

Chapter 7

Orion's Legacy: Men, Myths and Hunting

“Oh I’ve got something inside me to drive a princess blind. There’s a Wildman Wizard he’s hiding inside my mind...Oh I’ve got something inside me, not what my life’s about.”

- Harry Chapin, “Taxi”

Charles Bergman is a humanities professor who is erudite and intellectually sophisticated. His book, *Orion's Legacy*, is a cultural history of man as hunter. Like Stange, he thinks that the scientific basis for believing men were shaped by hunting has been thoroughly discredited. Though the feminists have uncovered chauvinism in science, which is to their credit, certainly the vast majority of biologists, anthropologists and psychiatrists remain convinced that it was the hunting life that shaped humanity, men and women both.

Anthropologist Cartmill wrote a serious book about hunting throughout human history, concluding that there is no reason to believe that hunting is natural or instinctive in human beings. He believes that hunting is not “natural” to humanity in any meaningful sense, and goes so far as to say that the majority of humans who ever lived have never hunted, but that is unfair considering that the majority of humans born have been in civilization. One might as well insist that since the majority of Manhattan’s pet cats have never hunted mice that it is not natural for them to do so. Cartmill might be surprised about the proportion of boys born in civilization who found themselves carried away by the untrained and unlearned impulse to use weapons to kill animals. Like Bergman, Cartmill ignores evidence and sound deductive argument from evolution, ethnography, mythology and human development in favor of hunting as natural and instinctive.

Bergman’s interest is not the debate about prehistoric man as hunter and his influence on contemporary masculinity, but in the prehistoric hunter who has taken up residence in the mythical landscape. Bergman says that if you’re a modern man, you’ve probably imagined yourself as a sort of primal hunter, a prehistoric hero battling with saber-toothed tigers and mammoths. This myth of the prehistoric man has lodged the hunter in our psyches as the primal patriarch. It is the standard stereotype against which every man secretly measures himself. The prehistoric hunter is the true source of our masculinity, and contemporary men are taught to

trace their ancestors back to the campfires of a weapon-bearing, big-browed predator.

From Bergman's point of view, hunting is part and parcel of modern masculine identity, whether there is a biological foundation for it or not. He's right to say that men long

for a return to primitivism, though their ancestors may never have dueled with saber-tooths.

He is hunting for the meaning in the fact that our persistent notion of the real man – a cave man, a jungle man, a man on the savannas, the original man – is that of a hunter. The hunter leads us back to our origins in nature, as Laurens Van der Post said, to "first things."

Bergman wants to see what the hunter in our heads has to say for himself. As the most emotional figure for men, Bergman seeks the hunter, not as a fact of nature or ecological niche, but as a cultural phenomenon. He treats the hunter as metaphor that men have created, not as what created men, but as a mythical theme that shapes our fantasies. Following words like tracks we can see how pervasive the hunter myth is in our consciousness:

A buck: is a dollar, from buckskin, frontier unit of trade with Native Americans;

A young buck is a young man;

Job hunt, witch hunt, fortune hunt, bounty hunt, bargain hunter, headhunter, manhunt;

Open season;

Closed season;

Fair game;

Straight shooter, long shot, cheap shot;

Cut to the chase, thrill of the chase;

Take a stand;

Make a killing, kill or be killed, dead meat;

Hot on the trail;

Pick up the scent;

Killer instinct.

Regarding the sexual hunt there is the prowl, poaching, stag party, love trap and so on, and the way men refer to women as prey is a bestiary of terms: bunnies; chicks; beaver; foxes; pussy. Which is to say that of all the things a man might call himself – lover, criminal, lawyer, doctor, fool – he is more or less a hunter in the way he thinks and imagines himself, whether or not he has a gun rack in his pickup.

From Elvis's hound dog to *Leatherstocking Tales*, from Daniel Boone to Hemingway and Melville to Teddy Roosevelt, the hunt is our historical identity.

In his search for the origin of our identity with the hunt, Bergman concludes that, unlike the Inuit whom he observed hunting in the far north, for civilized humans the hunt is a statement of power. He is right about the *image* of the hunt in our civilization being a statement of power, but for most recreational hunters, men and women alike, hunting is anything but a power statement. It may be for a very small elite group of men and women, wealthy business tycoons, military leaders and

power-hungry politicians, the new royalty, but it is not for the rank and file hunter.

Bergman is right about the ancient and modern myth of hunting, that the hunt's primary emphasis and justification have little to do with sensitivity, but are grounded instead in anxieties about power. As much as Ortega has been praised for his understanding of the inner side of hunting as religious, his view of hunting does suffer from the typical distortions of Western civilization and its prevailing myth of power over nature, domination and war. Ortega says, for example, that to hunt is to take possession of some other being of a species basically inferior to the human. Aboriginal hunters do not view wild animals as inferior to humans, and for them hunting is not taking possession or an "act of acquisition," as Aristotle said, but reception of a gift earned by "proper relationship," a term frequently used by Native Americans.

From the beginning, civilized men have deliberately employed hunting as preparation for war, and that is what has produced a distortion of hunting as a mythology of power. When Plato talks about the hunting of animals and the hunting of men, he reflects the way in which hunting and war became linked in culture. As I have said repeatedly, hunting in its pure form pertains to the pursuit and killing of animals for food and other products, but war is between humans (and their hominid ancestors) and big predators or other human groups.

With civilization and the overwhelming importance of war, hunting of typical food species continued by farmers and by warriors to train themselves in warring skills including weapon use, patience, tracking, physical stamina and so on. For the same reason that Maasai ritually "hunt" lions, the men of early civilizations "hunted" dangerous animals to prove themselves worthy and gain status as warriors. The taking of a lion, for example, required great courage and skill, and was far more esteemed than killing a boar, deer or hare. These were warring societies and men were ranked according to their deeds in war or against wild animals, which were measured by trophies.

Though aboriginal hunters collect trophies, first when they prove themselves worthy for manhood and marriage and then as they continue to hunt, their success on the hunting field is not aimed at power over the animal or human. The power they gain in killing an animal is spiritual, a gift from the animal to the man.

When warring with humans becomes significant, as it was for the plains Indians after the horse, which made mobile herds of bison defensible, then the "hunting" of dangerous predators becomes a pursuit of power transferable to warfare. A warrior who had killed grizzly bears not only held high esteem among men and women in his society, but he wore the claws of the bears around his neck as a trophy signifying his power to enemies, those who are inferior, "them," "animals," those we destroy. Genocide appears when humans of competing groups replace big predators as enemies.

While it was the hunt that brought us into competition with big predators – the original war on earth - it was possession of resources, wealth, whether in the form of bison herds that could be defended with horses, or livestock or grains, that shifted human life to a systematic pursuit of masculine power. That shift colored our stories accordingly and gave rise to the myth of Orion, who, though widely claimed to be a

hunter, is actually a symbol of the warrior, the archetypal male of civilization.

Bergman sizes up the myth of Orion as the emblematic heroic hunter whose prowess is celebrated in the constellation that bears his name: no image defines more accurately how the hunter “planted” notions of violence and rape deep into the male psyche.

But Xenophon and others say again and again that hunting among the warrior elite of Greece was undertaken to enhance warrior skills. Heroism is one of the components of the pastoral myth of domination. According to the myth of Orion he was anything but humble about his hunting exploits and frequently bragged about them. Perhaps it was his unbridled pride that got him killed and banned to heaven. Perhaps, like the myth of Narcissus, Orion’s story is actually a warning to civilized men about the dangers of hubris.

The many stories of Orion emphasize destructiveness, the dark side of the masculine. He even rapes the King’s daughter whom he had intended to wed. Bergman says that,

“This intersection of the hunter and the rapist, of hunting heroics and sexual appetite, is disturbing. The killing of animals, the seizing of women...the two slide into each other in the story...The elision can take place in the psyche of the great hunter because identity means all others must be reduced to serving his appetite – both hunting and sexuality coincide in narratives of erotic domination...Many men, I suspect, if they were honest, might admit that they fear a figure like Orion lurking in the nether regions of the soul – unbridled, drunken, violent. The stories of William Golding suggest that this night-marsh descent into primitive violence is a modern obsession as well, that under the thin veneer of civilization is a violence and rapacity embodied in this primitive hunter.”

There are many clues to the true identity of Orion and the meaning of the myth, not the least of which is, according to one version, that he was killed by Artemis, his hunting companion whom he hoped to wed but tried to rape. In another version in which he threatens to kill all the animals on earth, the earth goddess Gaea is offended and sends the scorpion to kill him.

Orion does not represent the hunter in the male psyche as Bergman keeps insisting, but he does represent the archetypal dark side of the masculine, which is greedy and barbaric. Orion’s male instincts have gone awry because, like Hercules, he was not initiated properly into manhood.

Bly says that one of the three components of male initiation is discovering our dark side. Rites of passage found among hunting societies are deliberately designed to temper the fire of masculine instincts with the cooling waters of feminine compassion. Among Australian aborigines the rituals extend as far as sub-incising the penis full-length so that young males bleed profusely, mimic menses and identify with the feminine within their own psyches.

With pastoralism and the importance of warring, the initiation of boys to manhood shifts from successfully killing a typical big game animal to demonstrate one’s hunting prowess and suitability as a mate and parent, to the ritual slaying of very

dangerous predators. The emotional pitch of violent aggression among young Maasai warriors confronting a lion reaches an extreme pitch – they literally go berserk, a term from Scandinavia that refers to the same intensity of fighting emotion associated with killing bears and combat with enemy humans. Nowhere on earth at any time have males of hunting societies exhibited warring instincts toward animals hunted for food, and that behavioral pattern also typifies recreational hunting among civilized males.

Orion is the untempered male, whose instincts are beyond his own control, a product of warring culture. That he rapes the very women he wants to marry tells us that he is incapable of embracing the feminine, and that because his masculine passions never linked up with feminine compassion, the goal of male initiation. Though Artemis hopes to wed Orion, she slays him. Orion is a man without soul. So dangerous is the untempered male to women, creatures and the earth that he must be killed, the very situation we must confront today.

Male initiation among hunting peoples may be relatively simple and last up to a year or two, but among pastoralists it is more extensive and may take as long as ten years. Initiating young men to enhance their warring prowess but also temper them sufficiently to control aggression and violence within society is a demanding process. However well different cultures have man-aged, their men may still end up psychically unbalanced. The story of Orion may reflect the period of early Greek pastoralism, which is indicated by the fact that Orion wiped an entire island clean of all wild animals in order to marry the King's daughter. The skin that Orion in the sky carries in one hand may be that of a lion. Both these components of the myth indicate that in Orion's time the people were competing with wild animals. Again, this suggests that Orion's great feats had nothing to do with hunting for food, provisioning, but with warfare against predators or other wild species that competed with livestock.

Bergman wonders why these ancient images of men as hunter-warriors are so persistent. He sounds a lot like the eco-feminists when he proposes that the hunter planted notions of violence and rapacity deep in the male psyche. Orion is but one of many myths that portray and reveal the meta-myth of civilized life as domination and subjugation. A few thousand years of continual warring among civilized nations has equated masculinity with warring and the role that hunting has had in preparing men for war. But it is not the hunter in prehistory or in our psyche that "plants" notions of violence and rapacity in the male psyche, but the farmer and pastoralist, the warrior. Orion is a warrior, not a hunter.

It is a common theme among civilized humans to project their own violence and rapacity upon primitive cultures, as we have seen in Bergman's interpretation of Orion and in Golding's *Lord of the Flies*. It is not only unfounded but harmful to our efforts to discern what is natural and healthy for us compared to what is artificial and pathological.

Behind the myths of Orion and Artemis is another myth, the myth of agriculture and its perversion of the hunting life. In his lustful pursuit of power Orion, a civilized man, abused and corrupted hunting, the original lifestyle of goodness. Despite 5,000

wars in as many years, there dwells in the deep structure of the male psyche a longing to abandon the life of power and recover the good life of hunting. Like many men of our time, Bergman has his wires crossed. His attempt to understand the hunt leads him to read books and observe the Inuit hunting, but that would be rather like reading sexual physiology texts and watching pornography to understand what it means to fall in love. One could know everything in the world about sexual physiology but know nothing about what it means to make love. There simply is no relationship between intellectual knowledge and observation of hunting and the personal experience of hunting itself. Which is to say that Bergman's faith, like that of Western civilization, is in reason, the intellect, ego, not the intelligence of the heart. The answer Bergman is looking for lies in direct experience of the hunt itself. We can – and I think we must – go back to first things. Van der Post understood the Bushman and what civilization is missing because he, too, was a hunter. The hunt invites a man to surrender the hopeless futility of a life of power to the earth and receive its blessings with an open heart. Tears will fall.

Narcissus, the Wild Man and Hercules

In his poem, "Chicago," Carl Sandburg says he has seen the painted women under the gas lamps luring the farm boys. Gilgamesh employed a harlot to seduce the wild man, Enkidu, whose desire weakened his connection with the wild animals and led him to the city, then to his moral corruption and finally his death.

The Greek myth of Narcissus makes the point well. As the story opens Narcissus is out hunting with his companions when he leaves them to drink at a pond. When Narcissus looks down into the water and sees his own reflection, he falls in love with himself, but when he later realizes that his own desire leads back only to an empty reflection of himself, he commits suicide by drowning.

Bergman interprets the Narcissus story as a relationship between desire and quest for power within the context of hunting. I see it as a warning and a lament about the risks of leaving the cooperative life of the hunter to pursue the self-glorification and vanity of power-hungry, civilized men who are, as Bly suggested of Narcissus, stuck in their own circuits. Narcissus turned his back on the ways of the wild man and his love of things wild, and chose instead self-infatuation only to come up empty. The path of Narcissus ends in self-destruction precisely because it glorifies the superficial, material level of reality. For the hunting life that he spurned in favor of the desirable possessions of civilization, Narcissus lost his very soul.

In the story of Iron John, the boy ends up by a magical pond and looks in it to see his reflection. Unlike Narcissus, he does not fall in love with himself, but rather with nature. He breaks free from himself and becomes deeply connected to the power, beauty and intelligence of nature as well as his inseparable relationship to it. The outcome for the boy in the Iron John myth is radically different because behind him stands the wild man, a mentor who serves as a model for the boy's initiation to manhood. The tragedy of Narcissus is the tragedy of the modern era in which young

men have been encouraged to turn their backs on “first things” and pursue egoism instead. Most have no mentors, no rites of passage, only a meaningless life devoted to chasing what is superficial, unenduring.

Without the help of the wild man, we end up like Narcissus, infatuated with ourselves, the glamour of cities and the illusory power of technology. When we let the wild man out of the cage and go with him to the wilderness he will reward us with great fortune and gifts: manhood founded on nature.

The Initiation of Hercules

Still the greatest heroic figure of Western civilization, Hercules was so strong as an infant that he killed two snakes in his crib, and as a boy taking music lessons he struck his teacher over the head with a lyre and killed him. With too much power for the world, Hercules was sent into the highland pastures to shepherd flocks. There he killed all the wolves and lions surrounding Thebes, and for his unparalleled achievement in killing big predators became a great hero.

In time Hercules married and became a father, but in a rage of insanity killed his own children. To appease his crimes he was given twelve tasks, the first of which included killing the dreaded lion of Nemea, which he did by squeezing it to death. After accomplishing all the feats Hercules became an even greater hero by virtue of his deeds. Again he was overtaken by rage and killed many of his fellows. He sought repentance, and Zeus sentenced him to three years of feminine duty during which he had to wear woman’s clothes and daily endure women’s work.

Then Hercules reentered society again, and, as before, assumed the life of a heroic warrior. The woman he was to marry was kidnapped by a Centaur, but Hercules shot the Centaur with one of his poison arrows. As the Centaur died he gave Hercules’ fiancé drops of a potion that supposedly would redirect Hercules’ attention to her if he should ever wander. That day came and Hercules’ wife gave him the drops of love potion, which actually were the centaur’s blood mixed with the poison from Hercules’ arrow.

Hercules was so strong that the poison could not kill him, but the pain was so enormous that he had a funeral pyre prepared and the trophy skin from the Nemean lion put over it. The gods of Olympus came to admire Hercules’ strength and bravery so much that they drew him up to heaven and welcomed him. The goddess who had plotted for so long against him and stricken him with fits of murderous rage, gave her own daughter – the goddess of everlasting youth – to Hercules in marriage.

Unlike the savage Orion and the unmentored Narcissus, Hercules’ father, Zeus, stood over his son the way the Wild Man, Iron John, mentored the boy. With genuine wisdom, Zeus placed Hercules into feminine life so his ego would be tempered by enduring woman’s work and he could acquire humility. The killing of predators that made him a hero as a young man in a pastoral culture reinforced his untempered egoism and eventually drove him to kill his own children. The atonement by heroic feats only had the same result: more uncontrollable rage.

The story of Hercules is the story of pastoral man and the terrible cost of a lack of rites of passage that temper the male ego. Preferring to wrestle and fight the young

Hercules even killed his music teacher who might have had a softening influence. It was Hercules' initiation to the feminine that put an end to his insanity and rage, and which ultimately won him divinity and marriage to the everlasting feminine, a symbol of his eternal soul. ***The message for civilized, warring humanity is clear: initiation to manhood must encompass compassion - the route to divinity is through the heart.*** And that is precisely what hunting offers our young men today. The instinctive fire that drives the boy to pursue the animal is tempered by compassion when he actually kills one, and the entire process transforms the boy to a man of heart.

In Jungian terms, the heroic flights of Hercules were destructive and the only way he could recover was through a more comprehensive identification with his whole psyche. Henderson explains that the essential function of the heroic myth is the development of the individual's awareness of his own strengths and weaknesses so that he will be equipped for the arduous tasks with which adult life confronts him. Once the male has passed his initial test and is allowed to enter adulthood, the hero myth loses its relevance. The hero's symbolic death becomes the achievement of maturity.

The symbolic death of the hero occurs when the young man kills the animal. Socially, his feat earns him manhood, but at a deeper level, killing the animal also kills himself so that he may be reborn. Taking the life of the animal is the death of the child and the birth of the man. When the boy dies his childhood wounds die with him, but when he kills to become a man he also wounds himself in the heart. Just as the animal sacrifices itself so the boy may become a man, the man sacrifices his own heart to honor the sacred animal. The word "sacrifice" means "to make sacred." This is the meaning of hunting as a rite of passage to maturity, not unlike the woman who sacrifices her body and heart for the sacred child.

Hunting and the Archetypes of the Mature Man

Carl Jung charted fertile ground with his psychology of the unconscious mind. He and his disciples demonstrated that there is a vast realm that reveals itself to the conscious mind through dream, myth and art. Jung understood that much of the unconscious was the consequence of repression resulting from civilized humanity's separation from nature. He saw the failure to integrate the unconscious into the conscious as unhealthy and dangerous.

The Jungian psychologists have identified archetypes in the unconscious. The archetypes are like blueprints or models of behavioral conduct. The hero archetype expresses itself in males during late adolescence as a powerful drive to strike out on one's own and prove oneself worthy as a man. For example, the Hollywood

movie. "The Right Stuff," is about the hero archetype including its negative aspects.

The Hero was born in the hunting life when the young man went out to kill a large animal and demonstrate his worthiness as a provider-mate. Once he did that his society went to great lengths to regulate his egoism and promote maturity. With the arrival of civilization and the emphasis on ownership, wealth and war the Hero was unleashed. The old European myths, for example, tell of the young man going out to "make his fortune," which meant to conquer, vanquish, kill and steal. The heroic hunt as a practical demonstration of masculinity turned to lust. Civilization still is governed by the immature Hero archetype.

David Moore and Douglas Gillette wrote *King, Warrior, Magician, Lover*, about archetypes of mature masculinity. Feminists have severely attacked male dominance and the patriarchy as oppressive and abusive, and they have argued that connection with love and gentleness comes only from the feminine side of the human equation. Moore and Gillette disagree, saying that the patriarchy is not an expression of deeply rooted masculinity, but of the immature, shadow, "crazy" or stunted side of masculinity. They go on to say that the patriarchy is based on fear, of women and men. As I discussed under the myth of power, I believe that the patriarchy arose with domestication of animals as an adaptive response to protect and defend herds of animals against predators and other men, that it is not founded on fear of women. I view it simply as an embellishment of the dark side of the masculine ego: greed, barbarity and control.

In any case, are men missing development of the inner feminine or are they missing connection with the mature male archetypes, described by Moore and Gillette as the "deep and instinctual masculine energies," which they identify as King, Warrior, Magician and Lover? They believe that mature masculinity has been blocked by the patriarchy itself, even by the feminist critique, and I agree wholeheartedly with them that men were being blocked by the lack of meaningful and transformative initiatory process by which they could have achieved a sense of manhood. For them, the crisis of masculinity does not call for less masculine power

but more of the mature masculine. For example, the archetype of the Lover is one of relating through feeling, commonly associated with the feminine.

Whether we define it as masculine or feminine, there should be general agreement that men do need to develop their feeling nature. Where Moore and Gillette fall short is their emphasis on civilized men. They define mature "individuated" men by their patients who fall short of maturity. It is true that you can learn much about lions by studying them in captivity, but you could never imagine the ferocity of their hunting or warring instincts by observing them in zoos. Likewise, to know what mature men are really like it helps to spend time with some in sane societies. The mature men of hunting societies do exhibit the calm strength and compassion that is uncommon among pastoralists, farmers and city men. In fact, I am convinced that masculine maturity reached its zenith in the hunting life and has been eroding ever since, though it still resides in many older hunters, warriors, athletes and artists whose life experience has been conducive to awakening the archetypes and integrating them into consciousness.

As psychoanalysts, Moore and Gillette have seen men acquire genuine inner strength and centeredness by getting in touch with male archetypes via meditation, prayer and "active imagination." These processes are effective precisely because they permit ego transcendence and identification with the unconscious, what I refer to as Spirit or the inner Voice of God and Tolle means by Being. And each of them is derived from hunting as alert presence and as prayer. Properly initiated males whose rites of passage include hunting, vision quest and art may access the archetypes of mature masculinity at a relatively young age

So what of the mature male archetypes? Is there an inner structure in each man for the King, Warrior, Magician and Lover? What exactly are archetypes? Are they

instincts in the sense that sex is an inherited drive with a developmental blueprint?

Some Jungian psychologists recognize that the King is the central male archetype around which the rest of the psyche revolves. In human life, the king as leader-chief is a relatively recent innovation. Most hunting societies, for example, do not have a counterpart to the king. As a group elders may serve the purpose of leadership and resolving tribal conflicts. If the King is central to the mature male then it must be primieval.

I suspect that on this point the Jungians are wrong, that the King is not an archetype at all, but the equivalent of Tolle's (1999) Being, Goswami's (1993) "quantum mind," the "Spirit" or heart of Native Americans, and Christianity's Holy Spirit, the Voice for God in everyone. I suspect that it was the King I accessed when I did the miraculous "things I never did." And that it is the King that gave puny Sri Chin Moy the "heart" to lift unmatched amounts of weight. Likewise for Jack Schwarz's instantaneous recovery from multiple punctures in his back, and the 80-year old Chi Gung Master's uncanny ability to repel five men simultaneously without exerting a single muscle.

If I am right, the King is the spiritual essence of a man: ordering, wise, calm. The King is the source of concepts and ideas in the sense that Plato described the shadows on the cave wall as reflections of a realm of perfect forms, and more recently Goswami's (1993) "monistic idealism." The King is the intermediary between the unmanifest and creation, and it is true that young men need the blessing of the King from older men whose lives embraced Him. When accepted and acknowledged by a mature man who is spiritually developed, a young man undergoes inner transformation. Essentially, recognition from the King in a mentor awakens the King within the young man so one day he similarly may bless and heal young men.

Though I doubt that the King is an archetype, I do agree with Moore and Gillette that when we access the King/God/Being energy correctly we will have a sense of being a participant in creating a more peaceful, fair and creative world. We will have a transpersonal devotion to our families and friends and also to the world. We will have some form of spirituality, and we will know the truth of the commandment around which human life seems to be based, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy Heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And thy neighbor as thyself."

So what of the other archetypes: Warrior, Magician and Lover? I believe that

they stem from the original mature male archetype of the Hunter, which somehow the Jungians missed. The Hunter is so present in us that it is largely transparent. In a sense the Hunter is the male prototype, as Ortega said, "the original man," without historical precedent. The genuine archetypes, Hunter, Warrior, Magician and Lover, are not exactly instincts, though they may have physiological correlates that are actual instincts, for example, the Lover archetype and the sex drive. The mind is to the brain as the archetype is to biological instinct. They are "spiritual instincts," in the sense that they are innate and have a spiritual origin.

The Warrior does not appear first in civilization, but as I have said repeatedly, he appears first as an aspect of the Hunter. Competing for animal carcasses, hunters have made war against dangerous predators for hundreds of thousands of years. The Jungians describe the Warrior as the source of aggressiveness. By this term they do not necessarily mean combative behavior towards other humans or animals, but rather the determination to get up and go and keep going. The Warrior energy arouses, motivates and energizes, exactly what the Hunter energy does. When Moore and Gillette say the Warrior embodies a "positive mental attitude," that he has an unconquerable spirit, great courage and self-discipline, they describe the Hunter. If a few Jungians had been hunters, they would know that it is the Hunter within that stirs a man's blood and rouses him hours before daylight and pushes him to go out into subfreezing weather and sit quietly but alert for hours on a tree limb or in a marsh. It is the Hunter inside that drives a Bushman out into the veld to pursue meat amidst lions and cobras for three days, and it is the same Hunter that holds an Eskimo's spear steady at an ice hole waiting 24 hours for a seal to emerge. Successful hunting requires years of self-discipline and training. Before the Warrior was the Hunter is.

Before the Magician is the Hunter. The Magician is considered to be the energy behind the shaman and the scientist, he who discovers how the world works and applies that knowledge. He is the knower and master of technology. It is the

Hunter who arouses a man's curiosity about the nature of things, that leads him to carefully observe ants, eagles and deer and discover the medicine in their food. The Hunter's keen alertness teaches him to read nature like a book. His life is one of relentless proto-science, formulating and testing hypotheses empirically. And he is the original technologist. Like the shaman who emerged from the hunter, the Magician understands the links between the unseen world of spirits and the world of nature. It was the hunter who first communicated with the spirit world and who honored it in his life. It is the Hunter inside that lies behind the recovery of magic and mystery in subatomic physics and depth psychology. He is the quiet observer, the detached witness, the eyes and ears of the King/God/Spirit/Being, and therein lies his power as healer of the psyche.

The shadow or perverted form of the Magician appears in modern science and technology which strive to master nature and control it. The original Magician, the Hunter, seeks and honors harmony, cooperation and reciprocity with nature.

The Lover is also an aspect of the Hunter. It is libido in the sense of vital energy, vividness, passion and creative energy. The Lover is deeply sensual and feels connected to all things, just as hunters, primitive and contemporary see their prey as their kin. Moore and Gillette say this about the Kalahari Bushman whom they view as lovers who are aesthetically attuned to everything in the environment. They are like hunters everywhere whose dance, music, song, speech and art either derive from the hunt or imitate and honor the wild animals they hunt.

The Bushman accurately can imitate the sounds of over 300 species of their world. Their expertise at imitating animals reveals their unparalleled affection for them and their sense of oneness with them. The foundation of mysticism is the Lover archetype of the Jungians, though it, too, is an aspect of the Hunter: the hunter's mystique.

The intuitive sensitivity of the Lover gives a man the capacity to feel at one with other beings and the world, even to feel their pain, again, a primary dimension of the Hunter who identifies with his prey. So it is with the Hunter that we are deeply and profoundly connected to the suffering of the world.

Moore and Gillette share a common misconception about civilized life compared with the hunting life, and being biased by their experience healing civilized men, they imagine that there never has been a time when the archetypes of the mature masculine have been dominant in human life. But they are wrong. They are dominant among the Tibetans and Hopis and many hunting societies. Like other writers, Moore and Gillette point to Golding's *Lord of the Flies* as an illustration of the savagery of primitive society, but what it actually depicts is the brutality of civilization. Civilization favors infantilism, not maturity.

It seems to me that the re-creational hunt awakens both the Warrior and Magician, and that the kill awakens the Lover. The demands of subsistence hunting are so extreme that they awaken the King. Vision quest also activates the King, and the Lover stirs us to create art.

The answer for the long haul is not psychotherapy employing masculine archetypes, but it is proper initiation of boys to manhood utilizing critical experiences that are transformative and maturing, including the hunt and vision quest. The Hunter connects the human male with the King, just as birthing awakens a woman to the Queen/Great Mother/Creator within. When Bly said that the hunt taught men about God, he was absolutely right. Ortega concluded that, 'The

hunter is the truly alert man.”