

Good research paper on first argument

[Health & Medicine](#), [Alcoholism](#)



Introduction

The issue under discussion is the raising the Minimum Legal Drinking Age (MLDA) twenty-one years from the common majority age of eighteen years.

The proponents are supporting the raised drinking while there are those who oppose the move and what the issue to be revised.

The significance of raising the drinking age is to reduce the number of deaths in American roads that occur as a result of carelessness from the youths who are believed to have not attained the right age to handle their alcohol life. The proponents believe that when a loud to start drinking at age twenty-one they will be mature enough and the number of deaths in our roads reduces as seen in paragraph two of edited MLDA essay.

There is, however, a claim that increasing the drinking age to twenty-one years is not logical. If an eighteen-year-old youth can be called to help protect the country as an army and even to be given the right to marry and divorce without the parents then they are able to control their alcohol life. There are better ways to control fatality on the roads in a more effective way than increasing the drinking age.

Background

Youths celebrate when they turn eighteen because of the privileges they expect to enjoy; they also sometime get scared of the responsibilities associated with the adulthood age. Since they are considered adult that may assume serious responsibilities in the country, they are also expected to have temperance over their alcohol life and should enjoy alcohol life when they graduate to adulthood age. However, this right had to be revised

because of lives that were being lost in the roads due to influence of alcohol. The women against drunk driving emphasized this. There are those who believe this move was inappropriate and should be revised giving a number of arguments that counter the proponent's arguments.

The first argument was that increasing drinking age to twenty-one reduced the number of death rates on the roads. The claim is that since the drinking age was increased to twenty-one in 1984, fatalities on the roads reduced remarkably especially among the youthful drivers. The claim gets support from various studies that show that remarkable decrease in the number of death rates. An explanation to this to this argument looking at the results from the study is that allowing youths to start drinking at age of eighteen must have been the cause of the rampant death rates in our roads and that by showing a positive change, it should be embraced to solve road carnage.

Counter Argument

Sub-claim in this argument is that there are other things that have seen the number of deaths reduce since 1984, which is not solely increasing the minimum drinking age. There are evidences from National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), which shows that there are more reasons that are possible in the decline in the fatalities by the roads and not necessarily the MLDA as purported by the proponents of age limit. The advancement of technology has been seen as one of the ways used in reducing the traffic fatalities. The use of technologies such as airbags and seatbelts among many other technologies has been reported to have reduced the road accidents. There regulations on those are intending to

drive when under the influence of alcohol. Explanation to this counter argument and the evidences is that, technologies are believed to be the major factors that have seen the traffic fatality reduce and not the drinking age limit of twenty-one years. Looking at the evidences available, there is a need to exploit all the technology to make sure that right plans are in place to improve the incidences on the American roads. Some of the technologies that have been proven efficient in reducing road fatality should be given much attention but not to refrain a given section of the country's society.

Rebuttal Argument

Sub-claim in this rebuttal shows that reduction in road accident may have been caused by lowering the drinking age to eighteen years but, there are also other significant reasons that have lead to reduction in death rate such as advancement in technology. The presence of seatbelt and other technology are an evidence enough to prove this. Reducing the drinking age on the ground of reduced rate of accident base on the passed results may not be objective if taken in entirety.

The Second Argument

The sub-claim in this argument is the belief that there is a deeply ingrained taboo, which supports the age drinking limit being twenty-one years. The evidence that proves this claim is the existence of the lobby group such as MADD that has always campaigned in support of the increased drinking age. With backing from mothers in the country shows how deeply the problem has been felt and the fear it has instilled in the society. There is for sure the goodwill from the society that shows the desire to have the age raised.

Counter Argument

The counter argument on the ingrained taboo in America is countered with the claim that youth's way of behavior is to go against the authority and that they will always want to go against this rule. Evidence supporting this claim is from the anthropologists who believe that the taboo especially in America seems puritanical when in the alcohol consumption. Countries such as Italy, Greek and even the Jewish cultural practices among many others do not view alcohol as an evil or a virtue but a normal way of life. These countries offer their citizen an environment full of tolerance and mature moderation, which is very different to the environment in America where the environment is a paranoid attitude on alcohol.

Rebuttal Argument

The rebuttal sub-claim on these arguments and the counter argument show that the fact that there are groups of people who support MLDA status quo can not conclusively imply that a citizen of the country has developed the taboo of protecting the youths from alcohol until they attain twenty-one. Evidence shows that only women were part of the lobby group the big question is fate of the rest of women and the men in the country. The taboo may not be the best way to handle fatality in the roads but proper teaching with an enabling environment.

Third Argument

The third argument focuses on the maturity of the youths there is that claim that eighteen-year-old youths are not mature enough to handle alcohol. The evidence is the number of road accident caused by the youths who are

driving while drunk. With high road fatalities registered in the roads, the youths seemed to be highly involved this would show youths are not able to control themselves when drunk leading to those accidents.

Counter Argument

Counter argument in this case explains that the fact that youths get involved in road accidents when drunk does not necessarily imply that they are immature. The evidence can be seen with the very youths being called to serious responsibility like being an army. If they can perform so well as they have done in our forces, then that is enough proof that at eighteen, youths are mature enough to handle the challenges that come by them.

Rebuttal Argument

The argument is that when an eighteen-year-old youth can be called to responsibilities such as being a voter, called in the forces, marry, and divorce without the parents, and then it is possible that youths are old enough to handle their alcohol life. Reducing drinking age claiming that youths are too immature to handle their life is very wrong.

Conclusion

Alongside other arguments in the essay, what comes out clearly is that responsibility lies upon individual, but the society has a great role to ensure that young people are guided in the right way to become mature and responsible people in the society. If the society does not come out to offer guidance to the youths, the consequences of irresponsible consumption of alcohol can ruin the future generation. However, this cannot be achieved by some of the common hypocritical laws but a fully changed notion on the

external control of youths with the use of humanistic approach. Adopting an attitude relying on developing personal values, and common sense need to be emphasized more than imposing external solutions. If an eighteen-year-old person can handle responsibilities such as voting, paying tax, and being called in the military then such a person has the common sense to be able to have desirable social behaviors. The value of moderation and better approach need to be taken to arrest the issue of reckless drinking by the young adults. Youths deserve the respect on their ability to behave and act like adults, and it is then that adult behaviors will be expected from the young citizens of America.

Works cited

Minimum legal drinking age Essay

Lovetta, Kenneth. "Let Kids Start Drinking At 18: Brooklyn Pol." New York post, 2010.

Ruth, C. "Forbidden Fruit," New York: Plume, 2013, Print.