

PRESENTATION

Dallas Safari Club

January 11, 2020

Presented by

Danene Van Der Westhuyzen

President, Namibia Professional Hunters Association

and

Michael G. Sabbeth, Esq., author and lecturer

Deconstructing the Interview of Danene Van Der Westhuyzen

by Emma Barnett, BBC's Emma Barnett Show, June 17, 2019

Lessons to Learn and Strategies to Implement

listen to interview

<https://www.facebook.com/watch/?v=403191380289594>

I am delighted that Danene and I can make this presentation. I believe it is unique in our hunting community.

Full disclosure about my history with Danene. I visited their home in Namibia; As her guest, I spoke at the 2016 --- seems so long ago --- NAPHA Annual Meeting.. and on one of their properties I saw the magnificent black rhino that was auctioned for a hunt by the DSC in 2017.

Her appearance is normal, yet she is a giant in the African hunting community. I respect her and love her marvelous family.

Please understand that this is the first time D and I are getting together for this presentation. It is not rehearsed, orchestrated or edited. Please forgive me if it is not an elegantly smooth presentation.

Due to time restraints, we could not cover every part of the interview.

This presentation will teach how to identify the traps used by a hostile media to undermine people that advocate for hunting and show how hunting advocates can fight back powerfully and persuasively against a biased media.

Our purpose: deconstruct; analyze, - see the con, in the anti hunting media...see their logical fallacies and rhetorical tricks and deceits... and help us identify... and then craft arguments and rhetoric to fight back against the anti hunting deep swamp...

BEGIN THE INTERVIEW

Emma: how did you get into hunting?

Danene:: well , I'm a Namibian first and foremost...hunting is part of our survival regime... in Africa we are reliant of on our resources... always been hunting with my dad.. showed what ethical and good hunting .. at first we hunted only for sustenance and meat... ... it's survival ..

Emma: do you eat everything you hunt?

Danene: Of course we do. we hunt mostly plains game.. gemsbok, kudu, wildebeest, ... and in Caprivi for some of the more dangerous animals. for buffalo, elephant,

Emma: do you eat the elephant you kill?

Danene: yes. without the elephant meat the people will starve in the Caprivi will starve.. quotas for sustenance of the meat.. we have a sustenance ration

Emma: are you reliant on meat? do you and your clients reliant on the meat?

Comment: the alarm bells should now go off in every listener. Emma is seeding the ground for a foundational anti-hunting narrative: eating the meat of the animal the hunter has killed.

Danene: yes; we are all part of Nature

Emma: Are your clients killing for their dinner or are they killing because they want a head on the wall?

Comment: Emma immediately begins to set up the moral framing of her anti hunting position: and uses the logical fallacy of the false choice to set up the frame

Danene: they are killing because they are conservationists.. they don't just sit on the back of a vehicle.. that nature is not beautiful all the time... . nature is death.. it's all about the experience; the sunset and the sunrise.....
.

Emma: It sounds terribly romantic,.....

Note: Danene just talked about nature being not beautiful all the time and about animals dying. Emma totally dismissed Danene's words. This common tactic ignores the guest's substantive point and then mischaracterizes the guest's description.

Danene expressly stated that Nature is death and not beautiful but Emma ignored that description and chose to characterize Danene's words as being 'romantic.'

Emma continues:

But take the romance out: assert alleged fact: lion numbers plunged 43% from 1993 through 2014. Giraffe subspecies: 2 were listed as endangered. I put it to you we don't need human involvement in the animal kingdom... We seem to be doing far more damage than getting involved with doing good

Let's analyze what is happening now.

Alarms in the listener's mind should go off again. Emma is now crafting one of the most powerful anti hunting narratives: that human involvement is causing the destruction of wildlife.

Note: Emma cites no evidence that the alleged decrease of animals was caused by hunting. Moreover, she offers no evidence that those same animals may have increased in other parts of Africa for any of a number of reasons, including hunting.

Danene aggressively tries to refute Emma's assertion regarding the malevolence of human involvement with wildlife

Danene: that is actually my point.. it's that none of those declines of numbers has anything to do with the trophy hunter.. not at all... ... if you have your facts straight—not one of those declines in numbers has anything to do with hunting ... your facts are wrong, ... human encroachment is killing the animals, it is poaching ; the one thing the hunters do is preserve habitat

Human Involvement

Comment: Danene is making two irrefutable assertions: human involvement in Nature already exists and will forever exist: wildlife / human conflict; habitat destruction and poaching and

- animal population declines are not caused by trophy hunters

Danene could not be more emphatic about existing human involvement.

Danene is asserting fundamental truths.

What does Emma do?

Emma: goes right to the issue of photos...a photo of a lady with a dead animal and asks Danene: What is your reaction to that?

Tactic: Emma ignores Danene's representations and insights about human / wildlife interaction and that hunters do not deplete wildlife. Emma makes the tactical decision to ignore Danene's arguments and moves on.

As if Emma were saying with condescension, Okay, that's nice but what about this?

Possible Danene response Danene could say: We can discuss photos later. Let's not move on. These are important points. I want to discuss them.

Comment: Note Emma's tactical avoidance of the fundamental issues of hunting's justification as she takes on a different and really irrelevant issue.

Lesson: stay on point !!!!!!!

Be aware of this tactic and stand up to it. Hold the interviewer accountable.

Emma: Are your clients killing for their dinner or are they killing because they want a head on the wall?

Comment: further setting up the moral framing of her anti hunting position:

Danene: they are killing because they are conservationists.. they don't just sit on the back of a vehicle.. ... the human being becomes part of nature. that nature is not beautiful all the time... . nature is death.. it's all about the experience. It's all about the experience... It does not mean you are randomly going to kill anything..... it's about seeing the sun rise...

Let's see what's going on at this point:

Note the logical fallacies of

- false choices—killing for dinner or are they killing because they want a head on the wall? Other choices exist. People other than the hunter can eat the meat and or the hunter might eat the meat at selective dinners...
- Danene refutes the “A or B” framing Emma presented. Danene offers a third choice: they are killing because they are conservationists –which benefits everyone—the hunter, the animals, the community, the tourism business
- and strawman argument: the logical fallacy that eating the meat is the only legitimate test for gauging the morality of the hunter.

Regarding the immorality of the trophy hunter: Emma's framing of hunting: either sustenance, which is good, or the immorality of the blood lust head on the wall

so, is the Texas rancher an immoral person drenched in blood lust because the cattle are sold for others to eat?

This is a logical absurdity

What moral principle, what ethical principle, justifies a person as immoral for killing an animal not for its own subsistence but donates the meat to others for their sustenance?

Emma and sustenance hunting: what she is doing: see it.. she is setting up the narrative that any hunting other than for sustenance is done for vanity and is thus immoral

As I stated, among other points, in my article on trophy hunting, Trophy Hunting: The Use and Abuse of Rhetoric, which is on my website: The Honorable Hunter.com and on the NRA-HLF website:

It is illogical and immoral to focus on the hunter's intent—whether or not the hunter wants a head on the wall, as she says—rather than focus on the *consequences* of the hunter's action: food for the community; giving value to the animals; conservation, less poaching and so forth. Our task is to smash the frame the hostile interviewer attempts to establish

Let's revisit Danene's last comment;

Danene: they are killing because they are conservationists.. they don't just sit on the back of a vehicle.. ... the human being becomes part of nature. that nature is not beautiful all the time... . nature is death.. it's all about the experience. It's all about the experience... It does not mean you are randomly going to kill anything..... it's about seeing the sun rise...

Emma: It sounds terribly romantic,

Note: Danene just talked about nature being not beautiful all the time and about animals dying. Emma totally dismissed Danene's words. This common tactic ignores the guest's substantive point and then mischaracterizes the guest's description.

Danene expressly stated that Nature is not idyllic; that Nature is death and not beautiful but Emma ignored that description of the

struggles and fatalities in Nature and chose to grossly mischaracterize Danene's words as 'romantic.'

Emma continues:

But take the romance out: assert alleged fact: lion numbers plunged 43% from 1993 through 2014. Giraffe subspecies: 2 were listed as endangered. I put it to you we don't need human involvement in the animal kingdom... We seem to be doing far more damage than getting involved with doing good

Let's analyze what is happening now.

Note how Emma is dishonest here.

Alarms in the listener's mind should go off again. Emma is now crafting one of the most powerful anti hunting narratives: that human involvement is causing the destruction of wildlife.

Note: Emma cites no evidence that the alleged decrease of animals was caused by hunting. Moreover, she offers no evidence that those same animals may have increased in other parts of Africa for any of a number of reasons, including hunting.

Danene aggressively tries to refute Emma's assertion regarding the malevolence of human involvement with wildlife

Danene: that is actually my point.. it's that none of those declines of numbers has anything to do with the trophy hunter.. not at all... ... if you have your facts straight—... human encroachment is killing the animals, it is poaching; the one thing the hunters do is preserve habitat

Danene aggressively tries to refute Emma's assertion alleging the malevolence of human involvement with wildlife

Human Involvement

Comment: Danene is making two irrefutable assertions:

- human involvement in Nature already exists and will forever exist: wildlife / human conflict; habitat destruction and poaching and
- animal population declines are not caused by trophy hunters

Danene could not be more emphatic about existing human involvement.

Danene is asserting fundamental truths.

Emma's avoidance tactic: What does Emma do?

Emma: goes right to the issue of photos...a photo of a lady with a dead animal.

Emma asks Danene: What is your reaction to that?

Tactic: Emma ignores Danene's representations and insights about human / wildlife interaction and that hunters do not deplete wildlife. Emma makes the tactical decision to ignore Danene's arguments and moves on.

As if Emma were saying with condescension, Okay, that's nice but what about this?

Possible Danene response Danene could say: We can discuss photos later. You are ignoring what I just said. Let's not move on. These are important points. I want to discuss them.

Comment: Note Emma's tactical avoidance of the fundamental issues of hunting's justification as she chooses to move on to a different and frankly irrelevant issue.

Lesson: stay on point !!!!!!!

Be aware of this tactic and stand up to it. Hold the interviewer accountable.

We should say... certainly could say: We can discuss photos later. You are ignoring what I just said. It's not okay to move on. These are important points. I want to discuss them.

Comment: Note Emma's tactical avoidance of the fundamental issues of hunting's justification as she chooses to move on to a different and frankly irrelevant issue.

Lessons:

- be aware of this tactic. It is common and it is effective
- stay on point and force the interviewer to stay on point.
- Hold the interviewer accountable.

Danene continues, responding to the photo question: I do not totally agree with photos being put on social media... for me first and foremost it is a personal experiences... the photos do not show the experience.. the conservation...should be shared with people that understand conservation and have an ear to listen...you are exposing

yourself and your country to people that don't understand necessarily conservation..

photo safaris: Danene: speaks of personal experience: the photo does not show conservation, The photos do not show the conservation impact and the observer of the photo does not understand this.

The Motherlode

At this point in the interview we see Danene's most powerful point, which is the basis for one of our most powerful lessons

Danene continues: You are asking me very around the edge questions.. instead of what does it mean to the country.. what does it mean for the species; if there is a value being placed on it because of hunting; whether it is for meat, whether it is for money

Danene continues: Namibia is very reliant on wildlife... for the animals.. in the 1970s animals were almost eradicated of all wildlife.. it was only cattle farming and sheep farming...we are very reliant on wildlife... it is an extremely dry country... tourism would be reduced by half if hunting was stopped in Namibia. Most people were commercial farmers; cattle farmers and sheep farmers. and becomes direct conflict with wildlife.. . and then people came to realize there is value in wildlife.. we appreciate it.. it is beautiful to look at.. we need to strive for a balanced life with our wildlife... it's our only resource.. habitat...habitat habitat...

Two points here:

One;

YOU ARE ASKING THE WRONG QUESTIONS !!!!!!!!!!!!!

Danene : this is her most powerful, insightful rejoinder to Emma:
here it is...

This insight is the key, the motherlode, of the interview and
Danene's defense of hunting: you are asking the wrong questions!!

Why are Emma's questions the wrong questions?

Emma is not asking about data on increased wildlife populations.
Not asking about money that goes to the community; not asking
about tourism value; not asking about the effectiveness of photo
tourism; not asking about increased food and habitat for the
wildlife. Not seeking wisdom; not seeking truth; Nothing.

if we do this rhetorical judo : do you see what happens? The
narrative shifts; we begin to discuss substantive content ON OUR
TERMS.. WE FRAME THE DISCUSSION..WE HAVE
RECLAIMED THE RHETORICAL POWER.... AM I
EXPLAINING THE CLEARLY?

We cannot allow folks like Emma avoid asking the right
questions.. and if they fail to ask the right questions, we must go
after them like a lion on a wounded gemsbok. They must be forced
to pay a price for their biases and incompetence.

Two

Comment: Danene talks about balance: here the balance: Danene
gives full value to photo tourism. But she began to talk about how
it is a half truth. Danene was cut off.

But the concept of balance is foundational: I tease her: she sounds
like Aristotle.. I know him... I was there. ... I chatted with

him...he was a good guy... a good writer... but his garage was a mess with all that papyrus...did you know Aristotle loved basketball? Yes. So, balance: the basis for the Greek concept of justice: the golden mean

remember: you do not throw your autonomy in the trash can when you are interviewed. You can fight back; you can argue; you can ask questions. Example:

Will you concede trophy hunting is beneficial if the trophy stuck on the wall led to more animals, healthier animals and enhanced the standard of living for hosting communities? Will you concede that?

Whatever answer they give—yes or no—you get moral clarity of their beliefs and moral clarity of their character

We want to control the narrative of the interviewer by demanding the interviewer asks the proper questions.

Danene has raised at least two powerful incisive points: ask better questions if you want to understand hunting and the concept of balance, which is essential for preserving wildlife.

What does Emma do? She ignores Danene and changes topics.

Emma asks if hunting is lucrative, whatever that means.

Emma: it is lucrative: you talk about how it is lucrative to get nature back to where it should be period how much does it cost to go on one of your hunts?

Emma: just to be clear, when you talk about the big five... do you also hunt lions?

Danene: gives a detailed answer.. . the big 5 no, I don't hunt lions..not have a quota... ..

Feel Guilty?

Emma: do you ever feel guilty after you kill an animal?

Danene: no --you never feel guilty – you feel sad ... you feel a lot of emotion.. because you are taking a life –

we want to see the animals in the wild want to have animals preserved for their children to leave a better future for my children... – I don't want my children to see the animals in a zoo one day.. I want them to see them in the wild.. see them in the wide open spaces where they belong.. .. it's a basic right of an animal to be in the wild..

Don't Understand: A Clever Strategy

Emma: I'm not trying to be difficult... I don't understand how hunting helps that happen...you are killing animals... and yet you're saying that will stop them from ending up in zoos. Surely...

Comment

“Not understanding” can be an effective rhetorical tactic

very important point here: not understanding. Professing to not understand is an effective diversion and dodge from acknowledging a truth. Saying you don't understand gives power to the speaker and puts the burden on the other person to persuade. But the alleged not understanding can be done in bad faith.

Danene: what did you already tell Emma?

Told her how hunting gives value to animals; told her how animals are exterminated when they have no value; told her how hunting provides significant sources of protein so communities do not have

to destroy wildlife habitat to accommodate sheep and cattle.
Danene talked about incentives to reduce poaching.

What more does this lady need to understand?

Either Emma has the brain of a pet rock, which is not likely, or she is too obtuse to understand fundamental principles, or she is lying. If she doesn't understand, it is because she does not want to understand.

Danene could directly challenge Emma: what precisely do you not understand? Giving value to animals means they will be protected?

That we grasp and identify this 'not understand' tactic is vital to defend hunting.

Danene: yes of course... I am not trying to take that away...you need to have a balance...

Emma ignores the practices of the implementation of balance

Emma: interrupts again... But why not get rid of trophy hunting... and just boost photo tourism...

Danene: trophy hunting takes animals off that are past their prime.. there is a 0.05 quota on trophy hunting ...In other words, there is no way that trophy hunting could ever have a negative influence on a species... no way....the things that have a massive influence... ... what does effect.. human encroachment, human-wildlife conflict.. and poaching....

Emma tries to interrupt again...

Danene: no.. let me explain this to you..

In essence, Danene says: shut up!

Danene refused to be interrupted if you live with an elephant.. and they trample on your crops... 20 elephant tramples plots... destroys your crops... so what do you do? you have nothing left... what do they do? they will easily kill all the elephants or poison it... or lions..... you are taking a life either way.. If you give value to that animal.. if that animal has no value, the farmer poisons it; kills it. And that one cow is worth more than twenty lions... But if I tell the landowner I will give you a hell of a lot of money for that lion... doesn't matter which animal... if you give value to that animal... if we offer to pay 50 thousand or 30 thousand dollars... then, all of a sudden, that animal means something... because our government gave sole ownership of the animals to the land holders... they own the animals... and all of a sudden talking about giving value to animals.. the landowners now have money.. they own the animals...; they have money and they have employment.. and that's how you save the animals .. and that's how you save it

That's A Bold Claim!

Emma : I understand the concept you are sharing and thank you for doing so ... but that is a very bold claim to say ... that trophy hunting can never have a negative impact on a specie

Danene: it is not bold: it's a fact: it's a proven fact

Comment:

Danene gave a very confident response

Here are Danene's core assertions.

They are the heart and soul of hunting's justification: tiny percentages of legally hunted animals and economic reality— giving value to the animal and thereby create value for the landowner and thereby increase the wildlife populations

Recognize Emma's tactical trick: Ignore and trivialize what Danene said

Emma ignores and refuses to address Danene's powerful overarching economic and statistical arguments and leaps to attack on what Emma thinks is Danene's hyperbolic "gotcha" exaggeration on a point—but on a point that, even if true, is thoroughly trivial:

Emma: That is a very bold claim to say ... that trophy hunting can never have a negative impact on a species.

Danene says it's a fact. No doubt Danene is technically correct... but let us concede 'never' is a challenging standard for measurement.

So what?

Emma's Tactic: Ignore the Substance and Attack What is Meaningless

Now we shall see how Emma chooses to confront and refute what she believes is Danene's weakness.

The point that is illustrated here, which is very important for us should we find ourselves in these types of situations, is that the choice made by any interviewer illuminates the morality of the person making the choice. And the morality or lack of morality of the choice is where we hunters can attack and most persuasively refute the anti hunting narratives

Emma's Greatest Deceit

At this point in the interview we are introduced to Emma's most deceitful and biased tactic and arguments, aided and abetted by a so-called wildlife advocate.

Facts and Introduce Mark Jones

Emma: I know we have not spoken before, but regular listeners of this program know I am a big fan of trying to understand whether or not something is a fact ... so let me welcome to the program doctor Mark Jones, head of policy at the international animal charity Born Free

So Mark, who has been listening... welcome Mark: is that a fact that trophy hunting can never have a negative impact on wildlife?

The Ideology of Mark Jones

I Share a coincidence. While preparing for my general speech, I found this nugget in my notes:

My colleague John Jackson is a tireless advocate for conservation around the world and founder of Conservation Force, told me about the "animal rights" lawyers in the case .." Born Free USA, et al v. Norton, et al., D.C. 03-1497, told the District Judge "unequivocally" that "given the choice plaintiffs would rather see the elephants euthanized and dead than in a zoo."

Mark Jones::

Mark does not answer the specific question: Is that a fact that trophy hunting can never have a negative impact on wildlife?

Instead, Mark launches into an anti hunting rant

Let me say first of all that Born Free opposes the hunting or killing of any animal for sport or for fun... we oppose any hunting for trophies or for any kind of sport .. and I think many people are shocked to hear that

trophy hunters continue to pay to kill wild animals so they can stick their heads or skins on a wall or in a cabinet...this practice led to the collapse of many wildlife populations in Africa in colonial times... and most have never recovered...but every year hundreds of thousands of wild animals...still fall victim to trophy hunters... and not just abundant species.. if have enough cash...elephant, lions, leopard, ...but every year... .. and some of the animals targeted by the hunters belong to critically endangered species...and there is good evidence that the hunting continues to damage wildlife populations... so I certainly wouldn't agree with that ... we refute claims that hunting benefits wildlife conservation or local communities or represents some kind of animal management tool... .. I submit that modern trophy hunting is a cruel and damaging relic of a colonial era and really should be consigned to history

Emma asks Mark to comment on Danene's assertions...Mark: hunters often claim there are benefits.. but these claims... he says her claims don't stand up.. he says trophy hunters should just donate the money they spend directly to the community and not hunt...money rarely goes to the community... etc.. an independent hunting report.. says only 3 percent goes to the communities.... he says he will issue two reports... to prove that the money does not go to the communities.. says hunting does not result in the financial benefits that hunters claim... and that these countries want hunting to be ended...

we'll be releasing two reports. to show that hunting does not result in the financial benefits that hunters claim. He refers to Zambia... reveals that the local communities don't receive the money and have become sick and tired of the corruption and the lack of benefits and are really looking forward to the practice to be ended.

Danene:

Smacks down Mark.

I am first and foremost aghast by your comments...it is easy to say something is not factual... there are other studies...unbiased studies.. very good studies.. which prove the opposite.. and the money gets put back into conservancies... all of this is regulated.. Namibia would lose half of its tourism when hunting would close.. we would have no use for the wildlifeand people would kill off all the animals... the animals would have no use.. and would resort.. to cattle farming again and eradicate all wildlife... and we are not living in colonial times any more.. the words should not be usedwe are an independent country...and we have the commitment to the sustainable use of wildlife written into our Constitution. . . .so it is ludicrous to make those types of statements... .. it is very easy to make such statements when you live overseas and your crops aren't destroyed...it's ludicrous ... and should have more open discussions... . and in practice. it's not the picture you want to paint to the world

Not Live There

Emma: what about Mark's statements about disrupting animal populations by hunting...

Danene: says that this is not factual or true. It is unbelievably sad for me to hear him .. and this coming from a guy who has never been there or born there.

Emma: people are allowed to have factual opinions about places where they have not been: In this world a fake news I absolutely refuse to prevent ... don't like the argument you cannot have an opinion just because you were not born there or have not been there. Period. I refuse to let people on my show make that statement.

Okay. Emma makes a fair point. Danene acknowledges that.

Danene: Of course you can have an opinion, but he doesn't know the practicalities. He is not factual at all.

Emma: He is! How do you disprove it?

Here we see Emma's subterfuge.

Danene: I don't have the facts at my fingers.. look at our cheetah population; rhino population.. the largest in the world... due purely to custodianship... He does not have a factually based opinion. There is no way

Comment: Emma challenges Danene, challenging Danene as if to say: how can you disprove that? Mark said it's true!

Danene was sandbagged. She was not prepared to argue numbers and data. The professed topic was women and hunting.

Emma said Mark was factual, and that's the end of the discussion, as if Emma were screaming like that little insufferable environmental tyrant, Greta Thunberg: How dare you?! How dare you disagree with Mark. He's a doctor!!

mgs: this would be a great time for Danene to discuss the rhino hunting on her property... the mature rhino that killed 5 younger rhinos.. tell stories: then put Emma and Mark on the spot: would you oppose such a hunt? go for their jugular...and then go after Emma: you boast that you want to know the facts... and then you choose Mark.. and you don't inform me.. .why didn't you inform me!

The Architecture of Emma's Deceitful Tactic

So, how does Emma demonstrate that she implements her policy of wanting to know whether or not something is a fact?

Emma wants her audience to believe she has no bias and that she is compelled by virtuous search for the truth... yet the evidence of her

biases is overwhelming, and she attempts to mask her bias by glib deceitful rhetoric

She introduces Mark Jones, a biased, gloating, morally smug anti hunter

and she introduces him without notice to Danene; no time to prepare to share perspectives and compare data.

Emma tries to catch Danene in a rhetorical trap... whether Danene is accurate that trophy hunting can never have a negative impact on a species.

Emma trivializes the Danene's assertions and focuses on an irrelevant issue – trophy hunter can *never have* a negative impact on animal populations

Emma just stated self-righteously asserted that everyone familiar with her knows of her commitment to find the truth... to find what is and is not a fact.

How does she elect to find the truth about trophy hunting?

By bringing on as a surprise guest a rabid anti hunting ideologue

Emma uses Mark Jones as her sole arbiter of truth relating to trophy hunting.

Emma thoroughly rejects Danene's comments and implicitly denies that Danene has any expertise worth considering.

This is how you judge the morality or lack of morality of Emma's character

KEY POINTS

Okay: here's a key point: now that we know this; now that we have identified Emma's deceit,

WHAT DO WE DO WITH THE INSIGHT?

WE POINT IT OUT:

YOU DIDN'T INFORM ME ABOUT MARK. WHY NOT?

YOU COULD HAVE INVITED

Dick Cheatham; John Jackson, DSC Foundation; a Namibian environment minister to be her guest. She didn't. She chose a smug person whose salary is paid by an anti hunting organization.

so much for Emma's integrity and moral character

Analyzing Mark's Rhetoric

Mark uses the word 'stick a head on the wall.' That word is disparaging and condescending. It is also inaccurate. The word 'stick' illustrates more than a disagreement about the value of hunting; the word illustrates Mark's contempt for hunters

Colonialism

Mark's allegation of colonialism is supposed to be a dagger to the heart of the hunter... a resurrection of all that is evil about the colonizing white race.

But Mark is the colonialist. Here he is bragging about how he distributes money for the causes he believes in .. he's telling the dark skinned natives that his approach to dealing with animals is better than the hunters and better than their judgment regarding the value of hunting. And Mark is enticing them with money...

Western money from rich donors who couldn't find Namibia on a map if their triple soy lattes depended on it...

Moreover, Mark's solution to the allegation that the communities receive little money from the hunting enterprise is to eliminate all hunting and thus eliminate all funding that reaches the community.

I wonder if these people listen to themselves!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Mark's solution? End it all. Take all money away. Give them nothing. Does not even consider the possibility of figuring out how to get more money to the community.

CONCLUSIONS

Two questions must be raised:

1. What can we learn from Danene's interview and
2. What can we do with what we learned?

What Can We Learn?

Be Prepared

The attacks can be petty:

- Can hunting *never have* a negative influence?

Ask the Right Questions

This is the most critical point we can make in this brief presentation. If we can convey this point emphatically, we will have made a meaningful contribution to the pro hunting debate.

IF YOU DO NOT ASK INTELLIGENT QUESTIONS, YOU WILL NOT... EVER.. GET INTELLIGENT ANSWERS

IF WE ALLOW THE ANTI HUNTERS TO ASK UNINTELLIGENT QUESTIONS, WE WILL NEVER EVER GET INTELLIGENTS ANSWERS TO HUNTING'S ISSUES

THEREFORE

DO NOT LET THE ANTI HUNTERS DICTATE THE QUESTIONS

DO NOT LET THE ANTI HUNTERS CONTROL THE NARRATIVE

DO NOT LET THE ANTI HUNTERS DICTATE THE TERMS OF THE INTERVIEW

SAY: YOU ARE NOT ASKING THE RIGHT QUESTIONS. IF YOU DESIRE THE TRUTH, THEN ASK THESE QUESTIONS..

IF YOU DO NOT ASK THESE QUESTIONS OR YOU DO NOT ALLOW ME TO STATE THE TRUTH, I WILL END THE INTERVIEW

Understand

The tactical goal of the anti hunter: not only spread misinformation, but create doubt and permeate doubt deeply .. question the credibility of the hunting community

note the narratives are developed.. conceptualized.. to achieve an outcome.. not to disseminate a truth

the messaging is unrelenting and it is orchestrated and it is consistent

Emma Barnett and Mark Jones are effective messengers

What can we conclude about Emma? Questions are raised: is she a liar, or so obtuse and lacking in introspection that she does not see the irony of her actions as undermining truth? Is she simply stupid? A fool? I don't know. The answers do not matter.

Hunters have to deal with people like her irrespective of their character.

And she and Mark: are they merely highly compensated white privileged woke oppressing colonialists dictating to the dark skinned natives? What we do know for certain is that neither of them will ever pay a price for being wrong. And when the animals are gone, they will blame the hunters, never themselves

What Can We Do?

We must anticipate... practice our argument skills; be prepared; .. to deal with dishonesty, lies, stupidity, manufactured ignorance, smugness, virtue signaling and the complete rejection of facts and reality.

Learn the tricks and cons and deceptions used in interviews.
Anticipate them.

Listen to the opposing person. Don't be thinking of your next comment; listen to the comments and testimony of your opposing person and evaluate those words

Study the architecture of the process

Knowing the architecture of the process is our best hope for crafting strategies—rhetoric, media, legislation—for undermining anti hunting strategies

We must stop viewing anti hunting activists as conservation or wildlife organizations. They are political organizations, seeking to advance political agendas. They are well funded, well staffed, have lobbyists, NGOs. They must be treated politically.

Comment by Jim Shockey:

- I sent this text to Jim Shockey. He commented in reply: good material but in the heat of the debate, where the interviewer is practiced, confident and controls the rules, it will be tough to recognize the traps and respond as I outlined.

- My response to Shockey: true, Jim, but we will do better, much better, if we are aware and if we practice interviewing skills. We will do better

Why do I do this? What do I hope to achieve?

I don't want anti hunting people attacking my friends.

I don't want anti hunting people attacking anyone in our community

I want our community to have the wit and the skills to attack those anti hunters in such a way as to make them pay a price for their deceit, their dishonest, their pathology.

The message: immoral unethical attacks on the hunting community is no longer cost free.

No more.

Danene, thank you.

MGS