



**TOURO COLLEGE &  
UNIVERSITY SYSTEM**

Touro Scholar

---

Yearbooks and Newsletters

---

2-2008

## The Common Sense Volume 1 Issue 1

Lander College for Men

Follow this and additional works at: [https://touro scholar.touro.edu/archives\\_books](https://touro scholar.touro.edu/archives_books)



Part of the [American Politics Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Lander College for Men. (2008). The Common Sense Volume 1 Issue 1. Retrieved from [https://touro scholar.touro.edu/archives\\_books/285](https://touro scholar.touro.edu/archives_books/285)

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by Touro Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Yearbooks and Newsletters by an authorized administrator of Touro Scholar. For more information, please contact [touro.scholar@touro.edu](mailto:touro.scholar@touro.edu).

February 2008  
Volume 1, Issue 1

# The Common Sense

## In This Issue:

Letter from the Editor

From Goldwater Girl to  
Hillary Girl

Crashing the Party

About the Club

## Lander College Republicans

"We may not imagine how our lives  
could be more frustrating and  
complex—but Congress can." —  
Cullen Hightower

## Letter from the Editor



The publication of this newsletter represents much more than the dedication by the Lander College Republicans to their ideals and goals. It is the first newsletter of its kind in the College. Traditionally, no other clubs have had publications and we are proud to be the groundbreaking society to publish one. Student publications are the product of the inalienable right to Free Speech, and it is every able person's duty to voice their concerns and comments in a legal forum.

If I can use that as a spring board to my own opine, I would like to begin the inaugural issue with a sharp disagreement and objection to some leading conservative media personnel. Ironically, some are featured in this very publication.

The right-wing radio shows seem to passionately hate John McCain. They charge him with being too liberal and not true to his party. While I too believe those allocations are valid, these pundits are doing a tremendous disservice.

Some of their claims and complaints may be valid, but after Super Tuesday's turnout it seems that Senator McCain will be the Republican Nominee for our next President. You will read an article in this issue saying that our country would be better served if Republicans united and elected Hillary, since her *obvious* failure would hail a *real* conservative into office in 2012. That may or may not be true, but the life-appointed judges that Clinton will place into

America's legal system will certainly remain well-passed 2012 and leave a bigger impact than these radio hosts expect. When deciding the leader of the free world it is neither moral nor patriotic to play games to prove a point.

My point of disagreement with these loud-spoken conservatives is the exact reason I chose to include them in our launching issue. I may not agree with their opinion, but I certainly defend their right to voice it! It is with this spirit of liberty, this understanding that debate brings out truth, the desire to educate and let students form their own well-informed opinions, that the inaugural issue of *The Common Sense* includes and article that the Editors do not agree with.

## From Gold Water Girl To Hillary Girl

Ann Coulter

Nominating McCain is the gesture of a desperate party.

Republicans are so shell-shocked and demoralized by the success of the Bush Derangement Syndrome, they think they can fool the voters by nominating an open-borders, anti-tax cut, anti-free speech, global-warming hysteric, pro-human experimentation "Republican." Which is to say, a Democrat.

As the expression goes, given a choice between a Democrat and a Democrat, voters will always choose the Democrat. The only question remaining is: Hillary or Obama?

On the litmus test issues of our time, only partially excluding Iraq, McCain is a liberal.

-- He excoriated Samuel Alito as too "conservative."

-- He promoted amnesty for 20 million illegal immigrants.

-- He abridged citizens' free speech (in favor of the media) with McCain-Feingold.

-- He hysterically opposes waterboarding terrorists and wants to shut down Guantanamo.

Can I take a breath now?

-- He denounced the Swift Boat Veterans for Truth.

-- He opposes ANWR and supports the global warming cult, even posturing with fellow mountebank Arnold Schwarzenegger in front of solar panels.

The only site that would have been more appropriate for Schwarzenegger in endorsing McCain would have been in front of an abortion clinic.

---

**"He [McCain] promoted amnesty for 20 million illegal immigrants"**

Although McCain has the minimum pro-life record demanded by the voters of Arizona, in 2006, McCain voted in favor of using taxpayer funds to harvest stem cells from human embryos. He opposes a constitutional amendment to protect human life. And he frets that if *Roe v. Wade* were overruled, women's lives would be "endangered." This is the same John McCain who chides Mitt Romney today for "flip-flopping" on abortion. At least Romney flips and stays there.

Of course the most important issue for pro-lifers is the Supreme Court. As long as *Roe v.*

*Wade* is the law of the land, it doesn't matter how many hearts and minds we've changed. So it's not insignificant that McCain has called Justice Samuel Alito too conservative.

We ended up with David Hackett Souter when a Republican president was actually looking for an Alito. Imagine how bad it will be when the "Republican" president isn't even trying.

McCain uses the boilerplate language of all Republicans in saying he will appoint "strict constructionists." This is supposed to end all discussion of the courts. But if he's picking strict constructionists, he will have to appoint judges who will commit to overturning McCain-Feingold.

That could be our litmus test: Will you hold President McCain's signature legislation restricting speech unconstitutional?

In 2004, McCain criticized the federal marriage amendment, saying, it was "antithetical in every way to the core philosophy of Republicans." Really? Preventing the redefinition of a 10,000-year-old institution -- marriage, that is, not John McCain -- is part of the core philosophy of



being a Republican? I had no idea.

I'm not a lawyer -- oh wait, yes, I am -- but Republicans were proposing to amend the Constitution, a process the Constitution specifically describes.

It's like saying it's antithetical to the core philosophy of Republicans to require presidents to be at least 35 years old. It's in the Constitution! And Republicans -- other than the ones who voted for McCain-Feingold -- support the Constitution. You might say it's part of our core philosophy.

Of course, back in 2004, McCain was considering running on a presidential ticket with John Kerry. Realizing that this would not help his chances to run as a Republican in 2008, when he would be a mere 120 years old, McCain quickly withdrew his interest in being on Kerry's ticket.

But he defended Kerry from the Bush campaign's suggestion that Kerry was not tip-top on national security, saying on the "Today" show: "No, I do not believe that he is, quote, weak on defense." So that was helpful.

McCain also explained to an admiring press corps

why he wouldn't want to be anyone's vice president, not even a national defense champion like Kerry, citing the meager constitutional duties of the vice president as: (1) to assume the presidency if the president is incapacitated and (2) "to break a tie vote in the Senate." (At which point several members of the fawning horde were heard to remark, "What is this 'Constitution' you speak of, Senator?")

---

"If McCain is elected president, we'll have a four-year disaster with the Republicans in Congress co-opted by "our" president followed by 30 years of Democratic rule."

But McCain conveniently forgot the second of these constitutional duties just a year later when Vice President Cheney was required "to break a tie vote in the Senate" on a matter of utmost importance to liberals: federal judges.

Just one year after McCain had correctly identified one of two jobs of the vice president, he was indignant that a Republican vice president

might actually exercise one of them. Better to let a gaggle of 14 Senate malcontents pick the president's judges for him.

As part of the "Gang of 14," McCain hysterically opposed allowing the vice president to break a tie on judicial nominations. Following the Constitution with regard to the role of the vice president, McCain said, "would be a terrible precedent." Yes, if members of Congress actually read the Constitution, they might realize McCain-Feingold is unconstitutional.

If Hillary is elected president, we'll have a four-year disaster, with Republicans ferociously opposing her, followed by Republicans zooming back into power, as we did in 1980 and 1994, and 2000. (I also predict more Oval Office incidents with female interns.)

If McCain is elected president, we'll have a four-year disaster, with the Republicans in Congress co-opted by "our" president, followed by 30 years of Democratic rule.

There's your choice, America.

"IF I FIGHT ON IN MY CAMPAIGN, ALL THE WAY TO THE CONVENTION, I WOULD FORESTALL THE LAUNCH OF A NATIONAL CAMPAIGN AND MAKE IT MORE LIKELY THAT SENATOR CLINTON OR OBAMA WOULD WIN. AND IN THIS TIME OF WAR, I SIMPLY CANNOT LET MY CAMPAIGN BE A PART OF AIDING A SURRENDER TO TERROR... IF THIS WERE ONLY ABOUT ME, I WOULD GO ON. BUT I ENTERED THIS RACE BECAUSE I LOVE AMERICA, AND BECAUSE I LOVE AMERICA, I FEEL I MUST NOW STAND ASIDE, FOR OUR PARTY AND FOR OUR COUNTRY."—Mitt Romney



## Crashing the Party

Shlomo Pill

With Senator John McCain almost certain to win the Republican Presidential nomination much debate has erupted within the party whether to loyally support the party's candidate despite his many un-Republican positions or to vote against the party in the hope of showing a measure of disapproval and thereby influence the future results of party primaries. In some sense, I believe this debate itself presupposes some kind of value in supporting a particular political party, thus resulting in the aforementioned dilemma. Rather than considering whether or not to "vote with the party" we need to keep in mind that the focus should be our position on the issues that matter to us and how each candidate and party measure up to our own political interests.

Few remember the days when political parties were an American anathema. However, it behooves the politically conscious to bear in mind that political parties are only the means by which support of individual political preferences can be efficiently organized and coalesced into a real politically relevant force. It is our own policy interests that the parties exist to serve. How long has it been since Thomas Jefferson affirmed that "Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed;" why should the political organizations that exist to mobilize like minded individuals to political action be held to any less standard? Let us not, therefore, begin our political debate with The Party, for indeed, such talk harkens back to vaguely remembered passages of Orwell's 1984 and can only serve to limit the degree to which we exercise our freedom to pursue our own good. Rather, we must set as the foundation for our electoral decisions the exercise of our own discretion as expressed in our

personal preferences regarding those political issues that matter to us.

That being said, perhaps our question should not be "to vote with the party or not vote with the party," but rather, "what issues are important to me at this point in time; what is the position of the available choices for office on these issues; how do their platforms measure up to my own political choices regarding these issues."

In the spirit of enabling each individual to fully exercise their potential for personal expression of political preferences I will not make any attempt within these lines to persuade anyone of any particular view regarding the important issues of our day. Indeed, as I am conscious of the concern with "third dimensional power," I am weary of even trying to list those issues that are important. Purely for the sake of fostering debate, I will mention a few political issues that some might wish to consider when evaluating the degree to which the political candidates for the presidency serve their political interests, though by no means is this intended to be an exhaustive list.

First, Foreign Policy. What sort of general stance should we take with respect to dealing with other nations? Should we be isolationist? Perhaps increased intervention in foreign states would be the best? Indeed, what are the national interests relative to other nations that we should seek to pursue through our efforts in this area?

Second, The Economy. Should the government be attempting to prevent an economic recession through so called tax "rebates?" Should such efforts be coupled with decreases in federal spending so as to make up for the lost revenues? Is the social welfare state a more desirable method of promoting economic success for individuals than a more dedicated adherence to capitalist principles?

Third, The Military. Should we continue to fight a war with a peacetime



military? If not, how should additional forces be raised, through a draft, with increased incentives for volunteers? What should a peacetime and wartime military.

Fourth, Taxes. Should the government fund programs it can't afford and thereby incur increased debt? Should budget deficits be a concern? If so should they be addressed with increase taxes or decreased programs? Should the federal government be collecting taxes from the nation as a whole and redistributing the money to states in disproportionate amounts to the tax money that was received?

Although this is not at all an exhaustive or even marginally complete list of issues that may or may not concern American voters, it hopefully serves the purpose of calling us all to consider what issues are important to us, and what our

views on these issues are. The important thing to take from this discussion, if nothing else, is the notion that it is we, the citizens and voters of the United States that must set the agenda of political issues. It is we who must demand of politicians that they conform to our political interests, whatever those may be, in order to secure our vote of confidence. Let us all, Democrat and Republican, conservative and liberal, tell the political parties that they are not entitled to our loyalty and our valuable votes. They must earn out loyalty. They must earn our vote. And they will only do this by heading our demand that they recognize our political presences and serve these interests through their candidates.

## The Common Sense

Editor:

Andy Van  
Houter

Assistant

Editor:

Shlomo Pill

LANDER COLLEGE  
REPUBLICANS

75-31 150th St

Kew Gardens Hills, NY 11367

President:

Shlomo Pill

Vice President:

Andy Van Houter

Treasurer:

Jesse Slater

Secretary:

Daniel Stonnick

E-MAIL:

thecommonsense@yahoo.com

"No man's life, liberty or property are safe while the legislature is in session." —

Judge Gideon Tucker

*"Meanwhile, Republicans can still grasp the standard of enduring principles that built and sustained the Reagan coalition. Most Americans still favor smaller, smarter government, oppose higher taxes, embrace traditional values and, above all, want safety and security for themselves and their country. On these sturdy foundations, the Reagan coalition can yet be restored."* —Robert Caldwell

### About the Club...

The Lander Republican Club does not endorse any specific candidate or position. Rather, the goal is to provide a forum to voice conservative thought, learn from peers, and spread

Republican ideology.

The club meets biweekly, and is engaged in obtaining special speakers and events. Club meetings are open to all, regardless of membership status.

If you would like to contribute to our next newsletter, please email the club at [thecommonsense@yahoo.com](mailto:thecommonsense@yahoo.com). Please be in touch with any officers if you have any other concerns.