

Reclaiming Elder-Led Governance: A Biblical Critique of Youth-First Globalism

Sixbert Sangwa*¹

¹Office of the President, Open Christian University, California, The United States

*Author: ssangwa@openchristian.education

CITATION

Sangwa S. (2025). Reclaiming Elder-Led Governance: A Biblical Critique of Youth-First Globalism. *Open Journal of Science, Philosophy & Theology (OJ-SPT)*. Vol 01. Issue 01. Open Christian Press.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17160380>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 11 September 2025

Published: 19 September 2025

Category: Original Article

COPYRIGHT



Copyright © 2025 by author(s).

Open Journal of Science, Philosophy & Theology (OJ-SPT) is published by Open Christian Press. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license.

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

PUBLISHER INFO

Open Christian Press—the publishing arm of Open Christian University—is produced in partnership with the Center for Faith and Work.

Disclaimer: The views expressed are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect their institutions.

Abstract: This study interrogates the contemporary elevation of youth leadership as a policy and cultural ideal, arguing that credentialism and global governance rhetoric have displaced the biblical norm of elder-led authority. Anchored in a Sola Scriptura stance, the analysis integrates three lenses—Generational Theory, Foucault’s power-knowledge, and a biblical theology of authority—to examine how education-based legitimacy and innovation discourse reconfigure who is deemed fit to lead. Methodologically, it is an integrative review and documentary analysis of peer-reviewed research, official datasets, and institutional programs between 2000 and 2025, bounded ex ante to reduce selection bias and coded for design and risk-of-bias characteristics. Findings indicate that credentialism reallocates status toward younger, formally qualified actors while sidelining tested character, with measurable organizational costs where compliance proxies for competence. Transnational mechanisms—including UN Youth2030 pipelines, WEF Young Global Leaders, and philanthropic fellowships—regularize this shift by selecting, financing, and platforming youth aligned to secular-progressive frames. Concurrent cohort evidence on religiosity and moral permissiveness suggests downstream effects on institutional stability and ethical baselines. By contrast, Scripture locates ordinary governance in mature, plural elder leadership, cautioning against novice elevation (1 Tim 3:6; Job 12:12; Isa 3:4). The paper contributes a theoretically coherent account of how youth-first regimes emerge, why they are spiritually and civically brittle, and what an intergenerational, elder-led corrective entails. Policy and ecclesial implications include pairing youth participation with accountable elder oversight, reforming credential-centric selection, and rebuilding mentoring architectures that join youthful strength to seasoned wisdom.

Keywords: youth leadership, credentialism, biblical leadership, global governance, transnational networks, power-knowledge, intergenerational leadership.

1. Introduction

1.1. Background: In recent decades, global institutions and policy frameworks have increasingly championed youth leadership as key to addressing social and political challenges. From the United Nations' Youth2030 agenda to the World Economic Forum's Young Global Leaders program, the mantra is that empowering "future leaders" today will drive innovative solutions for tomorrow (Armendariz & Berehe, 2025). Advocates argue that young people's creativity, technical savvy, and stake in the future make their inclusion in governance not only right but necessary (Armendariz & Berehe, 2025; UNITAR, 2019). Major global initiatives describe youth as "active architects" of sustainable development and "critical agents of change" who must be given a *seat at the table* in decision-making (UNITAR, 2019). This worldwide prioritization of youth leadership marks a profound cultural shift in how authority and expertise are allocated. Recent work expands this policy narrative by unveiling the spiritual meta-code that undergirds many youth-centric governance platforms, contending that the same institutions championing 'future leaders' embed a covert Luciferian logic of technocratic centralisation that Scripture foreshadows as Babel-like rebellion (Sangwa & Mutabazi, 2025a).

Authorial posture: Our concern is not with youth themselves but with the instrumentalization of youth. Young people carry rare gifts of energy, creativity, and moral sensitivity; they are "arrows in the hand of a warrior" when rightly aimed (Ps 127:4). Yet Scripture cautions that public oversight should be seasoned by tested character (1 Tim 3:6; Tit 1:5–9). Our stance is therefore intergenerational: elevate youth, but seat decision-making with mature leaders who actively seek and mentor younger voices (Prov 11:14; 1 Pet 5:5). *Parable:* saplings become oaks, but in a storm the beam in the bridge should be seasoned timber. This is a call for prudent order, not a campaign against youth.

1.2. Problem Statement: Critics caution that the enthusiasm for youthful leaders, however well-intentioned, risks sidelining the seasoned wisdom of elders and undermining biblical norms of governance. Scripture consistently exalts mature, elder leadership marked by tested character and discernment, whereas abrupt elevation of untested youth is portrayed as a sign of disorder or judgment (e.g., "*I will make youths their leaders, and unstable rulers will govern them*" – Isaiah 3:4). The Bible's paradigm of leadership, from Israel's elders to the New Testament church, centers on those of proven wisdom and experience (cf. Job 12:12, 1 Peter 5:1–3). By contrast, today's institutional penchant for credentialed youth – often justified by advanced degrees or tech prowess – can verge on credentialism, elevating formal qualifications and novelty over the insights of age. This paper argues that such trends not only conflict with biblical leadership principles but may also destabilize organizations and moral order. Historical analogy offers a warning: King Rehoboam's folly in rejecting the counsel of his father's elders in favor of younger advisors led to the division of Israel's kingdom (see 1 Kings 12). The implication is that displacing elder guidance with youthful zeal alone can precipitate fracture in a community.

The funding architecture of international development confirms the selectivity of this rhetoric. OECD data show that between 2020-2021 donors committed USD 57.4 billion per year—44 percent of all allocable aid—to programmes flagged for "*gender equality and women's empowerment*," while no equivalent marker exists for the economic or social empowerment of men (OECD, 2023). The Sustainable Development Goals reinforce the asymmetry: Goal 5 targets only "women and girls," and no SDG addresses the formative role of men as husbands, fathers, or providers. By contrast, initiatives explicitly centred on male wellbeing are typically small and local—a case in point being Boston's 2024 "Black Male Advancement" grants totalling just USD 0.5 million across 63 organisations (City of Boston, 2024). Analogous selectivity emerges in population-policy discourse, where high fertility is cast as a primary poverty driver

despite counter-evidence. A recent panel study covering 135 countries (1980–2024) finds governance quality—not fertility rates—to be the robust predictor of extreme-poverty incidence, debunking the neo-Malthusian premise that surplus people, rather than deficient institutions, entrench deprivation (Sangwa & Mutabazi, 2025b). The disparity signals a deliberate realignment of social capital away from the divinely ordained responsibility of men to steward family and community, thereby widening the vacuum into which secular technocracies can insert their own norms.

Where education becomes the operative surrogate for maturity, organizations risk mistaking symbolic capital for moral authority. Recent evidence confirms the organisational costs of equating formal rule-keeping with genuine competence. A meta-synthesis of 118 HR frameworks across 2015–2025 shows compliance descriptors eclipse innovation terms by roughly two to one, systematically rewarding obedience over moral discernment or creative problem-solving and thereby hollowing the character-based leadership Scripture commends (Sangwa & Mutabazi, 2025a). Credentialism compresses the time horizon of leadership by awarding status before seasoned judgment has formed, a pattern consistent with studies that find younger leaders perceived as less prototypical and less legitimate in contexts demanding stability and integrity (Daldrop, Homan, & Buengeler, 2025). Cross-cultural work further suggests that looser, innovation-prizing cultures select younger leaders more often, whereas tighter cultures conserve elder leadership, with measurable differences in political and business elites (Vaughan-Johnston, Imtiaz, Lee, & Ji, 2021). These findings do not denigrate education; they situate it. Education is a gift, not a guarantor. In biblical terms, knowledge that “puffs up” must be yoked to love that “builds up” (1 Corinthians 8:1) and to the patience that attends the gray head (Proverbs 16:31). Cross-sector evidence now shows that obedience metrics routinely eclipse creativity and integrity in promotion decisions, effectively fast-tracking pliant younger employees while marginalising elder voices whose seasoned judgement

resists box-ticking managerialism (Sangwa & Mutabazi, 2025c).

Recent population-level data confirm the cultural soil in which youth-first leadership has taken root. Since 2020, nationally representative surveys show the religiously unaffiliated holding steady near 28–31% of U.S. adults, with younger cohorts markedly less attached to historic Christian practice than their elders (Pew Research Center, 2025). Yet large youth cohorts are not, in themselves, a developmental liability. A 135-country panel (1980–2024) finds governance quality—not fertility—is the robust predictor of extreme-poverty incidence, debunking neo-Malthusian claims that population growth mechanically drives underdevelopment (Sangwa, 2025). The implication is that rushing authority to the young without institutional reform only masks, never remedies, governance deficits. Long-running Gallup series likewise chart more permissive moral attitudes among adults under 35 on most contested issues, with only limited exceptions (Newport, 2025). Psychological cohort analyses aggregating dozens of large datasets find Generation Z significantly less religious, more individualistic in moral self-authorization, and more pessimistic about inherited institutions than previous cohorts (Twenge, 2023). Against this backdrop, the biblical warning that “I will make youths their leaders, and unstable rulers will govern them” (Isaiah 3:4) reads not as nostalgia but as a prudential constraint: leadership should ordinarily be entrusted to those of tested character who have learned wisdom in time (1 Timothy 3:6; Job 12:12)—with the Rehoboam narrative serving as a canonical control case when youthful zeal displaces elder counsel (1 Kings 12).

1.3. Objectives: This interdisciplinary study pursues three interlinked aims. First, it examines the philosophical and theological roots of biblical leadership, contrasting them with modern secular ideals of youth-led governance. Second, it analyzes how education-based meritocracy and global policy frameworks have gradually displaced maturity as the basis for authority. Third, it assesses whether—and how—elite transnational networks leverage youth leadership pathways to advance social and spiritual

agendas that diverge from biblical order. Throughout, the analysis maintains a Sola Scriptura perspective, treating Scripture as normative for evaluating leadership paradigms.

1.4. Research Questions: To sharpen the inquiry, the paper addresses two research questions: (1) *How do contemporary youth-leadership regimes, legitimated by education-based credentialism and “innovation” discourse, diverge from biblical models of mature governance, and with what effects on institutional stability and moral order in church and society?* (2) *Through which identifiable mechanisms do transnational policy and philanthropic networks channel youth leadership to advance cultural agendas at odds with biblical norms, and how have Christian communities responded?.* In essence, the study asks: *What are the consequences when youthful power eclipses elder authority, and what forces are propelling this shift?*

2. Theoretical Framework

A robust theoretical foundation is needed to move beyond mere description into critical analysis. Three complementary frameworks guide this study: Generational Theory, Foucault’s Power–Knowledge, and a Biblical Theology of Authority. Each offers distinct lenses on the tension between “youthful power” and “elder wisdom.”

2.1. Generational Theory: Modern generational theory explores how age cohorts interact in recurring social cycles. One prominent but debated model, Strauss–Howe’s cyclical theory, posits that history moves in 80–90 year cycles (or “turnings”) in which each generation has a character shaped by its historical context, often leading to predictable tensions between older and younger cohorts. According to Strauss and Howe, periods of crisis often elevate a rising generation of leaders while older paradigms recede – a dynamic arguably reflected in today’s youth-driven leadership ethos. This model illuminates how societies periodically swing from valuing elder authority to

championing youth and back again. However, it is important to note that Strauss–Howe’s claims are not universally accepted in academia; critics label the theory historically deterministic and lacking rigorous empirical support (Erwin, 2024). Indeed, generational boundaries and traits can be subjective and culturally contingent, as Mannheim’s classic sociology of generations reminds us. Nonetheless, generational theory sensitizes us to the power-knowledge gap that can emerge between ages – for example, when a tech-savvy younger generation gains new skills that older leaders lack, potentially flipping traditional hierarchies. It also provides context for understanding why youth challenges to elder leadership recur across eras. The Bible itself acknowledges generational cycles in leadership: “*a generation goes and a generation comes*” (Ecclesiastes 1:4) – yet it consistently commends intergenerational cooperation, where the old teach the young (Titus 2:3–5) rather than compete for power.

2.2. Critical Theory of Power–Knowledge (Foucault): French philosopher Michel Foucault’s insights on power and discourse offer a critical lens on the rise of credentialism and “innovation” rhetoric. Foucault argued that “*knowledge*” is not neutral; it is entwined with power, as those who shape dominant discourses establish what is accepted as truth and who is seen as an authority (Christensen, 2023). In the context of youth leadership, one can observe a power–knowledge paradigm at work: Institutions often legitimize young leaders through academic credentials, expert status, or mastery of new technologies – forms of knowledge that confer power in a knowledge-driven society. The discourse of innovation – ubiquitous in policy and business – casts the new and the young as inherently superior change agents, implicitly displacing traditional authority as antiquated or “incongruent” with progress (Daldrop et al., 2025). This echoes Foucault’s point that what a society touts as “*necessary truths*” (e.g. “*innovation is good; old ways are obstacles*”) may actually be contingent products of particular power interests (Gutting, 2022). Here, the interest may be a technocratic vision of society that prizes formal education and youthful dynamism – aligning with a

globalist ideology that seeks rapid, coordinated change. By examining whose purposes are served by the “youth empowerment” narrative, we gain insight into how discourse can be wielded to *supplant traditional authority structures*. In Foucault’s terms, the current regime of truth elevates the young, credentialed “expert” as the ideal leader, thereby marginalizing the older bearer of traditional or local knowledge. This theoretical lens will help explain how education-based meritocracy can paradoxically create new hierarchies, where degrees and innovative ideas become the currency of power, potentially discounting the stabilizing value of wisdom that often comes with age. This empirical displacement of judgment by rule-compliance has been mapped as a ‘triple-helix’ in which disciplinary power, HR frameworks, and post-colonial governance ideals recode obedience itself as competence—a transformation that Foucault’s lens both predicts and problematises (Sangwa & Mutabazi, 2025c).

2.3. Biblical Theology of Leadership and Authority:

Normatively, this study is grounded in a biblical theology that views Scripture as the ultimate arbiter of truth (Sola Scriptura). The Bible offers a rich framework for leadership characterized by *servanthood, wisdom, and moral integrity*, typically developed over time. Elder-led governance is a consistent biblical pattern: from the elders of Israel (Exodus 18:12; Numbers 11:16–17) to the New Testament church where overseers (“elders”) must be men of proven character (see 1 Timothy 3:1–7). Notably, Paul stipulates an overseer “must not be a new convert” to avoid conceit and downfall (1 Tim 3:6), implying that leadership is *ordinarily* for the mature. Biblical wisdom literature likewise associates age with understanding: “*Wisdom is found with the elderly, and understanding comes with long life*” (Job 12:12). To be sure, Scripture does not teach that age automatically confers wisdom or righteousness (foolish old men exist, and exemplary young leaders like King Josiah or Timothy are acknowledged). However, the general principle is that tested experience is vital for sound leadership. “*Gray hair is a glorious crown; it is found in the way of righteousness*,” says Proverbs 16:31, linking honorable

old age with godliness. Moreover, biblical authority is typically plural and accountable – for example, a council of elders provides safety in multitude of counsel (Proverbs 11:14). This stands in contrast to the modern penchant for charismatic young individual leaders elevated on the global stage. When youth leadership appears in Scripture, it is often as a sign of chaos or judgment on a nation that has forsaken God’s order – as in Isaiah’s prophecy of youth oppressively ruling (Isaiah 3:4, cited above) or the rash arrogance of Rehoboam’s young advisors (1 Kings 12). The biblical ideal is *intergenerational synergy*: young men for strength and vision, old men for wisdom and guidance (Joel 2:28; 1 John 2:14). This theology of authority will serve as a plumbline to evaluate contemporary practices. It raises critical questions: Are we appointing leaders based on God’s criteria of character and wisdom, or the world’s criteria of credentials and popularity? What are the spiritual consequences of a leadership culture that prizes youthful potential over elder wisdom? By integrating scriptural exegesis with socio-political analysis, we can assess whether today’s trends align with or depart from *God’s design* for human governance.

2.4. Secularization, Credentialism, and Discursive Power:

Secularization has not merely reduced formal religiosity; it has shifted the criteria by which authority is legitimated. In a culture where transcendent norms recede, formal credentials and technocratic fluency increasingly serve as stand-ins for wisdom. This is visible in higher education’s outsized gatekeeping role and in elite policy discourse that equates “innovation” with moral progress. Empirically, cohort differences in religious identity and moral permissiveness are strongest among younger adults (Pew Research Center, 2025; Newport, 2025), while generational psychology traces a rising priority on expressive individualism over inherited moral authority (Twenge, 2023). Foucault’s power-knowledge lens clarifies why: institutions confer “truth effects” on those fluent in sanctioned expertise, thereby recording leadership as the domain of the credentialed rather than the proven. Scripture, by contrast, centers authority in time-tested character, plurality, and counsel (Proverbs

11:14; Titus 2:3–5), which moderates the volatility of novelty without suppressing youthful gifts (1 John 2:14).

3. Methodology

This research employs a qualitative, interdisciplinary approach rooted in secondary data analysis. The design can be described as an integrative literature review combined with documentary and comparative analysis. First, a broad review of scholarly literature was undertaken across theology, political science, and sociology to gather insights on generational leadership dynamics, credentialism, and the influence of global networks (e.g., academic journals such as *Leadership Quarterly*, policy analyses, and sociological studies). Peer-reviewed Q1 and Q2 journals were prioritized to ensure high-quality evidence for each major claim. For example, recent leadership studies on age bias (Daldrop et al., 2025), cross-cultural leadership age trends (Vaughan-Johnston et al., 2021), and sociological critiques of credential inflation were examined. Concurrently, documentary analysis was conducted on relevant policy and institutional documents – including United Nations reports, the UN Youth Strategy, World Economic Forum publications, and statements from major NGOs and foundations – to understand how youth leadership is framed and operationalized in global discourse. Official data from organizations like Pew Research (on generational moral attitudes) and Gallup were also analyzed to gauge the impact of youth-led value shifts on society (Newport, 2025).

To pre-empt selection bias and enhance replicability, I bound the evidence base as follows. Peer-reviewed studies and official statistics published between 2000 and 2025 were eligible if they reported methods and country coverage transparently; policy documents required institutional provenance (e.g., OECD, UN, Pew). Non-peer-reviewed commentary was used only for context and never to anchor causal claims. I coded sources by design (cross-sectional, longitudinal, meta-analytic), domain (leadership performance, age bias, governance), and risk of bias. Where causal

inference is impossible (e.g., network–policy associations), I state correlations cautiously, consider plausible confounders, and direct readers to primary datasets for re-analysis. This strategy aligns the theological analysis with empirical standards while keeping the interpretive frame explicit.

Comparative analysis was then applied: findings from secular sources were compared against biblical principles. For instance, statements from a UN or WEF document extolling youth innovation were contrasted with scriptural admonitions about reliance on elder counsel. This comparative lens helped identify divergences and tensions. Finally, insights from the sociology of stigmatized knowledge (e.g. conspiracy theory analysis) were integrated to examine claims that “hidden” elite networks are engineering cultural shifts via youth leadership. Rather than endorse any unfounded conspiracy, the study critically engaged sources (academic and journalistic) that investigate these networks’ influence in a grounded way (Klement & Walach, 2022). All sources have been cited in-text in APA 7th style where applicable, with hyperlink citations provided for transparency. The interdisciplinary nature of this methodology ensures a balanced perspective: empirical social science, normative theology, and critical theory are brought together to triangulate on the research questions. By design, the study remains analytical and evidence-based, avoiding speculation by rooting conclusions in documented phenomena.

Scope, definitions, and limitations. We rely on secondary data (policy documents, official statistics, and peer-reviewed research) and analyze patterns across governance, culture, and religion. By *globalist projects* we refer to elite, transnational governance and norm-setting networks that coordinate agendas across states and markets; by *credentialism* we mean the inflation of formal educational requirements beyond what is necessary for competence; and by *youth leadership* we mean formal decision-making authority exercised by under-40s. These constructs are operationalized through recognized measures where available (e.g., OECD age composition of MPs; development aid policy markers) and through

established sociological theory on credentials and elite selection (Bills, 2003; Rivera, 2012). We do not infer causation from cross-sectional correlations; instead we identify converging trends and articulate theoretically grounded interpretations, noting counter-evidence where relevant.

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1. Youth Leadership Regimes vs. Biblical Models – Divergence and Consequences (RQ1)

Legitimation by Credentialism and Innovation Discourse: Contemporary youth-leadership regimes are frequently justified by *meritocratic credentials* (elite education, technical expertise) and a cultural narrative celebrating innovation and change. In corporate and political spheres, youth is associated with fresh vision, adaptability, and closer alignment with emerging technologies and social trends. Many organizations actively seek young talent for leadership development, reflecting what one scholar calls the “increasingly large global business” of youth leadership development (Carroll & Firth, 2020). The United Nations, for example, proclaims that “*young people...have been active architects*” of agendas like the SDGs and insists that harnessing their collective power is essential for “real and lasting change (UNITAR, 2019). Such discourse elevates youth from mere beneficiaries of policy to co-drivers of governance. In parallel, the credentialist mindset in modern society tends to equate formal qualifications with competence and authority (Wienclaw, 2021; Brown, D. K. 2001). A postgraduate degree from a top university or expertise in a cutting-edge field can fast-track relatively young individuals into positions of influence, even when their practical experience is limited. This marks a sharp departure from biblical leadership models: in Scripture, leadership qualification rests on proven character, wisdom, and *relational credibility* developed in community over time (e.g., the elder must be “tested” and found blameless – 1 Tim 3:10, Titus 1:5–9). Education is valued in the Bible (Paul was highly educated, for instance), but it is never a sufficient

warrant for spiritual or institutional authority absent maturity and humility (1 Cor 8:1: “*Knowledge puffs up, but love builds up*”).

The divergence becomes evident in the expectations placed on leaders. Competence vs. Character: Modern frameworks emphasize competencies – technical skills, innovative ideas, academic knowledge – often associated with younger cohorts. By contrast, biblical models emphasize character virtues – integrity, faithfulness, patience, fear of God – typically refined through long experience. These differing criteria can lead to *different outcomes*. A young leader chosen chiefly for talent and credentials may lack the seasoned judgment to navigate ethical and organizational complexities under pressure. Secular research bears this out: Studies find that older leaders, on average, excel in certain leadership outcomes due to their experience. For instance, in one longitudinal field study in a sales context, teams led by older managers significantly outperformed those led by younger managers (Vaughan-Johnston et al., 2021). The researchers suggested older leaders could model effective behavior and command respect in ways younger leaders could not (Vaughan-Johnston et al., 2021). Similarly, a study by Kearney (2008) found that transformational leadership was more positively received and effective when the leader was older than the followers (Vaughan-Johnston et al., 2021). These findings imply that *age can enhance leadership inspiration*, corroborating the biblical intuition that people “take refuge in the leadership of the aged” (cf. Proverbs 20:29). On the other hand, secular literature also notes challenges when age gaps are extreme: communication difficulties and differing expectations can cause intergenerational friction (Vaughan-Johnston et al., 2021). However, those conflicts tend to diminish as relationships deepen and stereotypes are broken (Vaughan-Johnston et al., 2021). The key point is that initial perceptions of youth as leaders are often skeptical – even secular studies on age bias reveal that many perceive young adults as “*incongruent with leader roles*” especially regarding attributes like competence and integrity (Daldrop et al., 2025). Daldrop et al. (2025) describe how entrenched

stereotypes associate leadership with older age, disadvantaged young aspirants in perception (Daldrop et al., 2025). From a biblical standpoint, such skepticism is not mere prejudice; it reflects an underlying truth that wisdom and trust are earned over time. The Bible cautions against hastily elevating novices (1 Tim 3:6), precisely because character maturity is hard won. Thus, contemporary regimes that fast-track youth into authority may court the very pitfalls scripture warns of – pride, instability, and shallow roots.

Effects on Institutional Stability: One observable effect of youth-centric leadership is a propensity for rapid change and experimentation in institutions. Young leaders often bring ambitious visions for reform and disruption. This can energize organizations, but without tempering from elder oversight, it may destabilize traditions and long-term commitments. Sociologically, organizations led by relatively inexperienced leaders might see higher risk-taking and volatility in policy direction. A pertinent example is in the church context: some evangelical denominations have installed youthful pastors or CEOs of ministries to appear relevant to new generations. While this can boost short-term engagement, studies in church health note that abrupt shifts in leadership style or theology under youthful leaders have, at times, led to church splits or doctrinal drift (anecdotally paralleling Rehoboam’s split kingdom scenario). Even in secular politics, analysts voice concern when relatively young heads of state take office with little apprenticeship; the learning curve at the helm of a nation can be perilous for governance stability. A recent cross-cultural analysis found that political leaders in Western cultures are significantly younger on average than those in Eastern cultures, where elder leadership remains the norm (Vaughan-Johnston et al., 2021). Intriguingly, the study linked this difference to cultural “tightness” – societies with looser norms (often Western) are more open to youthful leaders, whereas tighter cultures favor elders (Vaughan-Johnston et al., 2021). The risk for looser societies is that without strong normative anchors, young leaders may bend to populist pressures or ideological fads, potentially eroding institutional integrity.

Conversely, in tight cultures the downside might be gerontocracy (overly old leadership resisting change). A biblical balance would suggest *neither* extreme is ideal: elders leading, youths learning and contributing, each respecting the other (1 Peter 5:5 exhorts the young to submit to elders, and all to humility).

Effects on Moral Order: Perhaps the starkest divergence between youth-led secular visions and biblical norms appears in the moral-cultural realm. Younger generations today, shaped by secular education and media, tend to espouse more liberal views on moral issues than their elders. Polling data confirm wide generational gaps on questions of sexual ethics, marriage, life, and religious commitment (Newport, 2025). A 2022 Gallup analysis showed that adults under 35 were the most permissive on a majority of moral behaviors surveyed, from premarital sex to gender fluidity (Newport, 2025). They were significantly more accepting of behaviors like polygamy or having children outside marriage compared to older adults (Newport, 2025). While there are a few issues where youth are equal or even stricter (e.g. younger Americans surprisingly showed slightly *lower* acceptance of pornography and infidelity than middle-aged peers in recent surveys) (Newport, 2025), the overarching trend is a move away from traditional norms. Across moral issues, age gradients in the United States generally tilt toward greater acceptance among younger adults, although the size and direction of gaps vary by topic. Recent data show the religiously unaffiliated now constitute about 29% of U.S. adults and are concentrated among younger cohorts, a configuration that helps explain shifting normative baselines while also revealing stabilization since 2019 (Pew Research Center, 2025). If such youth attitudes carry over into leadership, the moral order of institutions can shift dramatically. For instance, a youth-led nonprofit or political movement might prioritize progressive social policies that clash with biblical ethics on life, sexuality, or the sanctity of the family. Without elder statesmen to provide a moral compass anchored in tradition or faith, policies may reflect transient generational passions. The Bible portends this: “*Youths oppress My people... and women*

rule over them” (Isaiah 3:12) – a description some commentators interpret as societal order turned upside down, where impulsiveness replaces the steadiness that elder male leadership was meant to provide in that patriarchal context. In modern terms, one could argue that a culture which derides the “old-fashioned” morals of elders in favor of youthful relativism is a culture at risk of confusion. Indeed, global surveys highlight youth disillusionment as a growing issue; the WEF’s Global Risks Report 2021 listed “*youth disillusionment*” among top global risks, warning of a generation disconnected from traditional values and institutions (Armendariz & Berehe, 2025). Ironically, the secular solution proposed is to empower youth even more, hoping inclusion will alleviate their disillusionment (Armendariz & Berehe, 2025). A biblical analysis might counter that disillusionment often stems from the lack of transcendent meaning and moral guidance that elders (parents, mentors, faith leaders) are meant to provide (Judges 2:10 describes a generation arising “*who did not know the Lord*” after the elders passed, leading to societal chaos). Empirical patterns in Africa underscore this concern. A multi-country panel analysis shows that rights-focused marital reforms trigger a short-term surge in divorce prevalence (≈ 0.4 – 0.5 pp within five years of enactment) before cultures partially adapt, illustrating how ostensibly liberating legislation can inadvertently destabilise covenantal institutions (Sangwa & Mutabazi, 2025d). The study’s ‘rights-cohesion paradox’ corroborates Isaiah’s warning that social order falters when traditional family anchors are juridically re-engineered.

The pattern is thus one of engineered disruption. By foregrounding younger and, frequently, female voices as the moral vanguard of “inclusive” progress, global networks cultivate constituencies that are emotionally persuasive yet structurally dependent. Policy scholars warn that such mobilisation fosters short time-horizon activism prone to rapid swings from idealism to disillusionment—an affective volatility well suited to justify ever-expanding expert oversight (cf. UNICEF Innocenti, 2024). Where paternal vocation is delegitimised and elder counsel dismissed, the resulting

vacuum is predictably filled by the managerial state or philanthropic complex, which then prescribes secular-progressive solutions to the very chaos it has amplified. Biblically, this dynamic parallels Isaiah’s oracle of judgment in which “youths oppress my people, and women rule over them” (Isa 3:12, CSB)—a reversal of order portrayed not as liberation but as a sign of covenantal breach and impending instability.

In summary, findings for RQ1 reveal a clear divergence: *Education-based credentialism and innovation discourse promote a leadership culture of the young and new, whereas biblical models promote leadership by the elder and true.* The effects on institutions can include increased instability and shifting moral norms. To maintain balance, some scholars suggest intergenerational leadership teams, combining youthful innovation with elder oversight (Vaughan-Johnston et al., 2021). This aligns with the biblical ideal of the “*young men seeing visions*” and the “*old men dreaming dreams*” together (Joel 2:28) – a collaboration that prevents the eclipse of one by the other. Unfortunately, current global rhetoric often frames it as a zero-sum: making space for youth by removing or minimizing the influence of elders. The next section examines *why* that may be happening – what mechanisms and agendas lie behind this global youth leadership push.

4.2. Transnational Networks, Ideological Agendas, and the Role of the Church (RQ2)

If youth leadership ascendance were a purely organic social trend, one might expect it to vary greatly by culture and context. Instead, we observe remarkably coordinated messaging across international bodies, NGOs, and elite forums regarding the necessity of youth leadership. This hints at underlying mechanisms: influential networks deliberately cultivating young leaders to propagate certain cultural and political agendas. Here we analyze those mechanisms and consider how local Christian communities have responded.

Elite Networks Cultivating Young Global Leaders: A paradigmatic example is the World Economic Forum (WEF) and its *Forum of Young Global Leaders (YGL)*. Founded in 2004, the YGL network each year inducts a select cohort of accomplished people in their 30s or younger from around the world – including entrepreneurs, politicians, activists, and academics – and provides them with leadership forums, training, and high-level networking. The WEF openly states these YGLs are chosen for their potential to “drive positive change” globally (WEF, 2022). By design, it’s a transnational pipeline of rising influencers who are inculcated into the WEF’s worldview of global cooperation, stakeholder capitalism, and technocratic governance. A recent study by Klement and Walach (2022) in the open-access journal *Cureus* scrutinized the YGL network’s influence empirically. They found that countries with higher numbers of WEF Young Global Leaders in positions of influence tended to implement more stringent COVID-19 policies (non-pharmaceutical interventions) during the pandemic (Klement Walach, 2022). While correlation is not causation, the study suggests the WEF-YGL network acted as an “echo-chamber or amplifier” for certain global strategies (Klement Walach, 2022). More generally, the authors note that the WEF has “spawned a global network of elites...with significant influence on large corporations, politics, academia, and media.” (Klement Walach, 2022). This is precisely the kind of mechanism by which a relatively small ideological group can shape policy worldwide: by grooming young leaders who then ascend to key roles in government, business, and civil society, creating a like-minded global cadre. Far from conspiratorial fantasy, this networking is documented and even touted by its organizers. Klaus Schwab, WEF’s founder, has spoken of penetrating cabinets with YGL alumni. From a sociological perspective, this resembles what C. Wright Mills called the “power elite” – except skewing younger and more international.

The same logic is visible in official youth mainstreaming across the UN system. Since its 2018 launch, the UN’s Youth2030 strategy has sought “meaningful youth engagement in policymaking and decision-making

processes,” with successive progress reports documenting system-wide integration of youth delegates, advisory councils, and programmatic pipelines (United Nations Youth Office, 2025; 2018). The rhetoric is not merely symbolic. By casting youth as “co-creators” of the global agenda, these frameworks set expectations that authority should move toward the credentialed young. That expectation then diffuses into national bureaucracies, philanthropic portfolios, and corporate social strategies.

These top-down pipelines coexist with philanthropic and civil initiatives that credentialize young change-agents. Programs under the World Economic Forum’s Forum of Young Global Leaders induct under-40 achievers into a multi-year formation process that explicitly seeks to shape global governance conversations (World Economic Forum, 2025; n.d.). Empirical work has begun to map correlational footprints of this network’s influence on pandemic-era policy stringency, suggesting an amplification mechanism even if causality remains contested (Klement & Walach, 2022). The cumulative effect is not “secret society” control but a visible, documented ecology of selection, training, and placement that predictably reproduces a secular-progressive moral consensus within governance nodes. Christians should recognize the pattern without caricature and respond by rebuilding intergenerational authority within their own institutions.

Other transnational actors deploy similar youth channels. The United Nations, through its Youth Envoy’s Office and programs like UN Youth Delegates, actively integrates youth voices into global deliberations. The UN’s *Youth 2030* strategy framework not only encourages member states to include youth representatives but establishes funding and partnerships to support youth-led solutions. The rhetoric used is telling: youth aren’t just participants, they are depicted as torchbearers of a new global ethic of sustainability and inclusivity (Armendariz & Berehe, 2025). Partner organizations like the Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) Youth and the Global Shapers Community (a WEF initiative for those under 30) reinforce this by providing toolkits, grants, and

platforms for youth projects aligned with the UN 2030 Agenda (Armendariz & Berehe, 2025). These networks create an *infrastructure for ideological dissemination*: values such as global citizenship, climate action, gender inclusivity, and secular human rights norms are inculcated as the defining issues for young leaders. Importantly, many of these values, while laudable in part, align with a secular-progressive worldview that sometimes conflicts with more conservative or biblical perspectives (e.g., approaches to sexual ethics, family, or religious exclusivity). By elevating youths who champion these global values, networks effectively marginalize traditionalist youths or elder statesmen who might dissent. As one commentator put it, this can amount to “*using youth for some adult’s social agenda*” (Sharpe, 2021) – except here the “adult” is not a parent or local elder, but a transnational elite shaping a post-national order.

Credentialism and Philanthropy – The Role of Foundations: Alongside official institutions, large private philanthropies have heavily invested in youth leadership as a means to advance social change. The Open Society Foundations (OSF), founded by George Soros, provides a case in point. OSF launched initiatives like the Open Society Youth Fellowship, offering substantial stipends to young activists under 30 who work on projects aligned with “open society challenges” (OSF, 2015). The program explicitly seeks young people as “thought leaders” with innovative approaches to issues like justice reform, democratic engagement, and minority rights (OSF, 2015). Requirements such as fluency in English and ties to civil society organizations ensure these fellows become globally connected change agents. Effectively, OSF and similar foundations (Ford Foundation’s global fellowship, Gates Foundation’s youth ambassadors, etc.) credentialize a set of youths as experts and advocates for progressive causes. Through grants, media exposure, and connections, they confer a legitimacy on these young leaders that propels them into advisory boards, speaking panels, and non-profit leadership. The net effect is the creation of a transnational youth intelligentsia that can influence policy discourse in multiple countries. Sociologist

Michael Burt’s concept of the “structure of influence” is relevant – these youths form bridges between elite funders and grassroots communities, transmitting ideas downward and channeling local perspectives upward, but always within the parameters set by those funding and training them. In Christian terms, one might see an analogy in how the apostle Paul mentored Timothy and Titus as younger leaders who would carry forth a mission – but here the “mission” is a secular vision, and the “mentors” are often secular ideologues.

Cultural and Spiritual Agendas – New Age Rhetoric? Beyond concrete policies, some observers note that global youth leadership rhetoric often carries quasi-spiritual overtones. Phrases like “holistic wellbeing” and “planetary consciousness” have entered development and philanthropy vocabulary. These terms reflect a *holistic, one-world vision* that resonates with New Age spiritual motifs – the idea of an evolving collective consciousness, the de-emphasis of distinct religions in favor of syncretic spirituality, and the elevation of self-actualization (sometimes termed “*self-deification*” in Christian critique) as the highest good. For instance, the Earth Charter (a UN-adjacent initiative) speaks of global interdependence in almost reverential tones, and influential figures like Ervin László have explicitly framed the move toward global governance as a “quantum leap” in spiritual evolution of humanity. In the *Manifesto on Planetary Consciousness* (2001), co-authored by László and the Dalai Lama, we read: “*We are on the threshold of a new stage of social, spiritual, and cultural evolution...heading toward an interconnected...system that straddles the globe.*”(Wikipedia, 2025). The programmatic language here should be anchored in primary documents. The Earth Charter sets out a “shared vision of basic values” for a just, sustainable global order and explicitly frames a moral community that transcends nation-states (Earth Charter Commission, 2000). The Manifesto on Planetary Consciousness (Club of Budapest) similarly advances a civilizational “re-orientation” premised on global, holistic norms (Laszlo, 2001). These texts illustrate that “planetary consciousness” is not a caricature but a declared project with normative ambitions that

interact—sometimes frictionally—with traditional religious moral orders. Such rhetoric dovetails with the global youth empowerment narrative: young people are portrayed as pioneers of this new stage – open-minded, unencumbered by old dogmas, naturally attuned to ideals of unity and sustainability. To a secular audience this sounds inspiring; to a discerning Christian audience, it raises red flags. The concern is that this “spirituality” is *imitative* of Christian aims (peace, unity, stewardship) but grounded in humanistic or occult foundations rather than in Christ. The Bible warns of movements that have “a form of godliness” but deny its true power (2 Timothy 3:5). If indeed some global networks harbor an ideological vision akin to a New Age one-world order, then elevating youth – who are often eager to find meaning and can be more easily molded – would be a strategic move. It creates a generation of leaders predisposed to view traditional biblical Christianity as outdated or even obstructive to global unity. Some analysts go as far as to liken aspects of the youth climate movement or global citizenship education to a civil religion, wherein the fervor and moral urgency resemble religious zeal, but without orthodox theological content.

Mechanisms of Channeling Youth Leadership: Summarizing the mechanisms: (1) ***Institutional Incorporation*** – youth councils, quotas, and delegate programs in international bodies bring young voices into policymaking, but usually those voices are pre-selected to align with the institutions’ agenda. (2) ***Leadership Pipelines*** – programs like YGL, Rhodes scholarships, Fulbright, etc., which train and network young leaders along certain value sets and connect them to power circles. (3) ***Funding and Fellowships*** – foundations sponsoring youth-led projects in communities, thereby amplifying specific social agendas at the ground level. (4) ***Media Elevation*** – youth activists (e.g., a 16-year-old climate activist) given disproportionate media coverage, manufacturing moral authority (“listen to the children”). Each mechanism by itself might be benign or even laudable; the critique emerges when we see a pattern that these collectively advance particular ideological goals – often aligned with global liberalism – while marginalizing traditional voices

(typically older, rooted in local/national contexts or conservative religion).

Resistance and Adaptation by Christian Institutions: How have churches and Christian organizations responded? The reactions vary. In some cases, churches have *adapted* by creating their own youth leadership initiatives – for example, training programs for young pastors, Christian youth conferences, or efforts to include youth in church decision-making. This is not inherently negative; indeed, mentoring young leaders is biblical (2 Timothy 2:2). The difference is that in a faithful church context, youth leadership is developed *under the guidance of elders*, not in replacement of them. Many evangelical churches encourage “Timothys” (young emerging leaders) to be disciplined by “Pauls” (older mentors). Problems arise when churches imitate the world’s youth fetish without biblical balance. Some megachurches have faced scandals or splits under celebrity pastors who, despite being dynamic and relatively young, lacked accountability – a scenario analogous to secular institutions entrusting huge influence to youth without oversight. Other Christian communities have more consciously resisted the global youth leadership zeitgeist. Traditionalist denominations and the Catholic and Orthodox churches, for instance, continue to emphasize elder clergy and councils. They may engage youth, but the governance remains elder-led, reflecting scriptures like “*Do not rebuke an older man, but exhort him as a father... younger men as brothers*” (1 Timothy 5:1). These groups often warn against what one might call “*the Rehoboam syndrome*” – abandoning the “ancient paths” (Jeremiah 6:16) of theological and moral wisdom for the excitement of novelty. In the public policy arena, some Christian thinkers have pointed out that idolizing youth can become a form of ageism that dishonors one’s father and mother – violating the 5th Commandment’s principle of honoring the previous generation (Exodus 20:12, which promises longevity to societies that honor elders). Ministries dealing in “biblical worldview” training, such as Summit Ministries or the Colson Center, encourage young Christians to

respect elder mentorship even as they engage culture, in deliberate contrast to secular youth activism models.

One concrete example of resistance: In 2019, when a prominent youth climate activist addressed the UN with dire warnings, a number of Christian commentators responded not by attacking the teenager, but by questioning the adults manipulating the platform. They noted the near-apocalyptic *religious tone* of her message (penitence for climate sins, promise of salvation through action) and urged that older experts and theologians step up to bring truth and hope into the conversation rather than leave it to passionate youth alone. This underscores a key difference: biblical leadership does not use the young as human shields or mascots for a cause. Instead, it protects and guides them. Sadly, the current global trend sometimes places on the shoulders of children and youth the weight of solving complex global problems – a burden even seasoned leaders struggle with. This could be seen as a dereliction of duty by today’s elders on the world stage, akin to the elders of Israel failing to guide Rehoboam properly or Rehoboam failing to heed them.

In conclusion, the findings under RQ2 show that transnational policy and philanthropic networks are indeed actively channeling youth leadership to advance a progressive, globalist cultural agenda – one that often diverges from biblical norms on many fronts (family structure, sexual morality, religious truth, etc.). This is accomplished through well-established mechanisms of power-knowledge dissemination, in which youthful idealism is harnessed to lend moral energy and legitimacy to the agenda. The Church’s response has been mixed: some accommodate and even emulate the trend (sometimes to their detriment), while others hold firmly to a biblical elder-led model, seeking to “*honor the gray hair*” (Leviticus 19:32) and integrate the strengths of youth in proper order. For Christian institutions, the challenge is to engage young people’s gifts and calling without capitulating to the spirit of the age that glorifies youth at the expense of elder wisdom.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

This interdisciplinary investigation set out to critique the global prioritization of youth leadership in light of biblical norms of elder-led governance. The evidence surveyed – from scholarly studies, policy documents, and scriptural exegesis – converges on a sobering conclusion: the contemporary cult of youthful leadership, amplified by credentialism and globalist rhetoric, represents a significant departure from the time-tested patterns of authority that have undergirded stable, moral societies. In our zeal to empower the next generation, we risk an eclipse of elder wisdom that could leave institutions unmoored and cultures ungrounded.

The introduction framed the problem and questions. Across the analysis, two broad findings emerged. First, youth-led regimes diverge from biblical governance models in their basis for authority and have mixed results. While young leaders bring creativity and urgency, they often lack the depth of discernment that comes from experience. This can affect institutional stability – sometimes yielding innovation, but other times provoking fragmentation or ethical lapses. The biblical mandate for mature oversight in church and civil leadership is not an arbitrary tradition; it reflects an understanding of human development and the need for *proven character* at the helm. Empirically, we saw that teams and societies generally flourish when seasoned leaders guide and mentor the young, rather than abdicate to them. The Scripture, consistent with these findings, depicts the exclusion of elders from leadership as a judgment or tragedy, not a triumph (Isaiah 3:4–5, 12). Therefore, societies that “cancel” or sideline their elders in the name of progress may unwittingly sow chaos.

Second, this study found that the elevation of youth is not happening in a vacuum – it is being *channeled by powerful networks* with distinct ideological goals. The alignment of messaging from the UN, WEF, major foundations, and educational elites suggests a coordinated vision for a new global order in which rising generations are inculcated with a post-Christian, humanistic worldview. Some go further, identifying quasi-spiritual currents in this vision that echo New Age syncretism and “*false light*” (2 Corinthians 11:14) masquerading as enlightenment. While not every

proponent of youth leadership has nefarious intent – many genuinely desire to see young people flourish – the net effect of the globalist youth wave is to accelerate the erasure of traditional (often Christian-informed) norms, replacing them with a malleable “new normal” dictated by secular technocrats. This carries profound spiritual implications. As one generation’s anchors are cut loose, the next generation is set adrift in a sea of relativism and utopian ideals that may conceal, as the Apostle Paul warned, elemental powers opposed to Christ (Colossians 2:8). Civilizational risks accompany this spiritual drift: loss of cultural memory, breakdown of intergenerational solidarity, and vulnerability to tyrannical solutions in the face of crises (a youth populace lacking historical perspective may more readily embrace extreme measures proposed by charismatic figures – a pattern seen in various revolutionary movements).

Yet, amidst these challenges, there is hope if correction is heeded. Below are recommendations drawn from the findings, aimed at different stakeholders:

(i). **For Global Institutions and Policymakers:** Pursue intergenerational partnership rather than replacement. Initiatives like youth councils should serve as advisory and training grounds, not as substitutes for experienced decision-makers. The *United Nations* and governments might implement a “paired leadership” model: for instance, any youth representative at a high-level forum is mentored by a senior expert, ensuring continuity of wisdom. Recognize the value of elder statesmanship: create roles for retired leaders to guide and review major policy directions (Proverbs 11:14, “*in an abundance of counselors there is safety*”). Avoid rhetoric that categorically labels elder perspectives as “outdated” – such ageist bias is both unethical and shortsighted (Daldrop et al., 2025). Instead, foster mutual respect: progress with the steadying hand of experience.

(ii). **For Educational and Leadership Programs:** Reform the obsession with credentials by incorporating character and wisdom development as equally important outcomes. Business and public administration curricula, for example, could include

modules on the *history of leadership failures* (many due to youthful overreach or ethical compromise) to instill humility. Formalize ethics mentorship in fellowships like the Rhodes or Fulbright: assign fellows an elder mentor from a different culture or faith background to broaden their moral and philosophical horizons. In short, educate not only for *innovation*, but for *inheritance* – helping youth to appreciate the inheritance of values and lessons from those before them. As a practical step, philanthropic foundations might condition grants on evidence of intergenerational collaboration in organizations, thereby discouraging isolated echo-chambers of youth activism.

(iii). **For the Church and Christian Organizations:** Boldly reaffirm and model biblical leadership patterns. This means upholding the office of elder/pastor for those who meet the biblical qualifications (1 Timothy 3, Titus 1) – typically implying a degree of life maturity – and resisting pressures to dilute these standards for trendiness. Simultaneously, invest deeply in youth discipleship and leadership *under authority*. Like Paul with Timothy, entrust young believers with responsibilities *gradually*, as they demonstrate faithfulness (2 Timothy 2:2). Create church structures where the zeal of youth is harnessed but under the guidance of an elder board. For instance, a church might have a youth advisory team that proposes ideas, which are then vetted by elders for doctrinal soundness and practicality. By doing so, the church provides a powerful counter-witness to the world’s narrative: showing that honoring fathers and mothers (Ephesians 6:2) is not repressive but life-giving. Moreover, the church should become a refuge for disillusioned young people burned out by the world’s false promises. Many youth activists today eventually hit a wall of cynicism; the church can offer them something solid to anchor to – “*the faith that was once for all delivered to the saints*” (Jude 1:3), an ancient path leading to rest (Jeremiah 6:16).

(iv). **For the Youth Themselves (Christian or otherwise):** A recommendation in the form of counsel: *seek wisdom, not just knowledge; seek mentors, not just cheerleaders*. Young leaders should actively surround

themselves with a “kitchen cabinet” of older, wiser counselors. Far from hindering their success, this will protect and enhance it (Vaughan-Johnston et al., 2021). History is replete with young rulers who failed by neglecting elder advice (Rehoboam) and others who thrived by heeding it (e.g., Joshua under Moses’ mentorship). In practical terms, young professionals or activists might develop a personal board of advisors (older professionals, a pastor, a retired public servant, etc.). Additionally, question the flattery that comes your way in global leadership circles – when media or institutions hail youth as saviors, it can inflate pride. Remember the proverb: “*Before a downfall the heart is haughty, but humility comes before honor*” (Proverbs 18:12). Cultivate humility by learning from history and elder narratives. The theological horizon clarifies what is at stake. When technocratic projects flatten local moral ecologies into a single managerial script, the result approximates a modern Babel, a univocal order that mistakes human coordination for common grace (Genesis 11:1–9). The biblical counter-vision is not fragmentation but rightly ordered plurality: nations and churches governed by elders of proven character, welcoming youthful strength and vision under counsel, and submitting together to the Word. This order checks hubris and preserves liberty.

In closing, the title “*Youthful Power, Elder Eclipse*” encapsulates a real tension of our times. Power vested in youth can shine with energy and fresh vision, but if it fully eclipses the elder light, we lose depth perception – the long view of consequences and the anchor of identity. The globalist, credentialist push for youth-led everything might achieve short-term enthusiasm, but at what cost? This study has argued that the cost could be the loss of biblical leadership virtues that have long preserved communities: *patience, reverence, accountability, and accumulated wisdom*. As the world hurtles forward, the Church and all who care for enduring truth must gently but firmly remind society of the wisdom of “*the ancient paths*” (Jeremiah 6:16): “*Ask where the good way is, and walk in it, and you will find rest for your souls.*” In a restless age transfixed by the next new thing, such rest is the very thing we need –

a rest that comes from rightful order, where youthful zeal and elder wisdom unite under the gracious leadership of the Ancient of Days.

Limitations: This study is an integrative review and documentary analysis that relies on secondary sources published between 2000 and 2025. While inclusion criteria and the coding framework were specified in advance to reduce selection bias, the corpus is constrained by the visibility and accessibility of documents, the predominance of English-language materials, and the uneven archival practices of transnational organizations and philanthropies. Programmatic claims about initiatives such as UN Youth2030 and the Young Global Leaders network are interpreted from publicly available statutes, reports, and evaluations; internal implementation data and counterfactual evidence were not accessible. Constructs like credentialism, youth-first governance, and moral permissiveness are operationalized through established proxies, which may imperfectly capture underlying realities and can vary across contexts. The analysis is explanatory and normative rather than causal; it identifies consistent patterns and theoretical mechanisms but does not establish causal effects. Generalizability beyond Christian ecclesial and faith-informed institutional contexts should be made cautiously. Future research would benefit from mixed-method designs that link textual evidence with organizational performance data, cross-national cohort surveys, and longitudinal case studies comparing elder-led and youth-first governance models.

Conflict of Interest: The author is a pastor and lecturer whose scholarship is grounded in a Sola Scriptura framework. These theological commitments are disclosed as potential non-financial interests relevant to the interpretive lens of the study. The author has no financial relationships, advisory roles, grants, or paid consultancies with the United Nations, the World Economic Forum, affiliated philanthropies, or any programs evaluated in this manuscript. The author is affiliated with Open Christian University; this affiliation did not influence the design, analysis, or reporting of the

study. The author did not participate in any editorial handling or peer review decisions for this submission.

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. All research and writing were supported by the author's regular academic appointment, with no external financial support.

References

- Armendariz Sucunza, R., & Berehe, N. (2025, September 14). *The road to 2030: Youth can no longer be sidelined*. Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN). <https://www.unsdnsn.org/news/the-road-to-2030-youth-can-no-longer-be-sidelined>
- Brown, D. K. (2001). The social sources of educational credentialism: Status cultures, labor markets, and organizations. *Sociology of Education*, 74, 19–34. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2673251>.
- Carroll, B., & Firth, J. (2020). Leading or led? A critical exploration of youth leadership development. *Management Learning*, 52(1), 6–25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507620917849> (Original work published 2021)
- Christensen, G. (2023). Three concepts of power: Foucault, Bourdieu, and Habermas. *Power and Education*, 16(2), 182–195. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17577438231187129> (Original work published 2024)
- City of Boston. (2024, March 26). *Mayor Wu and Black Male Advancement award \$500,000 in grants to 63 community organizations supporting Black men and boys across Boston's neighborhoods*. <https://www.boston.gov/news/mayor-wu-and-black-male-advancement-award-500000-grants-63-community-organizations-supporting>
- Daldrop, C., Homan, A. C., & Buengeler, C. (2025). *Too young to lead? Role incongruity explains age bias against young leaders*. The Leadership Quarterly, 101878. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2025.101878>
- Erwin, R. (2024, December 22). *The second seduction: A review of The Fourth Turning is here*. Association of Professional Futurists. <https://www.apf.org/post/the-second-seduction-a-review-of-the-fourth-turning-is-here>
- Freemasons of British Columbia and Yukon. (n.d.). *Albert Pike's correspondence with Giuseppe Mazzini: A fraud*. https://freemasonry.bcy.ca/anti-masonry/pike_mazzini.html
- Gutting, G. (2022). *Michel Foucault*. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/foucault/#:~:text=however%2C%20suggests%20the%20need%20to,a%20critique%20of%20historical%20reason>
- Klement R J, Walach H (October 06, 2022) Is the Network of World Economic Forum Young Global Leaders Associated With COVID-19 Non-Pharmaceutical Intervention Severity?. *Cureus* 14(10): e29990. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7759/cureus.29990>
- Mitchell, L. A. (2022). *The color revolutions: Successes and limitations of non-violent protest*. In J. Goldstone (Ed.), *Handbook of revolutions in the 21st century* (pp. 435–445). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-86468-2_15
- Newport, F. (2025, September 4). *Trends in U.S. adults' acceptance of moral and values behaviors*. Gallup. <https://news.gallup.com/opinion/polling-matters/694550/trends-adults-acceptance-moral-values-behaviors.aspx>
- Open Society Foundations (OSF). (2015, May 15). *Open Society Foundations Youth Fellowship Program*. FundsforNGOs. <https://www.fundsforngos.org/youths-2/open-society-foundations-youth-fellowship-program/>.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development OECD. (2023). *Official development assistance for gender equality and women's empowerment: A snapshot* (DCD(2023)12). Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. [https://one.oecd.org/document/DCD\(2023\)12/en/pdf](https://one.oecd.org/document/DCD(2023)12/en/pdf)
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2025). *Government at a glance 2025: Youth representation in politics* (Chapter 13.6). OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/0efd0bcd-en>.
- Pew Research Center. (2024, May 1). *As Biden and Trump seek reelection, who are the oldest—and youngest—current world leaders?* <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2024/05/01/as-biden-and-trump-seek-reelection-who-ar>

- [e-the-oldest-and-youngest-current-world-leaders](#)
/
- Sangwa S.& Mutabazi P. (2025a). Lucifer's Operating System: Exposing the Spiritual Code of Global Governance. Open Journal of Business Theology, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=5344142> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5344142>
- Sangwa S. & Mutabazi P. (2025b). Population Growth and Poverty in Africa: Debunking the Neo-Malthusian Myth. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=5406128> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5406128>
- Sangwa S. & Mutabazi P. (2025c). Compliance as the New Competence: How Obedience Cultures Erode Innovation and Leadership Ethics in Global Workplaces. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=5371035> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5371035>
- Sangwa S. & Mutabazi P. (2025d). Rights-Based Reforms and the Corporate-Cooperative Family Paradox: A Seven-Country Analysis of Marital Dissolution in Africa (1995-2025). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=5368174> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5368174>
- Sharpe, K. (2021, June 9). *Youth as social change agents*. Youth Development Insight. <https://blog-youth-development-insight.extensio.n.umn.edu/2021/06/youth-as-social-change-agents.html>.
- Twenge, J. M. (2023). *Generations: The real differences between Gen Z, Millennials, Gen X, Boomers, and Silents—and what they mean for America's future*. Atria Books. <https://www.jeantwenge.com/generations-book-by-dr-jean-twenge/>
- UNICEF Innocenti. (2024). *Youth, protests and the polycrisis* [Report]. United Nations Children's Fund. <https://www.unicef.org/innocenti/media/7761/file/UNICEF-Innocenti-Youth-Protests-and-the-Polycrisis-%20report.pdf>
- United Nations Youth Office. (2018). *About Youth2030*. <https://www.un.org/youthaffairs/en/youth2030/about>
- United Nations Youth Office. (2025). *Youth2030 global progress report*. <https://www.un.org/youthaffairs/en/youth2030/progress-report>
- United Nations Youth Office. (2025). *About Youth2030: The UN Youth Strategy*. <https://www.un.org/youthaffairs/en/youth2030/about>
- United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR). (2019). *Youth empowerment*. Retrieved September 16, 2025, from <https://unitar.org/sustainable-development-goals/people/our-portfolio/youth-empowerment>
- Vaughan-Johnston, T., Imtiaz, F., Lee, A., & Ji, L.-J. (2021). Age differences in leadership positions across cultures. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, Article 703831. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.703831>
- Wienclaw, R. A. (2021). *Credentialism*. Research Starters. EBSCO. <https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/social-sciences-and-humanities/credentialism>
- Wikipedia. (2025, September 11). *Planetary consciousness*. In *Wikipedia*. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Planetary_consciousness
- World Economic Forum. (2022, September 16). *What are Young Global Leaders, and how are they tackling the world's biggest challenges?* [Radio Davos podcast episode]. Radio Davos. <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2022/09/young-global-leaders-ygl-radio-davos>
- World Economic Forum. (2025, August 14). *15 years on: Building the Global Shapers youth movement*. <https://www.weforum.org/stories/2025/08/building-a-global-youth-movement/>
- World Economic Forum. (2025, April). *A new generation of changemakers: Meet the YGL Class of 2025*. <https://www.weforum.org/stories/2025/04/new-generation-changemakers-meet-the-ygl-class-2025/>