



*Anti-civ anarchists attempting to ground their reasoning for hunting in primal human behavior are being self-contradictory. Surrendering one's innate primal mutualism to anthropocentric supremacy grounded in moral and ethical ethos manifests in human incursions dominating and even killing other wild life. All wild animals live within a natural range, for example other great apes. They don't naturally invade, conquer and colonize all of earth. Accepting civilization's anthropocentric domination, as in hunting, is accomplished via indoctrinated moral conditioning, and is as much an authentic primal desire as that of a child to kill a rabbit and eat its raw tissues instead of picking and eating berries, mushrooms and nuts.*

Warzone Distro  
WARZONEDISTRO.NOBLOGS.ORG  
2024



**Absurd  
Disingenuous  
Rationalizations**

**of**

**Ranting  
Humancentric  
Anarchists**

**A Response by Vegan Primitivist  
Ria Del Montana**

We all do it. Are you self-aware enough to know how and why you rationalize, to evade open consideration of an accustomed lifeway uncomfortable to change? The device of rationalizing is pronounced when it manifests on a mass scale and is especially curious when it occurs seemingly with no coordination, as if the same sentiments were magically originating within individuals. Most who've been vegan for a while have become inured to the same exact knee-jerk declarations from mainstream people. They believe they are thinking freely, generally unaware of their societal indoctrination into absurd disingenuous arguments. *You can't live without protein. Native people used every part of animal. Plants feel pain too.* Mass rationalizing amongst non-vegan anarchists, including green anarchists and anarcho-primitivists, has its own set of mass knee-jerk rationalizations. Here's a review of some common greenish anarchist rationalizing blocks, and response.

**\*Desire to hunt is primal and not guided by an anthropocentric morality.**

*"Being aggressive herbivores (hunters), is post-primitive. It's a CULTure."*~Danny Nichols

While mainstream vegans may think through a lens of human supremacist morality, anprim vegans tend to perceive in other ways. Anti-civ anarchists attempting to ground their reasoning for hunting in primal human behavior are being self-contradictory. Surrendering one's innate primal mutualism to anthropocentric supremacy grounded in moral and ethical ethos manifests in human incursions dominating and even killing other wild life. All wild animals live within a natural range, for example other great apes. They don't naturally invade, conquer and colonize all of earth. Accepting civilization's anthropocentric domination, as in hunting, is accomplished via indoctrinated moral conditioning, and is as much an authentic primal desire as that of a child to kill a rabbit and eat its raw tissues instead of picking and eating berries, mushrooms and nuts.

If anti-civ anarchists truly sense the natural of primal, how do their senses tend to cherry pick early human events for glorification and re-enactment like hunting, but not infanticide or rape? Imagine the lengthy list of behaviors modern humans could rationalize as 'natural' because 'early humans did it too', or because it fits the conditioned "desire" to do so.

Imagine you were born in a place where all humans lived in line with their herbivore biology, and you were surrounded by vegan humans. Would you have any impulse to slaughter and consume an animal? In days dominated by humans harming and eating animals, why have there been individuals with simultaneous repulsion to human necrovoxy, a mass feeling that truly originated from within? There's a reason killing animals takes cultural indoctrination: We're wired for compassion for other animals. To act otherwise requires



that nixes return to their wildness altogether.

**\*Dubious health value.**

Wow, still clinging on to that? Can you imagine all the plant foods before our kind razed wild foods? Still, even with the poor nutrient value of domesticated plants, kinda crazy when I'm standing in front of a person telling 22-year healthy vegan me that vegans need meat to survive. So-called anarchists' propensity for rationalizing support for genocide of fellow beings and ecocide of wild Earth knows no bounds. Here I am, addressing their points on their terms - absurd, disingenuous rationalizations of ranting humancentric anarchists' rational terms. When is it your turn to play this game on the feral battle field?

"For as long as men massacre animals, they will kill each other."

----Pythagoras ---6th Century BC

powerful unnatural devices, like rationalizing, rituals, mythologies, traditions, norms, etc.

*"Without defensiveness and denial, with an open heart, speaking to some uneasy feelings, what are the ways a human feels when aiming a weapon at an animal with the intent to kill? If you sense any qualms, then you sense primal desire to not cause harm. THAT'S primal, not anthropocentric or moral. The so-called "desire" to hunt is what is anthropocentric and moral construction. The human's first impulse is to care and not harm. So where does 'desire' to hunt truly come from then? The qualms prove primal compassion." ~Jack McMillan*

We've witnessed the affects when humans eschew their innate compassion for other animals. Imagine if all humans retained this compassion intact, how would all wild earth be thriving today? Animal lifeways are not stagnant. We are not stuck with hunting. Animals that don't keep adapting to changes lower their odds for survival. It's an adaptation to end hunting that's been rationalized as our primal nature, not on moral grounds, but to flourish in wild community of our human animalia compassion both individually and as a species. Hunting, since its origins, has served as the epitome of human disconnect from, and savagery toward, fellow animals and all earth.

**\*Vegans cherry pick studies to support an anthropological view of what people ate way back.**

All civilization's studies are bias, cherry picked. Some adhere to 'objective' science more closely than others, but that then biases the study toward science, one of the gods of civilization. Why are studies even sought after, when most all we really need to 'know' is intuitive, feeling, and perceived through our animal senses. How can civilized beings re-engage their primality to shake their civ bias, to experience and know through their primal essence, in lieu of civ's academic formalities that obfuscate the primal real?

So you're right, my bad. I cherry pick science to attack the Leviathan propped up by science. What is the alternative to letting the bully choose the weapon? A question might remain as to whose version is more bias, but it's rather irrelevant. The most important question is on restoring the primal wildness of our hearts reembedded within Earth.

**\*In what ways has controlled fire led to our consumption of meat? Have our ancestors ever eaten meat raw?**

In his book Against the Grain: A Deep History of the Earliest States, chapter

one: *Domestication of Fire, Plants, Animals, and . . . Us* anthropologist James C. Scott speaks to the impact of humans' mass use of controlled fire on Earth. It was perhaps the singular greatest step humans took toward civilization, in time exponentially degrading and razing habitats of wildness. He wrote:

*The use of fire to clear land and open the canopy was the key to humankind's growing sway over the natural world. The concentration of resources in this light places the milestones of the classical civilizational narrative in a new light.*

Indeed, James sees the steps of civilization's domestication as first occurring with controlling fire, without which there would have been no ability to even move outside our native habitat range.

To replicate the most primal of human essence, envision humans without sculpted weapons and controlled fire. Even if you totally rid yourself of your compassion for other animals, can you see yourself craving animal 'meat', running down and catching an animal, ripping into her flesh with your 'claws' and blunt canines, relishing biting into her, assuming you're even physically able to chew her raw being?

What food opportunities were likely in the immediate environment living in our natural habitat? Dropping today's pop-culture science mythology of "man the killer ape"(with which science itself disagrees) does your gut tell you a killingway was our original, regular dietway? Would you be surprised if even civ's science is telling a different story? My gut says that deep down on some level, your animal self knows. I envision we all sense it in one way or another.

**\*Veganism is hating power in oneself, hyper-pacifism, and that doesn't happen in the natural world.**

Does compassion happen in the natural world? Does mutualism? Symbiosis? Do those beings hate themselves for it? Have powerful animal liberation actions been inspired by feelings of compassion, and grounded in love? Has killing and eating the bodies of others never been cowardly, never evoked self-hatred? In humans' essence, is the power to dominate, kill and consume other animals not a colonial mentality foundational to civilization's mass ecocide? While some might classify authoritarian mindsets and impulses as "natural", for others can becoming vegan be a "natural" response, following one's primal feelings?

**\*Not enough land for vegan primitivism.**

How do you know how much land would be needed for wild foraging? How many seasons can an acorn harvest last? Wapato? Jerusalem artichoke?

*more to do with how well they support dominant mythologies than with their scientific veracity."*

James C. Scott:

*"...if you were hunter-gatherers or nomads, however numerous, spreading your biodegradable trash thinly across the landscape, you were likely to vanish entirely from the archaeological record,"*

Not only do hunter-gatherers leave little evidence, plant foragers leave even less, likely resulting in greatly over-exaggerated claims of inherent human hunting.

Archaeobotanist Sarah Mason:

*"For the most part the Pleistocene, and even the earliest post-glacial, is a blank when it comes to evidence of humans eating plants. No wonder the old men's stories, of chaps who hunt great mammals and eat their meat, still dominate our unthinking visions of hunter-gathering in that period."*

Andree Collard and Joyce Contrucci, authors of Rape of the Wild:

*"...denying validity or even recognition to alternative interpretations, access to alternative values and beliefs capable of freeing a society from its own self-destruction is closed."*

Archaeologist Lyn Wadley:

*"Many archaeologists are not interested in botanical remains."*

Anthropologist Penny Spikins on Raymond Dart's 'killer ape' theory:

*"A tendency to see what we think ought to be there was perhaps never best illustrated..."*

**\*Would have to migrate to equatorial climate**

What are the natural human habitat limits? Is it not anthropocentric to think you have a right to occupy and control any wild space you want? Are your actions not guided by food accessibility and temperatures in your naked biological form? Why not live under the sea if you want to. In space if you want to? That returning to wild habitat is not a part of anprim reveals a human supremacy

Andree Collard and Joyce Contrucci in Rape of the Wild: Man's Violence against Animals and the Earth, wrote that *"the efforts of modern man to rationalize the contradictions and delusions surrounding the hunt and the hunter extend to the romanticized images he fashions of primitive man as the archetypal hunter with the hunt as the sine qua non of his existence."*

Even if you embrace the 'spiritualism' of hunting, how can a self-rewilder whose ideal is based on early cultures with spiritual hunting honed through generations, communicate with the spirit of the hunted animal? This may be why many hunt in rote form: *I am wild simply by hunting and eating animals*. How is the human intimate connection with non-human animals formed, when they don't experience other animals as persons? Their rewilding is artificial. They are a babe thinking themselves into a virile doer of civilization's 'rewilding'. Observing a lifetime would not bring them a step closer to their goal with their mindset. They cannot accept that ancient knowledge of ecological embeddedness has vanished, and reconstructing wild knowledge takes generations. In today's hurting wildscape, wildness requires immense healing first, lifetimes of giving back. When your friend is hurting, you don't use her, you offer aid. Wild is hurting, and if your animal being is open to sensing the pain and you don't give aid, and instead exploit wild even more, your relationship is based in the disconnected aloofness of disregarded pain. Despite their justifications, they flail in attempts at ecological embeddedness by hunting animals, without perceiving their harm to the habitat.

And besides, how many people use man-the-hunter mythology to justify buying pieces of tortured carcasses in stores & drive-through windows?

**\*No examples of indigenous subsistence.**

As discussed above, there are, but Leviathan doesn't want to know them. Man-the-hunter bias dominating archaeology, and many other modern academic disciplines, makes searching for contrasting propagandized narratives a challenge.

Samah Seger, author of Veganism Is Not Anti-Indigenous writes:

*"How often have you heard — "would you tell an Indigenous person to go vegan?" In fact, the argument that veganism is incompatible with Indigenous culture is unfounded. Advocates for humans, animals and our ecosystems are natural allies in the fight against oppressive colonial structures."*

Christopher Ryan, author of Civilized to Death: The Price of Progress:

*"The popularity and persistence of scientific narratives often have*

Mongongo nut? Tubers of sedge tiger-nuts? Ground nuts? Who still holds this knowledge to make the calculation? If collapse happened overnight, would there be enough land for everyone to hunt? Why are you imposing the excuse of overpopulation on vegans only?

**\*Modern liberal values extending rights to animals.**

Modern values and rights would not long for smashing civilization. It must be challenging to distinguish consumerist veganism from primitivist veganism. We're a rare breed.

**\*Utilitarianism to lower amount of suffering.**

Do anprims want to lower suffering in the world? I thought Anarchy Radio routinely reported on all the suffering. Why? Do animals not try to have less suffering in themselves and those around them? But, good point. It's oversimplistic utilitarianism to merely try to "lower" the amount of suffering we inflict on animals we harm and kill. Why not end it?

**\*Rationally managed society.**

Once again, confusing consumerist veganism with primitivist veganism.

*"Veganism is essential to wildness. Not only is exploiting and killing animals a humanape-constructed activity and form of authority, but it socially evolved into the leading political regime worldwide. Very often humans want to pinpoint about such questions as origins, saying that "it has always been so even prior to civilization", and extreme rationalization has destroyed the last bits of remorse that could be left – nonetheless, if there is any initial "project" for humans, here we are, and we fail." ~Nicolas Dupont*

**\*The study mentioned was 'low meat', not 'no meat'.**

Why cherry pick a study with a weakness to what one wants to believe, when there is building evidence contradicting what one wants to believe?

Being that alternatives to modern mainstream narratives tend to be silenced, scorned and sternly denied before considered, even when alternative 'proof' is discovered, is it recognized for what it is? Or explained away with acceptable culturally mediated ideology?

Challenges to false propagated narratives do manifest, but face uphill battles in

gaining mainstream acceptance. The study: DNA analysis shows that forest gathering Neanderthals found in a cave in Spain drew their food and medicine from plants, mushrooms, pine nuts, and moss. Why are non-vegan anarchists covering their eyes to these kind of studies?

Weyrich, Laura S., et al. "Neanderthal Behaviour, Diet, and Disease Inferred from Ancient DNA in Dental Calculus." *Nature, International Journal of Science*, vol. 544, 2017, pp. 357–61. <https://www.nature.com/articles/nature21674>

At Spy cave, Belgium, Neanderthal diet was heavily meat based and included woolly rhinoceros and wild sheep (mouflon), characteristic of a steppe environment. In contrast, no meat was detected in the diet of Neanderthals from El Sidrón cave, Spain, and dietary components of mushrooms, pine nuts, and moss reflected forest gathering.

So here's DNA evidence that some pre-civ humans subsisted wholly on plants, mushrooms and moss, challenging civilization's romanticized man-the-hunter image and pro-meat bias. Why is your first response to try to disprove it? Why isn't this something to celebrate?

#### **\*Cannot survive vegan outside technology / Leviathan.**

It's been done, and you refuse to acknowledge it. Seasoned wild tender Finisia Medrano has told me it's very doable to subsist vegan on the sacred hoops, even in the scarce landscapes she tends. The man-the-hunter myth is popularized, overgeneralized, hyped up. Modern minds project modern indoctrination into early human narratives. Scientific narratives are processed and molded through cultural values. For example, when modern meat eating paleoanthropologists find any evidence of hunting, they routinely deem all individuals comprising an entire group over vast areas and times as 'hunters'. Mainstream-embraced evolutionary narratives, that most anprims were indoctrinated into, tend to be value-laden and biased, far from primally directed or informed.

#### **\*Anthropocentrism to maintain their world view.**

Is conjuring up a pre-civ ideal, egalitarianism with hunting, to recreate into the present and future, an act of mindset morality? How is green anarchist darling Paul Shepard not human-centric in his predatory sexuality of hunting?

*"The human hunter in the field is not merely a predator, because of hundreds of centuries of experience in treating the woman-prey with love, which he turns back into the hunt proper. The ecstatic consummation of this love is the killing itself. Formal consummation is eating... The prey must be eaten for ethical not nutritional value, in a kind of celebration."*

#### **\*Veganism imposes universal moral rights.**

Vegan primitivists do? Or man-the-hunter ideologues like Paul Shepard, encouraging all boys & men to hunt? I am vegan because my entire animal being tells me to not kill or eat animals, without being indoctrinated into it. As a child I instinctively fought to be vegan in a world of killers. It seems unlikely a child born into a world of vegans would fight to kill animals. Would I like for humans to end the killing of non-human animals? As much as I'd like for humans to end the killing of human animals. My animal being recoils from humans killing. Shepard comes off as a psychopath in saying he saw no difference between eating a vegetable and an animal, yet, he saw hunting as deeply spiritual:

*"Hunting is a holy occupation, framed in rules and courtesy, informed by the beauty of the physical being and the numinous presence of the spiritual life of animals."*

For Shepard, "eating animals is a way to worship them." "(T)o be kindred... means... a sense of many connections and transformations – us into them, them into us, and them into each other from the beginning of time." Shepard encouraged every man to hunt to recover "...the ontogenetic movement; ...the value of the hunt is in a single leap forward into the heart-structure of the world, the "game" played to rules that reveal ourselves. What is important is to have hunted. It is like having babies."

Marti Kheel wrote how sects of Deep Ecology:

*"...employ ethical discourse as a means of shielding the hunter from the actual experience of the animal he kills... The focus of the hunter is on his own interior mental state. As long as his mental attitude is said to conform to a particular ethical code, his violent behavior is thought to be legitimized. The emphasis on the instinctual (sexual) nature of hunting functions to further remove the hunters' conduct from ethical reproach, since hunting is seen as a natural and elementary drive. The ethical discourse thus functions as a "decoy," focusing attention not on the state of the animal who is about to be killed, but rather on the hunter. What the holy hunters see as a "reciprocal" activity is, in reality, a unidirectional morality in which the hunter formulates and follows his own moral directives... the animal is reduced to an object, a symbol against which the hunter seeks to establish his masculine selfhood and moral worth."*