

Sohaib - 047

Topic:- Would the world be better if women ruled the world?

Outline

1- Introduction

If women ruled the world, it would witness both peace and conflict depending upon the challenges. However, the leadership style of women could make it better. There will be less conflict in a peaceful world.

2- Peace or conflict in the world with women in leadership position

3- How women leaders would make the world better? (Thesis)

- a) More collaborative nature while having a leading role
- b) Empathetic governance by focusing on social welfare
- c) Prioritization of social issues
- d) Reduced violence and conflict
- e) Sustainable development by engaging everyone

f) Challenging traditional power structure

g) More equitable and just legal system

4- World will remain in conflict even if women are in a leading role.

(Anti-thesis)

a) Overlooks individual abilities and skills

b) Lack of evidence

c) Patriarchal norms and expectations are not easily changeable

d) Inclusivity in leadership will make world better

e) Risk of reverse discrimination against men.

5- Women leadership role will have more benefits than harm (Synthesis)

a) Leveraging the strength of both genders

b) Existing evidence indicates potential benefits.

c) Prioritization of policies that address systematic inequalities

d) Inclusivity should increase female representation

e) Creation of level playing field

6- Conclusion

The Essay

Imagine the world with complete peace where there is no conflict, no power struggle, human rights are protected, resources are distributed equally, there are no conflicts among power-holders, upbringing of the lower-class, everyone living in the same good conditions, concept of poor and rich become irrelevant, etc. Does not it seem like a utopian world? Yes, it is which cannot be achieved due to the avarice nature of human being. However, this world can be made better if women^{are} also allowed leadership position. If women ruled the world, it would witness both peace and conflict depending upon the challenges. However, leadership style of women could make it better. There will be less conflict in a peaceful world. By their collaborative nature and prioritization of social welfare they can engage in empathetic governance. Engaging with every party can reduce

conflicts and challenging traditional power structure through legal system can help in making this world better. On the other hand, opposition view it as a false imagination that it overlook individual abilities, lack of evidence, patriarchal norms cannot be challenged, inclusivity is required and may result in reverse discrimination. All these counter-arguments impedes the representation of women so there is a need of leveraging strength of both genders, increase role of women on available evidence, and ensuring inclusivity and level-playing field by lowering male dominance.

Benazir Bhutto was the first woman elected to lead a Muslim-majority nation as a 11th and 13th Prime Minister of Pakistan. While her tenure was marked with political turmoil, she advocated for the rights of women, democracy in Pakistan.

and worked for social welfare of people such as introducing Benazir Income Support Programme. However, women are not immune to the challenges in the leadership position. As in the case of Indira Gandhi, she led India into Bangladesh Liberation War in 1971. While the war led to the creation of Bangladesh, it also caused widespread suffering and economic instability in India.

Women leaders tend to make this world a much better place to live by having a more collaborative nature. This collaborative nature of women can resolve many conflicts by not showing force or state missionary to suppress the opponent. They use democratic behaviour by communicating all the parties involved in an issue. According to the meta-analysis by Harvard Business Study published in 2017, women seek

authority by without relying on the autocratic behaviour and use collaboration of force against opposition. This shows that women can handle such situations by fostering collaboration.

While being more collaborative in nature, women are also empathetic in making their decisions and policies. By focusing on social welfare issues, women are able to do empathetic governance enabling them to be more people focused. Some studies show that not only in leadership position like politics but also at managerial level women are more people-focused and empathetic than their male counterparts. According to the KPMG Women Business Leaders Outlook, around 64% women in UAE prioritize investment in developing their workforce skills and capabilities compare to 24% men who

prioritize buying new technology
Hence, this shows us how
women in a leading role
can be more empathetic
towards people.

Empathetic nature of women
in a leading role also help
them in prioritizing social
issues. These social issues include
women rights, education, health,
etc. Women in a leadership
position represent marginalized
society and work for their
uplifting by raising voice for
them. From 2000 till 2015,
women representation in Brazil
at a mayors and state or
federal legislature increased
by 20% which also resulted
in decrease in child mortality
rate from 25% to 13% during
the same period. (Phillip Hessel,
Increase in Women's representation,
July 2020). This data shows
that how increase in number
of female representative is
linked with decrease in child
mortality rate.

While prioritizing social issues, women also try to reduce the conflict and violence domestically or internationally. These conflicts can be unrest among citizens or an international dispute with other countries. Women are more focused on empathy and its citizens so that they can uplift their citizens while avoiding any type of conflict through solving them by democratic means. A quantitative study between state militarism and domestic gender equality shows that women are less likely to use international violence than men (Mary Caprioli, Gendered Conflict, 2000). Thus, women in a leadership role avoids any type of violence to reduce conflict.

Reducing violence and conflict by collaboration also help women leaders to achieve sustainable development by engaging with every party. Women

leaders try to achieve their goals more sustainably. In all situations, whether women are leading a role in businesses, corporate sector or governance, they prefer policies that are sustainable in long-term. A report by Europe Investment Bank, published in 2023, suggests that by putting more women in charge of institutions, more policies will be generated that will be sustainable for both environment and economy. So, we can say that women are more environment friendly and make sustainable practices by engaging everyone.

Women leaders have ^{also} the capability of challenging the traditional power structure instead of only focusing on social issues. Traditional power structure is usually against the uplift of human rights and we autocratic system against its citizens. Women leaders

by advocating the rights of people can challenge these autocratic or traditional power structure Aung San Suu Kyi, the daughter of Myanmar's independence hero, resisted against the military junta of the country by ~~by~~ opting democratic reforms for which she received nobel prize in 1991. It shows us how ~~now~~ women can challenge and resist traditional power structure.

Challenging traditional power structure not ~~at~~ only brings prosperity but also improved legal and democratic system which women leaders can achieve. As an advocate of social welfare, women leaders using their position also use their power to strengthen the legal system of their country. legal system if equitable can make a strong base for a country and can help country politically and economically. Following the 1994

genocide, women of Rwanda took a leadership position. This increased representation of women has improved legal reforms regarding women's rights and gender-based violence. This example shows us how women leaders can play a role making a world better legally.

Despite the proponents who advocates for women to be in leadership position, there is also opposition to this thinking and debate. They argue that leadership role suits to anyone with better capabilities, skills and abilities. Leadership encompasses the skill, ability of a person to lead an organization regardless of the gender. Leadership role require certain beliefs, traits and characteristics from a person so he/she can lead others and put that vision into strategy. According to the study published in Journal

of Applied Psychology, there is little to no ^{or} difference between men and women as leaders. It tells us about to stop this debate as it overlooks individual skills and capabilities.

Not only they overlook the individual abilities but also there is a lack of evidence that women are better in leadership position and that the world will become better. Such statements are very biased without any authentic facts and evidence that really shows how women can make the world better if they ruled it. There are stereotypes that exist that the leaders need to show their masculinity in making decision skills. A study shows that while there are some differences in leadership style between men and women, the evidence does not demonstrate

that one gender is better than the other. (Anne Koenig, Are leaders stereotypes masculine, 2011). Thus, this type of debate also lacks evidence that who will be a good leader for better world.

There are some other factors beside lack of evidence, one of that is women in leadership position cannot challenge the patriarchal structures of society. These structures are entrenched within a society due to culture, ethnicity or religion advocate for otherwise. People use religion to argue against liberals who are supporter or right activists. Golda Meir, the fourth Prime Minister of Israel was a strong advocate for women's participation in the workforce whereas Orthodox Jewish groups resisted to maintain traditional gender roles. Thus, women leader are not capable of easily challenging these patriarchal structures and norms in the society.

A viable option to settle this debate is to increase gender diversity by increasing inclusivity and equality. In this way, world can get benefit from both types of leaders if in regard they have little to no difference in their leadership style. Men and women together in a leadership position can represent their genders equality and much more issues will be resolved such as women's rights. According to a report by McKinsey published in 2015 it reports that if diversity is increased by more women participation, \$12 tr can be added to Global GDP by FY2025. It tells that how increased diversity will be better for world ~~not only~~ ^{instead of} the world ruled by women.

Another challenge will emerge if only women started to rule the world and that is reverse discrimination against men. If the debate goes on

and advocates for only women leaders have effective voices in power arena, a discrimination will start against men resulting in negative impacts for the world rather than benefits. There are systems like quota system used to increase representation of minority groups. For example; this type of discrimination also happens in companies while achieving these diversity goals they might lose a talent if they hire a less experienced woman than a man who has a strong qualification and education. Hence, there is a risk of reverse discrimination if the world started ruling by the women.

All the arguments given by opponents of women as a leader do not hold water for one reason or the other. As they argue that women as a leader overlooks the abilities of individual, one may observe that this point is not valid.

To make this world better, companies, institutions and countries can leverage the strength of both the genders equally.

By increasing women representation by removing barriers, one can use the strength of both the genders. Such type of collaborating strength can be used for the betterment of people by resisting against the oppressor. One such example is of post-apartheid transition in South Africa in which Nelson Mandela with a number of influential women moved nation towards democracy and reconciliation. This use of strength by both the genders show how countries suffering from social issues can resist collectively.

Another argument the opponents of women as a leader presents is a lack of evidence. This argument is used only as a excuse to create a

a stereotype that men are better leaders than women. A more number of studies is a dire need to end this argument but depending upon the existing evidence one should raise voice for the increased representation of women as a leader. In 2003, Norway introduced a law that 40% of board members in publicly listed companies be women which improved corporate governance in the countries and is a example evidence for other countries to follow. Hence, one can say there is no lack of evidence but an excuse to put a barrier.

The third argument used by the opposition is that Patriarchal norms cannot be challenged by women leaders easily. Whereas, we have discussed in the arguments that advocate for women leaders who prioritize social welfare. By prioritizing

and ensuring systematic inequalities through their collaborative nature, one may observe that women will have an upper hand in solving patriarchal issues as compared to men as a leader. In 1948, a group of women launched Seneca Fall movement and started Women Suffrage Movement in the US to break patriarchal structures of getting denied of the right of vote. Thus, shows us part evidence how women can struggle and break patriarchal structures.

Furthermore, the argument presented by the opponents is of inclusivity. It is a good argument and a supported one but this inclusivity should mean inclusivity including women representation equality. Inclusivity in a leadership position as an organization or a country could reap good benefits out of it. Although this argument

support both genders but in the modern world we see male dominance in representing as a world leader. In the past century, the world has witnessed a number of conflicts starting from WWI to the present day conflicts and mostly dominated by the male as a decision maker. Hence, inclusivity should mean equal representation instead of one gender dominance over the other.

The last argument by the opposing party is risk of reverse discrimination which can be handled by providing level playing field to everyone. Level playing field gives every individual a chance to express their opinion freely. In a leadership position, there should be a quota base system where number of men participating should be equal to the number of women. According to Harvard Business Review in 2019, women outscored men on 17 of the 19 capabilities that

distinguish excellent leaders. Thus, the last point also became invalid about the risk of discrimination as women are also compatible and can be provided level-playing field.

In conclusion, this world cannot become a perfect place to live but we human beings using our minds can create a better place by working together. For this we should consider the rights of every marginalized group. The first of them ^{are} women rights that by supporting women in a leading position we can create a more better world. Women's collaborative nature and working for social welfare can overcome several challenges of the world. Inclusivity is a good and viable option but it should show equal representation so that we all can make this world a better place.

Former US president, Barack Obama:-

"Pretty undisputably... better than [men] women in high executive offices "there would be less war"