

Did a transition toward exploiting animals correlate to a transition in habitat spread from tropical and sub-tropical to seasonal climates inhospitable to wild humans? Did this change necessitate exploiting other animals for survival (consuming them, wearing their fur, paradoxically fashioning animals' dead body parts into weapons to keep killing more animals, etc.)? Could it be that human transition to hunting is a major factor shaping our physical and nature-connection evolution, turning our species more predatory and colonizing? How did and does human attempts to survive outside natural habitat equate to becoming a parasitic species, and what are potential paths for returning to our nativity? Until answers to these questions emerge, might the most reconnecting innate path, 'giving back' in lieu of 'taking from' via restoring wild habitat, reawaken our dormant wild senses and compassion for other animals and Earth?



Warzone Distro
WARZONEDISTRO.NOBLOGS.ORG
2026

Raging Questions on Lost Wildness



Ria Montana & Jack McMillan

Questions on the nature of rewilding by 'hunter-gatherer' anarcho-primitivists burn inside me. In returning to primeval wild, how are primitivists preferential in selecting the bits of our past ways they strive to make future? As we hominids have been scavengers far longer than hunters, how does the label 'hunter'-gatherer so proudly persist?

When archeological or anthropological evidence arises of cannibalism, infanticide, rape, humans as prey not predator, etc. why is the knee jerk reaction to rationalize it away as somehow not truly in our most natural nature? Is an-prim extoling hunting civ-moral cherry picking? Why is evidence of hunting so straightaway accepted, lauded and proliferated? Is an-prim extoling hunting merely creating a different version of patriarchal civ? Does the fact that humans have done a thing for a long time justify the necessity for its continuance in a future primitive?

Why is there such disdain for searching further back than industry and agriculture for humans' wrong turn? What if there were even earlier gradual catalysts like controlled fire, wearing clothes, hunting tools, and organized hunting that removed us from our habitat and allowed us to adapt and evolve our way into the dominating colonizing species that we have become today? Were we not living most 'in balance' when settled into our early human habitat than when we spread far and wide across Earth?

Why do hegemonic primitivists react defensively to any evidence of instances of hunters of 'hunter'-gatherers setting sapiens on a misbegotten venture degrading biodiversity and warring upon animals even to the point of extinction? Or when asked their conception of the human habitat, how is it that they universally answer as if we have innate superiority, and freedom from natural habitat boundaries as all other animals have? If other primates spread and overpopulated as we have, how would we feel, respond? When a primitivist is challenged to hunt and eat without artificial means, like all wild omnivorous animals hunt and eat, does his sense of outrage that his weapons and fire for cooking were 'taken away'

the face of onslaught. In rewilding Earth, would humans instinctively and organically rewild themselves, returning to a species that belongs?

Will this dream path forward come true? One certain answer. All good dreams wake up to reality. Realistically, our kind is bound for collapse. In civ's end, a small number of sapiens may be fortunate to find their way to a habitat where they and wildness once again thrive. Until then, the civilized human remains entrapped within its own Leviathan, struggling in vain to replace unflinching hope with some kind of meaning beyond the monsters that we've become.

Ria Montana is a folio-frugivore anarcho-primitivist and
Jack McMillan is a vegan naturalist, anti-civ anarchist

For connecting and more discussions please join the
Vegan Anarchist Primitivist
Facebook group!



remains presumed and overgeneralized.

The main question becomes, *Did humans evolve into an invading, colonizing species when we expanded out of our habitat?* What 'inventions' manifested to survive the new climate and habitat? How did the introduction of hominids, and their new inventions, impact habitat they encroached? What is the human habitat? All life has an obligate habitat, with all its benefits and limitations. If we are a part of the natural world, do we need to honor that nature-reality? A species can forgo co-adapting and 'overadapt' to the point that it degrades diversity, and harms and even kills the guild. If we have the awareness that our civilized nature has now swollen to uncoupling nature connections, including within our own species, do we also have the motivation and ability to devolve ourselves into our natural habitat, forgoing our mega-dominating stance of today?

A Path Forward?

Did a transition toward exploiting animals correlate to a transition in habitat spread from tropical and sub-tropical to seasonal climates inhospitable to wild humans? Did this change necessitate exploiting other animals for survival (consuming them, wearing their fur, paradoxically fashioning animals' dead body parts into weapons to keep killing more animals, etc.)? Could it be that human transition to hunting is a major factor shaping our physical and nature-connection evolution, turning our species more predatory and colonizing? How did and does human attempts to survive outside natural habitat equate to becoming a parasitic species, and what are potential paths for returning to our nativity? Until answers to these questions emerge, might the most reconnecting innate path, 'giving back' in lieu of 'taking from' via restoring wild habitat, reawaken our dormant wild senses and compassion for other animals and Earth?

Our species has perceptibly profoundly impacted all habitats, razing them for ourselves and other species we've domesticated to exploit. Virtually all wild species are struggling to find & keep their niche in

not reflect his sense of dominion?

Is bias found in mis-interpretations solidifying mis-beliefs? For example, primitivists point to Richard Wrangham's *Catching Fire: How Cooking Made Us Human* to conclude 'meat made us human'. But what if the point of the book is reflected in the title itself? What if it is cooking itself that allowed for rapid consumption of calories and nutrients by breaking down plant fibers that led to a larger brain? In his book Wrangham lays out that meat was unreliable and humans' early diet was primarily plant-based. What if his book proposed that cooked starches met the energy demands of an increasing brain size? What if some of our ancestors thrived without animal flesh, just as some of us still do today? And what is so much better about having a larger brain? Could cooking have enable not only our larger brain, but our deviant dominating lifeway? Did cooking drive our 'progress' and techno-violence degradation and destruction of life on earth?

Plant Foraging Persists

Despite science and culture's bulked up propaganda on 'man the hunter', from earliest hominid origins, we have foraged plants. This has been a primary dietway fundamental to who we are biologically and intuitively. The evolutionary roots are deep, with lineage before sapiens, evidenced even 600,000 years ago with starch-heavy plant diets.

Our foraging instinct still thrives today, as evidenced especially in innate actions of our young. I first began witnessing the natural state of human eating in the seconds after my son was born. His strong neck muscles propelled his heavy head, lining up his mouth into perfect suckle position, clasping my breast with his tiny fingers encouraging flow. At 18 months he wandered outside in a new place, spied ripe grapes on a vine, walked up to them for closer inspection, intuitively plucked one off with primal foraging fingers, placed it in his mouth for an exploratory taste, decided it was good as he chewed it with pleasure and swallowed. He had never before seen a

grape.

This led me to wonder if the 'stage' young humans go through of 'putting everything in their mouth' is not a stage at all, but the beginning of learning to forage from all the food around in wild habitat. Whereas in this human domesticated world, behind drywalls, young are reprimanded for putting 'things' in their mouth until their foraging instincts are suppressed. In a wild world, young hone their foraging for berries, nuts, seeds, flowers, leaves, stems, tubers, grains, fruits, and mushrooms. My son never saw an animal and salivated, never instinctively chased an animal down, nor craft a weapon for killing them.

Even before his foraging instinct was suppressed by culture, unless taught to by an adult, a child still does not mouth any living animal. Try to put a live cricket or worm in her mouth & she grimaces. She has to be conditioned to overcome her disgust. Her only first reaction to animals, no matter how small, nonthreatening or 'tasty', is curiosity or fear. But children are generally enculturated to accept and trust what adult humans put in their mouth. Even pieces of charred animals' tissues (that disguise the animal corpse) would have been revolting if not for the sleight of hand cooking and seasoning. When humans put animal tissues in their babies' mouths, is that the first indoctrination into and normalization of a rationalizing myth that humans are intended to be 'killer apes'?

But...Paleo!

Primitivism calls for an Earth devoid of artificial technology. Some say the only period that sustains that lifestyle is the Paleolithic which is characterized by hunter-gatherer. Many respect vegans' boycott of civilization's brutal animal farming, but don't see how hunter-gatherer bands could be supported by mere veganism. Hence, the primitivist allure with the paleo diet.

Actual human diets during the 2.6 million yearlong Paleolithic era of vast migration included a broadly flexible food list reflective of

seasons and conditions. Despite popular belief, wild grains and legumes were included, with some evidence of food processing, such as flour 30,000 years ago. The most conclusive diet evidence of the Paleo era supports that diets based primarily on plant foods promoted increased health and longevity. Still, applying any version of a Paleo diet to today's food repertoire presents the extra challenge that modern domesticated plants and animals differ substantially nutritionally from those of Paleo times.

Earliest hominids came down from trees and became bipedal, their diet was overwhelmingly herbivorous (leaves, herbaceous stems, tubers, fruits, seeds, mushrooms, etc.), with no scientific evidence of hunted animal eating. Do humans hold an archetypal memory of our errant path into "hunter"-gatherer lifeway, beginning with an unnatural migration out of our natural habitat into inhospitable environs, necessitating the evolution of hunting for survival?

Is the deepest unanswered question on how hunting shaped who we became, especially in connection to hierarchy and civilization, unspoken unheard and unheeded?

Civilization vs Earth

Negative impacts of civilization onto wildness are stark, with well-defined catalysts such as agriculture. To effect change, we begin by understanding what led to humans' fading nature-connection. How does society consider the changes wrought by civilization's early stepping stones - control of fire, biocultural adaptations such as clothing, and hunting tools (*perhaps the first change toward dominance over the world*)?

Though painting an accurate picture of early humans is generally a game of guess, it seems to be fairly accepted that before the great spreading, earliest humans lived indigenously embedded in their original foraging habitat, with evidence increasingly revealing an ample plant diet. Under modern culture and science's patriarchal bent, evidence of earliest human hunting animals is not present, yet