



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on July 18, 2025

16-year-olds Will Be Voting: UK's Libs Aim to Stay in Power by Recruiting Kids

Facing severe manpower shortages in WWII's waning months, Nazi Germany conscripted adolescent boys, some as young as 12, into military service. This was a sign of desperation, of course, one that ended well for neither kids nor country. And we see another attempt to recruit the young for something they're ill prepared for today.

Britain's ruling Labour Party will allow 16-year-olds to vote in the next general election.

What's more, the party, the approximate equivalent of our Democrats, has dumbed down voter ID laws. My, a cynical observer could suspect that they believe poorly informed, inexperienced, and/or illegal voters are likely to support them.



SDI Productions/iStock/Getty Images Plus

None of this is hard to fathom. Britain's political landscape has changed markedly since Labour won the July 2024 national election. Reform UK, once a minority party and Britain's version of the MAGA movement, has surged. One Find Out Now [poll](#) put Reform at 29 percent, ahead of both Labour (25 percent) and Conservatives (18 percent). The latter are a bit like a cross between our Republicans and Democrats.

This story has wider implications, too, as liberals here in the U.S. also aim to lower the voting age. In fact, as I wrote July 5, some leftists want to provide [suffrage rights to children](#) — even *babies*. (Yes, really.)

Who's on First?

So what are the implications of the UK's changes? Regarding voter ID standards' corruption, American Thinker [writes](#): This effectively ensures that "not only will children vote, but so will illegal aliens and nonresidents from across the Third World."

As to specificity, Breitbart [tells us](#) that photo ID will no longer be required. "A bank card with the voters' name on [it] would be enough in [the] future," the site reports. This will wreck "the election security measures implemented by the last government" (relevant tweet below).

'Safe and Secure'? Britain's Sordid History of Mail-in Voting Fraud <https://t.co/jjr6lZqrY3>

— Breitbart London (@BreitbartLondon) [November 10, 2020](#)

One could wonder something, too, about the UK's next election. Will Brits hear afterwards that it was the "safest, most secure election in ~~American~~ British history"?



Young, Wise — and Not on Board With Voting

Interestingly, not all youngsters believe they should be casting ballots. Consider one Annabel Hogan. In a Thursday *Telegraph* [piece](#) titled “I’m 16, and I shouldn’t be given the vote,” she explains:

As a member of what is widely considered the most entitled and opinionated generation in recent memory, you might expect I’d support votes for under 18s. But along with most Gen Zs who aren’t devoted to Lefties like [Prime Minister] Keir Starmer and [socialist politician] Jeremy Corbyn (there’s more of us than you might think), I’m deeply concerned by Labour’s rushed announcement.

It was only in 1969 that the voting age was lowered from 21 to 18 and, as a 16-year-old who will vote for the first time at the next general election, I’d argue that we’d be better off reverting back to votes at 21. Those in their mid-teens don’t need a say in who runs the country.

Young people already have the opportunity to have much more political impact than they used to. My parents would take to the streets to have their voices heard. Now they only need to take to social media.

And surely you need to have lived a life and experience being a taxpayer before you have a say in how those taxes are spent? I know some youngsters do start earning below 18 — but they are a minority. If anything, children are more dependent on their parents now than they were when the voting age was last lowered. A report published by the Department for Education showed that around 70 per cent of 16-year-olds remain in full-time education.

Hogan merely states the obvious. When mid-teens really are quite mature, as she clearly is, they’ll understand that too many of their peers are not. They thus shouldn’t be voting.

Dumb Down, Then Lift Up

This is especially true since modern society stunts children’s emotional, moral, and spiritual development. There was a time when people became apprentices at eight and married at 14 or 15.

Would kids weaned on smartphones and social media, on infantilizing entertainment, be ready for this today?

Note that the youngest “prize master” (a sort of provisional captaincy) in U.S. naval history was 12-year-old David Farragut. Young boys back then (1812) often served on military vessels. But though they could bleed and die for their country, even they *weren’t* allowed to cast ballots. For it was recognized that adolescents make far better soldiers than voters. This is much as how teens may make great athletes with their youthful vigor. But the enterprise is run by coach, an old guy who perhaps can’t run well anymore but knows how to call the plays.

When you *want* the wrong plays called, though, because that benefits you, things change. The result can be schizoid policy, which Breitbart addressed:

Criminals are not generally tried in adult courts until the age of 18, and a soldier cannot be operationally deployed until the age of 18....

The new discrepancy in government-imposed age limits was picked up by Conservative



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on July 18, 2025

spokesman Paul Holmes, who said: “Why does this Government think a 16-year-old can vote but not be allowed to buy a lottery ticket, an alcoholic drink, marry or go to war or even stand in the elections they’re voting in? Isn’t the Government’s position on the age of majority just hopelessly confused?”

The kicker: Under relatively new legislation, UK 16-year-olds will [never, ever be allowed to purchase tobacco](#) — even as adults. So they mayn’t light up, but will be allowed to light the political system aflame?

Getting It Backwards

If anything and as Hogan stated, voting ages should be raised (some say to 30 or 35!). Oh, sure, it’s true that “wisdom doesn’t always come with age. Sometimes age just shows up all by itself,” as the saying goes. Regardless, experience counts for much on average. This is why, for example, men had to be 60 for membership in ancient Sparta’s *Gerousia*, a key ruling council. Those Greeks were onto something, too. Studies have shown that people continue accumulating knowledge in life until their 60s, when this process levels off. At that point, *healthy* sexagenarians have maximum knowledge, experience, and some wisdom (hopefully) while retaining the lucidity to make good use of these advantages. In other words, the best of them make ideal “coaches” for civilization.

To be even more precise, some people are born with the gift of wisdom. Let such individuals mature and cultivate virtue so that their gift fully blossoms, and the result is ideal leader candidates. Of course, these people aren’t always identified well, but it’s easy, in at least one case, discerning who they’re not. Those are the ones trying to give children the vote.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.