Debate leaves no clear victor

Both candidates exhibit their personal strengths but fall short of public expectations when discussing foreign policy and Wall Street's economy.

Last Friday, senators John McCain and Barack Obama faced off in their first debate as opponents vying for the presidency. While the country watched to see which candidate would dominate the discussion, both McCain and Obama focused on their usual talking points. There has been much deliberation since then as to who can be called the winner of this debate. Political commentator William Kristol stated on Fox News “There was no knockout and maybe even no knock down.”

CBS published a poll on the debate suggesting a slight advantage for Obama but this may not spell victory for the Illinois Senator. The results: 39% in favor of Obama’s performance and 25% in favor of McCain. However, 36% of those polled felt that the first debate resulted in a draw.

The original discussion format favored McCain in that it was supposed to focus solely on foreign policy, an area in which most Americans feel McCain has the advantage. But due to the recent economic collapse on Wall Street, the first half of the debate was reformatted to concentrate on the nation’s economy, an area of focus where pundits believe that Obama has the advantage.

The beginning of the debate focused on the economic collapse in relation to foreign policy. Moderator Jim Lehrer, said, quoting former president Dwight Eisenhower, “We are in this together.”

Objectivist views on election

Director of the Ayn Rand Institute speaks out

Objectivism is not a term one typically hears thrown about on a college campus like that of the University of San Diego. However, if one is lucky enough to spot a student reading “The Fountainhead” or “Atlas Shrugged” it may be mentioned. Ayn Rand, the author of the aforementioned novels, created a ripple effect in the philosophy world when she wrote those books.

The theory of objectivism, created by Ayn Rand, has gained recognition, especially here in the United States. The Ayn Rand Center for Individual Rights helps promote the ideas of objectivism and the executive director of the institute, Dr. Yaron Brook, is considered outspoken in regards to current government policies pursued by the United States.

Voting question raises debate

Do we have a patriotic duty to vote or a moral duty to abstain?

The USD Philosophy club hosted a unique debate Monday night entitled “To Vote or not to Vote.” The highlight of the discussion was Dr. Kevin Timpe’s unusual view that voting is immoral. “This came up because I made some off-handed comment about democracy,” admitted the professor of Philosophy.

Timpe argued that most people should not vote, because most people vote badly. Bad voting, Timpe says, is characterized by ignorance and bias. Furthermore, Timpe stated that Democracy is inherently flawed because it values quantity of opinions over quality of opinions. He believes that not all opinions are equally good, and