Voas, Robert. “There’s no benefit to lowering the drinking age.” The Christian Science Monitor 12 Jan. 2006: Opinion 9. LexisNexis Academic. Web. 17 Apr. 2006. In his editorial, Voas clearly supports age 21 as the legal drinking age and states and addresses New Hampshire’s, Wisconsin’s and Vermont’s consideration to lower it. He gives examples of counterarguments and states that the “21 law is predicated on the fact that drinking is more dangerous for youth because they’re still developing mentally and physically, and they lack experience and are more likely to take risks.” Voas refutes the you-can-fight-for-your-country-at-18 argument by acknowledging an 18 year old’s underdeveloped brain. He also supported himself with evidence that showed that in states where the drinking age was 21, teenagers drank less, and that the 21 law has saved 23,733 lives. This quantitative information can be used to support why the drinking age should not be lowered. He establishes his credibility by stating that he’s been studying drinking and driving for approximately 40 years and relies on various studies to prove his point.

Smith, Michael Clay, and Margaret D. Smith. “Treat Students as Adults: Set the Drinking Age at 18, Not 21.” Chronicle of Higher Education 45.27 (1999): B8. Academic Search Premier. Web. 17 Apr. 2006. Michael and Margaret Smith show the large increase in young drinkers in their short work. Not only has the number of drinkers increased, but the amount of consumption has, also. Many students “drink deliberately to get drunk.” Clearly the increase in the drinking did not do its job. The authors feel that a drinking age of 21 is harmful to college students because it embitters relationships between the police and students, it gives good students bad police records, it puts a strain on faculty-student engagement, and it forces students to party in less public settings. Due to this article’s poorly supported points, the main idea can be used to refute.