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By Tom Wiknich

My response to your comments on the last editorial titled: Was Trump out of line throwing out Univision reporter? Due to one fine reader’s challenging response to my editorial, I felt this would be a good way to respond. When I started this, I thought it would just be a short response like I usually do and then move on to a topic specific for today. But after I started writing the response, I saw there was a lot I needed to include in my response to be thorough.

Harry wrote, “I think you are right on with your analysis, Tom - good editorial.” Thanks, Harry.

Ethan provided a lengthy response, which is what caused my lengthy reply here. Even he agreed it was ok for Trump to throw the Univision reporter out. Ethan said the following, “Was the reporter an arrogant fool? Certainly. So, yes Trump was within his right to toss this guy out. What would be nice is for the candidate supporters to be fair and balanced in their perception and criticisms of all the candidates. Mr. Trump is also an arrogant bully. Where's the outrage when he insults a Vietnam vet POW? Where's the outrage when he insults a woman reporter by making disgusting references to her menstruating? Where's the outrage when he hurls ad hominem insults at illegal Hispanic immigrants by calling them rapists. If you want your opinion to be credible then it's vital to be even handed in your critiques. It is intellectually dishonest to ignore or spin away gaffes and transgressions when it's your preferred candidate that has screwed up.”

I’ll start with his last comment: He said in short: It is intellectually dishonest to ignore or spin away gaffes and transgressions when it's your preferred candidate that has screwed up. Ethan, when have I said Trump is my preferred candidate? I have not decided who is supporting yet. I’ll admit that I am encouraged with the way he has stirred things up, and that all the candidates have to address the issues that are important to us. Another of your questions: Where's the outrage when he insults a Vietnam vet POW? I have to agree. I did say this in an earlier editorial you may have missed. I believe he went too far when he criticized Senator McCain. McCain is a true American hero. Next you asked: Where's the outrage when he insults a woman reporter by making disgusting references to her menstruating? I watched that exchange between Megyn Kelly and Trump live when it happened. Not edited versions played over and over by news pundits. Not once did Trump refer to her menstruation cycle. While critics jumped to infer that is what he was referring too. Note: he started the comment by saying, blood coming from her eyes, and whatever. With the statement blood coming from her eyes is commonly used in referring to a person that is so mad at someone that they have blood in their eyes and are coming in for the kill. I have heard that phrase since I was a kid. Someone with blood in their eyes had nothing to do with menstruation. To change the meaning of a comment to fit someone’s bias against a candidate is to be expected. I believe you are wrong to immediately succumb to the media spin to turn his comment into something demeaning to women. Next you ask: Where's the outrage when he hurls ad hominem insults at illegal Hispanic immigrants by calling them rapists? Actually, he used more charges than what you stated. To discuss honestly, you have to put his entire comment in perspective. He was referring to his belief that the Mexican government is doing nothing to help stop the flow of illegal aliens across into the U.S. As a matter of fact, the Mexican government is encouraging these bad apples to leave their country and come here. Trump’s statement was meant to mean that within the large influx of illegal aliens, there are rapists, murderers, and lots of other undesirables which we need to stop. Did he say it badly? Yes. Did it sound bad the way he said it? Yes. It was easy to see as he stumbled through the comments, he was speaking without a written speech in front of him, no teleprompter, and ad lib. When people choose to speak ad lib, they sometimes say things not quite as elegantly as they should. But the meaning is still valid. As witnessed by all the huge Mexican gangs we have in the U.S. committing all sorts of crimes, and being extensions of the Mexican cartels, and all the serious crimes being committed against U.S. citizens, this influx of new criminals has to stop. If people are citizens and commit crimes against us, then we have to deal with it. When we have to deal with people committing crimes against us that shouldn’t even be in the country, then something needs to be done to keep these people out. No matter their citizenship, race, creed or anything else. If they weren’t here, we wouldn’t be their victims. You also make this statement: Mr. Trump is also an arrogant bully. I think that is not fair. What we are seeing is a candidate that is showing a backbone expressing his beliefs, and standing up to his attackers. If anyone attacks him (which is your charge of being a bully, I guess you think he should just take it and be quiet) instead, he fights back. He stands up to these people trying to bully him, mostly the news pundits and other candidates. The other candidates learned real quick that to attack Trump is not the way to go because, that only gives him the opportunity to strike back, and get more news coverage. Right now, the news pundits anxiously wait for someone to attack Trump because they know this will be the next great story for the day or week when Trump responds. Ethan, I hope this answer raises me up just a little in that you think I wasn’t being fair or balanced in my editorial about Trump.

Ethan’s final response for me to address is this: If you want your opinion to be credible then it's vital to be even handed in your critiques. To this I say to you Ethan, just because you might not see in a particular editorial a criticism of someone, doesn’t mean I might not have criticized them in a previous editorial. Due to time allowance, I don’t always have time to repeat things I may have said previously, and you may have missed. That’s ok. Just keep in mind, that to be fair to me as well, I may have already criticized Trump before. I will again state that I think he has said some things that appear over the top and definitely could have been said better. As I watch him ad lib speeches, I see him with a lot of things he wants to say in his mind, but he can’t talk and say things as fast as his mind is running. This causes him to say things that could have been said better. He’s not polished in his public speaking, like most of the other candidates. He is bringing a new excitement into this campaign. So, todays editorial was really just a response editorial to Ethan’s comments. My sincere hope is that Ethan sees this editorial response from me as just possibly another way to look at a situation. That people see and hear things differently. Often times interpretation differences are influenced by our internal opinions and biases. So to those of you that declare I won’t post comments that criticize me, here you go.

In conclusion, Ethan, thanks for your response. I really appreciate the opportunity to comment on your opinions. Oh, and by the way, when I finally do decide who I support, I will so state. There are a lot of fine Republicans running. I have to learn about them much more before making a choice.

I’m Tom Wiknich, and that’s what I think. I’d like to know what you think. If you have any comments about this editorial, or would like to discuss or recommend a topic, I’d like to hear from you. Please email them to info@kzgn.net.