cycle that starts with epistemic violence resulting from adopting a reductionist ontological lens that denies our interconnection and fosters existential estrangement. This already reduced predicament erases the possibility of accessing the compass and makes us rely on socially constructed teleological measuring sticks to guide us through life. Paradoxically this ontologically afforded scenario leads us to view our limited nature as evidence of imperfection, which exponentially adds to the existential anxiety induced through assuming separation. Then, we continue to feed that lens-induced stress by engaging in the ever-elusive game of complying with this lens’ epistemological demand of categorical completion by seeking to demonstrate to ourselves that we are making progress toward “identifying our ‘true’ self,” “becoming wholly aware of who we are,” “‘really’ knowing where we are supposed to be headed,” or “identifying some universal Truth.” In light of our ‘incomplete’ state these efforts only show us over and over again that we really are imperfect, because we cannot live up to the ontological standards created by insisting on separation. Moreover, playing the game of fulfilling the requirements for each ‘rank’ of a teleological measuring stick is simply a way to use our energy and co-creative capacity to create holograms that allow us, not to see how we are being co-creative or how we are capable of
turning our intention into reality, but as a method for becoming constantly and keenly aware of our shortcomings and not-enoughness.

The unbearable existential stress generated through this cycle induces a double-action on ‘Self’ and ‘Other.’ While seeing separation first gives us abundant reason for self-flagellation by giving us the mechanisms for interpreting our existential status as emergent, co-constituted components as imperfection, it also sets us up for seeing difference in the ‘Other’ as reason for domination. Through existential alienation, ontological separation both justifies and demands the drive to compete, judge and dominate through the use of its substitute tool, teleological standards. In addition to being the result of the comparison/contrast activity spurred by not recognizing our intimate connection, the drive to dominate is a particularly effective form of distracting ourselves away from the constant reminders of our own not-enoughness. In any of its forms, this drive to dominate reflects imbalance, an imbalance that starts first at the ontological level, which fuels energetic imbalance in turn and then informs our co-creations on the physical and emotional planes, including conflict, psychological domination and physical violence. The only place where going through this whole cycle takes us is back to more unresolved separation anxiety, which in turn demands yet another cycle of ‘life.’ In this way, the lens begets imbalance, which drives further use of the lens which further drives imbalance, etc.

However, if we stopped insisting on the imagined possibility of becoming categorically complete then we could begin to focus on the ways in which we are relationally complete, and this would help pull us out of the cycle. That is, in contrast to these sick, depressing and sad ‘(onto)logical’ tricks that we constantly play on ourselves (since we are the ones to choose to use this lens), we could just recognize our categorical incompleteness as evidence of interconnectedness and reason for gratitude for all of the co-creative mirrors that constantly
surround us and give us our bearings. This ontological switch would also allow us to celebrate
the fact that we are re-making ourselves in every single emergent kay pacha point through the
generative relation.

Granted once we are able to recognize our part in our co-creations, this implies that if we
want to see something different in terms of the contrasts we see, then it is up to us to integrate
and heal the contrast and to harmonize our relations. It takes courage to acknowledge our
participation in what we are co-creating, and this is perhaps the scariest and most difficult part of
this switch. Nevertheless, the option is to either do this and begin the process of engaging in
ayni or continue to inflict pain on ourselves and others constantly at the epistemic and physical
levels by insisting on the mirage of separation.

Just as the example of the tethered shadow above shows, re-producing this mirage still
has to abide by these cosmic energetic principles. In other words, this particular ontological
preferencing still constantly informs the energy that we are emitting and therefore constantly
informs our co-creations. So as we ontologically isolate ourselves from others and others from
ourselves in each moment, we re-create the sensation of separation, which, in turn, further
justifies the need to have these standards and to use them on others. Because these standards are
also co-creation, they continue to mirror back separation, imbalance or conflict, which constantly
reinforces the cause for anxiety (and on and on goes this spiral). In sum, this is how we
ontologically and ‘really’ shackle ourselves and engender imbalance and violence in the world.

The rampant outcomes of this constantly engaged energetic cycle certainly make it easy
to see why we ‘should’ engage in the study of international relations. We ourselves co-create the
reasons that legitimate this field of study. However, the fact that this field is thoroughly
enmeshed in and responds to the fruit of a time-spacescape wholly built off of the pillars of
ontological separation, efforts to produce knowledge based on the parameters of this time-spacescape will not be able to counteract these addictive cycles of imbalance. In other words, when we say that the goals of IR include decreasing the likelihood of war, increasing peace or fomenting sustainable development, all of which intimate a thrust toward balance, we can now know that these goals through this lens result in a lot of energetic investment without being able to witness ‘progress’ toward these goals.

Nevertheless some methodological efforts within international relations have been directed at focusing on the relational, co-constitutive aspect of international relations. In fact, Jackson (2011) has called the two monistic methodological thrusts within IR “analyticism” and “reflexivity.” These methodological strategies are seen as being radically different from the more mainstream, dualistically contrived, methodological approaches in the field (neopositivism and critical realism). However, these approaches are also incapable of providing an antidote to the problem due to a single but monumental difference between these ‘relational’ approaches and the more robust vision of complete interconnectedness. The former cannot and does not acknowledge the compass as one’s means to accessing the wholly interconnected cosmos that guides one’s efforts toward integration and balance and, without the compass, unevenness is generated and the vicious cycles described above are given life.

My assertion here is that because these more relational methodological approaches emerge out of a time-spacescape whose foundation is based on separation, several of the assumptions they make and the forms of disciplining that they undergo involve a privileging of imbalance over balance by primordially assuming separation. The next chapter is dedicated to reviewing the forms of separation that are taken for granted in the broader Western-style academic time-spacescape and then to showing how the ‘monistic’ approaches of IR respond to
them. Because so many of the naturalized partitions, in addition to the overall purpose of knowledge production, go unquestioned among all methodological approaches in this field, it can be safely argued that in fact the relation is not conjured as a compass and the implications of the *kay pacha* point are not fully grasped. As such imbalance continues to be fostered, and the drive toward categorical completion and the consequences this implies remain firmly in place.
CHAPTER 11

‘NATURALIZED’ PARTITIONS: OUR ONTOLOGICAL INHERITANCE WITHIN THE WESTERN-STYLE ACADEMIC TIME-SPACESCAPE

In the last chapter we saw that insisting on ontological separation led to the assumption of categorical completion/complete-ability, ontological fragmentation, and the rampant use of teleological measuring sticks to replace the loss of the generative, existential compass. That chapter also demonstrated that if the primary thrust of a lens is toward imbalance, then its fruits will also be imbalanced making the possibility of engendering balance always secondary to this primary thrust and therefore ineffective. This chapter in turn explores how these tendencies have given shape to the Western-style academic time-spacescape, its subfield international relations, and the monistic methodological approaches of this field.

The primary goal of this chapter is to substantiate my main assertion that to the degree that any effort within academia abides by certain naturalized partitions that emerge out of the logic of one-in-separation and seeks to ‘produce knowledge’ has, in some way, allowed the ontology of separation to define its working parameters. Any effort that falls within these parameters—no matter how relational or monistic it tries to be—still lends greater re-productive energy to ontological individualism (that is, still gives life to certain assumed categories) and therefore eventually generates the same logical implications. Two tasks will allow me to make this claim. First I must show how Western-style academia and the field of IR are founded on the pillars of ontological separation. Then I need to locate the monistic approaches of IR within this panorama and explain how even they have been forged through and continue to replicate a separation-based lens.

Before addressing specifically how I will go about executing these tasks, it is important to note that because the field of IR is embedded in the wider Western-style academic time-
spacescape, any time I address the wider time-spacescape, I am simultaneously referring to IR as well. Moreover, the lessons gleaned about the truncated monistic approaches of IR are similarly applicable to other monistic strategies employed in other disciplines also situated in the wider time-spacescape. Nevertheless to progressively narrow our focus down to seeing how the truncated monistic approaches of IR still respond to and abide by certain central pillars that derive directly from the ontology of separation, I have broken this chapter into three main sections.

In the first and longest portion of the chapter, I delineate the six most prominent partitions that reflect the fragmenting tendency of one-in-separation within the Western-style academic time-spacescape. At the end of this section I also address the appearance of specialized disciplines in academia as another expression of ontological fragmentation. The field of international relations, to which the second portion of this chapter is dedicated, reflects one of the resulting fractals. There I discuss how we can arrive at such an ‘interdisciplinary’ fractal through ontological separation before reviewing how the six principle partitions are reproduced in this field. Finally, I close my argument by considering how the monistic methodological approaches of IR differentially engage these divided inheritances.

The Partitions of the Western-style Academic Time-spacescape

This first section is dedicated to showing how the fragmenting/compartmentalizing tendency of the ontology of separation has resulted in six primary partitions that conform the ontological architecture of the Western-style academic time-spacescape. The first partition, separation from the divine, is the initial leap of faith of this lens. This initial perceptive preferencing is the maneuver that removes the compass and as such requires the use of teleological measuring sticks to replace its function. As a result, the other five naturalized
partitions also constitute ‘centrisms,’ which means that the categories on either side of the partition are conceived through a teleological framework whereby one category is favored over the excluded other. The five principle ‘centrisms’ within the Western-style academic time-spacescape include anthropocentrism, logocentrism, egocentrism, androcentrism, and ethnocentrism. These centrisms can be concentric and can overlap in certain ways as we will see throughout this chapter.

Historically the Western-style academic time-spacescape arose in response to the pressing perceived needs generated through ontological separation. When humans choose to see themselves as separate from the whole and to face gnawing existential uncertainty, being concerned about the plight of human beings and their survival is considered a ‘natural’ response. This ‘condition’ coupled with the human capacity to ‘reason’ (logocentrism) justified the emergence of a practice and then an institution dedicated to generating knowledge about that uncertain reality. Integral to this practice was the observation that human language distinguished the human race from all other beings and things in the universe (anthropocentrism and logocentrism). Another critical factor in the establishment of academic practice was the atomized individual human unit (egocentrism) afforded by applying the fragmenting tendency of ontological separation to human beings.

When this ability to aggregate and disaggregate individual units was coupled with the drive to categorize and rank, the last two partitions of androcentrism and ethnocentrism emerged. Dividing the human race categorically by sex and privileging men can only be garnered through

---

183 I owe the initial inspiration of ethnocentrism, anthropocentrism and androcentrism to Josef Estermann’s (2009) “Andean Philosophy as a Questioning Alterity: An Intercultural Criticism of Western Andro- and Ethnocentrism.” While he does not discuss the time-spacescape in the same way that I conceive of it, his work pointed my attention in the direction of identifying the partitions enumerated here and examining both how they shape the resources afforded to us within a time-spacescape that assumes these partitions and what this means for knowledge production. These partitions are also totally naturalized in the wider Western-style time-spacescape. One can look to the Judeo-Christian creation story for a very clear rendition of how these divisions have given shape to society in this tradition.
ontological separation as can separating humans into categorical ethnic groups and deeming one way of life as superior to the others. Even though these last two centrisms have not been as conspicuously involved in shaping the academic enterprise, they still inform its constitution in subtle and important ways. This overall ‘anatomy’ of the Western-style academic time-spacescape will allow us to see how it has been reproduced in the field of IR and created the ‘architecture’ to which monistic methodological strategies must respond to remain part of the same time-spacescape.

Separation from the Divine

What has been perceived to be humans’ necessarily limited or ‘incomplete’ state has encouraged two predominant and irreconcilable leaps of faith. In Part II we saw how this condition elicited the assumption of complete interconnectedness. Another response has been to assume that our incomplete state is indicative of a fundamental existential separation from the cosmos. Because these leaps of faith constitute the primordial assumption of each respective lens, any other fruit borne through either lens already bears the mark of the given leap of faith.

As we have seen, assuming separation generates an emphasis on the categorical, encourages the use of a teleological framework to replace the missing compass, and engenders an existential uncertainty that disconcerts us to our core. In this ontologically afforded scenario, we humans have generated two compartments for responding to this anxiety. First, the ‘spiritual’ realm has been in charge of explaining existence and our purpose in life without being required to substantiate claims beyond that which resonates among those participating in this sphere.

---

184 Again there may be more approaches of which I have yet to become aware.

185 In this particular ontologically afforded time-spacescape, monotheism has been the most ‘logical’ way of engaging the mystical, since uneven unitarism gives the impression of a single path to a single categorical unit.
Then, the compartment of ‘academia’ or ‘science,’ has been tagged with the task of producing knowledge in a more reliable fashion.

Latour (1993) distinguishes this approach of separating spheres as the ‘modernist project,’ and explains how “the crossed-out God” resulting from these divisions was critical for allowing for the emergence of science and reason. In this case, God has been conceived as being ‘externally’ out of ‘verifiable’ reach and as dwelling ‘internally’ in the hearts of humans. Now extracted out of the empirical world that allows itself to be objectively studied, the crossed-out God’s “position became literally ideal.” By being “bracketed twice over, once in metaphysics and again in spirituality,” Latour (1993) explains, “He would no longer interfere in any way with the development of the moderns, but He remained effective and helpful within the spirit of humans alone” (34). This is how we get to the dualist donut:

![Figure 9. The dualist ‘donut.’](image)

The lens of separation afforded the ability to extract Him from the ‘empirical’ realm “while leaving Him presentable and usable nevertheless” (32-3). That is, people could call on “Him at will in the privacy of their own hearts” (34). As a result of this maneuver, “spirituality was reinvented.” Latour continues:

---

186 In his work Latour contrasts the “modernist project” with a “non-modern” society. This semantic choice of “modern” and “non-modern,” focuses on the presence/absence of teleological assumptions regarding modernity in society. While the presence or absence of teleological measuring sticks definitely distinguishes between a lens of separation and one of complete interconnectedness, the use of “modern” and “non-modern” is a bit misleading since the ontology of complete interconnectedness can and is still being readily applied today and since we have a clear account of the use of ontological separation in the Old Testament of the Bible written roughly 3500 years ago. For such a narrative to emerge at that point, though, the (onto)logical resources must have already been well established. I am supposing that this timeframe precedes that which is generally perceived to be ‘modern.’
The all-powerful God could descend into men’s heart of hearts without intervening in any way in their external affairs. A wholly individual and wholly spiritual religion made it possible to criticize both the ascendancy of science and that of society, without needing to bring God into either (Weber 1992 qtd. in Latour 1993, 33). In this sense, the Judeo-Christian tradition becomes the perfectly “modern” religion by being doubly dualist: While the divine may be ‘way out there,’ it is still accessible ‘way inside,’ and in neither case does it interfere with the objective strivings of science. In this way the “moderns” could “be both secular and pious at the same time” (Weber 1992 qtd. in Latour 1993, 33).

Here we can see how the separate purposes of each compartment respond to separation anxiety in complementary fashion. Religion, as a “wholly individual” and “wholly spiritual” sector, could contribute to quelling this angst on an ‘internal’ plane by providing answers and spiritual support about those aspects of reality that were either beyond the reach of the empirical secular realm or had yet to be ‘discovered’ and ‘analyzed’ through ‘science.’ Nevertheless, because the divine has been conceptualized as being externally out of reach, it has remained a space of ‘unverifiable beliefs’ and so therefore has not been considered a reliable source against the existential uncertainty created through losing the compass. ‘Science’ then was seen as the means for producing knowledge in an ‘objective’ and ‘verifiable’ fashion about that uncertain reality. These two compartments and the division they represent still have a stronghold on the social imaginary today.

The points made up to this point in the dissertation however allow us to understand how that initial thrust toward fragmentation generates a reduced picture of the cosmos and our place in it and as such continues to create the conditions for sensing existential anxiety. This anxiety
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187 This account of what happens to the divine is similar to Watts’ description and critique of Christianity in both Nature, Man and Woman and The Two Hands of God.

188 We can only conceive of a “wholly spiritual religion” when we can imagine there to be a realm solely dedicated to religion. This is only possible by compartmentalizing reality. The “wholly individualized” aspect of religion also arises through the same process of segmentation, whereby autonomous and separate individuals are conceived to have an essential interior in which these religious tendencies, practices, beliefs etc. can be experienced.
along with this reduced view in turn further encourage and justify using this particular lens and its corresponding tools for engaging reality. Consequently, in the ‘religion’ compartment, an ‘absent’ God and His corresponding religion cannot give definitive answers about why we are here, what for and how we should behave. Likewise a science based on a teleological thrust toward categorical completion will always—due to the incomplete nature of the humans engaging in this enterprise—come up short of the ideal and will not ever be able to provide ‘definitive’ answers about an ‘uncertain’ reality. So in short, when a time-spacescape is constituted at the most basic level on the notion that a mystical realm exists outside of the realm where rational (verifiable) knowledge may be produced, activities in both compartments will just continue to feed the vicious cycle because, by acting according to their compartmentalized parameters, they reinforce the perception of separation.

While the partition is rather drastically guarded today, this divorce did not occur overnight. In fact, in the wake of the Thirty Years War and through the Enlightenment period, philosophical texts such as those of Descartes (2000) and Locke (2009) were still full of links to the divine. While they were in the process of formalizing these separations back then, today the language of academia has been effectively ‘sterilized,’ and the general prohibition of alluding to the ‘mystical’ or sacred (except in theology departments) is indicative of how strongly this partition has been erected. In fact, today in academia we often hear of the definitive distinction made between (humanly understandable) worldly things and (not humanly understandable) other-worldly things.

---

189 It is interesting to note here that what we commonly call ‘Cartesian anxiety’ has actually been extant since the sphere of complete interconnectedness was reduced to that shaped through ‘one-in-separation.’ Nevertheless, by being the one to articulate the clearest scientific ‘antidote’ to it in his era, it makes sense that this anxiety be most attributed to him.
Overall this section identified and described the primordial leap of faith that characterizes the Western-style time-spacescape. Separation from the divine was a critical initial maneuver that afforded the emergence of two separate, yet complementary ‘compartments’ with distinct tasks for engaging the uncertainty attributed to reality. Despite their seemingly divergent purposes, both compartments have historically reflected parallel ontological architecture whereby God and Truth sit beyond the threshold of our incomplete state.

However, they are not the only categories inhabiting that *au-delà* when using this lens. Absolutely everything and everyone have part of their assumed-to-be-complete whole sitting outside our ‘incomplete’ reach. Such is the case for every category implied in the centrisms developed below. Moreover, as categorical fruits of this initial pre-supposition of separation, they are also expressed in teleological terms thereby responding to the need to gauge progress toward ‘categorical completion.’ Consequently each sub-section below defines the division in question, explains how it is teleological, and discusses what it does in and for academia.

Anthropocentrism is the first centrism to be covered after the initial leap of faith of separation, because it is perhaps the most ‘obvious’ level for ‘naturalized’ separation between humans and flora and fauna to occur. Also, since humans are the ones perceiving this separation, they are also the ones to picture themselves as sitting at the top of the imagined teleological trajectory in relation to other beings and phenomena in the world.

**Anthropocentrism**

Anthropocentrism involves distinguishing and privileging the human race over all other beings in nature. In light of the ‘absent God’ reviewed in the last section we may see the ontological progression moving as follows:
Starting with the dualistically conceived donut covered in the last section (Graph A in Figure 10), humans and nature both fall within the empirical secular realm. Graph B depicts the next step of ontological fragmentation that divides these two categories. In this case, the difference between humans and the ‘natural world’ seems to be ‘clear as day,’ but that is because we are solely focusing on the material in exclusion to the space in which it is suspended.

The move to Graph C portrays the convenient removal of the “crossed-out God” from consideration in the empirical secular realm. Since its effects are ‘unknowable’ to ‘incomplete’ humans, God cannot figure in efforts to produce knowledge about the empirical realm. In effect, this absence facilitates an easy slip into a subject-object dichotomy between humans and nature and forces the use of a teleological framework, such that the categorical subject-object divide facilitates determining who lands at the top of the teleological measuring stick (shown in Graph D). More than the possibility of one human dominating a mountain or the ocean (even though we see these expressions in mountain climbing or deep-sea diving), this subject-object divide is more related to presumptions about the ‘knower’ and the ‘known.’ This position has translated into the cultural tendency to treat humans as the most important life form on planet Earth or see humans as dominant over nature.190

---

190 See Linder (1956), Adler (2002), Kluckhohn and Strodbeck (1961) for discussions on this cultural understanding of humans’ relation to nature.
This orientation is reflected clearly in the common expressions of ‘environmental conservation’ or ‘environmental resource management’ in academia as well as in non-profit and governmental practices today. Even “the language of culture,” according to Inayatullah and Blaney (2004), “leads us to sustain a strong (but not absolute) contrast between human artifice and the fixities and givens of nature” (16). I would add, though, that while the contrast may not be absolute, over time it has become so strong that it does not allow us to acknowledge the contribution of the ‘Other’ in a fuller sense of the term.

Furthermore, we can witness just how far back this centrism goes through the Judeo-Christian creation story. In this story humans are separated from the flora and fauna of the Earth through God’s instructions about how to live in the ‘garden of paradise.’ First He states, “let [man] have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth” (Genesis 1:26). Then after a blessing, He asserts, “Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth” (Genesis 1:28). Besides the obvious fact that, even if this is the inspired word of God, it is still a text written by humans for humans, these instructions clearly establish a mandated chain of command and leave no space for treating all Beings that inhabit the Earth in equivalent fashion as seen from the Andean perspective based on complete interconnectedness in Part II.

This subject-object divide has also strongly contributed to the construction of the natural and social sciences. In both cases the teleological assumption of the superiority of the knower over the known remains consistent among those who fully embrace the ontology of separation. For example, the assertion that humans have the faculties (language and reason) for studying

---

these phenomena and even for generating strategies to mitigate the issues that we help create expresses clearly the anthropocentric attitude underlying the Western-style academic time-spacescape.

Perceived separation from and assumed superiority over non-humans encourages non-acknowledgment, which precludes altogether the ability to conceive of the need to engage in *ayni* by responding to a more robust ‘Other’ in the wider conversation. In this way, anthropocentrism leads to dishonoring the broader notion of ‘Other.’ Solely communicating among humans in human language about supposedly human-regarding phenomena continues to first re-emphasize the importance of human-to-human communication to the exclusion of human-whole communication and second reinforce the belief that due to our condition of separation we can only legitimately know that which is generated through separation. This doubly anthropocentric trap is how we get to such drastic forms of reductionism as reviewed in the chapter on *ayllu* and is why I made such an effort to clarify the implications of complete interconnectedness and its emphasis on energetic communication, *ayni* and the wider conversation in Part II.

Latour (1993) has similarly attempted to open discursive and conceptual space for a more robust concept of the ‘social’ dimension. In *We Have Never Been Modern*, he suggests that we use the term “collective” to describe “the association of humans and nonhumans” and “society” to designate “one part only of our collectives, the divide invented by the social sciences” (4). Whether “collective” or the ‘robust form of *ayllu,*’ these broader notions allow us to emphasize the wholly interconnected nature of the cosmos and everything in it as well as to contemplate the possibility of communicating with all Beings.
In short, anthropocentrism is the teleological thrust that justifies engaging in the human study of everything. In addition to formalizing the division between humans and all else, this bias upholds studying and speaking for the ‘Other’ in both the natural and social sciences. This position of entitlement is not surprising given the inability to engage in the wider conversation fostered through this lens.

**Egocentrism**

Egocentrism, or the privileging of the ego as a unique, separate, and separable individual, is the effect of applying ontological individualism to humans. This circle encapsulating a single human being makes the traditional conception of the individual possible, but more accurately egocentrism involves conceiving of oneself and all others as ontologically autonomous categories or units. In a different sense, egocentrism can also take place within the individual. Here different aspects of the person, such as mind/body and id/ego/superego, are conceived of as separate and separable. Just like for all centrisms, the part justifying both cases is that the individual, category or unit is ontologically privileged over the relation.

This tendency can be observed in the wider Western-style time-spacescape in the cultural value of rugged individualism or in the Judeo-Christian creation story when the first two ‘individual’ humans are designated as separate and described as having even materially different origins. In the realm of academia, any methodological strategy in the social sciences that fully embraces the ontology of separation like falsificationism is also egocentric. The assumption here
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192 The Bible states that Adam came from dust and divine breath (Genesis 2:7) and that Eve came from Adam’s rib (Genesis 2:21-22). For many interpretations this means that they are of the same ilk. Others argue that having the one derive from the other’s rib makes them perfect complements. That one derives directly from God through his divine breath and the other from a secondary source, albeit one of God’s products, still underlines a difference. If God proved himself capable of creating with just dust and divine breath in the first place, then why did He not simply repeat the process so that they would be in essence of the same material origin? The general result of this maneuver in the Bible is to conceive of an essential difference between humans and even between the sexes (covered under Androcentrism below) and as such compare them according to teleological standards.
is that each actor is ontologically independent and so therefore can be aggregated and disaggregated to a given sample or pool with ease. Barry (1970) has called this an economic, as opposed to sociological, approach to knowledge generation (Barry 1970 qtd. in Jackson 2002, 439-440). In addition, all expressions of rational choice theory in IR, ranging from public opinion polls to rational-choice-based institutional analyses, rely heavily on this bias.

By foregrounding a basic, individual unit, egocentrism is foundational to scientific methods based on separation. Furthermore, insisting on the ontological possibility of the individual unit reinforces a sensation of separation at the most basically conceived ‘whole’ level (as a person, as a ‘self’), and this sensation further contributes to our participation in the vicious cycle spurred by the lens of separation reviewed in Chapter 10.

Logocentrism

The next partition, logocentrism, is an ‘internal’ division of the egocentric unit; I define it graphically here:

Figure 11. Logocentrism superimposed over the time-space system on the human body. Source: Adapted from Javier Lajo, Qhapaq Ñan: La ruta Inka de la sabiduría, (Quito: Abya-Yala, 2003), 158.

In this case the holistic Andean system for sensing and processing information has been divided with a line right above the shoulders. Here the ‘head,’ sitting on top, is teleologically privileged

Although Derrida is most well known for his work on logocentrism in philosophy, this argument does not follow his development of the concept.
and represents both human language and reason. “Logocentrism” encompasses the preferring of both aspects through the similarly signified breadth in its Greek root logos meaning "word, speech, discourse” and also "reason." 

For those fully embracing the ontology of separation, these two particular features of human beings constitute critical justifications for anthropocentrism beyond just the visibly physical differences. That other living beings do not share such a ‘complex’ or ‘developed’ language as humans reinforces the categorical distinction of human race. Then humans’ ability to ‘reason’ in contrast to the beasts, creatures or plants justifies their teleologically superior position.

This particular conceptualization of human communication and reason has had a strong influence on how we perceive the world and process received information. For instance, the focus on human language implies that any other means of communicating is downplayed, ignored and eventually denied. Then the only prioritized form of processing what we sense is the linear logic discussed in Chapter 10. This approach was contemplated as the most adequate strategy in light of the consequences of unchecked invisible beliefs experienced through the Dark Ages and the Thirty Years War. In this case, treating reason as a separate and separable process facilitated establishing a continuum from subjective to objective, whereby objective knowledge produced through reason would be ‘more solid’ than subjective emotions or beliefs.

---


195 While a science has been generated of non-verbal communication, this usually goes hand-in-hand with the overall human-centered conversation. Mehrabian (1998), for example, makes some extremely useful observations about the role of non-verbal communication in inter-human communication. Even Hall (1977) reviews in detail many studies on ‘proxemics’ and ‘synchrony’ from the 1960s that demonstrate how long the non-verbal dimension has been a central concern to human-based communication (71-84). Nevertheless, the ‘object of focus’ is still on inter-human proxemics and synchrony.
However, this dichotomy and the strategy itself are products of reductionism, just like the violence of the Dark Ages and the Thirty Years War and the constant concern about existential uncertainty. Instead of seeing both reason and emotions as participating in an inextricable parity-based relation that is integrated and harmonized through one’s daily activities or doings, here the very fear generated through separation is directed at the ‘intangible’ nature of emotions, but that is to deny and misunderstand their integral role in engaging reality. Once severed into an ‘either/or’ situation instead of a ‘both/and’ one, we are left treating reason as the superior faculty and completely unable to imagine how these two faculties could work together in an integrative fashion.

This approach, in conjunction with the linear time characteristic of a separation-based time-spacescape, is re-produced through several dimensions in the Western-style academic time-spacescape. In addition to equating ‘verifiable’ science to only one portion of our being for processing information, logos is also privileged through the necessity to write things down as part of our efforts to ‘preserve’ the ‘growing body of knowledge’ as if the written word, despite its reductionist nature, could capture those past moments. In this conceptualization the past must be saved for use as resources for an uncertain future and the present then becomes the means for engaging in this project.¹⁹⁶ Then a whole set of criteria exists about the linearly ‘logical’ way in which that written ‘word’ must be presented and the content that the words may address in order to be treated as ‘academic.’ Moreover, the methodological strategies deemed acceptable for any research project must also adhere to logocentric standards of how that information will be...

¹⁹⁶ Here we can see once again how the linear notion of time encourages being out of one’s kay pacha point and denies the role of the compass. The effect of this on imbalance cannot be emphasized enough.
sensed, recorded, analyzed and presented. In fact, not responding to these expectations in a research proposal can easily cost one either financial support or institutional approval.  

Holding on to this centrism in the academic time-spacescape engenders two critical consequences. The first consequence emerges through the encounter of logocentric, anthropocentric and egocentric tendencies. In this case our tethered relation to the ‘Other’ and the co-creative, generative nature of the relation are denied through the insistence on one’s ontologically isolated status. However, as stated in the discussion of *ayni*, just because we do not acknowledge the generative relation does not signify that we are not still constantly communicating in the wider conversation. In fact, we are constantly throwing our energy or intentions out there, and, because the relation is still generative, this means that we are still co-creating in every moment. In this scenario the cosmic principle holds even while humans deny it through ontological separation. So this raises the question of how those denying primordial interconnection perceive, understand and then theorize that which they are co-creating through a lens of separation.

Generally in the wider Western-style time-spacescape, we express our co-creative capacity by first visualizing our end goal conceived for some future hypothetical moment and then working toward it in linear fashion. In a context generated through ontological separation, reaching a goal or having things work out the way we hope is often attributed to ‘hard work’ in spite of any obstacles we may face. Nevertheless, this ability to achieve goals may

197 Regarding this topic Hall (1977) makes a very interesting argument about the differences between the Apollonian and Dionysian approaches to research based on Szent-Györgyi’s (1972) very brief article on the topic. Hall’s description of the Dionysian approach complements many of the principles learned in Part II including the comprehensive approach to sensing (123-126). However, because this approach does not make promises that respond to the drive to categorical completion and the linear logic of the Western-style academic time-spacescape, this approach is often rejected.

198 We also equally co-create that which we fear the most by exerting a lot of energy to avoid it.
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make us see ourselves as the authors of our lives. We may even thank other humans if they give us a hand, and we can feel genuinely grateful for being so ‘lucky’ or for being aided in mystical unknown ways by a supreme being to have things work out as they did.

We see this concept illustrated beautifully in ‘Manifest Destiny,’ which has shaped the culture of the United States in indelible ways. In academia, however, addressing God or luck has been removed from the discursive set of possibilities. This situation has led to the shaven-down concepts of *homo economicus* and the rational actor model. In this case the atomistic rational individual ‘creates’ or ‘manifests’ in ontological isolation with his ‘self interests’ in mind (which may still be other-regarding). In fact, the results of the co-creative, generative relation is how we can arrive at the very ‘self’-directed assumptions in approaches like rational choice institutionalism, whereby institutions emerge simply because humans decide that they are needed.\(^{199}\) Whether generally or in academia, in neither case do we have to consider, be grateful for or respond to the nurturing of the more robust ‘Other’ that sits right before our nose. In neither case are our energetic ties to the more robust ‘Others’ recognized as co-creative or generative.

In the opposite scenario, when things do not go as we hope, it becomes very easy in a context of shared ontological separation to blame the ‘unattached’ circumstances or ‘Others’ involved in the process. In academia these circumstances become reason for falsifying a hypothesis or for adjusting our models to include a different or additional factor. Here again our relationship to what we are observing is not regularly contemplated.

The second consequence is also linked to the necessarily anthropocentric thrust of logocentrism. Denying the compass, as we have seen, necessarily feeds the drive to dominate.

\(^{199}\) From the perspective of historical institutionalism, Thelen (1999) has observed all of the political-economic and materialist factors affecting how institutions emerge, thereby putting into question the simplistic understanding promoted by the rational choice institutionalists.
Specifically regarding logocentrism, Estermann (2009) has noted this effect while commenting on the evidence of this bias in Hegel’s work:

The most eloquent and radical expression of this pan-logic attitude is Hegel’s conviction that ‘all real is intelligible and all the intelligible is real,’ a logo-centric totality that doesn’t leave space for non-rational modes to approaching reality, and that reveals itself in the political and military fields as violent and conquering (145, FTNT 47).

The “pan-logic attitude” that Estermann mentions is the linear version of logic addressed by Hall in Chapter 10. While Hall was drawing attention to the fact that the logic assumed in the Western-style time-spacescape is not the only kind of logic that exists by distinguishing between linear and comprehensive logics, here Estermann is much more intent on making a connection between this singular, linear logic and violence. In this way his observation is consonant with my point in Chapter 10 about how the ontology of separation first beckons the use of the teleological measuring stick through the epistemic violence of reductionism and then drives domination as a consequence of the epistemological demand of categorical completion in the face of being existentially ‘incomplete.’

I would like to add that logocentrism does not only affect human relations. This bias also places all that which is not human in a place of submission relative to them. In this case, knowledge is produced in which humans ‘speak for’ the other beings, even though ironically this ontological lens precludes them from having the faculties to actually hear what the ‘Others’ are saying. Again this point re-emphasizes how viewing our ties to the robustly defined ‘Other’ in an equally relational manner can only be obtained through those forms of communication/knowing denied by this lens. Overall, then, the ‘Others’ and the constant co-

---

200 I do take issue however with Estermann’s use of “non-rational.” In choosing this term, he insinuates that ‘reason’ plays no part in alternative methods of sensing and processing information. This is incorrect. As we saw in Part II, reason also plays an integral role in the process but it is only useful for the purpose of harmonizing when it is employed in proportion to the other two centers. For this reason I use ‘more robust’ to indicate all three centers or ‘alternative’ and not ‘non-rational.’
creative nurturing they provide through this lens are at best not acknowledged as tethered to oneself, not listened to, do not receive our thanks, and at worst become the ‘object’ of blame, punishment or violence.

Briefly then logocentrism involves the privileging of both human language and reason. Human language reinforces the perception of separation between humans and the rest of the world, and reason supposedly justifies the assumption of superiority over all that falls outside the anthropocentric realm. Its repercussions include the denial and eventual atrophy of other faculties that could be used to sense and process information about the world and a general denial of the compass and generative relation, which further drives using a teleological framework and ‘naturalizes’ the categorical possibility of generating ‘knowledge.’ In addition to generally reinforcing a sense of ontological isolation, logocentrism also contributes to the non-acknowledgment and domination of the ‘Other.’

Androcentrism

In all of the separation-based time-spacescapes discussed herein androcentrism operates on two levels. I refer to these distinct androcentric instances in terms of the ‘timing’ of their epistemological appearance to discern them more clearly. The more ‘recent’ version of androcentrism is the one with which most people are familiar and at which most choose to launch their battles. This version privileges the male sex over the female sex, and these are conceived to be separate and ontologically autonomous categories. For this reason, I call this strain “categorical androcentrism.” Just like any other a priori category, this categorical focus on biological sex results from the initial insistence on separation, and this maneuver constitutes the epistemologically ‘earlier’ version of androcentrism. That is, favoring the masculine energetic principle by insisting on separation is the very shift that bears this categorical fruit,
because it subsumes the relation and denies the primordial integrative thrust of the feminine energetic principle. In this sense, “ontological androcentrism” is central to any time-spacescape based on the ontology of separation, because it is synonymous with it.

Since this section illustrates so clearly many of the concerns I have about truncated monistic approaches within IR and the Western-style academic time-spacescape in general, I develop it more fully than the other partitions. I first explain the basis for making this distinction between epistemological ‘moments’ before further elaborating on each androcentric maneuver. Then in the second half I explain how Western-style feminism—because it argues and interacts with categorical androcentrism but assumes and utilizes ontological androcentrism—in the end is counterproductive because it generates an androcentric response to the ‘plight of women.’ Nevertheless the tactics that androcentric feminists engage provide extremely insightful lessons for seeing the risks involved in embracing truncated forms of monism within the Western-style academic time-spacescape in general and in IR more specifically.

The ‘Progression’ of Ontological Slippage

To explain most clearly the differences between categorical and ontological androcentrism I recall again the ‘progression’ developed in Chapter 10 to show how a teleological framework comes on the scene once separation is established and affords the drive to compete, judge and dominate. While this same progression generates the circumstances for the emergence of all five centrisms covered in this chapter, here I specifically recall it to address the two phases that constitute the two expressions of androcentrism:
Andean juk-based relation

Assuming separation engenders autonomous categories

No compass requires applying a teleological framework to categories

Figure 12. The ‘progression’ of ontological slippage.

These graphs in Figure 12 depicting the ‘progression of ontological slippage’ illustrate the changes in how we conceptualize the configuration of the relation and its components when we move from assuming complete interconnectedness to assuming separation. A time-spacescape based on complete interconnectedness starts and stays in the first graph; this is the basis of its constitution. I treat it as the primordial scenario due to Bhabha’s, Nietzsche’s and many others’ observation that even after continuous efforts to root out evil (or any other category falling at the lower end of the teleological spectrum), the ‘Other’ never disappears because it is integral to the existence of its opposite. For this reason I see complete interconnectedness as the more robust realm that is reduced when a lens of separation is applied to that realm.

Graph (2) is the point of departure for a separation-based time-spacescape, since it is the result of the initial slip of privileging separation over relation. This is the ‘earlier’ version of androcentrism that I call ‘ontological androcentrism.’ Yet once the initial step from Graph (1) to (2) is made, the step from Graph (2) to (3) is immediately required. Since the first step of seeing separation as primordial reduces the field and wipes out the compass, the second step of employing teleological measuring sticks to understand, compare and exalt one category over

---

201 As mentioned in a footnote under “Separation from the Divine,” the step from Graph 1 to Graph 2 is ancient. In fact, the Judeo-Christian book of Genesis speaks of a time well before the arrival of Christ that clearly relies on a mythological rendition of creation based wholly on the ontology of separation.
another, or subjugate a category under another, becomes essential. Accordingly the first step affords the emergence of all of the partitions discussed herein, and the second step, hinging on the first, naturalizes the drive to teleologically assert one category over another (as witnessed in categorical androcentrism, anthropocentrism, logocentrism, egocentrism and ethnocentrism).

So in the case of categorical androcentrism, the ‘competing’ categories are the allegedly autonomous and clearly defined male and female sexes. Both ‘sexes’ in this case are ontologically similar in that they are considered to be existentially autonomous. At the same time, since the two categories are conceptually opposite one another, they are treated as having different ‘essences.’ These two qualities are already assumed in Graph (2).

This notion stands in contrast to the parity-based relation between men and women that is actually more about the relation between the masculine and feminine energetic principles described in Chapter 4. There (shown in Graph (1)) the tethered relation and the need to foment balance are absolutely critical. Here, the lens of separation mistakes the energetic principles with the body in which they are seen as being housed and treats each sex as a ‘separate’ (complete) category. Making them existentially independent from one another allows one to ontologically deal with one sex at a time. Furthermore, by eradicating the compass, this lens leads to their being thrown onto a teleological trajectory and pitted against one another. In this case, the dominant sex has been deemed to be the male, and the female has been relegated to the category.

202 Both movements are always implied in either action. Shohat and Stam (1994) recognize this in terms of racism. “Racism,” they write, “invokes a double movement of aggression and narcissism, the insult to the accused is doubled by a compliment to the accuser” (19).

203 Despite documented biological “irregularities” to this rule, any language-game that is limited to just a male and female pronoun (like English and Spanish) reinforces this naturalized notion of categorical sexes. When a being falls outside of this dichotomy ‘it’ is immediately labeled ‘abnormal’ and is often forced to assume one gender role over the other.
that sits on the lower half of this dualistically contrived set of categorical opposites (Graph (3)).

This generates a very different scenario than that produced in Graph (1), where all beings are conceived through their relation. In Graph (1) no being can be an existentially autonomous category. Instead energy flows between each component and animates all with life. Rather than seeing a man and woman as his or her body and as a separate entity, they constitute a complementary parity-based relation between energetic principles, whereby each component ‘contrasts’ or ‘mirrors’ to the Other and ‘mindfully’ engages that which is being mirrored by the Other for growth, integration, healing and balance. Moreover, it is understood that all living beings house both energetic principles to varying degrees and that in the end one’s ‘job’ in one’s own kay pacha point is to figure out how to harmonize one’s ‘own’ respective mix of energetic principles. To this end one energetically ‘attracts’ scenarios and relations with others of complementary profiles to generate the contrasts needed to identify how to harmonize one’s imbalances. In any case, the level of fluidity and permeability involved in this conceptualization of relations between any set of live beings is extremely difficult to conceive and express well through a lens that is highly categorical.

The parity-based approach is the result of honoring the feminine energetic principle first. In this scenario both energetic impulses are integral to the constitution of both beings, so neither is excluded. In contrast insisting on separation first through ontological androcentrism is to privilege the masculine energetic principle, which translates into the categorically androcentric divide between men and women among many other categories. In this scenario the other

---

204 This in fact would reflect how Adam and Eve came to be conceived as essentially different beings representing different degrees of separation from the Single Creator Unit in the Judeo-Christian creation story that would indicate a closer or more distant relationship from the divine unit. For more on this argument see Lajo (2003).
principle must be denied, eradicated, subsumed or blotted out, as seen in Nietzsche’s Yes-saying world.

This contrast between initial assumptions raises the question of how ontological androcentrism constitutes a centrism while starting with the feminine principle does not. This answer requires understanding the progression of ontological slippage and its implications covered above as well as how the feminine principle figures within that progression. Before reviewing it though we should start by examining expressions of the masculine energetic principle.

Besides the descriptions and graphic interpretations provided in Chapter 4, Estermann (2009) eloquently describes this energetic principle and one of its most critical consequences when used in isolated form:

The famous Roman adage ‘divide and conquer/rule’ is maybe the most clear and politically most consequential expression of the androcentric urge to conceive…reality, the world and history, and even the divine, and convert them in ‘concept.’ The masculine analytical spirit (análisis literally means ‘to unmake,’ ‘to cut in pieces’) is anatomical..., dissectional, mechanical, instrumental, destructive. In order to analyze life (a plant, an animal, a human being), we have to cut it in pieces – dissect it – and separate the parts that are organically inseparable, with the consequence of destroying the same life. Every synthesis based on the result of a real analysis will prove to be artificial and robotic (139).

In general then favoring the masculine energetic principle first is to privilege separation over connection, privilege analytical or abstractive thought over holistic, integrative sensing and processing, divisions and the categorical over relations and the componential, and linear over cyclical. This energetic thrust translates ontologically into a favoring of one-in-separation over two-in-one-relation.

205 While this last point may appear over-determined or too definitive for most in academia, seeing how it is the case becomes much easier once one (re-)learns to communicate in the wider conversation.
It is very possible that the very first time separation was established the maneuver had no teleological ‘taste’ to it. However, the very moment this maneuver was made, the second step from (2) to (3) was immediately required, and this is the step that sparks the vicious cycle described in Chapter 10. Since whole time-spacescapes are based on favoring the masculine principle first, then it is safe to say that those participating in those time-spacescapes are already deeply enmeshed in this cycle that forces the teleological framework no matter when the very ‘first’ slip occurred.

Starting with the masculine energetic principle spurs several consequences in addition to Estermann’s observations above. First, the Yes-saying scenario generated through the teleological framework translates into the drive to eradicate the feminine principle and its fruits. This is the ultimate part of the teleological process of boxing everything into hierarchies and asserting a dominant position. This push to deny the feminine energetic principle creates an imbalanced situation in which the masculine is the only principle to which attention is paid.

Estermann (2009) confirms this point:

It seems to me that the urge to separate and purify analytically the different aspects of reality is a typical male characteristic. I (as a man) practice it as well in this very work. And it is not bad in itself, but when this androcentric model of conceiving and managing the world is converted in the only possible approach, in the universally valid paradigm, [in the only] true road to salvation, it makes one neurotic and devastating (139). 206

This generated end-state is quite similar to the paradox of culture described by Hall in Chapter 10, which again reflects overemphasis on ontological androcentrism.

206 The fact that these observations (Hall’s paradox of culture and Estermann’s concern about ontological androcentrism) have been made by two men just goes to show how members of each sex are able to play off of or engage with both energetic principles. One does not have to be a woman to appreciate or apply the feminine energetic principle or a man to engage in activities that reflect the masculine energetic principle.
In addition to neurotic, this approach is necessarily reductionist. This is clearly seen in the progression from complete interconnectedness to uneven unitarism. In a sense more consistent with Hall’s paradox of culture, Estermann discusses this consequence of reductionism:

Andean philosophy questions the ‘classificatory mania’ of the West, that is to say the urge to put all phenomena and realities in conceptual drawers. … The ‘classificatory mania’ necessarily reduces the riches of life to a number of concepts and leads to a forced domestication or even annihilation of what cannot be classified with preconceived parameters (145).

In fact, one easy way to see how this compartmentalization reduces what we can know about the world is this very point about ‘gendered’ energetic principles.

Why is the idea that ‘gendered’ energetic principles as constitutive of all that is infused with energy such a foreign concept in a separation-based time-spacescape? The reductionism involved in ontological androcentrism forces categorical uneven unitarism, and this makes it impossible to see how this parity-based relation interacts to generate the dynamism of life. By losing this focus on complementary opposites, we cannot see either how abstraction, separation or the electric would reflect the masculine energetic principle or how the feminine is reflected in integration or the magnetic. So in the case of international relations, when the shared time-spacescape starts with a reductionist lens and when, as the saying goes, you cannot know what you do not know, then it is difficult to see how that lens is more limited than necessary and is not going to get us to a place of knowing that will help mitigate the issues that IR intends to resolve. Perhaps even more importantly the reductionist lens used within the Western-style time-spacescape makes it almost impossible to see how assuming separation or complete interconnection is a choice and that it is a choice about which ‘gendered’ energetic principle is employed in the first instance of ontological perception.

When one chooses to start with the feminine principle or the integrative thrust first, this choice does not constitute a centrism because the focus is on the relation. Emphasis then is
placed on the dynamic balance of the relation and the proportionalization of its components, which are engaged through the compass, through *ayni*. Because this lens allows us to acknowledge and use the compass, we do not need teleological measuring sticks and so no centrism results.

Part II illustrates what it means to start with this principle first in the particular case of Andean philosophy. Even Estermann (2009) argues that Andean thinking is “gynosophical” and clarifies that this term applies when “we identify the ability to synthesize, to establish relations and bindings, to mediate and to unite as something typically feminine” (140). In this case it is a bit difficult for him to clarify that he is addressing expressions of the feminine energetic principle because he does not distinguish between the categorical and ontological expressions of these energetic thrusts. Nevertheless, he explicates, “I am not referring to ‘pachamamism’ or to a form of Andean matriarchy, but to the same founding structure of Andean thinking, probably unnoted by the same protagonists (Andean people)” (140). Here he captures the point about how ontologically starting with this energetic principle first through a lens of complete interconnectedness engenders a certain holographic architecture for engaging with reality.

Estermann next elaborates on what abiding by the thrust of this energetic principle involves: “Andean philosophy tries to represent the essential complementarity of all that exists in the form of integrality (holism)” (140). That is, it implies thinking “in polar dualities”—or what I call parity-based relations following Lajo’s lead—“and not in dualisms ” (139). He additionally notes the tight correlation between this energetic thrust and the Andean philosophical principles of “relationality, complementarity, correspondence, reciprocity, integrality and cyclicity” (Kusch 1970 cited in Estermann 2009, 140). This schemata implies then that “the complements can only be analytically separated from the whole at the cost of their
integrality.” This observation signifies then that “[t]his holistic principle in the last resort coincides with the principle of life. There is no life in isolated form, but only in and by a network of complementary relations” (140). In contrast to the ‘lifelessness’ generated by using a categorical lens, this approach involves a celebration and honoring of life and harmony already implicit in the very set-up of the ontological lens.

So in the end I, like Estermann, am positing that the whole Western-style time-spacescape and its respective ‘sub-divisions’ reviewed here are ontologically based on the privileging of the masculine energetic principle as the primordial ontological leap of faith, and this has engendered a situation where the feminine principle is systematically denied. Moreover, the efforts at excluding this principle must be continuous, since, as we saw in Nietzsche’s Yes-saying world, this principle is still energetically tethered to—and is what actually allows for the existence of—the exalted masculine principle. Due to the very distinct affordances allotted through each initial choice described here, it is in this ontological sense, and in this ontological sense only, that I would call myself a ‘feminist.’ In other words, I favor starting with the lens that allows for both energetic principles to be recognized, honored, celebrated, integrated and balanced.

Returning then to the progression of ontological slippage presented at the beginning of this section, we may see how the first graph is both the beginning and end point when we ontologically initiate with the feminine principle. This lens maintains its robust position because both the feminine and masculine energetic principles are embraced as a parity-based relation. In other words, this integrative lens requires that both energetic principles be concomitantly
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207 I believe that this is the difference that Shiva (2010) is also trying to articulate in Staying Alive. However, on many occasions her analysis too slips into ontological androcentrism.
considered and attention be paid to their proportionalization through the relation. Focusing on only one of the two principles in separation from the other is not possible here.

Reflecting an ‘exclusive’ and ‘exclusionary’ approach to approximating ‘reality,’ ontological androcentrism emerges in the step from Graph (1) to (2), in the moment that the masculine principle is privileged over the feminine. This step would not constitute a centrism if it did not immediately spur a focus on the categorical and the subsequent employment of teleological measuring sticks to compensate for the lost compass. Then, categorical androcentrism appears in the move from Graph (2) to (3) when one category must be privileged over another in this teleological framework. In fact, all of the centrisms elaborated in this chapter are symptomatic of ontological androcentrism. This is what makes this strain of androcentrism the most critical element affecting assumptions about knowledge production within Western-style academia. At the most basic level, it establishes how we conceive of our hook-up to the cosmos and determines what might be conceptually afforded. Therefore its study (and integration and healing) merits much more attention.

The case of Western-style feminism shows the importance of being aware of both instances of androcentrism. Below we can witness the degree to which the feminine energetic principle is denied in this time-spacescape by watching how Western-style feminism paradoxically promotes and reinforces ontological androcentrism. Furthermore, by showing us how ontological androcentrism can be mistakenly employed to take on the discrimination manifested through categorical androcentrism, we can learn some key lessons about how these ontological lenses interact so that we may better understand what promoting a monistic thrust within the Western-style academic time-spacescape may imply.
Illustration: Androcentric Feminism

For this illustration I turn to Simone de Beauvoir’s classic ‘feminist’ début in 1949. While Western-style feminism has certainly evolved and developed much subtler arguments since then thanks to the methodological contributions emerging out of post-structuralism and constructivism, this argument set an important precedent that continues to inform contemporary feminists’ conceptualizations of the problem and strategies for ‘tackling’ today’s ‘gender inequities.’ I would like to recognize here at the outset that de Beauvoir was ‘simply’ responding to her context from her embedded, specific position informed by a whole set of factors, including available information and cultural programming, that was afforded through the predominantly shared lens of ontological separation in France in that era.

In her classic work, de Beauvoir first accepts the normalized view of men and women as a priori categories and acquiesces that women are the “second sex.” This assertion about women tells us a great deal about how she was conceiving of the issue. First it demonstrates that de Beauvoir was already ‘locked into’ the final step in the epistemological progression that involves conceiving of categories in teleological terms. That is, she was already two steps removed from robust monism’s juk-based relation between the feminine and masculine principles and was wholly immersed in the teleological framework that involves comparing ontologically separate units.

Woman as the ‘second sex’ in this case simply reflects the observation that women were predominantly being treated as the separate, ontologically autonomous, and inferior category in an arbitrary teleological hierarchy regarding biological sex. In order for de Beauvoir to be able to make this observation, however, several other steps needed to have taken place beforehand to produce the context on which de Beauvoir was commenting. First, the ontologically androcentric maneuver of choosing to see separation first must have already been made and
socialized throughout the time-spacescape. This would place attention on the categorical, and teleological measuring sticks would be conjured to stand in for the lost compass. Both of these elements together would support this lens’ demand to ‘complete the category,’ which in turn would foster Nietzsche’s noted Yes-saying scenario. In this competitive and exclusive context, the ‘physically stronger’ sex, by engaging in this competitively teleological scenario, was able to categorically subsume the female sex while simultaneously reinforcing ontological androcentrism. This is how de Beauvoir, her contemporaries and feminists today might get to the observation that women are categorically treated as if they belong to the bottom of the teleological totem-pole.

In this position, for apparently no other reason than the chromosomal combination of ‘XX’, women and their contributions have not been readily acknowledged, recognized, honored, prized or appreciated. In the same separation-based time-spacescape generating this mistreatment and abuse, women have responded with defensiveness, anger, indignation and hurt. Despite these emotional responses (also shaped through this very same separation-based lens), the ‘subjugated subject’ has found herself enclosed in a context based on uneven unitarism where the physically ‘weaker’ sex could not even demand balance based on a complementary honoring of each other. A strategy that seeks to foster balance and complementariness is not ontologically afforded here. No honor, value or respect can be accorded or even imagined for those who inhabit or have inhabited this socially constructed position.

However, a unitaristic, teleological framework does afford a single standard for gaining respect in a categorically conceived cosmos. Consequently, those sitting ‘higher’ on the teleological totem pole in this Yes-saying scenario were able to justify women’s position and mistreatment through their differences. To ‘compete’ or ‘fight’ for respect according to an
imaginary teleological standard, de Beauvoir had to overcome the ‘stigma of difference’ generated though this Yes-saying scenario by emphasizing the similarity between women and men. For this reason it should not be a surprise that de Beauvoir’s next maneuver, so brilliantly disruptive at the time, was to propose that women, in order to garner some respect, simply needed to take on male activities and attributes, that is, act ‘like men.’ For her (and any other following the afforded possibilities of this logic), this was the key that would unlock the door into this coveted circle of honor and respect.

To even be able to make this proposal, de Beauvoir had to ‘de-essentialize’ the perceived-to-be masculine activities while still treating the two sexes as sharing the same ontological status of existentially autonomous categories. The latter task was a non-issue, because it was already assumed in the lens being used. However, the essentialized differences that she had to minimize were already determined by the teleological architecture provided to her. In other words, she had to minimize those attributes reflecting more of the feminine energetic principle and maximize the masculine attributes to lessen the range of differences used to justify subjugation. At the same time this maneuver essentially ‘flipped’ the female category to now be in competition with that of the male. Graphically it looked like this:

![Figure 13. Complementary sexes now in competition: The ontological result of Simone de Beauvoir’s maneuver.](image)

Her maneuver, very similar to the doubly androcentric maneuver of conceiving of the two Inca ‘gods’ as being both masculine in nature, was simply responding to the singular and exclusive teleological logic based on categorical rankings. Both cases critically reveal how unimportant energetic balance is between complementary principles when using a lens of separation. This is
most ironic in this case, since the reductionist maneuver has been applied to one of the most obvious manifestations we have of these energetic principles: male and female human beings. We can even see by the result of this ‘feminist’ strategy that complementary balance is the antithesis of this logic due to this lens’ drive to eradicate difference.

In brief, this is how we get to androcentric feminism, that is, a feminism that assumes ontological individualism plus its corresponding teleological measuring stick and conceives of ‘the way out’ of oppression by acting like those higher up on the scale. While extraordinarily disturbing and seemingly liberating at the time by allowing women to take their anger back out on men and to see ‘progress’ in achieving their goal by getting jobs, etc., the gravest repercussion of de Beauvoir’s argument came through the imbalance generated by flipping one half of a complementary energetic relation over to create a doubly androcentric situation. This just illustrates, though, the extent to which an ontologically androcentric framework is only capable of bearing imbalanced fruits that deny the integral role of the feminine energetic principle, including for example the denial of equivalency, increased competition and the tendency to see everything in terms of a fight. I review these repercussions and more below.

Consequences

Addressing the consequences is easiest when we contrast the end product of each lens in terms of how relations are conceived:

![Diagram A and B](image)

Figure 14. Contrast of gender relations as generated through complementary opposite ontological lenses.
Graph A in Figure 14 reflects the beginning and end product of starting with the feminine energetic principle. Both components in relation are fundamental to the constitution of each and every living being.\textsuperscript{208} When a time-spacescape is constituted through a lens that predominantly honors the central role of the feminine principle, the effects of either ontological or categorical androcentrism are minimal and are usually ‘resolved’ by ‘reminding’ the actors involved of their connection with the whole. In this case neither masculine nor feminine can make any sense without being in complementary relation, and this tethered character as a \textit{juk}-based relation places their proportional balance at the ontological forefront. As a result equivalency, proportionalization and multidimensionality (covered in Part II) are all central considerations for engaging the relation in this ontologically afforded scenario.

Starting with the masculine energetic principle paradoxically blinds us to seeing energetic principles and instead fosters a categorical conceptualization of biological sex due to its perceptive preferencing of separation first. In this way relations between ‘sexes’ are also category-based, and each individual is treated as an existentially autonomous unit. Moreover, equivalency is neither a conjured nor demanded notion in this context of uneven unitarism. In fact, when the focus is on the categorical—and this includes relations defined by human language only—tending the relation or the proportionality of its components does not follow either. Instead, as we can see in Graph B, the relation between energetic principles is very secondary and almost non-existent as indicated by the ‘flip’ in categorical orientation.

Since the idea of a parity-based relation does not exist through this lens, that which both components have to offer in distinct and complementary fashion is neither embraced nor honored. Instead the two sexes need to ‘look alike’ in order for the teleological measuring stick

\textsuperscript{208} What differs among them though is the relative proportion of the principles vibrating in each being. This actually becomes the ‘motor’ or friction that allows for the possibility of recognizing one’s own imbalances and integrating or healing them.
to constitute a singular ‘right’ path fitting for uneven unitarism. As a result imbalance and competition characterize this relation, and ironically this is the ontological and conceptual basis for ‘gender equity’ or ‘gender equality.’ In short, Graph B depicts androcentrism in three instances. It portrays (1) a strategy conceived according to an ontologically androcentric framework to confront (2) a situation afforded through an ontologically androcentric slip wherein (3) men are categorically privileged over women.

With these distinct scenarios in mind, we can further discuss the consequences provoked by using ontological androcentrism to interpret ‘gender relations.’ First, as mentioned, competition and imbalance blot out equivalency and complementariness. We witness this in the often assertive and sometimes belligerent discourse in Western-style feminist arguments both in academia and activism. In this context, women have to ‘fight’ for their rights. They have to ‘demand’ equal pay. They have to ‘push’ to be equally recognized. Then to have these ‘dreams’ come true, women are also encouraged to become independent and strong. Using this language heavily imbued in the masculine energetic principle is, in fact, just part of the imbalanced process of turning the second-sex into ‘aspiring males.’

In addition to spurring the fight to rectify injustices that women have suffered, playing the teleological game of gender relations also forces Western-style feminists onto a path that denigrates the feminine energetic principle by bolstering the logic of ontological androcentrism. Consequently the recognition, protection and appreciation of the absolutely critical and fundamental role played by the feminine energetic principle are completely erased from the realm of possibilities within Western-style feminism. Estermann (2009) arrives at a similar observation:

Feminist (Western) philosophy is step by step correcting the idea that women don’t play a role of importance in the development of Western philosophy. Nevertheless, this
rereading of the official histories of the West still does not include the diatopical perspective of gender and, therefore, still doesn’t realize a deconstruction of current androcentrism (141).

In short, this maneuver paradoxically re-produces the conditions that justify using the lens that continues to bring us the problem of the ‘second sex.’

Another unforeseen consequence of using teleological measuring sticks is how their arbitrary character forces their proselytization and/or imposition as a means to cover over or ignore the separation anxiety produced by losing the compass. Accordingly, we have seen Western-style feminism promoted throughout the globe with almost missionary zeal. For example, much of the work in the global practice of international development is predicated on fostering gender equity or equality and not energetic equivalency and proportionalization. Drafted at the UN-sponsored Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing in 1995, the ontologically androcentric Beijing Platform for Action has informed many of these practices.209 This document of global reach and impact was preceded by the groundbreaking Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), which was approved by the UN General Assembly in 1979 and seen as an “international bill of rights for women.” This “bill of rights” is equally predicated on ontological androcentrism.210

The impact has been palpable. In addition to the spread of gender studies programs throughout the world, one often sees the governments of those countries seeking to be seen as ‘modern’ boasting of their committees, departments and public bodies that defend women’s rights and promote gender equity. This means that they have responded to the strategic

---


objectives and intermediate results demanded by these international programs, because, quite often, funding for seemingly unrelated sectors is not provided unless project proposals also include forms of “improving gender equity.” Through this particular means, androcentric feminism’s discourse of gender equity has reverberated globally, but most importantly it has been successfully imposed in those areas of the world that have the closest ties to historically shared time-spacescapes based on complete interconnectedness. Sadly the more that ‘gender equity’ or ‘gender equality’ is proselytized throughout the world, abhorrence of that which even minimally reflects the feminine principle is further encouraged at the ontological level.

Western-style feminism’s paradoxical favoring of ontological androcentrism has a few perhaps unsuspected consequences related to this final point. First, by rejecting the feminine energetic principle, the body or sex associated with this principle has also become rejected. That is, the more that gender equity is proposed, the ‘weirder’ the ‘feminine’ becomes due to the ‘homologizing’ thrust of the particular teleological measuring stick ‘guiding’ respect for humans divided by gender. For this reason, we see women today viewing ‘typically’ female roles with disdain or rejecting their essential biological reproductive characteristics or functions. Then, in light of this ontologically competitive scenario that goes against cosmic energetic principles, men also feel threatened about their loss of ‘place’ and find themselves on the defensive. Moreover, since men equally inhabit this separation-based time-spacescape, they also cannot imagine what honoring the feminine would look like or how it would be implemented.

---

211 In addition to being a ‘transversal theme’ cutting across all UN programs, I had the privilege to watch how this worked specifically through the Small Grants Program sponsored through the Global Environment Facility and administered through the United Nations Development Programme. The resulting corresponding activities were especially contentious in one of the project areas for the women.

212 This observation is not meant to downplay the central importance of the pain and dishonor experienced by women in these roles. Rather I wish to point out the result of the way in which we have chosen to respond to that pain and dishonor.
The third related consequence is conceptually tied more to the unitaristic result of this lens. Through this logic, even the notion of the ‘couple’ becomes ‘weird,’ because the relation, interdependence and dynamic balance do not figure centrally in uneven unitarism. Instead of being taught how to engage in complementary interdependence, people are taught to value independence, and this puts a strain on the daily practice of living (tethered) in relation. In addition to making the couple seem abnormal, the components of that couple also tend toward energetic imbalance as a result of the drive to annihilate differences presented by those constructed as being at the bottom of the totem pole. Since the effect of reductionism in this case has been doubly androcentric, various strategies have emerged in social behavior to energetically accommodate this imbalance.213

At the ontological level and in practice, Ms. de Beauvoir’s argument has left quite a legacy.214 Most importantly, it has continued to have a significant impact, despite methodological inventions that have brought about an incredible level of subtlety, in terms of how women still conceptualize ‘gender relations’ and the strategies they generate in the academic arena to counteract or rectify the situation. To show how this is the case, I must briefly break out of this section’s singular focus on those approaches that wholly embrace all of these

213 Today we see various responses to these energetic configurations. Already strong women may seek men who are even ‘harder’ than them. Alternatively men may ‘overcompensate’ for the overly ‘yang’ tendencies of women, rushing headlong into the ‘fad’ of being ‘metrosexual’ or finding themselves attracted to a culture where ‘women still know how to be women.’ Even ‘modern day’ fertility issues are directly related to these energetically ‘off’ configurations. I would argue too that although homosexual activity was certainly not prohibited within pre-Colombian life (as can be seen in many popular archaeological figurines), the degree and variation of ‘modern’ sexual behavior are simply reflections of the energetic configurations encouraged through ontological separation. This is neither ‘women’s’ nor ‘men’s’ fault. It is a socially shared consequence of engendering widespread energetic imbalance by choosing to (re-)produce the fruit garnered through ontological androcentrism. The ‘good’ thing about this is that the cosmos is more than vast enough to house couples expressing ‘too much’ of the masculine energetic element. Furthermore, once people realize that the contrasts they are confronting reflect key ways for healing and integrating their own personal energetic imbalance, these relations can be extremely informative.

214 It is important to note here that if Simone de Beauvoir had not done it, eventually someone else would have come along to make a similar argument due to the way in which these principles interact.
partitions generated through ontological separation and address some of the more post-
structuralist ones responsible for the methodologically more complex analyses of gender
relations. This will allow me to address how even the more ‘monistic’ approaches in Western-
style feminism, despite their increased subtlety, continue to generate ontologically similar results
as de Beauvoir’s original argument. 215

In the case of ‘contemporary’ Western-style feminism, the methodological insights
emerging out of more relational approaches have allowed contemporary feminists to execute
studies and arguments ‘free’ of the ontological inheritance of women and men as a priori
categories. These efforts have been very fruitful in terms of demonstrating the genealogical
development of these naturalized categories and the mechanisms used to ‘place’ these categories
along a teleological trajectory. However, these approaches have not realized that by making
these efforts to produce knowledge with albeit ‘new’ methodological strategies that move the
(human) relation to the center stage within a separation-based time-spacescape, they still
critically delimit the reach of the monistic realm through the boundary of human language. By
doing so, they necessarily privilege ontological androcentrism and deny the feminine energetic
principle right from the beginning.

So, even though they have brought on post-structural considerations that have allowed for
some relational aspects to be incorporated into their arguments, all of their efforts are still
subsumed to the analytical task demanded of ontological separation and as such lend greater
weight and credence to the masculine energetic principle. If the whole purpose of showing how
women got to the bottom of the totem pole in genealogical fashion is to ‘fight’ against finding
themselves there (since the effects of epistemic violence are felt as ‘real’), then engaging in this

215 As we will see in the section on truncated monism, adherence to any category will align methodological efforts
that claim to be monistic in character more closely with the ontology of separation and its respective fruits.
activity—whose basis is the masculine energetic principle—will not remedy the situation. Instead it will continue to re-create the same ontological conditions for the emergence of these circumstances.

Consequently the major difference between early Western-style feminists and more contemporary versions is that early androcentric feminism actually reified the categories borne of ontological separation and directly reinforced that view both categorically and ontologically, whereas the more contemporary feminists have tackled categorical androcentrism but reinforced ontological androcentrism through anthropocentric and logocentric methodological strategies. So while more contemporary feminists ‘get’ the issue with categorical androcentrism, they cannot see, due to the reductionism inherent in the anthropocentric lens they are using, either how their ‘logical’ framework is androcentric or how they re-create the conditions they so desperately seek to escape. In this sense, subtle lingering ‘tastes’ continue to be sensed and reproduced through this body of work that seeks to get women out from under the glass ceiling to which they themselves have contributed and continue to contribute. In the end this generates a strange sort of dissonance, the kind that is sensed when one spends one’s whole life believing that she is making ‘progress’ by mistaking the generative emergent compass for evidence of advances and yet never is quite able to completely rid herself of the scenario that drives her to action.

In short, understanding the two expressions of androcentrism allows us to see how Western feminism does not even take the feminine principle into consideration, but in fact, uses an ontologically androcentric lens to understand the problem and, as a result, begets the opposite of what is sought. The outcome is a feminism that continues to reinforce ontological
androcentrism, separation, abstraction and competition and cannot treat balance, integration or complementarity as primary considerations.

Ethnocentrism

The final imaginary boundary, ethnocentrism, encloses a particular human group’s way of doing things, which allows us to assume that our way of life is superior to that of another. By definition this enclosure is already anthropocentric. It also relies on egocentrism, since seeing a group as separate and separable from other groups relies first on conceiving of atomistic individuals that can be aggregated and disaggregated. The breadth of the group that is referred to as either superior or inferior may vary as much as the particular cultural characteristics in question. It can be as narrow as two people or as broad as the ‘global South.’ In any case ethnocentric assertions are normally used to justify intervention on another group’s way of life.

Getting to the point of seeing the group as separate is critical in two ways for the ethnocentric maneuver. First, separation removes the compass and incites the use of teleological measuring sticks that establish the path to being able to claim that one group or way of doing things is superior to another. The particular sticks used to compare ways of life reflect language justifying cultural subjugation and/or eradication by extending from ‘inferior’ categories like collectivistic, traditional, barbarian and backwards to the ‘superior’ categories of individualistic, modern, civilized and forward-thinking. Second to justify dominating the ‘Other,’ that ‘Other’ must be seen as being ontologically separate from the dominator. Otherwise, as stated earlier, when the ‘Other’ is seen as one’s ‘Self,’ the ‘game’ does not much make sense. In this way, ethnocentrism can be understood as a game played out in the name of an imagined collective still according to the demand of categorical completion when no compass is present.
A direct result of this ontological set-up is a rejection or negation of that which is different. In this case though the differences that one tries to deny or belittle are perceived as shared cultural attributes. These generalizations both of one’s own ‘culture’ and that of the judged ‘Other’ are made possible through what I have referred to as the ‘developed’ aspect or shared background of the collectively lived emergent moment-places within a particular social configuration. The seemingly ‘tangible’ aspect of the shared background allows us to sense when we bump up against a new set of rules or way of doing things and therefore identify critical and judge-worthy ‘differences.’

In the ayllu chapter I also showed how, through a relational conceptualization of culture, any ‘culture’ also has a developing aspect due to the co-constitutive dimension of the emergent moment-place. In fact the ever-present dynamism of the emergent-and-anchored moment-place renders the category’s boundaries quite nebulous. As such the definitions of ‘we’ versus ‘they’ are relative and specific in every instant; they are forever changing. As a result the notion of culture as a clear-cut category that can be celebrated over another becomes a rather problematic notion in two senses. First, the developing aspect of the ‘group’—or the emergent moment-place of that culture’s re-making—allows for considerable potential for change to the group’s boundaries. Then, since the particular configuration of watas or lifecycles has been changing in each emergent moment-place, having a full grasp of any shared background is impossible. With so much contingency and change, that is, with so little basis for the centrism itself, it is easier to see how this is a maneuver meant to relieve existential anxiety deriving from ontological separation and from one’s own ‘limited’ character that stands in the way of reaching categorical completion.
In the Western-style time-spacescape, we see this centrisn justifying global-level activity in the arenas of democratization, development, international law and, of course, war. To justify a war, ethnocentrism is absolutely critical for garnering public support. Then to justify democratizing the rest of the world, the discourse must similarly ring with ethnocentric tones. These tones may be heard when democracy is touted as the best political system or when a nation’s leaders or intellectual informants talk of the “need” to “free” the rest of the world through this process (see Huntington 1993). Even international law is a practice built on norms that are based on liberal conceptualizations of society and Judeo-Christian values that wholly reflect the pre-suppositions of the Western-style time-spacescape. Their assumed ontological bent makes them quite incompatible with ways of life based on complete interconnectedness.

Another example of the implementation of this form of teleological thinking is found in the attempts to ‘help’ other countries ‘modernize’ through foreign ‘aid.’ Here, even though the discourse and practice of international development parades around as universally applicable, its logical basis for existence is quite ethnocentric. The completely arbitrary ‘parameters’ of ‘modernization’ are still ‘set’ by those brandishing the teleological measuring stick. The development agenda and discourse are particularly intriguing since their quick assimilation throughout the world indicates the ease with which people ‘capitulate’ to the force of ontological androcentrism. Once labeled ‘underdeveloped’ or ‘Third World,’ people move quickly, dedicating much time, energy and focus to pulling themselves out of the given category. Often these efforts may include sinking the country further into debt or sacking the country’s ‘bank’ of natural resources. Furthermore having so many possible categories on which to improve helps keep people totally hooked on this game. Missing from this panorama though is the realization that even responding to any label is to accept the vicious cycle of ‘not-enoughness’ described in
Chapter 10 or that the arbitrary teleological straws dangling unattached in the cosmos will always be suspended out of reach for those so desperately trying to reach the ‘end’ category. In short, the mechanisms of global governance, policy and practices are opportune places for institutionalizing standards that reflect (and benefit) one particular way of doing things over another.

The Western-style academic time-spacescape is not immune either to ethnocentric attitudes. For example, the tendencies covered under logocentrism so valued within academia can also be understood as features that teleologically and ethnocentrically distinguish the ‘culture’ of academia from the society at large or any other contrasting sector like religion. Even the kinds of ‘philosophy’ and ‘logic’ deemed ‘legitimate’ within this time-spacescape share these features. Along these lines Estermann (2009) makes the following observation:

Until the dominant Western philosophy is conscientious of its own culturality (culture-centrism), raciality (ethnocentrism) and even masculinity (androcentrism), other philosophical paradigms will not be recognized as ‘philosophies,’ but at best as ‘thinking,’ ‘cosmovision,’ ‘mythology,’ ‘religiosity,’ or simply ‘ethno-philosophy’ (133).

This argument closely echoes Hall’s (1977) point about the ethnocentrism present in Western-style interpretations of “logic” and for this reason Hall himself suggests a “massive cultural literacy movement” (7).

Similarly to the expansive militant drive of Western-style feminism throughout the world covered under androcentrism or of development or democratization above, Western-style academia has also fostered the spread of ‘internationally accepted’ standards for academic accreditation by demanding that foreign institutions comply with these standards in order to have

---

216 While I agree with Estermann’s position here, I think it is critical not to lose the robust character of a term like cosmovision in contrast to the more myopic notion of worldview. In fact, instead of calling the one ‘philosophy’ and the other ‘cosmovision,’ both simply constitute the respective ways of knowing conjured through distinct, generally shared ontological orientations.
their graduates be considered for admission to graduate programs elsewhere and to be eligible to ‘capture’ the droves of students studying abroad today. Without ‘credit equivalency’ the institution falls outside the sphere of possible study-abroad destinations and its graduates face decreased chances of entry into foreign universities. The rapid and widespread promulgation of these standards attests to the spreading adherence to this teleological measuring stick concerning ‘legitimate’ knowledge production. Within academia, we also see ethnocentric attitudes at play in the battles over the most effective approaches to conducting research whereby each methodological ‘school’ or ‘approach’ can be seen as a ‘culture’ embedded within a wider cultural context. Again, proponents of all methodological approaches will find themselves using teleological measuring sticks to compete with the others, because they all—in order to legitimately participate in this separation-based time-spacescape—must deny complete interconnectedness or the compass.217

Across all of these centrisms we find that as people embrace categorical assumptions more strongly, adherence to teleological notions, identification of self with the categories that one and others use, and the assertion of the superiority of the groups to which one belongs also tend to increase. Moreover, we are able to maintain these centrisms (and many more) by keeping the respective categories in ontologically separate compartments where they remain just beyond our grasp while at the same time engaging a ‘progressive’ epistemology that promises to get us closer to each one over time. As we will see below the academic monists have been quite able to indicate these tendencies and in many ways have managed to ‘integrate’ and ‘heal’ the ‘contrasts’ these maneuvers pose.

217 One can easily look to the kinds of research projects currently being funded and/or institutionally sponsored to see what approaches are deemed ‘legitimate.’
Separation from the divine, anthropocentrism, logocentrism, egocentrism, androcentrism and ethnocentrism all constitute the fundamental pillars of the Western-style academic time-spacescape and have informed the way in which legitimate strategies for knowledge production are conceived. We are now in a place where we may revisit some of the assertions made in this dissertation’s introduction regarding the Western-style academic time-spacescape, which now may make much more sense given the points elaborated herein. Reviewing these assertions will be particularly helpful for seeing how these tendencies are also fruits of the ontology of separation before moving on to address the ways in which the monistic approaches of IR have responded to this partitioned panorama.

In the introduction, I stated that academia treats ‘reality’ as uncertain. This, of course, points to the general denial of the compass found in any separation-based time-spacescape. Moreover, since we have no compass by which to guide our actions in the broader time-spacescape, academics in their specialized ‘compartment’ are called to make that reality a little less uncertain by producing knowledge about it.

This task involves a few key assumptions that are also fruits of the logic of one-in-separation. First, the ability to produce knowledge about the ‘Other’ (or one’s environment to improve it or make it more amenable to one’s needs) reflects an anthropocentrism and logocentrism that also foster the sense that methodological ‘control’ is internally located. Second, what academics are supposed to be producing is a substantive, categorical noun called ‘knowledge,’ which is what allows for it to be accumulated and improved over time. This last assumption is consistent with the epistemological demand of categorical completion and corresponding emphasis on ‘progress.’ In fact, the question, “How will this project add to the
body of knowledge?” very commonly asked of research proposals reflects the degree to which this conception has a grip on the academic enterprise.

One of the major losses incurred by this conceptualization is the central role of the constantly dynamic, emergent present time-place. Instead the focus is re-centered on the historically established body of knowledge and on planning future research projects that will contribute to it. In this scenario, no space is allotted for ‘legitimately’ paying attention to that which is afforded right here right now as co-created contrasts or for responding to those signs in equally emergent, responsive fashion. (As a person, one may play the game of life in this way, but insights derived from this approach may not be discussed in this way as an academic.)

This casualty also contributes to an even further diminished sensing capacity because we forget how to be ‘present.’ The predominant emphasis on our ability to use reason also reinforces this atrophied capacity. That is, by separating this human faculty from the rest of our sensory and emotional systems and prioritizing it over them, we simply do not foster sensitivity through the other channels. Instead of listening to the nurturing provided in every emergent moment-place, we are encouraged to employ our minds (and will) to manage the methodological tasks of gathering data, processing it and turning it into knowledge about our world.

The drive toward ontological fragmentation, so central to the ontology of separation, has influenced another aspect of the Western-style academic time-spacescape. In addition to dividing time into segments, relational components into existentially autonomous categories or one’s information-sensing-and-processing system into only one legitimate center, the time-spacescape itself is subdivided into various fields of study starting with the principal division between the ‘natural’ and ‘social’ sciences. This central division plus all of the other subfields that emerged in relation to it are built on a tenacious insistence on separation, an enduring
reliance on the categorical, a continued thrust toward ontological fragmentation, and the unremitting utilization of teleological measuring sticks to understand what we are (supposed to be) doing. In brief, the most critical aspects of the ontology of separation have been most influential on the constitution of the Western-style academic time-spacescape today.

The Separation-based Time-spacescape of International Relations

The field of International Relations is one of the fractals of the social sciences, but at the same time it is considered to be an ‘interdisciplinary’ field that borrows many concepts and ideas from political science, economics, sociology, psychology and communication studies. This aspect invites further explanation. Many would argue that because interdisciplinary fields like IR exist, the Western-style academic time-spacescape equally fosters both integration and fragmentation.\(^{218}\) However, to argue this is just like arguing that IR’s purpose of decreasing war or increasing peace actually reflects an overall drive toward balance. What is misunderstood in both cases is the order of epistemological appearance of these thrusts. The integrative ‘interdisciplinary’ drive is secondary to the ontological splitting into fields just like the urge to foment balance is a secondary response to the overarching tendency toward imbalance. In both cases, separation has been the ontological basis for the context to which these reactions emerge as responses.

We learned in Part II and saw again in Chapter 10 that balance and imbalance, just like integration and fragmentation, are necessary components of parity-based relations to allow for each other’s existence. This is a cosmic energetic principle that is differentially engaged depending on the employed ontological lens and as such produces distinct outcomes. For

\(^{218}\) This position would echo Rosenau’s (1997) insistence on “fragmegration,” but that is to deny the epistemological ordering of each ontological lens that favors starting with one thrust or the other and the impact the privileged thrust has on the afforded fruits themselves.
example, when the lens is concordant with energetic principles—that is, it assumes complete interconnectedness—balance is the primordial thrust, because the focus is on the relation. However, because that relation is understood to be generative, the opposite of balance is an equally essential element of this dynamic motor. So even though the overall drive is toward learning how to harmonize in dynamic fashion those robustly conceived relations through which we are able to apprehend our co-created contrasts, imbalance is honored, respected and embraced here because it is integral to a dynamic world where the inhabitants have the opportunity to learn how to harmonize themselves and their relations.

In the opposite scenario, a lens of separation engenders uneven unitarism and so therefore the overall thrust is toward the singular category. This automatically generates ‘imbalance’ as the common state of being in this lens. Through this optic we have to consider neither the relation nor the tethered component that allows for that category’s existence, which means that neither proportionalization nor harmonizing is a principle drive of this lens. This second scenario encourages the proliferation of imbalance, which, in the case of IR’s focus of study, is expressed as conflict and violence throughout the world. Seeking to foment balance within this ontologically afforded context, as the field of IR purports to do, will not be able to counteract those constant threats, because that balance is being sought through an ontologically androcentric lens. This implies that it is thoroughly ensconced in a cycle that insists on the source of those threats, ontological separation, which still renders the drive toward balance secondary. The integrative ‘interdisciplinary’ thrust of IR stands in similar secondary fashion to the push toward fragmentation and isolation. In fact, the interdisciplinary nature of this field of study emerged as a response to the ‘weaknesses’ encountered through too much specialization, but again the
reaction is secondary and it still takes place in a time-place shaped through ontological androcentrism.

Additionally, despite its interdisciplinary character, this subfield of the Western-style academic time-spacescape is still constituted first through the partitions and general assumptions described above. As an academic ‘discipline,’ the ‘divine’ is completely wiped clear of the field of focus, which makes IR count equally on the initial leap of faith.\textsuperscript{219} The field of IR is also anthropocentric in that we assume that by studying our respective phenomena, we as human beings will be able to do something about the uncertain and threatening conditions of the global sphere.\textsuperscript{220} This position is especially easy to assume given that the large majority of IR’s content focuses on human relations—yet another manifestation of anthropocentrism.\textsuperscript{221} These positions are also reinforced through this field’s logocentric thrust that also takes the category of human language for granted. Moreover, the field is not immune either to the logocentric and ethnocentric mandate that research be presented and analyzed in legitimately logical fashion.

Then, as reviewed in Chapter 10, egocentrically conceptualizing individuals as separate units further centers attention on the category, which reinforces the assumption of separation and the denial of the compass. Together these outcomes generate the very reason for having to study IR in the first place (the perceived threat of chaos and conflict). Egocentrism, in addition to lending support to the generation of the field itself, also provides the fundamental logic for

\textsuperscript{219} When I say ‘divine’ here, I am not referring to the sacredness of the here and now but to the ‘divine’ as conceptualized in dualistic terms. However, it is due to this second version that the sacredness of the here and now cannot be acknowledged either in this time-spacescape.

\textsuperscript{220} Again, this is to assume that the factors that create the circumstances that we observe are external to us and that our job is to change those factors, not our respective energetic profiles that recognize our deep interconnection to the whole.

\textsuperscript{221} Even the environmental concerns addressed in the field are still addressed from the position of worrying about the long-term impact they will have on the humans that inhabit planet Earth. So it could be argued that all of the field’s content is anthropocentric in nature.
common concepts and theories embraced in this field, such as the social contract, Leviathan, democracy, liberalism, realism, etc. Next, as seen in the interdisciplinary illustration above, the field of IR is ontologically androcentric in the same way as any separation-based time-spacescape. However, many Western-style feminists assert that the field is also categorically androcentric, because it privileges a focus on the male-dominated ‘public sphere’ and encourages male-dominated strategies for mitigating the threats of chaos and conflict encountered there.

Finally, in addition to all of the examples listed in the previous section, it can also be argued that the field of IR is ethnocentric in that our theoretical and conceptual heritage is much more concentrated on the resources available in the Western-style time-spacescape. To verify this, one only has to look at the typically taught and cited cannon of ‘classic’ IR literature. Most sources reflect intimate ties to the Judeo-Christian tradition to the exclusion of other cultural or philosophical traditions. This attribute becomes excruciatingly evident when one teaches IR courses abroad.

Besides adhering to these partitions in fairly obvious ways, the field of IR can similarly be subdivided based on the embraced methodological strategy. Just like any field within the Western-style academic time-spacescape, International Relations has its particular ways of labeling these methodological approximations. Patrick Jackson (2011) has nominated the four main approaches as ‘neopositivism,’ ‘critical realism,’ ‘analyticism’ and ‘reflexivity.’ He distinguishes them according to where they stand in relation to two philosophical wagers (24-40). The first of the two wagers involves the “relationship between the knower and the known,” and the two sides to this wager include either “mind-world dualism” or “mind-world monism.”

222 Even though I explain why the term dualism is very misleading with regards to the contrast between ontological lenses that I build in this dissertation in Chapter 4, I use ‘dualism’ and its grammatical variations here to remain consistent with Jackson’s framework.
The second wager regards the “relationship between knowledge and observation” with the approach either being “phenomenalist” or “transfactual.”

By taking these wagers together, Jackson has generated a useful table that delineates the methodological panorama of the field, with neopositivism being both dualist and phenomenalist, critical realism dualist and transfactual, analyticism monistic and phenomenalist, and reflexivity monistic and transfactual (37). As predominantly dualist approaches, neopositivism and critical realism both adhere completely to the partitions addressed above. The distinction between them is found through the second wager in terms of how we might study that dualistically conceived world. Analyticism and reflexivity are also distinguished between one another along these same lines, but both take issue with many of the dualistically produced pre-suppositions and partitions of the field elaborated in this chapter.

Certainly important distinctions exist between the monistic methodological thrusts (analyticism and reflexivity) and those of a dualistic nature (neopositivism and critical realism), as Jackson (2011) so thoroughly reviews in his book. Nevertheless, all methodological approaches within IR share certain assumptions about how the cosmos is divided up and where the most generous boundaries of academic legitimacy lie. So even though each thrust adheres to these tenets of ontological individualism to differing degrees, they all re-produce the fruits of this lens to a minimal degree to be able to legitimately belong to the Western-style academic time-spacescape in general and to the field of IR in particular. It is this minimal amount that allows for the unraveling of the two-in-one-relation viewpoint, such that its more robust offering – emphasis on dynamic balance – is not even afforded. Because the first philosophical wager is where we can see most clearly the difference between the robust monism implied through an ontology of complete interconnectedness and the truncated versions of monism employed in the
field of IR, I solely focus on this wager throughout the rest of this chapter. Moreover, since I am dealing with the monistic orientation in general, I do not address either analyticism or reflexivity in explicit fashion. Instead the insights apply to both approaches and even to other monistic varieties in other disciplines as well.

Truncated Monism’s Divided Inheritances: Assumed and Contested

The monistic approaches of IR specifically and in the Western-style academic time-spacescape in general have undoubtedly added conceptual complexity and injected the field of IR and the broader realm of the social sciences with greater diversity in terms of levels of adherence to the centrisms elaborated above. Nevertheless they are still primordially separation-based. The following section aims to show how these monistic approaches go about participating in the partitioned terrain that they have inherited. Because this terrain includes divisions that are more and less open to negotiation, one aim of this section is to elucidate what is assumed and contested for each partition. This is a critical task for substantiating my main assertion that if a field starts with this prioritization scheme for how we conceive of our hook-up to the cosmos, then any effort to integrate a monistic perspective within a separation-based time-spacescape will still harbor some of the classic divisions. In this way I will demonstrate how these academic monistic approaches stand on the pillars of separation and essentially sever themselves from the possibilities afforded through complete interconnectedness.

Throughout this section the relevance of the context out of which truncated monism emerges cannot be understated. Truncated monists operate within a sub-division of the wider separation-based Western-style time-spacescape called academia. In fact, their methodological questioning arose in response to the application of dualistic methodologies within the social
sciences, and it was this particular trajectory that largely affected the range of possibilities available to academic monists.

The methodological approaches adhering to the ‘mind-world’ monistic orientation of the first philosophical wager sprung forth out of a set of philosophical arguments typically called the linguistic turn. The basis for one of the most disruptive ontological questionings within academia to date, this turn has been critical in advocating for the need to set the limit of academic efforts (particularly within the social sciences) to a monistic realm defined by human language as a means for curtailing the outrageous altercations within academia over truth claims founded on the separation-based teleological process described above. As a result, a whole new field of methodological possibilities was brought to the table and has been eagerly developed ever since. However, the context in which these possibilities have been elaborated has also shaped what strategies are afforded. In this context, some partitions may be addressed and analyzed while others must remain hallowed and untouched.

To address what partitions get contested and why, I first review the language dimension of the logocentric partition that defines academic monism’s realm of operation. With this panorama in mind, I then address how truncated monistic approaches have differentially engaged

---

223 While most of the theoretical insights were developed long before the identity crises that shook anthropology, sociology and psychology in the 1980’s, their inputs are still critical for pushing the methodological envelope today. Those sources most useful for getting a grasp of the general tenets of the turn include: Bakhtin on dialogism (1981); Wittgenstein on the language-game, the rules of those games, and meaning as use (1958); Foucault on the network, relations of power and method (1990), on emergence (1984a), and on how this ‘new’ approach is not a ‘disguised’ form of structuralism (1970, 1971); Weber on ‘objectivity’ in the social sciences, method and the ideal-type (1949); and Shotter on the conversational reality (1993a) and on ‘ethics’ based on the ‘intersubjective’ realm (1993b). Other principle works involve Nietzsche (1989), Sapir (1949), Whorf (1956), Vygotsky (1962) and Berger and Luckmann (1966). In the field of IR, we find differing levels of adherence to the principle of the linguistic turn. Nevertheless some key proponents in the field include: Jackson (2001, 2002, 2008, 2011), Kratochwil (2000), Kratochwil and Ruggie (1986), Kubálková, Onuf and Kowert (1998), Kubálková (1998, 2001), Neufield (1993), Onuf (1989, 1998) and Ruggie (1993, 1998). Wendt (1999) is also well known for making use of the techniques emerging from this turn but for more categorical ends. Another area of IR where the linguistic turn has had an important impact in terms of applied methods has been within institutionalism. Finnemore (1996), Finnemore and Sikkink (1998), Martin and Simmons (1998), Hall and Taylor (1996), Immergut (1988) and Risse (2000) have all utilized more discursive approaches to understanding how institutions work.
the partitions reviewed above according to their ‘negotiability.’ Once I identify the assumed partitions, I can address their particular effects on the affordances available to truncated monists. This task is facilitated through the contrasts provided by robust monism and an understanding of academic monists’ historical relationship to a time-spacescape based on separation instead of one on complete interconnectedness. By analyzing the impact of the three untouched partitions (ontological androcentrism, anthropocentrism and the language dimension of logocentrism) on the reach of academic monism, I am able to show how the truncated monists’ strategy paradoxically undermines their ability to carve out a ‘safe’ path to conducting research.

Logocentrism: The Defining Feature of Academic Monism

Logocentrism defines academic monism because human language is seen as our primordial filter for engaging the world. According to the linguistic turn it is the only way in which we can sensibly apprehend reality. Voloshinov for example explains the primacy of this filter:

There is no experience outside its embodiment in signs. From the outset, then, there cannot even be a question of a radical qualitative difference between interior and exterior. ... It is not experience that organizes the expression, but, to the contrary, expression that organizes experience, that, for the first time, gives it form and determines its direction (Voloshinov 1973, 101 qtd. in Todorov 1984, 43).

In another source he observes, “Outside material expression, no experience. More, expression precedes experience, it is its cradle” (Voloshinov 1925, 229 qtd. in Todorov 1984, 43). Capturing the ‘spirit’ of the linguistic turn, these quotes effectively assert the role of the ‘expression of signs’ in terms of how we engage reality. Anything can happen in the world, but we cannot make sense of it until we put it into words.

Sapir was another pioneer in encouraging the emergence of this turn. He argues that language is “a self-contained conceptual system which *previsages all possible experience* in
accordance with certain accepted formal limitations” (Sapir 1931, 578 qtd. in Hall 1977, 15). Here again the filter of language precedes our ability to make sense of any experience. In fact, Sapir posits, “categories such as number, gender, case, tense, mode, voice, ‘aspect’ and a host of others…are not so much discovered in experience as imposed upon it” (Sapir 1931, 578 qtd. in Hall 1977, 15). Given these pre-suppositions then the ‘imaginary circle’ surrounding the realm of human language delimits the world about which we can legitimately produce knowledge.

The benefit of this strategic maneuver is that it allowed for the foregrounding of relation, even if only human relations, which enabled a re-conceptualization of our lived realm in interactive terms. In this way a completely different panorama than that engendered through wholly embraced ontological ‘dualism’ was afforded. This new horizon then permitted academic monists to challenge certain partitions and/or dimensions of the partitions elaborated above. The next section reviews those aspects that have been contested.

Contested Partitions

Moving from complete adherence to the assumptions of the one-in-separation logic to a more relational approach afforded through the linguistic turn allowed for a partial or complete questioning of the divisions characterizing the Western-style academic time-spacescape. For example, even while embracing the aspect of logocentrism that affords the monistic arena in academia, truncated monism can still take issue with that part of logocentrism that privileges just one perfect notion of ‘logic’ understood in an essentialized and singular fashion lamented by both Hall (1977) and Estermann (2003) above. Wittgenstein (1958) poignantly clarifies the difference between the content of a language-game that is argued over and the rules of the language-game that are totally taken for granted and agreed upon throughout the conflict (§240-§241). Once we understand that those taken-for-granted rules of the language-game represent a
co-constituted form of life and that many language-games or forms of life exist, then the argument can be made that each language-game’s ‘logic’ is particular to that form of life and cannot be judged from the perspective of another language-game. In this case, while language steadfastly remains the logocentric boundary of the truncated monistic realm, the ‘logical’ element of logocentrism is put into question and its variability is facilely recognized.

This very same argument also razes the very basis for ethnocentrism. When we understand that the notion of culture, ethnicity and even race are social constructs that we produce and re-produce, it becomes fairly easy to show that any sort of teleological privileging of one social group over another is just that—a social construct based on arbitrary criteria. In anthropology, sociology and international relations, relational approaches that rely on the tenets of the linguistic turn have been able to highlight effectively the role of identity politics in exalting or subordinating certain groups within society and on the international scene. In the case of international relations, this has been a rather critical partition for truncated monists to question, since often expressions of ethnocentrism are used to justify genocide or international attacks. It even aids scholars of IR to see the ethnocentric bent informing the discipline itself. Further exploring this influence would help abate the generation of myopic strategies in the various areas of interest in this discipline, such as international human rights, international law, international development and diplomacy.

In terms of the egocentric partition, truncated monism has had mixed results. On the one hand, monistic arguments within the social sciences have effectively questioned the objective-subjective divide that is so near and dear to dualistic approaches and have instead proposed the intersubjective realm. Shotter’s work (1993a, 1993b) has been particularly useful for putting emphasis on that in-between relational realm of the conversational reality wherein neither an
objective outside nor a subjective inside have a place for existence. Rather all that we ever have access to is the intersubjective realm of relation.\textsuperscript{224} Besides putting into question the seemingly easy division between the knower and the known, the human individual also becomes more difficult to abstract out as a clear, essential category within this argument. Instead each intersubjectively co-constructed actor is imbricated in a rich social fabric where one is constantly being engaged and is engaging others. Here too Bakhtin’s work on the dialogical is rather critical for seeing how we are much less ‘autonomous’ than we normally take for granted. In this sense the ‘ego’ as individual is removed from the center of attention and inter-human relations are placed at the forefront, which allows recognizing the degree to which we humans co-constitute our reality. However, while using “social fabric” and “intersubjective” may help pull people out of the egocentric, dualistic way of thinking and into a more collectivist, monistic approach within relational constructivism, it only questions the limits of the human individual and does not question the anthropocentric bias inherent in both terms.

Egocentrism is not questioned in another sense either. When human language is the limit, the compass is not acknowledged and the existential fear that this absence fuels engenders another form of this bias. We see this egocentrism-as-existential-isolation still at play in statements like “everything is political.” This assertion is linked to the drive to ‘humble’ truth claims in that foregrounding the political nature of knowledge production helps abate the debates about which academic argument is closest to a dualistic sense of Truth. However, this point, which still adheres to the prohibition of acknowledging the compass, is more an observation about the fruits borne of ontological separation. In fact, to state that “everything is political” only becomes afforded as a possibility when one cannot acknowledge the compass. That is, it is

\textsuperscript{224} Probably the most disruptive piece of its time in the field of sociology, Berger and Luckmann’s \textit{The Social Construction of Reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge} (1966) was the first to systematically engage this objective-subjective divide head-on in its discipline.
a conclusion to which one can, and even must, arrive when using a limited relational lens to interpret the fruits of ontological separation.

When we realize the futility of the thrust toward categorical completion and see how the relation is co-constitutive but still hold on to the dualistic hangovers of the possibility of an external mystical and the limits of human language for the purpose of knowledge production, we necessarily get a reductionist account of reality that denies the compass, the wider conversation and the possibility of generating dynamic balance or harmony. Furthermore, because the relation is generative, stating that everything is political, just as stating that we are fundamentally separate from the cosmos (or that we cannot comment on that ‘sphere’ through language), co-creates that very reality. That is, despite the methodological ability to highlight the co-constituted, contingent nature of ‘identity’ as a social phenomenon, this declaration continues to egocentrically re-affirm the separation of the ‘individual’ at a most basic, cosmic level. It also engenders a sense of paranoia about relations and still denies the possibility of being grateful to the ‘Other,’ even in human form, for acting as a mirror to show us who we are and where we stand. In other words, it does not quite get us to the point of being able to throw off the ‘political’ (read ‘existential paranoia’) load, which means that the anxiety produced by denying the compass is still not quelled. Conversely it further justifies using the same co-creative framework to continue generating the same themes in future emergent circumstances.

The final partition in question, androcentrism, is also partially contested by truncated monistic approaches in the social sciences in general. Academic monists rigorously take on categorical androcentrism by denying the possibility of male and female a priori categories. In fact, a treasure chest full of useful tools toward this end can be found in Foucault (1980, 1990), a pioneer in pointing out the strange way in which we take these categories for granted. These
truncated monistic approaches that foreground relationality are still able to demonstrate the socially constructed nature of these sex-based categories and show how adamant we—as members of a separation-based time-spacescape—are about maintaining these categories, even in the face of those who do not fit neatly into either category. In the field of IR in particular, these post-structural techniques have similarly been applied to categories such as “rogue nations,” “First” and “Third Worlds,” “food security,” “underdevelopment,” “human rights,” among many others. Being able to trace the genealogical evolution of how discursive categories are constructed in the practice of identity politics has been useful and ‘freeing’ especially with regards to categorical androcentrism, ethnocentrism and even the individualist aspect of egocentrism.

As could be seen here, limiting ourselves by human language affords a level of relationality that has allowed us to put several aspects of these inherited partitions into question. For example, ethnocentrism as well as the ‘ethnocentric’ dimension of logocentrism that sees the linear version of logic as the only possible form can be recognized through this language-based relational lens. In a similar fashion truncated monists can address the formation and assumptions of categorical androcentrism bringing this tendency and its accompanying practices totally into focus. Moreover, those aspects of egocentrism falling within the confines of the anthropocentric realm can also be contested through this truncated form of relationality.

Assumed Partitions and their Implications

Nevertheless, while this restricted relationality allows us to see the problems engendered by these specific partitions, the language-based aspect of the logocentric bias still hinges on the central partitions of anthropocentrism and the ontological androcentric assumption of separation from the divine. Assuming that human language is a viable category necessarily invokes
anthropocentrism, and this centrism relies on a primordial separation from the divine. To understand the impact that these three remaining partitions have on the capacity of methodological efforts adhering to this curtailed version of monism, this next section first situates the truncated monistic thrust within its particular time-spacescape context before elaborating on two of the most critical consequences of defining the monistic sphere in categorical terms. These costs give significant clarity to the problem of engendering a monistic strategy within a time-spacescape predominantly informed through ontological separation in contrast to the fruits that flow forth through a lens of complete interconnectedness.

By further exploring the maneuvers employed by truncated monists within their situated context, we can then identify how the primordial assumption of separation remains firmly intact within academic monism. These developments put us into a position where we may clearly see how the most relentless critiques of truncated monism garner force. We can also see how they arrive at their alternative (incommensurate) strategies and corresponding limitations. This discussion helps us to discern the critical limit between truncated and robust monism, and we are able to comprehend why truncated monists cannot move beyond their self-enforced limits. I end by revealing how truncated monists engage in what might be their worst nightmare by showing how they are intimately complicit in (re-)generating the teleological game that they document, trace and describe.

To participate in this knowledge-producing enterprise and to respond to the inconsistencies arising between separation-based methodologies and the social realm, all ‘monistic’ approaches in academia have had to start with two primary maneuvers that have engendered specific ramifications. First they could not address the divine, and second they have had to draw the boundaries of that which is detectable and verifiable at the limits of human
language. While not speaking about the divine may be conceptually different than outright stating that we are separate from it, the results are the same in terms of the kinds of fruits these knowledge-generating efforts may bear. Also, if we cannot allude to the mystical due to the way in which the time-spacescape has been built and if dualist methodologies have not been able to demonstrate clear ‘progress’ toward ‘Truth’ within the social sciences, then, by definition, truncated monists must set the limits of what they discuss to that on which one can empirically comment, which is human language. The third partition, anthropocentrism, in this case, constitutes more a part of the contextual background, since both of these critical maneuvers reinforce the notion that humans are a separate and separable category from the rest.

Jackson’s (2011) definition of the academic realm of operations as being bound by the “mind-world” relation reflects the impact of these categorical assumptions. Even though he explains in a footnote that he added the modifier “mind-world” to the commitments of monism and dualism to “clarify the intent rather than changing the substance of the argument,” this modifier illustrates in very important ways how this reduced ‘monistic’ sphere is the case in ‘legitimate’ academia (219). First, in solely addressing the mind, we can see clearly how the logocentric partition is re-produced between the mind and the other sensing-and-processing spheres elaborated in Chapter 8. Given this initial curtailment, to what ‘world’ might he be referring in this case? From within the linguistic turn, that which is know-able through language defines the world. In Tractatus Logico Philosophicus Wittgenstein observes, “The limits of my language mean the limits of my world” (§5.6). Then in a later proposition he further elaborates, “That the world is my world, shows itself in the fact that the limits of the language (the language which I understand) mean the limits of my world” (§5.62). While this observation is made

\[225\] Moreover, the fact that both monism and dualism share this modifier simply points to the shared character of these initial ontological assumptions that must be made in order to constitute and distinguish academia from religion.
during Wittgenstein’s logical-positivist phase, it has been inherited as one of the most important defining clauses for the linguistic turn for it defines that monistic field about which post-structuralists may produce knowledge.\textsuperscript{226}

Since this definition of the monistic realm is based on human language and not energy, we may depict the monistic field with which we are dealing in the Western-style academic time-spacescape as it relates to the robust monism of complete interconnectedness as follows:

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{The respective ‘breadths’ of robust and truncated monism.}
\end{figure}

Here the internal circle is constituted through human language. While we cannot specify the boundaries of language (or those of any other category for that matter), we must methodologically respect them in order to produce verifiable knowledge. In contrast, the energy portrayed in the wider, perforated circle has no limits. There is nothing categorical to the ‘sphere’ representing the monistic realm of complete interconnectedness. Anything that we find in this reality from the furthest galaxy to the minutest particle is infused with and completely interconnected by energy. In fact, according to this perspective energetic expression is the only way that any phenomenon or situation may be experienced.

As might be deduced graphically, the choice to start with human language as the delimiting factor involves some critical repercussions. The first that I address below might be

\textsuperscript{226} We can contrast this definition with one reflecting the robust form of monism proposed by Grillo (1998a): “Here there is no world in itself differentiated from ourselves – unlike in the West where the whole is distinguished from the parts, or the contents from the container, and humans from nature – and about which one could speak in the third person: the world is this or it is that thing. No, here the world is ourselves” (128).
called a ‘sensory collapse,’ and the second is a bolstered ‘dualistic’ concept of the divine. They are further developed separately below.

The Sensory Costs of Logocentrism

The logocentric bias implies that words, speech and discourse are seen as methodologically superior sources of information and knowledge due to their more ‘empirical’ and ‘detectable’ nature. From this perspective energy is neither verifiable nor accountable; it is not even contemplated as a form of communication. Nevertheless, insisting on human language as the primordial and only legitimate filter implies certain perceptive costs, especially when we contrast this approach to the more holistic strategy for sensing and processing information of Chapter 8.

The first cost is that only acknowledging information processed through human language to the exclusion of other avenues necessarily engenders reduced and linear results. Hall (1977) makes a few critical observations regarding this dilemma. Language, he states “is too linear, not comprehensive enough, too slow, too limited, too constrained, too unnatural, too much a product of its own evolution, and too artificial” (57). These qualities render it “poorly adapted” for engaging the robust realm. Words themselves are already a reduced enclosure, and the need to present them in order to have them make ‘sense’ to ourselves or another delimits our perceptive capacity even more.

The second cost is the subsequently imposed directionality on information processing: If everything must pass through language, then everything must pass through the mind in order to become comprehensible. Accordingly, we like to say for methodological purposes that any phenomenon, be it an energetic impulse received and read by the central nervous system, an ‘intuitive’ nudge or an emotion, must first pass through language in order for it to ‘make sense’
and be studied, but this methodological ‘need’ has had a practical impact on how we re-produce ‘reality.’ This assumption necessarily subsumes emotions and other forms of communication to some realm where they only have meaning once they have been ‘legitimized’ by and acknowledged through language. In other words, for the purposes of producing knowledge and engaging with reality, we force the flow to occur in one direction—from logic to emotion or from language to energy—and not the other way around. As a result, we would not be able to acknowledge the fact that our body may already be reacting to a message while our head is still trying to figure out what the impulse means. In short, this imposed singular directionality spurred through logocentrism precludes the possibility of a more comprehensive form of knowing that senses and processes information on many levels at once.

These effects of logocentrism encourage several other ramifications as well. First, subsuming the sensory realm to language fosters a conceptual collapse between the sensory and the logical, between the sensual and words to the point where they are no longer methodologically distinguished. In fact, this is how sensing and logic can both be logocentric phenomena in this time-spacescape. Next, when we use only one linear sensing-and-processing center we continue to re-create, through the generative relation, the circumstances that reinforce the singular use of this center. In this way we move from a conceptual collapse to a practical one, whereby our perceptive faculties are first denied then atrophied. This outcome likewise leads very quickly to a constrained definition of ‘detectables’ that is actually a fruit of the very lens that is being used. In sum, insisting on language as the only detectable communicative

227 The lenses of complete interconnectedness and ontological separation arrive at two very distinct ideas about what constitutes ‘detectable.’ Generating knowing through the ontology of complete interconnectedness relies equally on empirical information as knowledge production through ontological separation. However, the multiple communicational channels that one uses in energetic communication allow for a very distinct range of what constitutes ‘detectable’ than that permitted through human language only. (I intentionally use the term ‘distinct’ here instead of ‘more robust’ because it is very possible that what we ‘detect’ without using the compass may actually be just as infinite. The major difference here is the impact of what we detect. Through a lens of separation
system and the mind as the only center for sensing and processing data by definition denies other forms of information ingestion, digestion and assimilation. In addition to significantly circumscribing the potential robustness of how we sense and process information, this reduced realm generated through these isolated tools also sets the stage for fostering imbalance, the consequences of which are the central focus of international relations as a field of study.

The Re-produced Au-delà

Academic monists also inadvertently reinforce the ontological possibility of an externally conceived divine by denying the existence of the sacred within the monistic realm. They do this by choosing to define the monistic realm by an arbitrary category, that is, by drawing the limits of ‘knowable’ and ‘verifiable’ at human language. In this way they maintain the dualistic possibility that some mystical may dwell ‘outside’ the category of human language. Here Wittgenstein (1999) most clearly pronounces this division in his final observations of the Tractatus. In §6.522 he writes, “There is indeed the inexpressible. This shows itself; it is the mystical,” and then in §7 he concludes by cautioning his reader to recognize the limits of speech: “Whereof one cannot speak, thereof one must be silent.” Again, even though these points were made during Wittgenstein’s early treatise on logical positivism, this warning is still used to ‘discipline’ efforts within truncated monism today.

Wittgenstein’s statements make it clear that he is addressing a truncated monistic realm and cannot conceptualize that he is also participating in a much more robust conversation. For example, his suggestion of silence indicates that he sees it as the opposite of speaking (while using human language). By juxtaposing silence and speaking he reveals his inability to fathom

we detect things that tell us that we are separate, incomplete, imperfect and really don’t know, and through a lens of complete interconnectedness what we detect indicates how we are connected and what we can do about fostering dynamic balance.)
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that we are always energetically talking even when silent. This is merely an effect of starting with a reductionist lens that insists on the existence of arbitrary categories. In short, he still sees human language as separate and separable from everything else.

Correspondingly, this self-imposed categorical limit reinforces the possibility of a divine resting ‘on the other side.’ In fact, this is the only way that he can conjure the ‘false advice’ that being silent is an adequate way for avoiding the (dualistically contrived) ‘mystical’ realm. This dualistic conceptualization of the divine can also be witnessed when Wittgenstein discusses the “inexpressible” that “shows itself.” I would like to elucidate this last point by contrasting it to the principles of robust monism. Quite simply, in a robustly monistic realm, a separate or separable sphere called ‘the mystical’ is not permitted. Instead, the ‘mystical,’ or energy, infuses all that exists. Furthermore, if energy, or the relation, is sacred, then it is lived in silence, in noise, in stillness and in movement among all sacred beings constituted of energy; it is not just shown. So, while the sacred may ‘show itself’ in this sphere, this ‘showing’ infuses all beings and all situations in each and every emergent kay pacha point.

The process of engaging in ayni also indicates other pertinent considerations for Wittgenstein’s mandate to remain silent for methodological purposes. First, in the sacred relational practice of ayni, responding to the constant nurturing we receive from ‘Others’ in the wider conversation sometimes requires speaking and other times being quiet, so silence is not always the appropriate response.228 Granted, for academics, engaging in ayni is not the same as producing knowledge. In fact, it could easily be asserted that this observation, while potentially useful for ‘spiritual growth,’ does not and cannot respond to the academic task of contributing to the body of knowledge in a reliable and verifiable manner.

228 I would definitely acknowledge however that being silent would put us in a better place to be able to listen to the wider conversation.
This response leads us to the second consideration. When we make such an assertion, we often forget that the whole purpose of knowledge production is to chip away at the existential uncertainty in which we feel engulfed. So even though the notion of ayni and its corresponding ontological lens do not contribute to producing knowledge according to the standards of the Western-style academic time-spacescape, they instead remind us that no ‘knowledge’ can actually be generated that mitigates that uncertainty due to the lens being used to generate the strategy of knowledge production. In other words, the very lens affording the substantive categorical notion of knowledge is the same one to nourish existential anxiety. Moreover, this robust orientation insists that the only way to get over both of these ‘minor’ obstacles that also happen to justify the existence of the entire academic enterprise is to ‘re-member’ our state of complete interconnectedness. Doing so will allow us to re-learn how to use our compass and how to be wholly present in our kay pacha point. Together these help us garner the generative, co-creative knowing that can be derived from engaging in the wider conversation. In the end this contrast shows us that we may only begin to understand how being silent is not the same as not speaking by stripping away the primordial partition of the separation from the divine.

These repercussions and their robust contrasts point to two types of discontinuity between the truncated and robust versions of monism. The first gap signals the aspects of information sensing and processing that are permitted and acknowledged through each lens. The second involves the location of the mystical: Is it still outside or fully integrated into the monistic sphere? While the implications of these inconsistencies are addressed below, it is important to first note that the limitations to which truncated monists subject themselves are directly related to the architecture of the time-spacescape to which they are responding. The academic sphere with which they engage constitutes one particular compartment of a broader separation-based time-
spacescape, whose predominantly shared lens has afforded many dichotomously conceived subdivisions.

The two primary compartments dealing with the question of existence in the Western-style time-spacescape have been academia and religion (in the form of the Judeo-Christian tradition). These two subdivisions have been constructed in ontologically parallel fashion. Both are reactions to the existential uncertainty fueled through ontological separation, and both are characterized by a division between the world ‘in here’ and a category ‘out there.’ For example, in the version of academia that remains most loyal to the principles of ontological separation, the world is ‘inside’ and the ‘Truth’ sits ‘outside’ what we can access as incomplete beings. Then, on the ‘inside’ of the religious compartment we find ‘imperfect’ human beings, and on the ‘outside’ a complete, perfect, omniscient God and His kingdom of heaven dwelling just beyond our (imperfect) reach. In addition to their parallel dichotomous architectures, they also share a common division between the compartments themselves. This partition is critical for the general architecture of the Western-style time-spacescape, because it allows each compartment to undertake distinct strategies for overcoming separation anxiety.

Out of this ‘neatly’ compartmentalized panorama, the linguistic turn emerged within the academic compartment as a way to question the dualistically contrived assumption of ‘Truth,’ since what most perturbed truncated monists was how this conceptualization permitted academics to make inordinate truth-claims within a teleologic framework. Fortunately the relationality garnered through the linguistic turn allowed truncated monists to see through the political nature of such a game.229 These observations motivated academic monists like

---

229 One example of a ‘truth-claim war’ in the field of IR that I find fascinating to watch is over the definition of power. Starting first with J.S. Mills’ (1957) exposé on the “power elite,” it is great to see how the three faces of power unfold through the heated responses of Dahl (1957, 1958), then Bachrach and Baratz (1962) and finally Lukes (1974). At the same time, it is critical to revisit Gramsci’s (1999) ‘improvement’ on Marx and Hegel’s
Wittgenstein to tame methodological strivings to categorically hone in on ‘Truth’ by proposing language as the limit of what is humanly verifiable.

Clearly, not starting in a robustly monistic time-spacescape drastically changed the issues with which academic monists were dealing and for which they thought they needed a response. Moreover, because they were already ensconced in this separation-based time-spacescape, their own concepts were conceived through a primordial assumption of separation. This strategy became possible because they were operating according to the separation-based parameters of legitimacy set within the academic time-spacescape. That is, both the dilemma and the monistic strategy to abate it were intimately informed through a generally shared logic of one-in-separation.

In the end this academic monistic strategy has been quite effective for humbling the teleological truth claims being brandished throughout the academic compartment and the social-science sub-compartment in particular. However, in the dualistically conceived universe, ‘truth’ is not the only phenomenon existing in some au-delà. The ‘mystical’ also reigns there. So when academic monists selected the category of human language as a way to nullify the possibility of a dualistically contrived ‘Truth,’ they also effectively removed the sacred, divine or mystical element of the religion compartment from this sphere as well.

Deftly crossing out the ‘God problem’ for the task of producing knowledge in academia (as reviewed under the first partition above) did not seem like such a bad idea, since academia has had to guard against the weaknesses of religion as well. What they did not see, however, through this reduced lens is how their categorical maneuver also denied by default any potential monistic version of the sacred or why it might be important not to lose this conceptual capacity.

conceptualization of power and pause to see how Cox (1996, 2000) re-applies the Gramscian power framework to IR specifically before reading Foucault’s (1990) chapter entitled “Method” where he blows the ontological presuppositions of this whole genealogical evolution of the notion of power right out of the water.
In essence, instead of contemplating what a non-sub-divided greater sphere would look like, those using a truncated monistic lens within the sphere of academia have continued to reify the categories of academia, religion and human language. As a result, the sacred is still interpreted in dualistic terms, and the existence of the academic compartment itself and its specific task, in contrast to that of the religion compartment, remain untouched in this maneuver.

Examining how this dilemma would be ‘grappled’ with (or not) from the perspective of robust monism clarifies the degree to which the academic monistic strategy to deal with the fruits of ontological separation is informed by the same lens. In a robustly monistic realm, all of life reflects both the sacred and the knowable simultaneously all of the time. Again, though, because this lens does not start with any categorical limitations, this ‘sacred’ and ‘knowable’ are of a distinct nature that is directly informed by the vibrant force that infuses all of life through completely interconnected relation. So again as we radically change our focus to the generative relation only accessible through our kay pacha point, we move from aspiring to the categorical completion of substantive nouns to living verbs, which means we move from seeking to produce knowledge to being open to a knowing derived through the compass. We also move out of a religion compartment that puts us on a path of futile comparison with a perfect, complete and never reachable God to becoming aware of the constantly sacred expression of life through the energy that makes experience possible and knowable in the robustly monistic sphere. In this context, dualistically contrived truth claims can be easily thwarted by the reminder that the kay pacha point is our only point of access and action to the interconnected whole.

Shrinking the legitimate, verifiable monistic sphere to that which is categorically enclosed by human language strikes out truth claims and the sacred simultaneously across dichotomously conceived compartments. In contrast, a robustly monistic approach puts the
compartments that subdivide the time-spacescape to rest. Obviously what this means is that this latter approach risks losing academic ‘legitimacy.’ However, this is a very small price to pay in light of its critical affordances witnessed throughout Part II.

Overall this contrast helps bring into view several aspects of truncated monism. First, embracing the linguistic turn definitely allowed academic monists to question dualistically conceived truth claims whether found in academia or religion and show how damaging this orientation may be. Yet, due to the particular conformation of the time-spacescape to which they have been responding, limiting attention to the category of human language has also knocked out dealing with a robustly monistic understanding of the sacred. A feat that may only be accomplished by shrinking the monistic sphere to an area that is categorically enclosed, this strong double maneuver both bolsters the division between academia and religion and at the same time gets rid of the two hauntingly central categories of ‘Truth’ and ‘God’ (among many others).

This contrast with robust monism also highlights how academic monism and academic dualism relate differently to these assumed categories. Academic dualists methodologically strive to define the parameters of these a priori categories. For academic monists, their relation to categories goes a little like this: Categories may exist. We do not and cannot know. Therefore methodologically striving to define them is both futile and dangerous. So we shall remove this drive from the realm of possible academic discussion by limiting ourselves to the bounds of one category in particular. However, instead of trying to define the categorical limits of language, we will simply obey and respect them, which means that we also accept and assume ontological androcentrism and anthropocentrism as a necessary strategy for playing the game of academia. Now while a significant difference exists between the drive toward categorical completion and
respecting the limits of a category, the paradox here is that by using a category to enclose the bounds of academic monism, truncated monists initiate with a primordial assumption of separation. That is, they methodologically truncate this sphere through their own categorical concept.

This presents certain benefits and costs. First, despite the exaggeratedly reduced nature of this monistic sphere, it still provides sufficient learnings about relational principles so as to able to demonstrate the limits of methodologically seeking to discern the parameters of a given category. At the same time however, starting with a primordial assumption of separation renders their arguments prone to many of the issues that accompany the logic of one-in-separation. For example, categorically drawing the boundary at language still engenders a categorical conceptualization of reality and denies the compass in a robust sense. This reduced scope in turn annihilates the potential to grasp the robust view and plays a critical role in disallowing the sacred in wholly monistic terms.

A substantial critique coming from the perspective of the ‘subaltern’ highlights how these limits of truncated monism are the case and points to the biggest concern generated through this limited strategy. Even though the ability of academic monists to effectively describe the game of identity politics and show how the mechanisms of domination are applied has proven to be extremely valuable for the purpose of building awareness, their inability to make a significant difference in the game itself has been the biggest concern especially for those falling at the lower end of the teleological spectrum. As we have seen, for truncated monists limiting themselves in this way has been an intentional maneuver, for they have realized that reacting or responding to the given teleological measuring stick necessarily involves engaging in ontological slippage—at least in the time-spacescape in which they have been operating. So in the face of any approach
afforded within this separation-based time-spacescape that happens to be even more reduced, they have ascribed to this ontologically androcentric, anthropocentric and logocentric limit as the most prudent and circumspect path. Yet for those living through the ‘real’ effects of epistemic violence—even when they understand that the teleological measuring stick is socially constructed and that they themselves participate in co-constituting that stick—this heedful response is extremely dissatisfying. Being aware of these points does not seem to do much to change their circumstances, nor does it show them a ‘way out’ of their skin, sex/gender, sexual orientation, political-economic situation, or whatever the category to which the teleological measuring stick is directed.

For this reason, many from the ‘subaltern’ who have become academics still prefer the more aggressive structuralist approaches proffered through ontological androcentrism. Quite simply these categorical approaches still offer a ray of hope through the supposed ability to make ‘headway’ against the injustices they see or suffer—as long as they choose not to see the incisive lessons emerging from post-structuralism about how these strategies themselves contribute to re-creating the painful scenario they are trying to ‘rectify.’ Furthermore, the categorical approaches arising out of ontological androcentrism also offer the added benefit of potential ‘vengeance,’ that is, the eventual possibility of making the other go through that to which they have been subjected. This makes this lens’ affordances extremely attractive. In another sense, this crafty teleological framework also provides the opportunity for those ‘suffering from oppression’ to momentarily feel better by wielding a distinct arbitrary teleological measuring stick and demonstrating how another is below them. In all three instances, though, using this framework further blinds the ‘disenfranchised’ to the arbitrariness of these teleological measuring sticks and
to how these sticks continue to be re-articulated as they ‘move forward’ in ever more distant terms making them the eternally evasive target.

Those that have realized that the category is forever elusive have tried the alternative strategy of employing constructivist methods for categorical ends. One normally arrives at this point when one understands the implications of fully embracing an ontology of separation and yet cannot bring oneself to grips with simply tying one’s own hands at the limits proposed by post-structuralism. Those choosing this path still want to do something about the injustices they see. This is not surprising to see in these alternative methodologies, since those forging new methodological terrain typically arrive there due to the irrelevance or limitations of other, more mainstream, methodological approaches. In IR theory, for instance, we see this move undertaken in Wendt (1999) and Finnemore (1996) and then in the post-development literature in Escobar (1995) and Shiva (2010). Perhaps one of the most important observations coming out of truncated relationalism regarding this incommensurate endeavor though has been repeatedly indicated by Jackson (2011): Using constructivist techniques will do absolutely nothing to get you any closer to the category (201-207).

For all of these alternatives seeking to remedy the apparent ‘weakness’ of truncated monism, Chapter 10 should sufficiently explain how these strategies will only beget more of the same (energetic imbalance, use of teleological framework, non-acknowledgment, domination, etc.) However, that the strategies emerging out of the post-structural camp do not and cannot respond to the expressed concerns of the subaltern still remains to be solved. So far the truncated monists’ response has been to insist that these limits are all that we may engage in a legitimately verifiable fashion (that is, according to standards already defined in the compartment of academia belonging to the separation-based Western-style time-spacescape). As a result, they
confine themselves to the exercise of tracing in detailed fashion how oppression is exacted instead of suggesting what might be done instead to change the status quo. The reason why they must do this, I suggest, is due to the initial ontological presuppositions undergirding the academic enterprise to which they believe they must respond. They adhere to these presuppositions to avoid falling into the abyss of murky, illogical, dark, sticky beliefs that are absolutely incapable of being evaluated against ‘verifiable’ criteria.

This fear based on ‘historical evidence’ still implicitly assumes the divide between academia and religion described above, and the mere contemplation of treading on that boundary elicits deep and powerful fears. To even approximate it risks being delegitimized in the very realm where truncated monists are trying to make a difference – academia – or worse, being banished to the ‘other’ ‘unverifiable’ realm of religion. What is important to see here is that these imagined hypothetical consequences still obey the partitioned architecture of the Western-style time-spacescape (and therefore re-produce it). Moreover, the ‘memories’ to which we are responding in academia are themselves fruits of a separation-based time-spacescape. That is, it was ontological separation that got us to the point of conjuring a categorical God and a categorical Truth. Then this same lens led humans first to the teleological dispute of which version of religion allowed us to best approximate that categorical God and then to the violence and domination that ensued said dispute. Now, hundreds of years after the Dark Ages, Thirty Years War and Inquisition, we continue to use the same lens to ‘re-member’ those memories to remind ourselves of that which we need to fear. At the same time we also deny the compass, feed separation anxiety, and as such re-create the reality that fuels the perceived threat symbolized in these memories.
Limiting ourselves categorically to detectable, empirical human language in response to the violence, subordination and power plays evinced through this lens has appeared to be a safe, humble and still legitimate methodological strategy for fulfilling the assigned task of knowledge production. After all, we have been able to discern several principles that become evident when starting with the relation, and, while reduced, this relationality has been enough to see through many of the limitations involved in insisting on all of the separation-based partitions at once. For example, it allows us to discern how the teleological game is executed. It also permits us to see the effects of categorical androcentrism, egocentrism within anthropocentric bounds, ethnocentrism, and the ethnocentric dimension of logocentrism. All of these have been very useful in bringing to the fore a disruptive methodological debate within academia.

However, the idea that we should limit ourselves to the detectables of human language as the ‘safest’ or most prudent route to knowledge-production is incorrect. We begin to get a glimpse of this in the concerns expressed through the subaltern about truncated monism. In addition to the costs of starting with a categorically defined realm listed above, this shrunken sphere does not allow us to explain why this game is happening or whence the anxiety comes. Similarly this strategy cannot show how we get to the point of needing to apply these teleological measuring sticks. In being blind to this chain of ontological cause and effect, truncated monists cannot alleviate the anxiety or address what one might do about it instead, and these are rather central for making a difference for those who find themselves at the lower end of the pole.

The aforementioned points just indicate the shortcomings of limiting ourselves to human language. To understand why this is not as ‘safe’ a maneuver as one would like to think, we need to examine what is left standing of the separation-based partitions and their impact on these ‘monistic’ endeavors. Stopping at the limit of human language necessarily assumes three
fundamental partitions: the language dimension of logocentrism, anthropocentrism, and ontological androcentrism. These constitute the most fundamental pillars of the separation-based time-spacescape and are the most critical for denying the compass, which in turn drives separation anxiety and the subsequent use of a teleological framework (the constituent parts of this game). As part of losing the compass, the language dimension indicates the delegitimization and loss of energetic communication and of two key centers for sensing and processing that communicated information. Anthropocentrism signifies the absolute non-acknowledgment of the role played by the more robustly conceived ‘Other’ in co-creating our reality. Finally, ontological androcentrism means the denial and even the attempt to eliminate the complementary opposite of the masculine energetic principle.

So even though the monistic camp of academia campaigns to stop the drive toward categorical completion by pointing to how people attempt this futile task, its members still obey the partitions that lead to this teleological activity. That is, their reduced framework for operations is still categorical. In the end, this paradoxical selection of a categorical boundary for a relational monistic realm precludes academic monists from explaining or responding to the concerns listed above. To play the game they cannot admit to the monistic whole.

As a strategy for restricting that which is seen as dangerous, circumscribing the monistic realm by reinforcing a categorical limit is actually an action based on fear—a fear arising from the assumption of primordial separation. By responding to this fear, truncated monists hardly put themselves in a position to overcome the effects of assuming this separation. Instead they become quite complicit in the whole game that constantly re-generates the circumstances that allow for the (re-)emergence of these categories and their corresponding teleological trajectories. Because truncated monists aid in the co-creation of these categories by respecting the most
central ones defining existence, they ensure that they will always have something upon which to comment. In other words, this strategy equally contributes to co-creating the circumstances that allow for ‘disenfranchised’ groups to exist.

Overall Part III has been dedicated to elaborating on the characteristic features borne of using a logic of one-in-separation. In Chapter 10, we examined the anatomy of uneven unitarism and its effects. We reviewed how ontologically insisting on separation necessarily leads to a focus on a singular unit, which we assume to be complete or whole in some realm beyond our reach due to being ‘incomplete’ and not able to acknowledge the generative relation. Starting with this initial conceptualization makes us want to learn more about each category we encounter, and, with the predominantly shared insistence on separation, our efforts become part of a widely shared endeavor to ‘complete’ categories. A fundamental part of striving for categorical completion is ontological fragmentation, which involves generating more categories to describe the one at hand and to deal with the exceptions to the rules that are constantly emerging for already extant categories.

Another critical piece is the ‘ability’ to gauge progress in this endeavor. Again, because we assume ourselves to be ontologically separate and separable, we cannot ‘knowingly’ access the compass and therefore must rely on socially constructed and shared teleological measuring sticks. These sticks encourage us to (re-)conceive our incomplete nature as an imperfect one, which in turn fuels a consuming sense of not-enoughness. Since existence in this case constitutes a constant reminder of our imperfect state, we are constantly looking for ways to alleviate the pain incurred through this ‘realization.’ Consequently we hold ever more tightly onto those teleological measuring sticks. We constantly compare ourselves and others to the
rankings implied by the sticks and often use them to subject others to our particular arbitrary standards as a way to justify our superior position. In the end, though, no one can live up to these arbitrary notions (not even the ones wielding the sticks), because no one can ever ‘complete’ the category. Nevertheless employing these sticks further entrenches us in a vicious cycle by pointing out how ‘imperfect’ we really are, which in turn motivates us to demonstrate that we are making progress out of or away from this debasing and painful state. All of this results from ‘simply’ insisting on primordial separation.

Chapter 11 then shows how these general fruits of the ontology of separation have constituted the more specific time-spacescape of academia and the discipline of international relations in key ways. First we examine the products of ontological fragmentation by exploring the central partitions characterizing this time-spacescape: separation from the divine or ontological androcentrism, anthropocentrism, logocentrism, egocentrism, categorical androcentrism, and ethnocentrism. After describing the role that each teleological centrism plays in academia, we then pause to contemplate the compartmentalized and compartmentalizing nature of the academic disciplines themselves as another manifestation of ontological fragmentation.

Through this particular exploration, we land on an important lesson from the field of international relations that helps clarify the implications of the primary and secondary thrusts of each ontological lens. This occurs in two instances. First, despite the drive of the lens of separation toward imbalance, this field’s overall goal of decreasing the probability of war and conflict actually seeks to foster balance. Second, while a primary thrust of this lens is toward ontological fragmentation, the interdisciplinary nature of the field of IR demonstrates the constantly present, compensatory urge to integrate. Since the drive toward balance and
integration through the field’s goal and its interdisciplinary orientation are responses to the fruits of ontological separation, they are secondary to the primary emphases on imbalance and fragmentation. This means that this lens will constantly (re-)generate the primary products first, and this has two implications for the secondary reactions. First, these fruits will always demand strategies that strive for integration and balance, thereby ensuring the secondary responses an ‘eternal’ reason for being. Then, as part of this process, these secondary efforts will always ultimately be ineffective in replacing the primary products, which again still ensures the need for their existence.

Following this lesson emerging from the field of IR in relation to the broader Western-style academic time-spacescape, I discuss methodological fragmentation, which brings me to the point of having to distinguish between the truncated and robust forms of monism. To explain the roots of their difference, I highlight the context to which academic monists are responding. Already subsumed within a wider time-spacescape constituted through the ontology of separation, academic monists are specifically dealing with methodological concerns that arise during the exercise of producing knowledge about existence. Because this endeavor is wholly entwined with the task attributed to the Western-style academic time-spacescape (with the hope of decreasing existential anxiety), we can say that academic monists are still responding to the fruits of predominantly shared ontological separation, especially when they constrain their focus and reach by limiting themselves to the categorical boundary of human language. Quite innovative within academia, this linguistic turn has allowed a questioning of some of the partitions addressed in the first part of the chapter but also leaves the most ‘sacred’ ones untouched. In this fashion truncated monists leave the fundamental architecture created through
ontological separation staunchly intact and preclude themselves from accessing the knowing derived from a completely relational ontology.
CHAPTER 12
A FINAL SYNTHESIS:
MIRRORED REFLECTIONS & LESSONS

The main body of this dissertation involved reviewing the primary characteristics and corresponding logics of each ontological lens. This final chapter synthesizes the lessons about these two lenses garnered throughout this dissertation and reviews their implications for the methodological strategies within academia that attempt to draw on relational principles for the purpose of analyzing the fruits of a lens of separation. The first section recapitulates the general lessons gleaned about these contrasting lenses by showing how each leap of faith generates a certain ontological picture(s). This general review illustrating how we go from an ontologically robust picture to a reduced one is then followed by an analysis of the most pertinent contrasting fruits of these two lenses based on their complementary opposite leaps of faith. Next the third section contemplates what it means to employ both lenses at the same time as in the case of truncated monism within Western-style academia and international relations more specifically. I end the chapter with some reflections and suggestions about what we may do if we seriously want to generate a different approach that may actually respond to the dilemmas studied in IR.

To undertake these tasks I should first recall a few points about philosophical ontology. First, the ontological lens we use is the one we choose to use even though most of us do not recognize that we are even using one. We can change the lens at will and can switch back and forth instantaneously despite the impression we get from the vicious cycles reviewed in Chapter 10 and 11. In fact, nothing holds us to either lens except for what we imagine to be the case through co-created holograms. Ontological slippage and losing the compass then are also momentary, constantly re-produced states that last as long as we apply the reduced lens.
These holograms are the fruits of interaction in the wider conversation. How we understand them depends on the ontological lens we apply, and the picture afforded through that lens is directly shaped by an initial leap of faith. The leaps of faith that inform the two lenses in question actually constitute a parity-based relation. To assume either complete interconnectedness or separation first is to choose to privilege either the feminine energetic principle or the masculine one. These primordial energetic principles and their corresponding leaps of faith in turn engender contrasting ontological lenses along with their correspondingly irreconcilable logics of two-in-one-relation and one-in-separation.

Yet we do not just interpret ‘stuff’ through an ontological lens, we also co-generate that stuff based on those perceptions. In this way those co-created fruits are determined to a large degree through the picture afforded by the corresponding lens. Because the initial leaps of faith constitute a parity-based relation, each lens affords certain possibilities in terms of fruits (be they things, tendencies or patterns) and not others. Moreover, the affordances themselves bear the mark of the specific energetic thrust of the initial leap of faith, and this in turn implies that the fruit itself is the complementary opposite of the corresponding fruit of the contrasting lens. The relationship between the initial leap of faith, the ontological picture that this leap of faith affords, and their corresponding fruits, then, (re-)constitutes the time-spacescape that corresponds to a predominantly shared lens.

Given the complementary nature of the initial leaps of faith informing the two lenses in question, I summarize in the table below the principle characteristics of each lens discussed throughout this dissertation. Because the initial leaps of faith are complementary opposites, their respective processes and evolutions are distinct. So even though it probably makes the most
sense to read each column separately, I have tried to align the characteristics and their affordances so that they may be contrasted in more direct fashion.

Table 2. Key characteristics of each ontological lens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ontology of Complete Interconnectedness</strong></th>
<th><strong>Ontology of Separation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- We see the relation first. We are totally interconnected.</td>
<td>- We see separation first. The relation as primordial generator of life is denied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The relation is generative, emergent and wholly anchored, which makes each moment-place specific and contingent.</td>
<td>- Without a relation, the first thing to which we pay attention is a disembedded component that we take as an ontologically autonomous category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- We see the components second. Their epistemological appearance subsequent to the relation makes them both interdependent and emergent.</td>
<td>- A category is assumed to be complete on some other plane and its essence, timeless and spaceless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The limited character of our perception is actually a required state of being in relation. It helps us recognize the degree to which we need the ‘Other’ as part of a ‘whole’ relation.</td>
<td>- The resulting reductionism is a form of epistemic violence that spurs anxiety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The parity-based relation is fundamental for understanding everything and privileges dynamic balance.</td>
<td>- Instead of being a necessary condition, the limited character of our perception is seen as incomplete and imperfect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- This engenders an embracing, inclusive, holistic, integrated and integrative model that emphasizes a ‘both/and’ approach.</td>
<td>- Unitarism makes dualism an optional concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Time-space is a point and is cyclical.</td>
<td>- The thrust toward imbalance comes first through a fragmented model of autonomous units that insists on an excluding and exclusive ‘either/or’ outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The kay pacha point is the only time-place through which the constantly new circumstances emerge and at which we may act.</td>
<td>- Time is segmented and linear. The hypothetical becomes central.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- This is also the only point at which we can access our compass as a portal to complete interconnectedness. Using the compass lets us recognize the impact of our speaking in the wider conversation and builds trust in the process.</td>
<td>- Without the compass nothing is recognized that can be trusted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- This lens is based on and in alignment with cosmic principles.</td>
<td>- Instead not being able to sense our compass creates the need to guide our actions according to arbitrary teleological measuring sticks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pictorial Synthesis of Contrasting Lenses**

These characteristics constitute the basis of the ontological picture(s) that we derive through each lens, which I develop separately below.
The Ontology of Complete Interconnectedness

Starting with the feminine energetic principle, the lens of complete interconnectedness generates the following single, robust, integrated and integrative picture of the relation and its components:

![Figure 16. Ontological image afforded through complete interconnectedness.](image)

This robust picture of two-in-one relation is characterized by a solid, heavy line denoting the ontologically privileged position of the energetic relation and by two perforated circles highlighting the components’ secondary and emergent character. These elements co-constitute each other through the generative relation in the emergent-yet-wholly-embedded moment-place.

Another important characteristic we see in this picture is the impossibility of ontological separation. The first implication here is that the model itself remains constant in integrative fashion, even though its content is constantly dynamic. The second is that by starting with the relation, this ontological model mandates a ‘both/and’ approach, which discards the possibility of engaging either component as it if were independent. For example, in the case of the primordial energetic thrusts, both are needed: The feminine element is responsible for the magnetic pull that constitutes the relation, and the electric thrust of the masculine gives us the ability to distinguish between the components for the purpose of contrast. Quite simply in a ‘both/and’ picture, exclusivity does not make sense, since every Being is alive and interconnected in this way.

Another key feature is how the equilibrium of the cosmos figures in this ‘complete’ juk. First, the respective components must be complementary opposites to make a whole and constitute equilibrium. Then, their completely tethered and complementary nature draws our
attention constantly to their relative proportionality. In fact, we can even glimpse how the purpose of engaging with our mirrors is to integrate and heal the imbalances that they reflect back to us so that we may be more equipped to foster balance in the dynamic, emergent moment. For this reason we can understand how a time-spacescape shaped through this lens would exhibit an overall push toward acknowledging and being grateful toward the Other’s willingness to serve as our mirror and co-creator through the generative relation.

The Ontology of Separation

The lens of ontological separation, in contrast, starts with the masculine energetic principle and forces in primordial fashion a series of reductions from the more robust picture before we even use the lens to engage reality. Below I depict this progression:

![Figure 17. Progression of reductionism from two-in-one relation (or a parity-based relation) to one in separation (or uneven unitarism).]

If (A) of Figure 17 denotes the picture of a parity-based two-in-one relation, then (B) portrays how we might initially imagine the effect of the complementary opposite leap of faith as the inversion of (A). Although inaccurate, this initial rendition is useful for showing how the ontological emphasis is reversed: In assuming separation, what were seen as emergent components above are now pictured as existentially autonomous categories or units (highlighted through their more ‘solid’ boundaries), and the relation moves from primordial to a secondary contemplation (as emphasized by the dotted line).
Depiction (C) is more accurate due to its inclusion of the perforated circles shown in (A). These inner circles indicate the ‘limited’ character of our access to ‘reality.’ In the case of ontological separation, however, that circle symbolizes the ‘incomplete’ or ‘imperfect’ picture of any category that we assume to exist (including our ‘selves’). If through this lens we see something as incomplete or imperfect, then this sits in contrast to a categorical ideal that is complete or perfect, here symbolized by an outer circle consisting of a solid line. This solid circle appears outside the perforated circle, since, when using a lens of separation, we always assume that there is something more to what we see not the opposite. The fact that this lens leads to the assumptions that something more to us or others exists and that our limitations preclude us from getting there indicates how this ontological configuration does not permit us to see how what we are taking as incomplete is actually a necessary dimension of interdependence that allows for a different kind of ‘whole’ comprised of a parity-based relation. Seeing our limited condition as evidence of being incomplete instead leads us to feel like we must do something to fix this ‘imperfect’ condition (or at least atone for it throughout one’s life).

Illustration (C) is not completely accurate either, because it still portrays a constant relation between two categorical wholes, and this is not always the case through this lens. In fact, the secondary position of the relation, in addition to its dubious status in terms of significance, points to the optional character of its contemplation. For this reason (D) is an even more accurate portrayal of the picture afforded by the lens of separation. Here we can see how it is possible to lose sight of both the relation and the tethered ‘Other’ in this picture.

The relation’s optional character can be regularly witnessed in two instances. First, we are typically compelled (at least in Western-style ‘science’) to determine the significance of the relation, which, through a lens of complete interconnectedness, is a moot point since the
significance of all relations is already assumed. Then the typical semantic strategy of addressing being ‘in relation to’ something or somebody instead of always and necessarily being tethered to it, him or her also belies this optional quality.

This maneuver is, in fact, the defining distinction between dualism and a parity-based relation. In this case, (C) illustrates those moments when we contemplate a dualism in contrast to the parity-based relation shown in (A). In (C) the units may comprise an observer and the observed or two concepts like up and down. If it is the former case, then the one perforated circle represents what the observer can know about him or herself and the other perforated circle signals that which the observer can know about the ‘Other’ based on his or her perceptive limits. If it is the latter, then the perforated circles indicate what we can know of both ‘up’ and ‘down.’

In both of these forms of dualism, the line representing the relation only extends from imagined totality to imagined totality, indicating a significant ontological blindspot. This gap between the concentric circles—that is, between our limited perception and the imagined ‘whole’ category—cannot be bridged by the relation, since it is as ontologically estranged as the completed category due to the denied compass. Otherwise, when the compass is acknowledged, one can tune into the energetic relation through one’s robust information sensing-and-processing system and see how we are integrally engaged in an emergent, co-creative conversation with the ‘Other’ (not reach the category’s parameters however). We can even sense how we are constantly being constituted through that relation and how we are generating the co-creations we observe through the same means.

Since this state of being a dualism is optional, it must be epistemologically secondary to the initial ontological picture portrayed in (E). That is, perception through a lens of ontological separation starts with the unitary assumption of one-in-separation, which makes (D) a secondary
and totally optional consideration after the unitary concept. In other words, after starting with complete separation, the two components that constitute the dualism have been (re-)aggregated and are still ultimately existentially autonomous according to this lens.

Graph (E), in fact, captures well the source of the separation anxiety that fuels this process of ontological slippage into reductionism: Assuming ontological autonomy can only generate existential isolation and angst. In addition, this contrast makes it clear that if we are filtering information, interpreting it, making decisions based on it and acting upon it through this picture, then we will continue to generate circumstances that both reinforce our insistence on this model as the correct one and justify our anxious state. Using (E) as our ontological starting point encourages seeing our limited picture as a life-long curse that leaves us incomplete, imperfect and insufficiently informed, in contrast to seeing it as a blessing that points to just how interconnected we are and that gives us our bearings by presenting us with interdependent mirrors. This situation may be encapsulated as the decision—conscious or unconscious—to let fear determine both our actions and the very lens we use to understand our connection to the cosmos.

This brief synopsis shows the considerable amount of ontological activity that takes place when we switch from privileging the feminine energetic principle to the masculine energetic principle before we even get to the ‘initial’ starting point of the separation-based lens. The gap between that which we perceive and the relation points to this lens’ inability to let us see either the compass or the logic of the parity-based relation. As such, this lens does not offer any way to honor our shared primordial interconnection. Furthermore, by failing to recognize the relation’s primordial position in the set up of the cosmos, we also lose sight of its generative nature. For
this reason we cannot fathom the degree of our own participation in the co-created reality we experience.

So far we have seen how the initial leaps of faith give shape to the ontological pictures through which we filter experience and act on it. This co-constitutive process begets a variety of fruits that bear the stamp of the respective leap of faith. (Seeing this nevertheless requires using the more robust lens, since the reduced lens can at most only recognize an ‘optional’ form of dualism.) Now that we understand how the initial leaps of faith constitute the complementary components of a parity-based relation, I can contrast in tandem those fruits that I have developed separately in the dissertation with those of the ontology of complete interconnectedness appearing in Part II and those of separation in Part III. By seeing the complementary and irreconcilable outcomes of the respective lenses in tandem, we will be in a much better position to notice how each thrust affords a certain view and not another and how this simply reflects the juk quality of their relation.

Contrasting Fruits

In this section, I will address the most central complementary-opposite features that characterize the fruits generated through these lenses, which include being holistic or fragmentative, focusing on the emergent and anchored time-place or emphasizing timelessness and spacelessness, privileging balance or imbalance, being integrative or expansive, and embracing diversity or annihilating difference. In this list the first component of each parity-based relation is that which is favored through the more robust lens and the second through the reduced lens. I focus first on whether the lens tends to look at the whole picture or at fragmented pieces, because this helps elucidate how time(-space) is handled from either lens. These two dimensions together then offer the chance to see how either balance or imbalance is privileged.
through a given lens and the extent to which the integrative or expansive impulse is fostered. These latter sets of fruits have the most critical impact on whether difference is embraced or denied. Juxtaposing what fruits get generated first and examining how they interact permits us to grasp more readily the implications of using each lens in life or in research. It is also particularly useful for identifying the limits of truncated monistic efforts within academia, which is the aim of the following section.

Holistic / Fragmentative

One parity-based relation arising out of the energetic thrusts that animate the initial leaps of faith is whether the lens ontologically takes a holistic or fragmented approach. The more robust optic that starts with the feminine energetic principle necessarily generates a holistic picture. This picture holds both feminine and masculine energetic principles together since their relation is what allows for each other’s constitution. Here the abstractive drive of the masculine energetic principle provides clarity by helping to distinguish the elements, but it is always held in conscientious relation to the feminine principle’s insistence on the tethered relation.

The lens that starts with the masculine energetic principle, in contrast, constantly favors fragmentation by starting with separation. Contemplating the unit on its own, for example, is already a fragmentative maneuver. Then the continuous emergence of exceptions to the rule when striving to better define assumed categories encourages further dismembering. The ability of this lens to generate a more holistic picture than the single unit, as in (D) above, still emerges as a secondary afterthought to counteract the effects of this fragmentation. However, these efforts at integration are never quite capable of overcoming the ontological gap created through assuming separation first. In this sense, although the ability to separate things in order to analyze them can be an added benefit, making it the primordial ontological choice reduces the field of
possibilities in a very debilitating way, such that attempts to see the broader picture only have the option of succumbing to and re-producing the same reductionist logic.

From Wholly Anchored and Emergent Time-space to the Possibility of Timelessness and Spacelessness

Another set of parity-based fruits emerging through these lenses involves how time(-space) is handled. The robust lens insists on the tethered, anchored and emergent character of time and space as a necessary feature of any encounter. In this way every time-space encounter is a single anchored point. Moreover as each living being moves through her particular series of lived *kay pacha* points, the interaction between time and space also constitutes a *wata* or life cycle. Be it a single point or a whole cycle of lived points, we never find the one dimension considered separately from the other for each one needs the other to have expression.

Through the lens of separation, in contrast, time and space go through a series of reductions that lead to a variety of important consequences. First, the fragmentative capacity of this lens unshackles the two dimensions from one another. Then, being able to employ each dimension separately when deemed relevant eventually allows us to imagine any lived phenomenon as having a timeless and spaceless dimension to it. This maneuver is consonant with and even reinforces the idea of the complete and perfect category that exists beyond our incomplete reach, and our efforts to define the contours of that category actually hinge on the timeless and spaceless quality of that unit’s essence. An extremely important consequence of the ‘timeless’ and ‘spaceless’ aspect of any element gazed through a lens of separation is that this maneuver makes way for the ‘universal applicability’ of any category. Furthermore, articulating those lived phenomena in categorical terms and not constantly tying them to both time and space
allows the subscriber of the lens to ignore the unreachable or hypothetical element of this whole
delay in contrast to the dynamic, anchored kay pacha point.\textsuperscript{230}

I would like to show how this process occurs in the case of two categorical
conceptualizations that are central to this dissertation’s argument: time itself and knowledge.
The case of time is particularly pertinent since it permits us to see the tailspin created when we
re-direct our attention away from our kay pacha point. Divorcing time from space allows it to be
segmented and spread linearly across a trajectory moving from a (hypothetical) past to a
(hypothetical) future. The past and the future are both inaccessible; they can only be played with
contectually in the present.

The illusory needs to decrease uncertainty and plan for the future spurred through
separation anxiety mean that we usually strive to respond to hypothetical circumstances.
However, because this activity relies on time as detached from place, doing so only exacerbates
our existential angst by re-directing our attention away from our kay pacha point. Moreover, the
categorical understanding of an inaccessible ‘time’ reinforces using the idea of ‘progress’
according to some shared and imagined teleological measuring stick that stretches over linear
time. Consequently, in addition to contributing directly to existential anxiety, this idea
completely disintegrates the need to focus on the anchored and specific emergent time-place as
the only point of reception and action. The only way to get relief from these ontologically
afforded circumstances is to re-focus our attention back on the only time-place where we can
actually make a difference: to the grounded, dynamic and emergent kay pacha point, which
allows us to access the generative, co-creative compass and simultaneously assuage existential
angst.

\textsuperscript{230} It is not a coincidence that hypothesis and hypothetical share the same etymological root.
The idea of knowledge is a timeless and spaceless category based on hypothetical time. In contrast to the totally dynamic and conscientiously re-produced notion of knowing enabled through a lens of complete interconnectedness, the timelessness and spacelessness generated through a lens of separation allows us to imagine knowledge-as-category against a stable, solid backdrop. This timeless and spaceless quality again is critical for teleological ‘progress.’ In these ontologically afforded circumstances, knowledge becomes a cumulative project that behooves constant ‘production’ as one gigantic collective effort at categorical completion as seen clearly in Western-style academia today.

Privileging Balance / Privileging Imbalance

As we have seen in various instances, both ontological lenses in question afford the notions of balance and imbalance. Two aspects that are particularly relevant for the aspirations of IR scholars to make a difference in the likelihood of conflict under focus here are how the distinct epistemological appearance of the elements affects which tendency is favored first and how the afforded ontological picture treats the opposite, secondary tendency.

Starting with the relation as in the case of complete interconnectedness always and necessarily conjures both components together. The integrative thrust of the relation as supported through the feminine energetic principle means that both tendencies are embraced. Recognizing the relation first however favors the thrust toward balance in this model. Each component needs to reflect fully back to the other to afford the greatest potential for growth through ayni. Moreover, this lens’ recognition the whole juk is in alignment with the general thrust of the cosmos toward equilibrium and as such emphasizes the parity-based nature of complementary opposites. In this case imbalance is not alienated for it constitutes a critical state
for knowing what balance is and for providing clues as to how to foster it through our co-creations.

Uneven unitarism necessarily engenders imbalance first, but even when ‘two’ are considered through this lens, as in the case of dualism in (C) above, the existentially autonomous units appear first and their condition of being opposites, or their relation, comes second. So imbalance is still generated first. Furthermore, because there is no way to jump from dualism to a parity-based relation without making a complete ontological switch to robust monism, balance and imbalance through ontological separation are still conceived as ontologically independent states (albeit with a potentially ‘more significant’ relationship than between apparently non-related tendencies). It follows then that because we do not have to constantly contemplate the one in relation to its complementary opposite or their proportionality, the secondary and optional fruit of this lens, balance, will never be able to overcome its stronger drive toward imbalance.

Another way of seeing how these two lenses differ regarding this parity-based relation is in terms of whether the lens engenders a form of centrism or not. Starting with the feminine energetic principle does not allow for centrisms. The ‘both/and’ vision that accompanies complete interconnectedness remains holistic and integrative as recalled in Graph A below. Ontologically acknowledging the compass precludes needing to invoke a teleological framework. As a result one component cannot be wielded over the other while focusing on the relation, because the emphasis is on fomenting the proportionality of the components.

Once the relation and the ‘Other’ to which one is tied becomes an optional consideration, we lose the reason for insisting on ‘both/and’ and find ourselves in an ‘either/or’ situation that actually encourages the opposite of balance. Since this ‘either/or’ scenario also implies that the components are taken as ontologically autonomous categories, the fostered process becomes one
of determining which component ‘wins out’ over the other in the absence of the compass, making the final thrust of this lens one of domination.

The two scenarios are illustrated graphically below:

![Diagram](image)

*Figure 18.* Privileging balance or privileging imbalance as a result of each lens’ initial leap of faith.

Through ontological slippage we move from (A) whose horizontal line symbolizes the emphasis of complete interconnectedness on proportionality through a ‘both/and’ scenario to (F) where the disconnect between units gives the illusion of having only an ‘either/or’ option between ontologically separate categories. This fragmented picture that captures Nietzsche’s Yes-saying world forces its user to assert one over the other in the viciously pernicious attempt to reduce the existential anxiety generated through the very lens that encourages teleological thinking as ‘a way out.’

**Integrative / Expansive**

Another set of fruits that helps us understand the implications of engaging in truncated monism is the primary thrust toward integration or expansion. The ontological picture that results from starting with the feminine energetic principle does not waver (as seen in (A) above) despite the fact that the content is constantly changing. Since this ontological model reflects cosmic principles, everything we encounter as part of the ‘whole’ simply makes much more sense when we apprehend reality through this integrative lens. The work on Andean philosophy in Part II illustrates how such an integrative logic holds across all philosophical principles once the robust picture is (re-)established from the reductionist interpretations cited there.
The reduced picture afforded through ontological separation paradoxically drives expansion both in terms of what it attempts to capture through its gaze and in the actual use of the lens itself. The ever-expansive thrust of this lens can be attributed to the arbitrary nature of the teleological measuring sticks that replace the compass in conjunction with our perceived-to-be ‘incomplete’ character. Its spread occurs both as the result of missionary action and as the effect of ‘contagion.’ Both ‘senses’ are fueled through the gnawing anxiety induced by insisting on separation, justified when we see our perception as incomplete or imperfect, and given form through a teleological framework.

The missionary tendency is produced through two means: through the drive to ‘complete’ the category and as a ‘method’ for gauging measuring-stick validity. The anxiety and uncertainty generated through ontological separation compels us to categorically ‘contain’ everything we encounter as a strategy for accounting for ever more of ‘reality.’ Even the drive to complete the category of everything that has ever existed is an expansive endeavor. Moreover, the ontological fragmentation that accompanies this activity also ‘expands’ reality by accelerating its segmentation.

This expansive tendency is also conducted in the more traditional sense of ‘missionary.’ Because we have what we perceive to be an incomplete picture of the whole, we cannot know for sure whether these teleological guideposts according to which we guide our actions are valid. This state of affairs ignites within us a missionary drive to spread a given narrative with the idea that the more adherents we garner, the more valid, solid and legitimate the sticks seem. This activity supposedly removes some of the existential pressure caused by separation anxiety.

While those using this lens are spurred to encompass ever more of reality and to cajole others into using those sticks to which they have chosen to adhere, the contagious nature of
separation anxiety also increases the use of this lens. For example, once we are ‘categorically’ labeled as ‘inferior,’ it is easy to be overcome with a sense of not-enoughness, lose sight of our compass, and respond from a place of existential fear. In fact, because we can change lenses at the blink of an eye, this discursive action based on separation and fear can even teeter a person who knows how to apply a lens of complete interconnectedness and who understands the amazing implications of that lens’ fruits. For this reason, it takes quite a bit of ‘discipline’ in terms of where we direct our attention and in what way to weather the ‘contagion’ effect spurred through the rampant use of teleological frameworks.

Both the missionary and contagion forms of expansion lead to one particularly important consequence: our attention again gets pulled out of and away from our kay pacha point. We may do this by trying to ‘fix’ others according to our particular teleological measuring stick or by allowing ourselves to engage in a (futile and arbitrary) teleological battle. In both cases we can no longer focus on our current energetic profile or on how we are nurturing our co-creations with ‘Others.’ This tendency is further addressed in the next section.

Embracing Diversity / Annihilating Difference

The final set of fruits that constitute their own parity-based relation comprises the contrary tendencies of welcoming diversity or trying to eradicate it. Difference in the case of the robust lens is embraced for it is understood as a necessary element of any juk whole. Here contrasts are seen as a ‘purposeful blessing’: What we see in our mirrored reflection is a form of nurturing that allows us to (dis-)integrate and heal the resistance that we have to that difference. This critical step for us as participants in the wider conversation of the ayllu allows us to hone our skills to foster balance and be fully present in our kay pacha point.
In the case of the reductionist lens, difference becomes the target of rejection through the particular fruits of ontological separation. When we deny the compass, we base our decisions and behavior on imaginary teleological measuring sticks and then use them to gauge our progress in completing each ranking toward the desired category. This afforded outcome of epistemic violence spurs two processes in the encounter with diversity. First, that difference itself is interpreted in teleological terms. When it is viewed as being superior to where we stand along a given measuring stick, we strive for it. Nevertheless this seen-to-be-superior 'Other' feeds our angst by constantly reminding us of our ‘inferior’ and thereby ‘imperfect’ nature. Alternatively, when that which is different is perceived as categorically inferior, it becomes the object of discursive ridicule or physical violence. In both cases our ‘incomplete’ character and the existential angst generated through separation are constantly at the forefront and reinforced through the use of a teleological framework demanded by insisting on separation.

The second process emerges from our need to ascertain whether we are “on the right track” with our selected sticks as mentioned in the previous set of fruits. In this case, when we encounter evidence that others are not following our preferred guideposts, their contrary character—besides representing a threat to the ‘measurable,’ ‘standardized’ ‘consistency’ demanded through any teleological measuring stick—only affirms our inability to figure out who we are, on what path, and how close we are to ‘completing the category.’ Reminding us that we really do not know whether the stick to which we dedicate our ‘life force’ is valid fuels our sense of not-enoughness, which we then take out on ourselves and others. This reaction in turn adds to the vicious cycle’s inertia by strengthening the anxiety that supports using teleological thinking, categorization, (self-)comparison, judgment and domination.
In short, whether the lens is robust or reductionist leads to very distinct approaches to difference. In fact, across all sets of fruits reviewed here, the difference in affordances can be summed up to whether we perceive existentially autonomous units first and then their relation or emergent relations first and then their components. For example, the first thrust mentioned in each set of parity-based relations listed here is animated through the feminine energetic principle, which means that both components would have to be embraced as part of the juk-whole. When we use the lens of separation, the second fruit in each set is the primary thrust. By starting with the masculine energetic principle, we remove the necessary tie between the two and can therefore, through the ‘either/or’ picture generated through this lens, treat the fruits independently. This form of ontological androcentrism, just as in the case of imbalance and balance, spurs that which separates, fragments, divides and abstracts first, which means that its opposite is at most a secondary alternative.

As I stated at the beginning, the ontology of separation and the ontology of complete interconnectedness are optics arising from complementary opposite leaps of faith. It is not a coincidence then that the ontological presuppositions of these lenses, their resulting logics and privileged fruits are diametrically opposed. (Nor is it a coincidence that we can only see their complementary opposite nature through only one lens.) In all, the ontology of complete interconnectedness renders a robust field of ‘anchored’ ontological possibilities, privileges integration and balance through the parity-based relation, and encourages embracing diversity. The ontology of separation in contrast denies the primordial relation and reduces the field of ‘anchored’ ontological possibilities by shattering its tightly integrated architecture. This maneuver then divorces and disembodies time and space, creates the illusion of timeless and spaceless categorical essences, encourages living based on hypothetical scenarios, and spurs
imbalance. Even though the logic of one in separation rejects difference, the fact that the complementary opposite never goes away due to being a cosmic principle makes the effort to eradicate and dominate the ‘Other’ a perpetual activity. In short, by obliterating the possibility of acknowledging the compass, the epistemic violence of reductionism soaks us to the core with a sense of ‘not-enoughness’ and leaves us only with imaginary teleological measuring sticks to understand our ‘place’ and that of others in the world, which, in turn, provides the basis for this lens’ own reproduction.

The irreconcilable nature of these initial leaps of faith and the fruits borne through their respective lenses presents certain issues when we try to partially adhere to both lenses. In the wake of these synthesized lessons, we are in a better position to re-examine the case of truncated monism as an ontological strategy for orienting methodological endeavors within the Western-style academic time-spacescape. The next section revisits the issues involved in taking on such an incommensurate strategy.

**Analysis of Truncated Monism**

Tasked with synthesizing lessons regarding the contrasting ontological lenses in question, the first half of this chapter emphasized the complementary-opposite nature of the leaps of faith informing each lens so as to clarify some of the irreconcilable issues that emerge when their fruits interact. In many cases the corresponding fruits themselves end up constituting parity-based relations and are irreconcilable across lenses. The initial leap of faith also shapes the order of epistemological appearance of the elements and thereby determines which fruits will be eternally privileged when using that lens. Consequently, using the lens of one leap of faith to (re-)interpret the fruits of another provides no way of grasping the logic that informed the generation of those fruits, as we saw throughout Part II.
The case of truncated monism elucidates yet another instance of how the leaps of faith that give shape to these lenses have certain limitations as to what they are capable of engaging. Chapter 11 outlines the ways in which Western-style academia and its disciplines as fruits of the lens of separation are geared toward producing knowledge about phenomena encountered in the cosmos. Within this separation-based time-spacescape, alternative methodological strategies have arisen to respond to gaps left by those approaches that wholly ascribe to ontological separation. Since favoring separation to such an extreme, imbalanced degree generates important holes in ‘scientific’ explanations, many researchers especially in the social sciences have been successful in solving certain problems by reincorporating some degree of relationality into the methodological equation.\footnote{As a matter of fact, these relational strategies have only been able to resolve problems generated by not ‘seeing’ relational contributions falling within the anthropocentric realm delimited by human language.} Because all of these approaches—no matter what they claim as their philosophical ontological wager—still operate within the parameters of this separation-based time-spacescape and work toward goals informed through separation, their attempt to inject relationality into this sphere is an incommensurate project.

In light of this quandary, this section has three specific aims. The first is to ‘situate’ truncated monism between the ideal-typical lenses of complete interconnectedness and separation. Here I refer back to Jackson’s (2011) methodological analysis of the field of international relations to anchor this discussion in that debate. The second aim is to summarize the important methodological contributions provided through the innovative use of a partially relational lens, before discussing its limitations both in general terms and with regards to the field of IR more specifically in the third section. By showing a bit more thoroughly how these lenses and their corresponding leaps of faith interact, I am then able to make some final
suggestions for those interested in doing something constructive about the stated goals of IR as a way to close the chapter.

Situating Truncated Monism as Methodological Strategy

Returning to the description of Jackson’s (2011) two-by-two table that roughly depicts the methodological panorama of the field of IR, I would like to re-articulate his observations in terms of the differing degrees of relationality across methodological strategies. To do so, I continue to focus primarily on Jackson’s first wager of philosophical ontology and re-situate the approaches he covers according to a continuum ranging from a fully embraced ontology of complete interconnectedness to a fully embraced ontology of separation and not just from monism to dualism. In this panorama the ‘neopositivist’ or ‘falsificationist’ methodological strategies he discusses coincide completely with the tenets of ontological separation and adhere to all of the separation-based partitions reviewed in the first part of Chapter 11.232 In this way, these approaches reflect in ideal-typical fashion what it means to wholly embrace the masculine energetic principle to the denial of the feminine.

Critical realism and the two truncated monistic approaches then reflect increasing degrees of relational compensation for the big gaping hole left by only taking one energetic principle into consideration when trying to erect an institution dedicated to ‘scientific knowledge production.’ The most modest injection of relationality appears in critical realism. While its adherents still explicitly embrace what is commonly called ontological dualism and openly adhere to the possibility of better defining the categories, they still depart from neopositivists by engaging relational tools to execute this task. So even though they cannot be considered as truncated

232 Jackson (2011) provides an in-depth bibliography for each one of the four methodological strategies he develops in his book. My discussion here applies to the sources he cites for each strategy.
monists, their maneuver constitutes a ‘first’ relational step away from a completely separation-based approach.

Then the more significant relational dose is found among the approaches that embrace truncated monism. These approaches recognize the impossibility of categorical completion as the end goal of any methodological effort, which fundamentally distinguishes analyticism and reflexivity from the ‘ontologically dualistic’ assumptions made by critical realists. In this case we might say that those falling under truncated monism apply relational tools to monistically conceived phenomena. The divergence of these compensatory efforts from critical realism however is still only a matter of degree, for the truncated monists are still using relational tools within a time-spacescape that demands that this be done according to a categorically assumed, cumulative field called ‘knowledge’ or ‘science.’ The difference here is that critical realists use relational tools toward explicitly categorical ends for the purpose of producing knowledge, and the truncated monists apply them to relationally conceived phenomena for the same purpose.

This distinction actually points to two instances of incommensurability. In the first case relational tools cannot be used to identify the contours of the category, because these tools derive from ontological assumptions that derive from the complementary opposite leap of faith to that which allows for the category to even be imagined. In fact relational tools must assume that categorical completion is impossible rendering this methodological strategy a barren one. Second, and for the same reason, relational tools cannot be used to produce ‘knowledge,’ or a cumulative substantive demanded by the Western-style academic time-spacescape. Instead relational tools can only get us to knowing, and knowing in the case of Western-style academia is completely delegitimized. For example, all four methodological strategies engaged in the endeavor of producing knowledge about international relations still abide by this purpose defined
through ontological individualism. Moreover, to remain a ‘legitimate’ part of this time-spacescape, one may not do otherwise. As a result this purpose denies the knowing derived from a fully robust logic of two-in-one relation as a legitimate activity. All approaches, then, that attempt to insert relational considerations into a separation-based time-spacescape and that work toward its separation-based defined ends are dedicating their ‘life force’ to an incommensurate project. Among the methodological strategies listed here critical realists engage in both forms of incommensurability while truncated monists only commit the latter.

Nevertheless, the reliance of all three approaches on relational tools to fill the gaps left from a singular focus on ontological separation still shows separation’s continued need for relation. That is, the cosmic principle of juk holds. However, when those strategies for fostering balance themselves are conjured in separation-based terms, parity is not afforded. That is, even though truncated monism sidles right up next to robust monism in terms of the principles to which it adheres, just one degree of separation denies the compass and therefore all of the benefits of embracing robust monism.

This situation calls into question the very philosophical ontological distinction between what has traditionally been called dualism and monism within Western-style academia, since the incommensurability required of the methodological approaches engaging in the latter orientation precludes them from actually making a difference. I suggest that we start to use a different lexicon, which will provide greater clarity regarding this issue. In fact, ‘ontology of separation’ and ‘ontology of complete interconnectedness’ more accurately address the presuppositions made in philosophical ontology than ‘dualism’ and ‘monism.’

These latter terms are problematic in two distinct senses. First, that ‘mind-world’ monism is a relational ontological orientation that initiates with certain fundamental pillars of the
ontology of separation indicates the limitation of the term monism: It signifies a ‘single (time-)space’ but the circumference can vary according to the parameters of a given defining category. So a whole variety of concentric circles may be drawn within the infinite reach of robust monism to portray varying circumferences depending on the category used. By relying on a categorically defined sphere, using the term ‘monism’ in academia does not ensure that a robust concept emerges. As such, employing the ‘ontology of complete interconnectedness’ or ‘robust monism’ is essential for being able to conceive of the fruits borne through a very robust understanding of reality.

Second, ‘dualism’ is a confusing misnomer since both the ontology of complete interconnectedness and the ontology of separation involve ‘two’ at different points of their respective epistemological progression. Here the ontology of complete interconnectedness requires the constant contemplation of the two components of any relation and their proportionality. Likewise, a ‘dualist’ lens ends up with the uneven unit as the ontological starting point, and this term hardly conveys this lens’ emphasis on singularity.

However, if we must continue to define the debate of Jackson’s first wager in terms of mind-world monism and mind-world dualism, I insist that those methodological strategies falling closer to analyticism and reflexivity be called either truncated monism or Western-style academic monism to recall the constantly reinforced limits of these efforts, since their incommensurate proposition does not qualify them as robustly monistic and precludes them from offering robust monism’s critical benefits for the stated goals of IR in particular. Even though the initial leap of faith defining the purpose of their activity still determines their relative standing along the continuum ranging from a fully embraced ontology of separation and a fully embraced ontology of complete interconnectedness, using this terminology will at least allow us
to capture the categorical limitations imposed on the potential breadth of the monistic realm allotted within this sphere.

In brief, all three ‘alternative’ methodological strategies responding to the deficiencies presented by applying a wholly separation-based methodological approach do so by re-introducing some level of relationality. When understood from the perspective of two-in-one-relation, this is a ‘natural’ response based on energetic principles of parity-based thrusts. This particular situation demonstrates clearly how a time-spacescape shaped through ontological separation can only afford relationality (and balance and integration) as a secondary response, how the logic of two-in-one relation is necessarily integrated and integrative, and how that of one-in-separation is expansive, encompassing and reductionist at the same time.

Contributions of Truncated Monism to a Separation-based Time-spacescape

Despite these circumstances each relational step taken to fill the gaping hole left by such a one-sided reductionist approach within Western-style academia still offers certain key insights into our understanding of reality. First we find that relational principles—even if bound by an anthropocentric limit—proffer critical subtleties to analyses that cannot be perceived with a lens solely informed by ontological separation. For instance, throughout Part II we saw how Salomon used a separation-based ontological lens to (re-)interpret Andean philosophical concepts. Because his selected lens does not even come close to prodding its users to seek the integrative capacity of whatever is under question, he was completely unable to generate (re-)interpretations that came anywhere close to the ‘sense’ conjured through a two-in-one-relation logic. Nevertheless, when he hit an explanatory wall, as in the case of ayllu in Chapter 6, he was able to conjure a concept of community closer to the robust conceptualization of ayllu by turning to Spalding’s relational insights on the topic.
Other relational theorists have been similarly critical to our understanding in the field of IR. Foucault, for example, has been able to demonstrate the costly effects of using a categorical approximation to reality in all of his relational analyses about the anthropocentric realm. In his work, he systematically moves our attention to the emergent relation and urges us to examine how ‘powering’ takes place through discursive relations in generative fashion. His work is also critical for helping us to see how the configuration of power relations and the shared background shape the options that become available in the emergent moment. For methodological purposes, he urges us to examine how ‘naturalized’ categories, like ‘rogue nations’ or ‘developing countries’ in the case of IR, come to be ‘normalized’ in genealogical fashion. Alternatively, Weber, in his critical article on “‘Objectivity’ in Social Science and Social Policy,’’ provides equally poignant insights into the inextricability of the observer from the observed and explicitly develops the ideal type as a way to share information about the researcher’s unique experience in a constantly emergent and wholly embedded context. While also adhering to the human-only realm, Weber is fundamental for moving us from the assumption that individuals are ontologically isolated—and as such can be aggregated and disaggregated at ease—to the idea of an intersubjective actor wholly embedded in the social fabric and for underlining the importance of this observation for methodology.

Truncated monists have certainly played a key role in making people aware of the effects of starting with a categorical lens ranging from the biopolitics of the medical gaze and the debilitating drive of chauvinism to the crippling impact of methodological imperialism. By demonstrating the impossibility of ever arriving at a complete category, these academic monists’ efforts have been crucial in ‘humbling’ the reach of ‘truth’ claims, showing the arbitrary character of ethnocentric claims, outlining the damage that can be exacted when we accept these
teleologically conceived units, and questioning a universal/ized notion of logic. In short, truncated monistic efforts have been able to complement wholly separation-based approaches in important ways to respond to those gaps that could be resolved through relational insights that concomitantly respect categorical boundaries on a metatheoretical level.

What Gives? The Limitations of Truncated Monism

This very same set of circumstances however also constitutes the source of the weaknesses of this orientation’s methodological strategies. In their efforts to respond to these gaps, they also have to respond to the parameters of a separation-based architecture. Academia is still a fruit that bears the mark of prioritizing the masculine energetic principle. As a result they have had to take the most hallowed partitions of the ontology of separation as given while they engage this project. More specifically, they have abided by certain categorical parameters by defining the ‘knowable’ relational realm based on the categorical criterion of human language.

The hybrid character of this venture induces considerable, irreconcilable friction, such that something has got to give to even allow a methodological strategy based on relational principles to exist within the Western-style academic time-spacescape. Accordingly I identify the most critical ways of ‘compensating’ for this incommensurate condition through a framework based on complete interconnectedness, since the ontology of separation is blind to its own complementarity. This framework of contrast or mirroring allows us to understand how each energetic thrust is absolutely integral to a whole juk while simultaneously giving us insights as to how the two logics interact and therefore the eventual end results of methodological strategies relying on truncated monism.
Using this approach we can identify the four main intertwined forms of ontological compromise, which all constitute forms of epistemic violence. In the first case, mixing ontological lenses, as we have seen repeatedly, immediately generates a reduced rather than robust picture. This necessarily reduces the range of possibilities and allows for ignoring the robustly generative quality of the energetic relation and its associated implications. A reduced lens can only afford a constrained sphere of what might be encompassed and conceived in the academic monistic realm. Second, when we partially embrace both lenses in any methodological endeavor, the categorical trumps the relational and componential every time. With just one degree of separation, the integrative and relational become secondary to the fragmentative and categorical, which means we become blind to the tethered aspect of every ‘Other’ we perceive.

The third compromise involved in asserting a relational approach while respecting categorical boundaries is that we can only partially contest the separation-based partitions that characterize the Western-style academic time-spacescape. Basing relationality on the human-only sphere by limiting it to human language leaves ontological androcentrism, anthropocentrism and the language dimension of logocentrism firmly in place and even reinforced. This situation spurs two other consequences. First, in contrast to starting with a robustly monistic realm based on energy, this essentially categorical maneuver paradoxically bolsters the idea that something mystical also exists beyond our reach. Second, reinforcing those partitions fortifies and justifies separation anxiety and therefore the vicious cycle of ontological separation.

Finally methodological approaches that hold on to the partitions of ontological separation are not going to get us any closer to balance. The same degree of separation that favors a reduced categorical approach as well as ontological fragmentation also immediately drives imbalance before balance. This compromise may not seem terribly severe when all we want to
do is produce knowledge as a substantive noun, but when a field of study’s goal involves decreasing the likelihood of war or increasing the chances for peace, it presents a serious obstacle. In this case being able to flip the imbalance-to-balance ratio requires honing skills for knowing in the present, emergent and anchored kay pacha point.

In fact, that which is denied through each compromise listed above is exactly the piece that can make a difference in the field of IR. To illustrate this point I would like to revisit the relation between thinking and sensing/feeling. As we saw in Chapter 8 the reductionist lens allowed for a separation between thinking and sensing/feeling and, through the process of being interpreted teleologically through an ‘either/or’ filter, this resulted in a virtual collapse of the two processes into one. By flattening the more robust system for sensing and processing information into a unidirectional, linear system solely based on thinking, we ontologically discard the possibility of imagining the need to integrate and harmonize thinking and feeling, let alone being able to do it. Consequently, those faculties that allow us to sense energy are atrophied because we are ontologically ‘blinded’ to them.

Furthermore, while the premises of the linguistic turn are precisely what allow us to both introduce relational principles into the separation-based Western-style academic time-spacescape and identify the gaps created through an ontological lens wholly based on separation, the fact that we start with categorically defined human language itself paradoxically reinforces this thinking-sensing collapse engendered through reductionism. Using the narrative that all social construction, which includes human emotion, intuition, thinking, etc., is understood through language limits all legitimate forms of ‘knowledge production’ to thinking, and this activity is based on one energetic principle, one area of the body, and the predominant elements of air and
fire. This strategy does not and cannot generate a comprehensive form of knowing. As a result the very basis for the linguistic turn denies the possibility of knowingly participating in the wider conversation based on energetic communication.

In this way then the very innovative approaches spurred within the linguistic turn already disable themselves before research is even conducted. Because they draw on the feminine principle, they are able to ‘get’ the relational principles and compensate in part for the serious imbalances. Yet by starting with a categorically defined realm, all of these compromises must take place and all of them end up favoring ontological separation.

Take the concepts of ‘rogue nation’ or the ‘Third World’ for example. First, while we can study the traces of the genealogical development of the discourse of a given label, studying an anthropocentrically defined category is already limiting. Then if we try to ‘de-construct’ it by using categorically limited tools, those tools also force a curtailed notion of ‘detectable’ and insist on a collapse between sensing and thinking. With this approach we actually end up reinforcing that label’s inertia and therefore that way of seeing the world. In short, we breathe life into whatever it is to which we think we are responding: If we start with a reduced lens and only employ a collapsed thinking-sensing system, then we can only reproduce a limited picture and limited fruits.

This scenario points to the traps into which truncated monists have fallen and from which they have yet to escape. Two traps in particular come from being blind to the more robustly conceived (energetic) relation. The first trap can be expressed through a question: On what do
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233 Comprehensive knowing requires a dynamic balance in use and application of all three areas of the body (monay, ruay and yachay) and all four elements (water, earth, air and fire). The Andean alternative on sensing and processing information as described in Chapter 8 allowed us to unpack the conceptual collapse of sensing and thinking and partially resolve the practical collapse involved in shutting down the other centers that has generated so much huecha (imbalance) by only using one or two element(s) and not acknowledging the essential contributions of the others.
truncated monists rely when they cannot acknowledge the compass due to the hallowed partitions to which they subscribe and when they denounce the use of teleological measuring sticks? When we seek to respect the categorical boundaries of the time-spacescape in which we want to continue participating, we ontologically back ourselves into a corner. The only option is to refrain through self-limits and discipline, which demand the compromises and incur the repercussions listed above.

This peculiar position takes us to the second trap—that of allowing ourselves to believe that we are engaging in a ‘safe’ endeavor by restraining ourselves in this way. However, using relational principles for a categorical purpose is to engage in an activity deemed ‘safe’ according to categorical, not relational, standards. In the end this is hardly safe in terms of the concerns typically raised from a truncated monistic perspective (power, domination, etc.), for these efforts, as we have evidenced repeatedly, obtain the opposite of what is intended. As such, within the Western-style academic time-spacescape we see how post-structuralists re-create the conditions that justify and beckon future research, relationalists end up reinforcing ontological separation, and Western-style feminists further drive ontological androcentrism in very similar fashion. In addition to (re-)creating these situations for themselves, they cannot do anything either to keep other humans from engaging in categorical completion. That is, while generating pivotal social critiques about this activity and the teleological framework that drives it, truncated monists cannot explain why it is happening, because they do not and cannot acknowledge the compass.

In short, these outcomes both for the scholars themselves and their eventual audiences signify that using truncated monism will still ensure an endless array of content to study, follow and document and that we will be able to fill hard drives with studies about all of the horrible things that humans are capable of doing to one another and to the environment. However,
because we will not be getting ourselves any more aligned or in balance through this endeavor, our study of these phenomena will only support their inertia. In the case of IR and its corresponding goals, this situation represents a self-prescribed ‘death sentence’ that guarantees ‘long-term employment’: If truncated monistic strategies enhance uneven unitarism and imbalance, then we will hardly make a dent against this field’s aims while co-creating lots of opportunities for study.

Furthermore, truncated monists actually help promote using ontological separation by encouraging its spread. Because employing an already reduced form of monism can do nothing to actually overcome the architecture that spurs imbalance first, it can also do nothing to stop encroachment and fuels it instead. Due to the ways in which two-in-one relation and one-in-separation interact, these efforts actually contribute to the logic of one-in-separation and its corresponding fruits. So even though truncated monists do not condone domination outright, their work does not remedy the vicious cycle and therefore still encourages ontological isolation by being blind to the robust whole, which is the very source of the relational principles they promote.

One of the ways in which we see this encroachment is through the global expansion of the forms of knowledge production characteristic of this time-spacescape. The global spread of international education standards for accreditation, facilitated through the missionary and contagion effects delineated above, is deleteriously treading on other ways of knowing that constitute important contributions to planetary well-being. Truncated monistic approaches are involved in this trend, since post-structuralism, post-modernism and constructivism are now an integral part of the cannons of contemporary Western-style academia. As such they get reproduced and assimilated into other time-spacescapes that foster other ways of knowing,
especially now with the big push toward graduate education throughout the world. When a given context nudges one to feel like he or she needs to rank higher on some imaginary teleological measuring stick called ‘education’, adopting and assimilating the fruits of the lens that accompany the process are easy.

In addition, subscribers to this methodological orientation can also feel the urge to recruit others to ‘their cause’ throughout the globe, because they have no way to resolve the teleological missionary urge either. From a ‘peripheral’ point of view, it is especially curious to see how these approaches are particularly alluring in those parts of the world that appreciate relational considerations. Often these approaches offer just enough of a relational bent to pull some into the separation-based Western-style academic time-spacescape (although not necessarily enough to ‘dupe’ the structuralists representing the subaltern as reviewed at the end of Chapter 11).

In the end, even though understanding the basic tenets of truncated monism makes it easier to make the leap to robust monism given its relational orientation, using it to inform one’s methodological strategy within the Western-style academic time-spacescape will firmly hold ontological androcentrism in place through (a) an exaggerated reliance on mind-based ‘logic’ to the exclusion of the whole information-sensing-and-processing system, (b) a continued denial of the compass, and (c) the methodological privileging of analysis, dissection and abstraction over integration and synthesis. In brief, these are the effects of attempting to maintain a viable, relation-based methodological project in a separation-based time-spacescape like academia that necessarily involves partially adopting two ontological lenses in incommensurate fashion and having to acquiesce certain allowances every methodological step of the way. In a broader sense, this very scenario demonstrates what I mean about ontological separation’s drive to encompass everything—including relational methodological approaches—while at the same time
effectively reducing each assimilated component and thereby curtailing the potential capacities they represent, such as being able to flip the balance-imbalance ratio.

Overall I have striven to demonstrate through contrast how the one logic that is predominant throughout the world today is not capable of taking us to the balance so central to the logic that afforded Andean philosophy. In sum this exercise has allowed us to see the critical lack of fit between the logic used to constitute the field of IR and this field’s drive to decrease war, increase peace, foster sustainable development, etc. As a result my conclusion is that the (onto-)logical means used among all methodological strategies within this field of study cannot engender the sought-after ends. Not even the monistic approaches that have arisen within the separation-based time-spacescape that uphold certain partitions as legitimate are (onto-)logically capable of inculcating peace, ensuring sustainability or diminishing the tendency toward war, because they still abide by and re-produce several key partitions that are the fruits of ontological separation. As a result, they too are blinded to the only means through which a significant difference in balance may be exercised: the compass.

The point that I am making here is not a matter of ‘power.’ The fight over power comes after the choice to employ the lens of separation. Instead I am talking about how the anatomy of a given ontological lens permits a certain mechanical range (just like the human body has one particular variety of motions in which it can engage and the hummingbird another). The fact that we choose our lenses means that it is crucial for us to understand what is afforded through each lens so that we may see the link between our choice and its consequences. Even though most people deny the ability to choose—understanding their particular lens as an inevitable part of their ‘programming’—whatever choice we make involves several integral ramifications as
delineated here. Since we are the ones co-creating our reality, our shared time-spacescape will not change until we begin to perceive it differently.

In addition to knowing how each lens works and what it may afford, it is equally important to grasp how the lenses interact and why. As we saw throughout the list of compromises, any degree of separation immediately loses the potential to reach the most critical fruits of complete interconnectedness. With the categorical trumping the componential every time, the logic of robust monism cannot be subsumed to serve a categorical purpose—as, for example, learning more about “inter-national relations” or “world politics”—without losing the force of that logic and handing over any garnered results to the force of the categorical one.

This point has been illustrated in two main ways in this dissertation. Part II showed what happens when we use a separation-based anthropological lens to understand the fruits of a time-spacescape predominantly shaped through the ontology of complete interconnectedness. This interpretive lens obtained a very reduced understanding of the philosophical principles reviewed there. Then the case of truncated monism in Part III allowed us to witness the same reductionist tendency when we attempt to apply relational principles to methodological strategies within a time-spacescape predominantly shaped through separation.

This particular situation creates a peculiar time-place for truncated monists. While they have made commendable efforts in pushing the envelope from within the academic ‘bubble,’ the attempt to force the recognition of our primordial connection to the ‘Other’ goes directly against the very thrust of the ontological lens that has given shape to the parameters that they must respect in order to participate. Moreover, since the lens of separation is blind to its own complementary nature in relation to the lens of complete interconnectedness, it ends up encouraging the eradication of the other. Basically then truncated monists are trying to
encourage acknowledging the relational in a Yes-saying world that tries very hard to annihilate its existence. Despite the fact that the fruits they condone are so desperately needed to energetically compensate for the time-spacescape’s constant push toward imbalance, these efforts to re-assert the relational as a feminine energetic thrust have been rigorously challenged in this time-spacescape. This peculiar situation has required the intricate work of walking on a discursive tightrope where the balancing act depends wholeheartedly on not acknowledging or recognizing the implications outlined throughout this dissertation.

So far their strategy of partially embracing both lenses has saved them within that realm, but in the broader scheme of things they are disabling their own efforts by playing this game. We might re-articulate this situation in the following manner: If an orange tree represents the ontology of separation and an apple tree that of complete interconnectedness, don’t expect to get apple juice from an orange tree that one has been treating as an apple tree. If the orange tree bears fruits that engender imbalance as their primary thrust, do not expect to get fruits that do otherwise. When we choose the tree, we also choose its fruits and all of the other by-products that then become possible, such as juice, marmalade and pies. In this case, truncated monists’ work on the orange tree still results in orange juice over the long haul.

Fortunately though I am not addressing apple and orange trees, but ontological lenses that arise from complementary opposite leaps of faith, and several important differences emerge here. First, we can change the lens we use whenever we choose to do so. Second, just because the lens of ontological separation offers a reduced view of the field of ontological possibilities, it cannot actually destroy either that which is intimately tethered to it or the relation. So no matter how much weight is lent to the reductionist lens, both energetic principles still exist. No matter how
blind we are to the state of constantly being part of a parity-based relation, we never actually get out of it.

Third, the integrative and integrated aspect of complete interconnectedness only *seems* ‘weak’ in the face of the disintegrating tendency of separation, but we can only arrive at this conclusion when viewing the situation through a reduced lens in the first place. I have been arguing that starting with the feminine principle or the ontology of complete interconnectedness is actually the more robust approach to seeing the whole, since starting with the masculine energetic principle only allows us to see one (uneven) unit in separation at a time. So in spite of the lens of separation’s ability to effectively ‘disintegrate’ the ontological robustness of complete interconnectedness, the whole integrated/integrative logic becomes apparent just as quickly by changing lenses. This may not be as ‘easy’ as the first, since this requires ‘getting’ the logic of ‘juk’ and going through the process of removing partitions and re-recognizing relations through the Andean-style process of mirroring/contrast, but at least it is always already there and accessible in wholly integrated and integrative form when we allow ourselves to see it. Since this is the more ‘cosmically aligned’ lens that allows us to see the ‘wholer’ picture, trying to ‘kill’ it is futile, because each one of us depends on its truths in order to exist ourselves. Not even the ontology of separation can make sense unto itself without standing in contrast to interconnectedness, and this ‘simple’ truth points to the everlasting strength of this lens.

Fourth, just because the lens of separation blinds its adherents to the complementary opposite leap of faith does not mean that there is not still a drive or pull towards the opposite. No matter how hard we try to deny difference or contrast, it does not go away, and in fact the more out of balance we become toward one component, the more circumstances start to call for its opposite. This is the cosmic law of equilibrium: No matter how far out on a separated limb
we go, we must still come back toward the integrative trunk at some point. We see this being applied all throughout academia. Descartes’ formula for making progress against uncertainty reflects a longing to get back to wholeness, despite his severe insistence on separation. Then the critical realists’ and truncated monists’ use of relational principles to explain some of the gaps left by a singular focus on separation is essentially an energetic compensation for the imbalance generated by only using the masculine principle. Even the drive of IR to counteract the constant threat of violence and conflict in the world demonstrates this point.

While our relation to the ‘Other’ can never energetically go away, it is critical to pay attention to how the particular ontological image afforded by each lens deals with the secondary tendency of any given parity-based relation to see clearly the kind of reality that lens can generate. A lens of complete interconnectedness proffers the ability to see both components at once and to nurture their relation with the complete understanding that this contrast is the evidence of life and an important reason for celebrating it. A lens of separation in turn denies the integral role played by the ‘Other’ by removing the primordial relation from ontological view. Moreover, as we have repeatedly shown, the separation assumed between the components of any parity-based relation fosters a Yes-saying, ‘either/or’ world in which the secondary tendency is demeaned, dishonored or dominated. As long as this particular dynamic, so well noted by Nietzsche, Fanon and Bhabha within the anthropocentric realm, remains the case for both human-only relations and those of the more robust ayllu, the time-spacescape we inhabit will continue to exacerbate social and environmental ills and leave the efforts undertaken in the name of IR ineffective.

With what I have been able to discern and outline here, I would argue that it would be worth our while to contemplate completely changing lenses to co-generate a very different
reality. In fact, unless we use a different lens, we will not be able to see that what we are experiencing is our co-creation, realize the role we play in giving that co-creation its presence, or integrate and heal the contrast that it represents. Unless we use a different lens, we will still be ineffectively looking to the ‘Other’ or ‘Others’ as a way to fix the problems of the world. I will admit that the sheer weight of repetitions of these shared vicious cycles alone renders pulling oneself out of the lens of separation an extremely hefty task due to the constant ‘discipline’ needed to remember to stay present in one’s kay pacha point and focus on the compass, but it is really the only way in which we can make any difference at all for anything. In fact, doing so may actually start tipping our co-created reality back towards balance.

**My Suggestions for Those Concerned with Contributing to the Goals of IR**

Since we can now see how truncated monism cannot actually generate apple juice and how the lens we choose to employ gives generative shape to the time-spacescape in which we find ourselves, I make the following suggestions for those who actually want to ‘do’ something about the state of affairs that concerns students of international relations the most, like an international system that constantly threatens upheaval, ‘shocking’ social violence, rampant environmental destruction, and an economic system that insists on accumulation whereby those who do not are rejected. To start doing something about these fruits of ontological separation, two steps are particularly necessary. First and foremost, we need to understand how this ego game of separation works so that we may see how difficult we make it for ourselves to feel the connection by playing the game of demonstrating superiority within us or against others. This task however paradoxically requires the second step of using a lens of complete interconnectedness, because it allows us to see the relationship between ontological separation
and the fruits of domination and violence. The robust lens lets us watch the emergence of a teleological contest to see which one must win out and which one must then be subsumed when the situation is reduced either into a total collapse or defined in ‘either/or’ terms.

(Re-)learning how to use a lens of complete interconnectedness requires several measures. First, acknowledge that you are using an ontological lens and recognize the nature of that lens. Then allow yourself to see that at least one other initial leap of faith is available and open yourself up to exploring the ‘reality’ afforded by its corresponding lens. This step will require several changes to your ontological assumptions based on separation, the first of which is to acknowledge, instead of attempting to eradicate, the feminine energetic principle. This can happen initially by recognizing the primordial character of the emergent, generative relation that holds together its respective components. Know too that the wholly relational character of our being requires that we, as components of relations in the completely interconnected whole, must necessarily have a ‘limited’ picture. Wholeness comes through the relation only, and we can only grasp ‘our part’ of that relation through our unique kay pacha point. That is, the means to the interconnected whole is to engage in the wider conversation through our compass. In this way it becomes easier to see how this cosmic configuration is already ‘perfect’ as it is.

Now, with regards to making a difference in terms of what we see, we need to undertake two other related processes. We need to first acknowledge our intimate participation in that emergent co-creation and second learn to balance ourselves. Both require understanding how we are an integral part of the wider conversation. To begin to sense this conversation through the more robust sensing-and-processing system, your intimate connection to the robust ayllu must be acknowledged. This requires knowing that the kay pacha point is your only ‘portal’ for
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234 The backdrop provided in Part II, for example, was absolutely critical for indicating the ontological anatomy of domination and violence delineated in Chapter 10.
receiving and sending messages. Another integral element is the realization that you are constantly ‘talking’ on the energetic plane and that what you see, hear or feel are responses to that talking.

However, to begin to participate in the wider conversation in a more aware and intentional fashion, the first critical skill that needs to be honed is listening. Start by becoming re-acquainted with your compass by noticing the impulses you feel through it. (No ‘cognizant’ response on your part is needed at first.) Allow yourself to sense the broader realm that is detectable through energy and recognize how much of your robust information-sensing-and-processing system is actually available, despite the limitations that you and the programming you have inherited have historically placed on it. Once open to becoming familiar with how it works, the ‘Others’ as well as your own system will gladly show you.

In becoming aware of your other faculties and of the wider conversation, you may begin to see the ways in which you are being nurtured and therefore those aspects that you may integrate, heal and balance. Once you can recognize that you are experiencing the effects of your talking in the form of interconnected co-creations, it becomes much easier to capture the energetic understanding of the saying, “There is no such thing as a coincidence.” In fact, as you listen to the broader ‘Other’ in the wider conversation, it also becomes easier to ask, “Why am I seeing what is in front of me instead of something else? What are these circumstances showing me about myself? What are they trying to tell me?” This understanding also makes it easier to give thanks to the contrasts for presenting themselves for they constitute the means through which we can integrate, heal and grow.

Just recognizing the state of being wholly interconnected and beginning this emergent, co-creative, generative endeavor from your kay pacha point will help you trust the process and
release your separation anxiety as well as its tight hold on how you navigate the waters of life. Furthermore, once you are fully operating from within your kay pacha point, it is easier to give up the notion that the interpretations mean something that all will come to see and agree upon. This idea is intimately tied to a teleological framework that you no longer need. Instead, each specific and emergent moment-place has a different purpose now that you are ‘tuned in’ to your compass: The contrasts or forms of nurturing that manifest themselves in any given time-place are your co-creations and serve as guides for your next moves in learning to harmonize your relations, which is the next critical step for making a difference in what you see.

For example, once you recognize the parity-based relation between separation and integration as a full juk cycle, you can begin to ask how you might foster balance between these energetic principles within yourself as a way of harmonizing All Our Relations. Fully engaging in this conversation is to undertake the concept of ethics called ayni or the juk-based process of mutual listening and mutual nurturing. As you start to ‘co-create’ in more intentional fashion with a delicious knowing of your intimate relation to the whole and embrace the opportunities for learning, integrating and healing that present themselves through the constant nurturing you receive, you can begin to understand how practicing knowing is a celebration of life. Instead of insisting on the ‘dead,’ unchanging essences of a priori categories, you may contribute to the dynamic balance of our ‘reality’ by engaging the dynamism of every moment.

Undoubtedly getting ourselves re-connected and re-aligned requires a certain level of discipline particularly within the panorama of today’s co-creations. The emphasis on harmony and balance that necessarily follows starting with the energetic relation will provide those mired in the ‘programming’ resulting from one-in-separation with more than a lifetime’s worth of ‘work.’ However, once we can see how incredibly supported we are through this process of
healing, integration and dynamic balance, the ‘work’ overall becomes a much more enjoyable process than responding to existence based on separation anxiety.
CHAPTER 13
CONCLUSION

This elaboration on two ontological lenses, their complementary-opposite leaps of faith, and respective fruits has demonstrated the ways in which the lens of separation begets both anxiety through ontological reductionism and the impulse to dominate as a reaction to insisting on separation. Since this lens is the predominantly employed lens within the Western-style academic time-spacescape and within the field of international relations more specifically, the fruits of this lens will ultimately not permit ‘progress’ toward fulfilling IR’s goals of decreasing war and increasing peace. The exploration of Andean philosophical principles, included herein as a way to show the assumptions, qualities and potential of a lens of complete interconnectedness, serves as a mirror of contrast to the lens of separation. Its constitution, afforded ontological image, and application were able to answer the question of why people engage in teleological games of domination and suggests that in order to do anything about the overriding drive of ontological separation toward imbalance, we need to allow ourselves to sense the connection and become ‘wholly present.’ In an age witnessing the rampant spread of the logic of one in separation, its contagious nature and the subsequent missionary impulse to further spread its reach, we must recognize our integral participation in this ‘reality’ and our choice to embrace the lens of separation. In light of these co-creations, only we can ‘re-member,’ ‘re-align’ and learn to engage in ayni – in the listening and following as part of the wider conversation—not as a way out of this reality, but as a means for changing the vibration of our co-creative capacity. According to Andean philosophical principles—and any other locally articulated philosophy based on complete interconnectedness—this is the only way for us to redirect the current trajectory we see in the world.
EPILOGUE

Do not…forget that a book partly writes itself and the author emerges from that experience changed—sometimes shaken.

— Ashis Nandy “The Intimate Enemy after 25 Years: A Postscript”

As a very humble gringa, I admit to being trapped in the logic of separation. It is my programming. It is the basis for my entire background out of which I have emerged and grown. While I hope that I can continuously unearth these layers and release them, I have realized the degree to which this ontological lens and its fruit preclude us from engendering balance at the level of the person, the family, the neighborhood, the community of All Beings, and world politics.

Once we are able to conceive of this other lens, becoming aware little by little, garnering tools one at a time, integrating imbalanced patterns layer by layer does allow one a bit more confidence each time in recuperating a sense to life, to one’s life, to all of life. It also conjures a magnificent awe of all of the ways in which we are supported that we have not allowed ourselves to see as well as a genuine gratitude for the chance to heal oneself and to nurture the whole.

I must thank the fragments, the pieces that the Andeans still hold on to everyday for allowing me to come to many of these realizations. These are the riches that you carry with you. These are riches that are beyond capitalist comparison. No amount of money will ever be able to patch over the gaping hole and ensuing violence left by insisting on separation. You have in your hearts, your blood and your collective memory the ability to honor this wisdom. Unfortunately, though, every time you denounce or deny your indigenous blood, your roots, you reinforce the strength of the ontology of separation, increasing general existential anxiety and the corresponding needs to brutalize yourself and the ‘Other.’ At the same time, you deny yourself the chance to express that wisdom.
Yet, through your ways you have allowed me to see the holes in my own ontological lens and allowed me to make the argument included herein. You have supported me through my journey – meaning to or not. You have let me respect you more and more for the wisdom you hold.

I would like to ask for your forgiveness for every time that I have responded to you through a lens of separation, encouraged you to employ this lens even more so in the name of better preparing you for things to come through the global economy. I am now more convinced than ever that it is the lens that you still express in fragmented bits that will prepare us even more for the future.

*Mi rezo por Uds. es que sean lo suficientemente generosos y cariñosos con Uds. mismos para dejarse acordarse de la gran sabiduría que se haya fomentado en esta región. No solo merecen acordarse sino merecen sanarse del daño histórico que sigue reproduciéndose, que siguen reproduciendo.*
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