

Motion: The United States should lower the voting age to 16.

Proposition

Introduction:

Judge, 16 year olds are mature. This debate is about the rights of 16-ers. If they are old enough to have jobs and have sex, then they are **certainly** old to make educated decisions about things that will have a big impact on their future.

Points:

I. This is **taxation without representation**.

1. According to the **IRS**, American teenagers are responsible for **9.7 billion dollars** in sales taxes **alone**, not to mention the amount of taxes on income!

A. I quote: “Youths pay billions in taxes to state, local, and federal governments yet they have absolutely no say over how much is taken” or what is done with this money.

2. I repeat: this is taxation without representation. The least we can do is to lower the voting age so that 16 and 17 year olds have a say.

3. Policies such as minimum wage, working hours, and conditions are also determined by governments. If 16 year olds are old enough to have jobs, then they are old enough to be able to vote on things that will affect their future.

3. I conclude this point by stating that 16 years of age, you can get a job. You also pay taxes, as stated before. It is **undemocratic** that you have **no say in who manages and sets these taxes**.

II. The Opposition may state that young people are not so well-informed.

1. Well, they aren't well informed because **they can't vote!** If they cannot participate in a voting, what makes you think they will have the motivation to learn?

2. **They won't.** Therefore, by lowering the voting age, teenagers will learn and be educated about politics at a younger age.

3. A good example is “Kid's Voting.” This is a simulation where children participate in a mock voting, such as the one held here at JM.

A. Reports show that this activity increased the interest of voting in entire families! More parents discussed politics with their kids and were more likely to vote because of this. An estimated **600,000** adults were more likely to vote, according to the **New York Times**.

4. I would also like to point out that students are learning much about politics in **school**, which also helps them to make **more informed decisions**.

5. I'd like to sum up this argument by saying that this **strengthens democracy** and helps **both adults and kids** to make more **educated votes**. This is a new **incentive** for the public to become knowledgeable.

III. What the Opposition is likely to do is to exaggerate the chances of these kids being influenced by the 3 Ps: Peers, pressure, and parents.

1. I'd like to point out, judge, that **these are not 13 year-olds**. These teenagers are 16 years of age. They are mature, their bodies are adult, they have experience, and they have been educated for at least 10 years.

2. If 16-ers are old enough to have a job, and have sex, they are certainly old enough to control their life, according to **the International Debate and**

### **Education Association.**

IV. There are just as many people out there who are uneducated about politics as there are who are educated.

1. Let's think about it this way: if you are uneducated about politics, that means you don't care. And **if you don't care; why should you vote?**

2. You see, judge, according to the **New York Times**, many kids who don't know enough about what they are voting on actually don't vote. This means that there is less of a chance of the uneducated people voting.

I'm going to remind everyone of my arguments:

I. This is **taxation without representation**. One of the same things the Revolutionary War was fought over. This is a **democratic country**: it includes 16 year olds because they **pay taxes and they have jobs**.

II. Younger people **are** well-informed. However, there are some that are not well-informed. If we lower the voting age, then it will **give them a reason** to become well-informed.

III. **16-ers are not 13 year-olds**. They are mature and have control over their life. If we can trust them to handle a job, **we can trust them** to withstand pressure and make the right decision.

IV. Most uneducated people **don't care and therefore don't vote**.

Judge, these are mature teenagers with control over their life and their job. They pay taxes. They have sex. They can make the right decision. Thank you, and please vote for the Proposition.

### Opposition

Intro:

Judge, honestly, do you think that 16 year olds are mature enough to make good decisions? **Do you think that their intelligence and experience level is equal to that of an adult who has seen 30 years?** No. Not only are they inexperienced, young people are often affected by the 3 Ps: **Peers, pressure and parents**, which leads me to my first point.

I. I'd like to start off by stating that allowing today's teenagers to vote could be disastrous.

1. Often times teenagers vote on whom or what they like, with much disregard for whether it is the right person or thing. Often times they vote based on popularity, not on sincerity or motives.

2. Teenagers are also vulnerable to seducing. An example of this would be Justin Beiber; have you noticed that it's mostly girls that like him?

3. Some teenagers vote on the same side that their parents or friends vote on, not because they feel they are that way about a proposition or motion.

A. Keep in mind, judge, that 16ers are susceptible to the influence of **peers, pressure and parents**.

II. My second argument is that yes, 16 year olds **do** in fact have jobs. And they are taxed. My first argument is that it is *because* these policies affect young people that we shouldn't trust them to make the right decisions [according to the New York Times].

1. Due to the fact that these things affect them, it affects how they vote. They may vote on things in their favor because it benefits them, **not** because it is the right thing to do.
  2. We should trust mature adults, who have several years more of experience, to vote on the behalf of children and make the right decisions.
    - A. Because these children are the next generation; the future, in a sense. And they need experience before they can have this responsibility. Yes, they will earn it in due time, but while they are still developing they need to learn.
- III. Just because 16 year olds have jobs and the right to have sex doesn't mean they are mature and fully developed.
1. In fact, we see examples of abuse of these rights all the time in the form of **rape**.
  2. If anything, this proves that we can **not** trust 16-ers. If they abuse the rights they already have, what makes you think, judge, that we should give them more? Do you reward a bad act? No. If anything, we should raise the voting age.
- IV. A good solution would be "Kid's Voting."
- A. This is a simulation where children participate in a mock voting, such as the one here at JM.

I'd like to summarize my points:

- I. Allowing today's teenagers to vote could be disastrous. With too many people voting wrongly, who knows what will happen?
- II. Yes, 16 year olds **do** in fact have jobs. And they are taxed. My first argument is that it is **because** these policies affect young people that we shouldn't trust them to make the right decisions.
- III. Just because 16 year olds have jobs and the right to have sex **doesn't mean they are mature and fully developed**.
- IV. A good solution would be "Kid's Voting," or other mock voting programs.

#### Conclusion

Judge, allowing teenagers to vote at a younger age will weaken society. Keep in mind, judge, the 3 Ps: Peers, pressure, and parents, along with the fact that they **can be seduced**. We should trust mature adults to make the right decisions for them until the time comes when they can handle and look at a situation **without having their opinions affected by other influences**. If 16ers are already abusing their rights, we should wait before we give them more. They need to learn to be responsible. Thank you, and please vote for the Opposition.