

| | identity | difference | social areas | |
|-----------------------|----------|------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| integrated difference | + | - | Inside | non-integrated difference |
| | + | + | included outside | |
| | - | + | Outside | |
| | | | social inside | |
| | | | social outside | |

Fig. 3: Integrated and non-integrated differences.

outside to reproduce itself; it would remain sterile without such contact. Thus, a paradoxical "incorporated or socialized outside" is created within the inside and the non-incorporated, non-socialized surrounding remains outside.

Without stressing notions of affinity, consanguinity, or reciprocity such a process may be understood as a reentry of a given distinction (identity/difference) into the area of identity, thereby creating multiple levels of reference and the necessity to indicate from which level of reference the world is described. Louis Dumont argued that oppositions in non-Western societies are not symmetrical but hierarchical. Such hierarchies result from values inscribed in these distinctions. The inversion of a hierarchical opposition – in contrast to the inversion of a symmetrical one – therefore implies a significant shift of reference levels *within the same whole* (Dumont 1983). As I argued elsewhere (1998: 294 ff.), among the Yukpa – and perhaps many other Lowland Amerindians – there is no single highest value. Stress on harmony and conviviality is contrasted to, and coexists with, predation and different forms of violence (Halbmayer 2001).

In Louis Dumont's view "integrated distinctions" (Halbmayer 1998) produce an internal differentiation within the whole or totality they are part of ("englobed") and simultaneously one side of the distinction – the highest value – stands for the whole. By contrast, in hierarchically non-differentiated systems such as those of the Yukpa a concentric dualism combines internal "integrated" and external "non-integrated distinctions." I call a non-integrated distinction a distinction which lacks an integrative totality and where the unity between the separated parts is avoided, feared, or the matter of specific ritual contexts. Non-integrated distinctions, therefore, refer to the existence of a multiverse and to the relations *between* multiple worlds in Amerindian cosmologies (*kopatka oweija* – *other worlds*) rather than the existence of an integrated universe (Overing 1985, 2004). Non-integrated distinctions are typically those to a

surrounding outside, whereas integrated differences define internal differentiation.

These types of distinctions are insofar alike as both distinguish identity from difference, but they are not the same. In one case identity and difference form part of a common whole or totality, whereas in the other case every whole is surrounded by a remaining outside without being integrated into a common encompassing totality. The relations toward the "englobed" and toward the surrounding area are in consequence different and the crossing of an integrated and a non-integrated distinction juxtaposes different norms and prohibitions (see Fig. 3).

Communitary: Beyond Community, Sociality, and Society

Drawing on Dumont, Viveiros de Castro located the value in the outside. In the language of kinship the affinal relations hierarchically encompass consanguinity (Viveiros de Castro 1993). Although I find this position innovative as it offers the possibility of including non-human actors into a common social area, Viveiros de Castro inherits one of Dumont's major problems, namely that of a common integrated whole or totality.¹⁸ Among the Yukpa there is no common whole able to integrate the outer space and the inner space: whatever the integrative ability of the inner space might be, there is always a surrounding non-integrated space and no all-inclusive overarching whole, totality, or universe.

If integrated distinctions define a common sociality, how should one call in contrast the relationships across the non-integrated differences, e. g., those with enemies, animals, or spirits? Obviously we need a term which allows us to distinguish between morally integrated sociality and social and communicative interactions which go beyond.

¹⁸ See Halbmayer (1998) and a recent attempt to deal with that problem by Viveiros de Castro (2001: 27 f.).