

(re Hunting & Sex: why it feels good)

HUNting feels good for the same reason women do: we evolved that way. There is no other reason why nubile women need protruding breasts and <sup>over 300</sup> ~~rounded~~ buttocks. The rest of the primates get along ~~fine~~ without such ~~xxx~~ cumbersome sex-symbols -- though they may have simpler estrus displays which humans find unappealing, and ~~embarrassing~~. Human females need their embellishments because their males like them. ~~The~~ <sup>= interest in</sup> males like them because ~~the~~ females have them. The curves and the ~~attraction to~~ <sup>abandon the</sup> those curves grew together over the time it took women to ~~evolve an estrus cycle in which ---~~ ~~sex-gx-felt-good-most-of-the-time-abandon-an-estrus-cycle--~~ the old, <sup>(which restricts all other mammals.)</sup> ~~restrictive~~ estrus cycle, <sup>(Of the new cycle, in which sex feels good</sup> most of the time, it can accurately be said <sup>(to women)</sup> that "you've come a long way.")

Today a man from outer space -- or a gorilla, if he could think that way -- might find it impossible to understand the year-'round attractions of the human female. Human males understand instantly, indisputably, and regardless of cultural conditioning. Women <sup>a has,</sup> ~~have~~ for males of <sup>her</sup> ~~their~~ species, the most exciting of all possible ~~xx~~ shapes. She knows it. <sup>(whether or not)</sup> ~~If~~ nature slighted her on any of the useful symbols, she spends a great deal of ~~xxxxx~~ money for corrective <sup>Cosmetics, hairdressing, and</sup> clothing, even surgery. Ancestral women who did not know <sup>how to</sup> ~~these~~ <sup>a track mates</sup> things did not transmit <sup>her</sup> their genes. A sixteen-year-old girl ~~today~~ knows much that she does not understand.



but not all,

Some, ~~xxxxxxx~~ anthropologists believe that her attractions were designed for bringing ~~xxxxxxx~~ <sup>a</sup> her mate back from ~~different~~ distant hunting grounds. ~~Others disagree but have not advanced more plausible hypotheses.~~ It is certain that game requires a good bit of chasing, and that the chase leads hunters far from any fixed points. There ~~are~~ <sup>can be</sup> many ~~other~~ reasons for returning to a camp: for example, the need to rest, ~~and~~ <sup>and get the latest footwear from the women.</sup> recover from wounds. But modern hunters, at least, <sup>(also enjoy getting)</sup> like to get back to their ~~ex~~ wives; and ancestral wives must have had ~~some~~ <sup>a powerful</sup> strong reason for doing ~~so~~ something as anti-mammalian as abandonment <sup>(f)</sup> to the estrus. Certainly a woman who ~~did~~ <sup>could</sup> pull her ~~man~~ <sup>mate</sup> back ~~every night or so~~ <sup>frequently</sup> and not twice a year <sup>feel her</sup> ~~she~~ would have been more ~~likely~~ likely to ~~raise~~ <sup>a</sup> ~~xxxxxxx~~ <sup>was</sup> ~~well-fed~~ children than ~~the~~ mothers who ~~were~~ only in the mood once in awhile.

All of this ~~xxxxxxx~~ sounds sexist, which I regret. Unfortunately, ~~ex~~ despite some valiant efforts by female anthropologists, most evidence suggests that ~~xxxxxx~~ our ancestors were dreadfully unliberated.

Hunting, ~~of course~~, did not evolve to please humans. In fact, <sup>(edible)</sup> ~~xxxx~~ species that did not learn to avoid our ancestors became ~~extinct~~ <sup>+</sup> extinct. But human males who did not enjoy hunting had a poor chance of transmitting ~~gh~~ <sup>a</sup> their genes, if only because the females considered them a poor prospect.



Viewed merely as a job, hunting and fishing are ~~much~~ less attractive than <sup>say,</sup> ditch-digging. Granted, the environment is <sup>prettier</sup> ~~more pleasant~~. But you freeze and sweat and soak and slap at biting things. You sleep little, eat badly, and work ~~a great deal~~ harder than anyone could pay you to work. <sup>at the end,</sup> ~~The results are uncertain.~~ <sup>much less certain than a nice ditch. And</sup> You run some unaccustomed risks. Statistically, ~~they may~~ they may not be as serious as the risk of driving to the supermarket, but they ~~for~~ feel perilous. For our ancestors, the risks must have been <sup>really high,</sup> ~~serious indeed~~, but not as ~~serious~~ <sup>high</sup> as the risk of doing without animal protein.

<sup># So</sup> You do it <sup>today</sup> for a reason that makes no more sense than watching the garters of the girls with the longest legs in the chorus line.

~~xxxxxxx~~ On a cool October day, you whistle at your dog, slide two heavy shells in your gun, and stride off over brown fields and falling leaves. If you are eighty years old with ~~xxxx~~ arthritis of the hip, you still think <sup>that</sup> you are striding. To say that ~~ix~~ it feels good is to say nothing. The elation is something that words cannot describe, and which therefore cannot be communicated to the rest of the human race. All hunters agree. ~~xxxxxxx~~ They

\* p. 2. Russell, have often groped for words. <sup>Franklin Russell</sup> said: "The aloneness of Franklin. The hunter, and his thoughts of his hunting past, are the very genesis of primitive energy. He is always a young man, then, and making his most daring journeys. He will not think of middle age, and even the responsibility of his family will be dim as he pauses, every sense alert for the sound of what he plans to kill. This is really the only time that he is fully alive. All the rest is dreaming time." \* ~~Charles Waterman~~ called it ~~xxxxxxx~~ The Part I Remember, a title

~~which xxxxxxxx~~  
~~xxxx-ful-body,-good-acid,-and-no-fruit,-~~ which for me has a full body, good acid, and no fruit. I ~~ex~~ spent thirty years traveling around the world in Uncle Sam's Foreign Service, fully intending to save the world for democracy and other important things, but that part is all hazy. The part I remember <sup>happened while I was</sup> ~~is the time~~ outdoors, wasting my time.



Even anthropologists seem to  
fall into this thinking. Boy

note that there is a  
It is important to ~~straighten-out-the~~ difference between  
hunting and aggressive behavior against humans. Commentators ~~fixate~~  
have often suggested that ~~hominids~~ hunted animals are a sort of surrogate  
likely to be capable of  
humans, so that a hunter of animals is also ~~likely to be capable of~~ violence  
against humans. Perhaps so. ~~There--is-the-myth-of--~~ Hunting in  
(and even recent)  
primitive times was certainly considered practice for war. There is the  
myth of Cuchullain, who returned from the chase with

It is <sup>also</sup> certain that successful hunting involves some violence.  
So, of course, does all flesh-eating, <sup>whether or not</sup> in which case a butcher  
<sup>used as</sup> is ~~the~~ surrogate. ~~It is not possible to--~~ Killing ~~hominids~~  
is violence.

<sup>And it is</sup>  
~~It is also~~ clear that ~~hominids~~ hominids from the beginning  
have distinguished between violence against animals and violence against  
humans. There were, and perhaps still are, complicated theological  
arguments to this effect. But the distinction began at least five million  
years before the ~~theology~~.

(Note Ardrey argument that hunting life style caused  
nuclear families.)

Note that humans are both aggressive + cooperative, murderous  
+ loving - + not far apart.



- 1) ... "romantics who attribute superior qualities to all animals except the human sort." (NYT movie reviews.) - Bambi syndrome.
- 2) — There for whom ~~non~~ non-human animals are resolutely "lower," en 2  
of argument. 3) as moderate

### Humans and other animals

[Dogs first]

It might be argued that dogs have learned to copy humans, having evolved with them for so long. But it is easy enough to see behavior to which we can relate even in non-mammals. Pigeons, for example. Most of the year it is difficult to tell the males and females apart, unless you are another pigeon. In the spring it is easy. The female is the inconspicuous bird trying to ignore the other one, or pretend that she is ignoring. She smoothes her feathers down, looks small, turns away from him, seeks a speck of food on the roof. He importunes. With feathers fluffed, he looks twice her size -- a football player in uniform compared to a cheerleader. He struts, coos, bows, pursues, tries to intercept her path without provoking her to fly. In courtship he is a fine fellow indeed. She pretends not to notice but must have good peripheral vision. He notices that she has seen and redoubles the energy of his display. She hesitates, lowers herself, spreads her tail. As quickly as it can be said, he mounts, achieves, dismounts. Perhaps he may stay at her side for another moment, but he is as likely to fly off -- feathers now sleeked down. There was no commitment. If she wants more of his time, she will have to ignore him for longer on the next occasion when he comes strutting around. It all looks like a bit of fun, and I have no doubt that it is.