



Waleed Afzal

23p-0566

Section C

English Assignment

TO: Sir Abdul Basit

Q: Nowadays young people hold the important positions in the government. Some people think that it is innovative. While others argue that it is not suitable. Discuss both views and give your opinion.

A: The increasing number of young people in important government posts has become a major point of debate in modern politics. This event caused a wide spectrum of reactions. On the one hand, there is a widespread belief that this ability is both innovative and progressive, indicating a change toward a more dynamic and open political scene. Supporters say that the rise of young leaders shows an acceptance of new ideas and a realization of society's continually changing nature. Opponents argue that young leadership is inappropriate for governance, claiming inexperience, a lack of judgment, and the possible consequences of quick choices.

Arguments in Favor of Young Leaders:

Supporters of young government leaders consider it as an innovative and progressive step. They believe that because they have grown up in a digital and connected society, young people contribute fresh insights to politics. They are more advanced in technology, flexible, and have a greater understanding of modern issues. This qualifies them to deal with the the details of today's politics. They are also frequently seen as more open-minded and inclusive, which is critical for addressing social problems and interacting with minority groups. This is especially important when diversity and inclusion become more prominent in political debate.

Young leaders can also be more open to change and experiment. They may be less restricted by traditional political beliefs and more willing to experiment with new ideas and answers to modern complicated concerns. Their excitement and energy can bring new ideas to the table, and

their ability to quickly adjust to changing situations can be an excellent asset, especially in times of crisis.

Young leaders, according to supporters, have a natural capacity to connect with a variable electorate. They are able to reach and engage citizens thanks to their use of social media and digital channels. This could result in greater transparency and more educated citizens, both of which are required in a democracy to hold the government responsible.

Arguments Against Young Leaders:

On the other hand, those who oppose young leaders have raised several concerns. Firstly, they argue that young people may lack the necessary experience and skills to navigate complex political processes and make sound decisions. This is especially true in areas such as foreign policy, where a deep understanding of history, culture, and diplomacy is essential. Secondly, young leaders may lack the leadership and management skills necessary to oversee large bureaucracies and teams of employees. Thirdly, young leaders may be more prone to taking risks and making rash decisions, as they have not yet developed the caution and wisdom that comes with experience. Finally, young leaders may lack the respect and credibility that older leaders command, as their youth and inexperience may be seen as a weakness rather than a strength.

On the other hand, people who oppose young leaders claim that politics requires experience, wisdom, and a solid knowledge of difficult topics. They claim that vital judgments in management require the kind of experience and knowledge that can only be gained through time and exposure to governing. Foreign relations, diplomacy, and economic policy frequently

necessitate a deep understanding that comes with years of experience. They claim that young leaders may lack this depth of knowledge.

Opponents also worry that young leaders may be more liable to populism. In order to maintain their popularity, inexperienced leaders may make decisions based on popular opinion rather than sound policy. This might result in narrow-minded policies that respond to immediate voter demands without considering the nation's future effects.

Critics are also concerned that young leaders may be unpredictable and make fast choices. They believe that government decisions should be well-considered, taking many elements and their effects into account. Youth, while keen, are feared because they do not have the controlled and careful approach required in politics.

So, how do I feel about this? A balanced strategy, in my opinion, is the best. A government with a mix of ages, where both young and experienced leaders have a place, can provide the best of both worlds. Young leaders provide innovation, new ideas, and digital proficiency, but their qualities should complement senior leaders' wisdom and experience. A generations approach understands that effective administration requires a complex strategy and a mix of young energy and depth of experience.

This strategy promotes mentorship and collaboration, allowing younger leaders to learn from older leaders and, in turn, introduce government with new energy and ideas. It provides a system of constant growth and flexibility.

This is not an innovative idea. Many democratic systems have checks and balances in place to make sure that leaders have a diverse set of experiences. Legislative bodies frequently have members of different ages, reflecting the electorate's variety. Consulting committees also contain both new and experienced voices, acknowledging the importance of diverse viewpoints.

Young people in my opinion, are appropriate for a few roles in government, such as technology, but more experienced leaders should serve in government for the good of the country. For example, the position of "Chief Justice" or "President" requires huge expertise and knowledge, as well as innovation and new perspectives. As a result, those positions are not suitable for untrained young minds.

We can go to the corporate world to see how important this strategy is. Many successful corporations actively push leadership diversity and inclusion. They recognize that different points of view lead to more accurate choices and innovation. In today's most inventive companies, it's usual to find skilled executives working with young entrepreneurs. In a continuously changing economy, this method has proven to be beneficial for advancing progress and adaptation.

Conclusion:

In conclusion, the question of whether young people should occupy important positions in the government is complex and contentious. While there are merits to both sides of the argument, ultimately it should be based on merit rather than age. As long as leaders are selected based on their qualifications, values, and track record, rather than their age, gender, race, or other superficial factors, then we can be confident that we are getting the best possible leaders to guide us into the future.

Finally, the increasing participation of young people in important government roles is a point of controversy. Those who support this trend regard it as innovative and useful since it provides the government with new perspectives, energy, and adaptability. Those who oppose it, on the other hand, are concerned about a lack of experience, potential impulse control, and ability to influence. In my perspective, both youth and old age have their advantages. It is critical to find a balance between seasoned leaders and rising stars. What genuinely important, regardless of age, are the individuals who fill these roles' expertise, honesty, and dedication. Any country can benefit from a combination of expertise and youthful energy. It is this harmony that blend which should shape our approach to leadership and governance.