

## **Demo Student**

### **Should the Voting Age be Changed to 21?**

**633 words**

**Sat May 25 2013, 3:02 pm**

According to Ann Coulter, "Brain research in the last five years at Dartmouth and elsewhere has shown that human brains are not fully developed until age 25 and are particularly deficient in their frontal lobes, which control decision-making, rational thinking, judgment, the ability to plan ahead and to resist impulses."

This alone argues for a raising of the voting age. Teenagers are too volatile, too immature, too easily swayed by liberal do-good arguments. Teens are too young, they don't pay taxes, they don't pay rent, they don't pay health-care, they sponge off their parents, their sole object in life is having fun. They cannot be expected to take politics seriously - and they don't. All they are interested in is booze and sex, and maybe drugs as well.

They side with the underdog, too easily swayed by emotion rather than by reason. They don't understand how the world works, and they do not have a sense of responsibility.

If we allow the trend to continue, we would be giving the vote to 10-year olds, and then what a fine mess we would have. Instead, we should be raising the voting age. By 21, teens have more maturity, are no longer teenagers, and have grown out of all their youthful foolish excesses. Their frontal lobes are nearer fully developed, which enables them not only to make better decisions but to remember where they left the car keys.

We do not have to phase this in in one go. We could experiment, state-by-state and election by election. If we do not like the results, we can have a recount, eliminating first the 21-year-olds, then the 22-year-olds and so on, until we get the result we do want.

An extension of this idea is to take the vote away from people we do not like, people with red-hair or green neck-ties. We could charge people \$1,000 a time to vote, thus keeping the poor and disaffected from voting. It would mean that people who were really interested in voting would happily pay up, and those who don't really care eliminate themselves. The money raised could be used for something useful, like bonuses for politicians who vote for certain laws, or reducing taxes for the very rich.

Reducing taxes for the very rich is a very useful idea, because it will make for a fairer society, and what could be fairer than a fair society? This is such a good diea that I think we should charge people \$5000 to vote in presidential elections. Think of all the money we could raise to reward our politicians, think how much we could reduce taxes for the very rich. Once everyone is paying the same rate of tax regardless of how much or how little they earn, we shal have a truly fair society. Isn't this worth fighting for?

Going back to the original argument, I think that schools should educate students so that they are more prepared to vote when they are old enough. They can have lessons in where and how to place their Xs. They should not be allowed to graduate until they can put all their Xs in the right places, with their eyes blindfold.

Online voting could make this more complicated, but I am sure that computers can be rigged so that, no matter where the voter thinks he or she has placed their X, it in fact goes to the right candidate, preferably the far-right candidate. This is already possible, thanks to the latest app from the app store. This doubles as a global positioning system, constantly telling drivers to go right, go right.

And then can democracy as we know it win.

Print

Close Window