

# The term voter apathy



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

I think to most citizens the term voter apathy would mean a lack of interest in the voting process all together, If this is the issue it??™s been mostly resolved in recent years as we see a 10% increase over the last decade. This can be attributed to various causes, celebrity endorsements, over dramatization by the media, the flux of the internet, or just a drastic need for a change. I on the other hand don??™t see the problem simply as being a lack of voters, more so the apathy of any given voter to find out more about the politician they are voting for. If a person who knew nothing of politics, economy or history decided not to vote my mind would be more at ease.

Instead I see videos, reports and illiterate statements in relation to why a person is voting for any certain candidate. Never mind the facts that education levels in America are barely average on international scales or only 30 percent of Americans go on to college. What I find unsettling is the large amount of voters, which, based on trivialities like physical attributes, party leanings, popularity, or spite decide on which candidate is best.

Whether this has always been the case is yet to be seen as certain, although it??™s more apt to happen today because of the flooding headlines and opinions that leave out specific detail on each inspiring politician. As it stands the internet is spread wide with speculation and false information that is often mistaken as fact but still impacts how some people vote, causing a major flaw with the voting process. We can try to educate each individual, but we cannot force them to participate in learning about each candidate.

What we can do is require a fact based test to be taken on American history and economy prior to a person being registered to vote. This test would be administered in the American language, as this is usually what a candidate

speaks when he explains himself vaguely on the issues. Also we can use another fact based test on the history and stance of each candidate administered prior to voting at the polling places.

This would, of course, conflict with the time allotted for voting. Unfortunately a required test like this would also inhibit much of the working class that wouldn't find time to research each candidate. Just the same, it would inhibit many supporters who knew little regarding the candidate they were supporting.

This solution is a bit far fetched but it goes to demonstrate the complexity of voter apathy, other than encouragement which only goes as far as it has today. Another issue that is often tied to voter apathy is an innate inclination for Americans to hate or mistrust the wealthy, and as such, feel disenfranchised by corporate funded elections. There's an easier solution for this but not completely without flaws of its own, this answer to some is referred to as public funded elections. Public funded elections is where a candidate can't spend money out of his/her own pocket, can't receive private contributions, and is forced to set a spending limit to what can be spent on their campaign. The solution would partially solve voter apathy as I see it.

This would require each candidate to campaign to individuals rather than to large conglomerates. As a result, the person would learn more firsthand the personality of each candidate. Not what the media paints them to be.

Another way a public funded election would help, as well as hinder, is it would herald more candidates and maybe rid ourselves of a two party

system. Every candidate would be independent and a voter could not vote based on party leanings.

There would be issues with this as well. The message of each candidate would not be as far spread without the large campaign contributions, less people would learn of each candidate and in the end votes would be dispersed so thin that a candidate could win on a 10% vote. Meaning 90% voted against the winning candidate. There??™s a lot more options I can suggest for recycling the voting process in America, such as, each candidate would have to be in the military first before running for president, a political ladder that each candidate would be required to climb, or abolishment of the Electoral College. As it stands today any celebrity could run for office and have a better chance than most as we see the percentage of American idol voters far trumps the voting of presidents. The public image of a celebrity is so much more appealing.