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The 74th KZGN News Talking Points Editorial.

Is CNN correct in changing the criteria for the next Republican debate?

First, a response to last Tuesday’s editorial discussion with Ethan: Ethan replied yesterday with this, “I'm not entirely sure where to begin or if it’s worth any more of our time to do so. I will say three things. First, when Mr. Trump said Megyn Kelly had blood coming from her eyes and whatever, we all know what he meant by the ‘whatever’. Your spin/dodge, while commendable, misses the mark. Second, you defend Mr. Trump's tossing of the journalist or him standing up to his attackers. That supposed showing of backbone apparently inspires conservatives. There is a man in the oval office who has had his own verbal tussles with journalist. Interesting how the very conservatives who applaud Mr. Trump for showing backbone to a mouthy journalist have chastised this POTUS for doing virtually the same thing. What say you about the obvious hypocrisy exhibited from conservative pundits when it comes to this POTUS’s handling of the media compared to conservative politicians? Lastly, I’m not sure but I do believe in your editorial you left off the part about my political leanings that I wrote in my initial response. When you quoted my post, it would have been nice had you included that small disclaimer so those who listen/read this editorial have an accurate perception of my frame of mind instead of assuming I am a disgruntled liberal.” Thanks for the comments, Ethan.

Here’s my answer to your comments, and I agree we can move on. Answers in order of your comments: First, even though you call it spin/dodge, I stand by my statement. We all do not agree with the spin liberals have chosen to use interpreting his comment. I’m not calling you a liberal, just that you refuse to consider a potential other interpretation of his comment. Where I grew up back east, the description of someone having blood in their eyes was in relation to their level of anger and desire to cause you serious harm. If anyone said that phrase, “he has blood coming from his eyes” to me, I would interpret it as a very intense attack coming against me. If you can’t accept my sincere definition, then that is your opinion. But it’s not spin. It’s a real phrase used in common language.

As far as your second point about backbone and president Obama, we weren’t talking about Obama. We are discussing Trump. Instead of addressing my comments about Trump’s backbone, you try to change the subject to how pundits criticize Obama when he stands up to reporters. I have never done an editorial about how Obama runs his news conferences other than his continuous use of teleprompters. Instead of discussing my editorial about Trump, you seem to want to move the discussion to tie me into other conservative commentators. I’m not doing my editorials about other commentators. I saw no need to go out searching for other people to compare his backbone to others. I wish all the candidates stood up to the attack pundits. Finally, you requested I include your disclaimer for your comments. While I didn’t initially include them, as I saw no need to, I will now since you have specifically asked me to. Here’s Ethan’s disclaimer, “Now, before you jump to the conclusion that this is just the ramblings of a lib, progressive, democrat, it is not. I am an independent that votes for person and message and not party. I like Rand Paul, I would have voted for him or even Rick Perry. Above all of that, I just want honesty from the candidates and balanced analysis from the pundits.” Thank you, Ethan. I think this was a good discussion. I respect your opinion. I would hope you do the same towards me. My opinion comes from my heart, after sincere life lessons learned, research, and education.

Todays editorial: Is CNN correct in changing the criteria for the next republican debate?

With a large field of candidates as we see on the republican side, limiting the size of the group is necessary. This is to make sure and have enough time to ask questions of the candidates, and let them all have the opportunity to answer. While the lower rated candidates do suffer from splitting the debate panels, it has to be done. Of course, if I was one of those second-tier candidates, I’d be very upset too. The real encouragement for the change in criteria really comes from the Carly Fiorina camp, and rightly so. She came off the last debate as the winner of the second-tier debate. Many even said she won the debate from the perspective of considering all the candidates in both debates. Apparently she had a massive grassroots campaign putting pressure on CNN to change the criteria. She has shown a rapid rise in all the early state polls, and she is rising in national polls. Leaving many of the second-tier candidate’s behind. To this, I say good for her. Again, this is making for an exciting campaign. This changing of criteria enables the debates to be effective and informative.

In conclusion, I believe the changing of the criteria is appropriate. I look forward to a great 2nd debate.

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](mailto:INFO@KZGN.NET).