



Analysis of Intellectocracy: A Contemporary Political Philosophy

Dr. Hafiz Hammaduddin
Ph.D from
Department of International Relations
FUUAST, Karachi – Pakistan
hafizhammaduddin@gmail.com

Dr. Shahnawaz Muhammad Khan
Assistant Professor
Department of International Relations
FUUAST, Karachi – Pakistan
shahnawaz.khan@fuuast.edu.pk

Muhammad Asif
Lecturer
Department of Political Science
Hazara University, Mancehra
KPK – Pakistan
Muhammadasif082@gmail.com

Abstract:

To decide how democratic system has missed the mark regarding meeting flow and future worldwide issues, along with what must be done to cure the present circumstance, the specialists directed their exploration around here. Intellectocracy is another political framework established on the Szellemiism theory, which contends that a person's capacity to cast a ballot ought not really set in stone by their schooling, experience, and information on the climate in which they live, regardless of whether public or worldwide. In spite of the fact that everybody is conceived something very similar, individuals make differentiations as indicated by philosophy as per their obtained ability to work in this world. The idea of intellectocracy is characterized as another political framework where chosen authorities at all levels are picked based on rules as opposed to individual tendencies and judgment yet additionally through weighted democratic using state of the art innovation based on singular agreement, information and experience. As indicated by the discoveries of the exploration, as the globe advances toward a troublesome territory,



it will be important for smart, patient, and educated pioneers to cooperate to deal with nearby and worldwide issues.

Keywords: Democratic system, philosophy, Politics, Education, Government.

Introduction

It is a fact that the globe slips across critical, problematic ground socially, economically or politically. It is not a supposition. In a world where new technology is exploding and the way things are done has changed dramatically, fascism and authoritarianism are on the rise. The insecurity of the future has evoked the idea of closing your eyes and return to the past instead of opening your eyes and taking this change, while making essential changes in institutionalism and ideology so as to accommodate the transformation to the good of the world's community as in the last two centuries, accepting capitalism and democracy as the only twin Democracy, being the nature of state before 1914, was not deemed a viable system of governance (Shumpeter, 1962). The American and French revolutions, together with the First World War and the American civil war, transformed democracy into a regime of the elite. Democracy was an ephemeral form of government. Democracy has been raised into the constitutional form of government, notably following the formation of the American constitution, out of its Athenian origins – essentially direct rule and deemed unstable non the long term.

Democracy as a new form of government wasn't disseminated around the world until US President Woodrow Wilson gave it new importance and advocated it as the only way for governing that can promote the good interests of any country during and after the First World War. Wilson advocated democracy on the idea that it is a sort of system that may create a stable administration taking account of its people's needs and wishes (Hobson, 2015). But Tocqueville (1835) and Riker (1982) also thought that democracy may unintentionally fall prey to demagoguery and a mediocre system of leadership. Riker (1982) therefore contends that demagoguery can lead to popular sentiments and mislead the public. Consequently, citizens should be informed and logical decisions made by their citizens. The same emphasis is given to good political leadership by Tocqueville (1969). He claimed that it would not be advantageous to enable all the people to be involved in the political process since that would provide individuals who are not enough qualified to occupy the office. Dahl (1982) rejects Riker on the grounds that increased democracy is the only option to resolve democratic issues. He also says that the democratic system should ensure that the public is not represented by a single interest group but that several of them must be elected. However, Tocqueville (1969) stressed that political parties are embedded with a restricted interest in themselves; thus, it raises the chances of social



polarisation, which ultimately exacerbates several disputes between different stakeholders.

He also believed that, mainly because of its intrinsic mechanisms that permitted the people to alter their views, democracy produced poor leaders. This research thus focuses on the function and features of political leadership and takes the methods used for selecting individuals who finally occupy public office into consideration. Aristotle didn't like democracy because he thought it might deteriorate into self-fulfilling governance (Cunningham, 2002). Kellerman (1986) therefore claimed that individuals who are eager to become politicians are really yearning for control. They usually do not want to serve the public in the greatest way possible, but rather increase their personal interest or richness.

In 1919 Weber argues that a political leader is otherwise "that can take advantage of the feelings of the multitude." Kellerman, on the basis of his qualities and abilities, discriminated against excellent and poor leaders. He stressed that effective leaders are capable of vision, mobilising the common people for the common good and ensuring order via cohesiveness in civilization (Masciulli et al., 2016). Kellerman also claimed that poor politicians are generally the ones who lack the competence and capacity to grasp the issue and make judgments accordingly (Langlias, 2014). The intellectocracy notion focuses on democracy, the kind of leadership picked by the State's qualified populace and the means utilised for political leadership. In particular, to obtain better political leadership, the technique to choose political leaders must be changed since intelligent, sober and widespread leadership cannot be practised systematically without alteration of processes for picking.

Reviewing the Contemporary Political Development

For the gravest observers of our present global situation, the notion that we are entering the period of human advancements characterised as 'high speed in our history and the unpredictability of its path.' Today, expectation and optimism are one of growing paradoxes, uncertainties and risks. Various psychological and physical obstacles were removed, considerable transfer of authority and influence from traditional centres (mainly governments) was abolished and civil society was helped in empowering and decentralising decision making. They allowed more connectivity but also isolation, the concentration of wealth in tighter circles, increasing expectations on continuous growth in living standards and broad concern for the sustainability of our development. As a result of significant improvements in baby mortality, a steady deterioration in average life expectancy, and an increase in literature, the different indicators have radically improved over the past half-century in light of a spectacular reduction in the frequency of serious



poverty. There are growth limits and we accomplish them as a projection, as suggested decades before. We cannot follow our current road without a breakdown and the past is not a future path.

Fear of the future, more insecurity, polarity and social gap, and lack of optimism is still more evident among young people today who are often faced with an uncertain future than that of their parents. The economy emphasises profit over employment for the wealthy, many advancing or even decreasing in the midst of decades, with half the world's population still having basic necessities. Poverty, marginalisation and neglect are fundamental societal issues that are not simple to resolve. The global economy is building up debt, threatening a decade before a return to financial catastrophe, while the capacity for manoeuvre of governments has substantially diminished. The disintegration forces are represented in the increasing evidence of poor governance institutions, with frequently discredited leadership, extensive corruption, the recent emergence of populists and the loss of public trust, authoritarian activities opposing diversity and multilateralism. A general lack of moral responsibility, higher ethics or values, or even spirituality, might contribute to all of this, filling the void left by materialistic society's absence of all higher human objectives.

In order to prevent a collapse and to achieve the required paradigm change and the fundamental transition towards a more sustainable future as the Agenda 2030 requires, there are counter-balancing integration forces and many signs of progress that need to be strengthened and expanding, including globally, by the United Nations (UN) and elsewhere.

In a worldwide culture and economy, the enhanced international authority must work a significant position in this critical time when, for social, economic and environmental reasons, change is more urgent. It is not simple to prioritise the various issues today, because they are all connected. Their complexity requires new ways for dynamic, interconnected systems that evolve through ongoing technological innovations, modes of communication, organisational patterns and institutional frameworks. The task for governance mechanisms at all levels of human organisation is to attend and guide such developments to guarantee the mutual benefit, establish limitations that prevent the already affluent and powerful from capturing them for their personal advantage and finally provide a just society that ensures the good of all the world's people.

Analysing Numerous Political Ideologies of Different Eras



Ideology is described as a doctrine providing direction in the anticipation of specific results for particular acts by humans. It is a method of defining and measuring social order using common criteria (Seliger, 1976). There have been various political ideas throughout history, but this study concentrates on those linked to or opposed to democracy. This essay will thus cover four ideologies: liberalism, socialism, fascism, and communism. Because key thinkers of the 19th century placed increased focus on research techniques, to comprehend via the concept of positivism, the connection between people and the state. Although socialism originated during the early industrialization of the mid-18th century in response to capitalism's rising influence. Before the 19th century, it was not directly associated with the revolutionary concept of Friedrich Engels and Karl Marx (Esenwein, 2004). From the late 18th through the late 20th century, there were various socialisms: reformist, revolutionary, historical, fabian, and democratic. Contrary to popular belief, Robert Owen and his colleagues described historical socialism as a system capable of achieving social and economic equality for all its members without necessarily including proletariat-bourgeois struggle.

During the 18th and 19th centuries, widespread education and rapid industrialization fueled socialism (Esenwein, 2004). From a system that fought capitalism without class distinctions, revolutionary socialism developed from the continuing struggle between the two classes within an industrialised society. Eventually, socialism became communism (Kyambalesa, 2019). According to certain academics such as Jules Guesde and Jean Léon Jaurès of France and Eduard Bernstein of Germany, the third kind of reformist socialism arose around the end of the 19th century. During the same era, Annie Besant and Bernard Shaw, both middle-class intellectuals, embraced Fabian socialism. The idea was to create a Fabian society where all members of society had equal economic and political rights, not only workers. The last form of socialism is democratic socialism. After the Soviet Union was founded in 1922, socialists were forced to choose between supporting Russian revolutionary socialism or remaining reformist socialists.

As a consequence, most socialists in Europe remained reformists. The socialist retreat lasted more than fifty years until the 1980s, when, by means of democratic methods, the Socialist Party of Spain and France embraced the intellectual foundation on which neoliberalism was based. Like the renowned British Labor Party, a Democratic-Socialist party. Socialism has helped the globe by fostering free education, social welfare and economic equality, whether you like it or not (Esenwein, 2004). In February 1848 Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels wrote a book called 'Communist Manifesto,' Marx is an ardent economist while Engels is an entrepreneur and philosopher. Marx argued that economics cannot be separated from politics since economics drives relations between individuals and states (Morgan, 2015). "Exchange value" is the genuine value plus the capitalist's



excess, and it is the true denominator of our task as workers, he remarked in his famous work "Das Kapital." True wages, in which a worker earns according to his labour and does not produce an additional surplus, were also fundamental to Marx's communism (Prychitko, 1988).

Furthermore, when work becomes a trade commodity, it generates the phenomena of "self-alienation." He stated that self-alienation takes place since the individual is compelled to labour so that he or she survives. He or she has no time for oneself or for the community he or she lives in, therefore the self-alienated one would be urgently called upon to rebel in a system and fulfil his or her real potential (Prychitko, 1988). However, until Lenin became the forehead of Marxism's doctrine by forming a "Vanguard Political Party," communism was not seen as the appropriate kind of administration (Morgan, 2015). However, Marx outlined various stages of communism, the first of which was each country's fundamental economic position. He was referring to a period of transition during which capitalism was destroyed in order to make way for the new system. At the time, he emphasised the proletarian revolutionary dictatorship - that is, during the transition period, the prospect of dictatorship exists, but only briefly, until the final and ultimate phase of communism occurs, when social classes vanish and the state eventually vanishes, since the state, in his view, is a symbol of class conflict. However, Leninism placed a greater emphasis on the transition period, claiming that the Vanguard party or "Bolsheviks – Russian Communist Party" was tasked with the responsibility of constructing a whole society. Lenin advanced Marxist thought in building the political framework essential for a truly socialist system, or communist society (Prychitko, 1988).

However, he died in 1924, following the establishment of the Soviet Union in 1922 and Stalin's opportunity to seize power. However, rather than advancing Lenin's cause, he pursued self-advancement and utilised Communism as a tool to expand his geographical control in European countries (Janos, 1996). Mao Zedong, another passionate Communist leader, brought a new dimension to Marxism by introducing a new war plan in Vietnam and China termed the 'guerilla war strategy,' with the goal of eventually replacing China's system with the new Com model. Although Mao and Lenin had major disagreements, both tried to realise their communist ideals through a political organisation (Morgan, 2015). Fascism is the name given to an ideology that integrated certain communist ideals and is still prominent today. It was an Italian term that was largely used in the first half of the twentieth century but has remained influential in the field of political dialectics to the present day. The role of fascist ideology may be traced all the way back to the late 1860s civil war. However, in the early twentieth century, it resurged during the First World War and remained popular until the Second World War, when Mussolini and Hitler alternated



as Italian and German leaders (Paxton, 1998). It is an ideology that is not based on a pre-imposed State identity but on a political system that values the individual's historical and cultural identity. It is the ideology that promotes ethnic identity and asserts that some ethnic groups have been valued more than others throughout history due to their superiority (e.g. morally, intellectually and physically). Thus, philosophy does not believe in the supremacy of individual liberty (e.g. liberalism) or societal organisation (e.g. communism), but in a common or ethnic superiority, emphasising the individual's ongoing struggle to maintain such superiority (Mussolini, 1932).

Interestingly, fascism, which is normally popular through its mass popularisation method, does not occupy the international political scene without the aid of its conservative allies and sometimes even fascism is created by politics of conservative manner (e.g. India). In the 19th and 20th centuries, "Modern Liberalism" re-emerged as a philosophy after some of its basic principles were modified (Bell, 2014). Others, like Stanton (2018), see Locke or Hobbes as the founding founders of modern liberalism in the 17th century. In addition, liberalism is typically put in the realm of democracy, even though it was particularly in the 19th century that some scientists sought to combine the two notions, democracy and liberalism. But Shklar (1957) said that liberalism's basic purpose is to build a legal framework that guarantees maximum human freedom to gain economic, social and political advantages. However, it was also the concept, extensively debated and celebrated during a period of light which was an important ideology that in the last 200 years other ideologies such as socialism, communism and fascism were developed (Alexander, 2014).

It is the ideology that underlines the independence of people in the interpretation of the world around them and in their realisation of their individual rights. However, liberalism is distinct from communism or socialism, which refers to a genuine social unit as a person. Liberalism owes individual rights and sees them as independent, independent and non-externally influential, whereas socialism owes them the same rights but emphasises that human acts are influenced by their environment (Alexander, 2014). The Definition of Kant from 1991 states that liberal societies would have three features: firstly 'freedom for all members of society,' secondly 'common law' and thirdly.' Several writers have created the idea of liberalism during the last three hundred years and the notable figures include Friedrich von Hayek, Locke, Hobbes, Milton Friedman, John Maynard Keynes, John Rawls, Sabine, Laski, Kant and Mill (Harrison & Boyd, 2018). Because this research focuses on the future of liberalism, the aforementioned writers will only explore relatively few definitions and concerns. Hobbes was the first person to speak about human natural rights and he is free to make informed decisions about his life as a human being. In his two main writings, *Letter Concerning Toleration* (1689) and *Two Treatises*



on Government Locke argued for capitalism and stressed individual ownership rights and social compacts (1690). (Columbia, 2018). 1967, 1967, 1967. Liberalism was the foundation of concepts of freedom, individualism, equality and pluralism.

The conceptual evolution of liberalism, classical liberalism, modern liberalism and neo-liberalism has undergone three changes (Harris & Boyd, 2018). Locke was a defender of traditional liberalism, stating that the state should provide the means by which maximal freedom and rational choice for all Member States may be ensured. Locke was followed by Laski and Sabine, thus Laski (1936) claimed freedom was the government's responsibility in the liberal society, and the government's development was the direct consequence of the governor's consent. It is by permission, in fact. Sabine (1939) claimed that self-interest is prominent in a liberal society. Locke, therefore, saw personal freedoms as more important and the government should not meddle in the area of private property and freedom (Stanton, 2018). However, opponents of classical liberalism argued that liberalism fostered negative freedom and not positive freedom. Accordingly T.H Green and L.T. Hobhouse argued that unfettered self-interest and promotion of capitalism will worsen poverty and uneven income distribution across society. So, by taxing the affluent and welfare of the poor and investing in public services, the State needs to interfere and foster positive freedom. That is when the concept of social welfare was born; for the first time ever, Britain started to support programmes for its residents (Harris & Boyd, 2018).

In fact, the current type of liberalism, known as "neo-liberalism," lies in classic and modern liberalism. While new liberalism welcomed and assigned the duty of redistribution and welfare the State involvement, it was rejected by classic liberalism and urged to minimise it. According to neo-liberalists, the state should give welfare and remain out of the economic process until when absolutely required. So the major role of government now is to control the economy through monetary and financial policy, rather than managing the economy through demand management, as Keynes advocated during his time as Secretary of State in the 1940s. As a result, the bulk of liberalism's fundamental ideas are accepted by all cultures on Earth today, including the concept of ruler consent and the ruler as supreme arbitrator, plurality, tolerance, and the resolution of conflicts by argument rather than violence (Boyd & Harris, 2018). As previously stated, the concepts outlined above have stayed relevant for millennia because they were relevant to the culture in which they evolved and flourished.

However, as a result of the new difficulties posed by technical advancements and the expansion of globalisation, they have become outmoded or useless in some form in many cases. Future ideology will, as a result, reflect contemporary reality in order to fill the gap



left by twenty-first-century changes. It is important to note that Szellemiism (derived from the Hungarian language) is in no way linked to liberalism since it emphasises the individual's right to liberty and the state's duty as the last defender of people who live on its land. Rather than emotional sentiments or consciousness, the essential basis of this philosophy is reason and objective evaluation of persons, things, and events, rather than emotional feelings or consciousness. It believes in the principles of positive liberty, justice for everyone, economic and political equality, poverty reduction, individualism, and a global rather than a national view on issues. Additionally, it adheres to egalitarian ideals in both politics and the economic sphere. It is a political philosophy that seeks to establish a new political system in which leaders at all levels, including organisational, subnational, and national levels, are elected on the basis of rational choices and political equality for individuals based on their objective understanding and knowledge of national or global issues, rather than on party or ideological affiliation. It is the concept that a person's ability to vote should be defined by his or her educational background, work experience, and awareness of the environment on a national or international level that is referred to as Szellemiism.

Essentially, this concept states that all individuals are born equal, but that their acquired performance in this environment leads to a disparity between them. As a result, they must all be granted political rights in proportion to their ability to engage in the political system. It also argues that corporate merit is the most effective representation of this method of value creation since its performance now rests largely on its contribution to human resources and is not appreciated for its ability and aptitude simply to be mature human beings. The primary premise of ideology is the individual's intellect and abilities rather than his/her conscience or instinct.

Intellectocracy - A Modern Concept

Intellectocracy isn't a new political system in reality but it is nevertheless a new wine in the same bottle of democracy. Democracy means "a kind of people governance or people governance," Intellectocracy is sometimes referred to as "a type of governance for those who are smart or productive and not equal by all the eligible residents of the allocated region" and is based on the ideology of Szellemiism. It is a type of governance led by individuals who comprehend the problems provided by the domestic and global situation and who are able to address some of them, if not all of the mental, intellectual and physical challenges. This is a type of administration in which politicians are not only picked for their speech and propaganda abilities, but for their knowledge, wisdom and personal aptitude to address contemporary public and international problems. Nevertheless, two kinds of democratic systems are widely employed by contemporary



nations in selecting their current leaders, namely presidential and parliamentary democracy and each involves three primary functions: executive, legislative and judicial. Politicians accomplish their first two roles, Executive and legislative, using political and bureaucratic procedures; however, the difficulty is the fact that they are appointed not on the basis of their natural intellect, experience and extraordinary knowledge of state difficulties but on the basis of majority vote. The majority dictatorship can be attributed to this fact (Tocqueville, 1835) which combines a desire for the majority of all to decide, even the minority. The majority of voting is a process of communal decision-making rather than a vote on the bulk of the state's current concerns (Levine, 1981).

This distinguishes intellectocracy from democracy because it stresses the fact that every citizen of the state should not have equal right to vote and the vote should be weighted, as John Stuart Mill argued in 1976 that the educated and professional experts should have more votes in the political system. However, the problem with Mill's argument is that it contradicts the very core premise of democracy as well as the individual's ability to act rationally in their own lives. The idea of liberal democracy and is also in direct conflict with the authority of people who believe in them (Cunningham, 2002).

A solution to this problem is provided by the concept of Intellectocracy, which emphasises that political leaders are formed by political entities, rather than just by political parties. The parties, whether they believe Schumpeter's Classical Pluralism (1962), Macpherson (1965), Locke (1967), Mill's (1976), Sartori (1987) should acknowledge the need for an intellectual and democratic mechanism to choose future leaders as they are for presidential and parliamentary forms of democracy. The political parties system shall take into account the training, experience and social work (not simply the political careers and status) of the candidates, so that they choose, based on the type of person, by utilising technology to compete and then take over the democratic process. Later, the process of democracy should be introduced into the realm of domestic politics when it has culminated in political parties. This indicates that leaders should be nominated for national or sub-national level when picked by a majority of political workers. Riker (1982) stated that voting isn't a method of aggregating voting preferences, but rather a way of getting rid of leaders who didn't fulfil their expectations. In practice, voting has become either a means to advance one's own interests without regard for the interests of the general public, or a means to express one's own feelings without regard for the views of others (Elster, 1998b). Consequently, intelligence-based democracy focuses on the basic issue of democracy; they are voting procedures if every individual living in the region has equal voting rights, which they do if they do not. Equal voting rights for all people in a particular region is unjust since it parallels giving the same weight to a peon and a head of state.



By extension, the concept of intellectocracy is consistent with John Stuart Mill's concept of weighted voting rights, in which the vote is weighted in accordance with each individual's contribution to society and his or her education, career, and welfare activities are weighted in accordance with his or her contribution to society. Despite this, intellectocracy does not reject individual rights or a liberal democratic individualistic point of view and does not think that two persons may be distinguished by declaring one to be superior to the other. Rather, it simply draws attention to the distinction between those who have reached their greatest potential and those who have not. It focuses on global complexity as a result of globalisation, as well as on rapid technological advancement in the world today. It is now apparent that world leaders must stand out collectively, rather than individually, in order to address the issues at hand. This indicates the need for thorough selection and balloting of the political leaders at junior and senior levels rather than a majority, as is the case in fundamental democracy. No more than 20 per cent of the voters should get the weighting of the vote, and no more than one and no more than three.

The use of technology can aid in the construction of voting systems; however, if the total election turnover is greater than 60%, the weighted average should be reduced in order to justify the use of the electoral technique. It is a system in which every member of society has the right to vote for its leaders at all levels of society, from the lowest to the highest, but only if they possess the necessary abilities. Whether or not it is a constitutional democracy, Intellectocracy always opts for the representative government as in the famous British democracy example. The idea of personal freedom, collective security and social security will remain the same as that of enhanced democracy, but the processes used to elect politicians at all levels will be more focused and majority-winning systems will restructure the current political system so as not to pave the way for authoritarianism or fascism. Strong federalism and rational control and balances would be advocated by the intellectocracy to preserve the stability of the system.

Examining Intellectocracy in Current Political Era

It is a reality that society requires competent leaders in business, technology, politics or various other sectors throughout the world. Field leaders decide on the present and the future of their regions, as Ibrahim Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson of the 20th century, Henry Ford of the 19th and Steve Jobs from the 21st century can be seen in the best instances. Leadership is largely based on two factors: personality and circumstance, which influence the kind and type of management style. Thus, conventional, charismatic and rational forms of governance as proposed by Weber (1964) in various political and social circumstances. But Tucker (1981) reasoned that humankind requires intelligent political



leaders that comprehend and are able with their abilities, their vision and their fresh thoughts to solve national and global issues. Several scholars, including Hildebrand (2019), have lately claimed that democracy in the twenty-first century is not a desirable form of governance since, while we have the system in place in other areas, it does not have a means for selecting competent individuals (e.g. judiciary, bureaucracy, etc.). The environmental complexity, false news, and the internet are components of the democratic process, according to Hildebrand (2019), and they are thus insufficient for the twenty-first century, according to Hildebrand. According to Rawls (1993), democracy in the twenty-first century is heavily reliant on the constitutional framework; however, the problem is that because the Constitution was established ten years ago, it cannot be used to address current problems and challenges unless it is amended to take into account today's challenges and challenges. Consequently, intelligence-based governance supports significant constitutional reforms to prepare the way for global coordination and collaborative decision-making, rather than the use of regional or national constitutions.

This includes the creation of a global constitution. Democratization has survived for so long, according to Ferrara (2013), because of its ability to manage environmental concerns successfully (e.g. economic, political and social). But the 21st century is a riddle that is difficult for many components of the environment to align. Helbing et al. (2017) noted that while technological development supported the notion of economic automation and social control post World War II, the tools to do this were lacking. This image has shifted dramatically in recent years as a result of the development of AI, which not only comprehends data patterns but can also interpret them on its own. Additionally, Helbing et al. (2017) stated that it will alter future political systems by enabling huge manipulation of human judgments through the use of AI, therefore screening the political process for democratic basic principles of individual thinking and discretion. Additionally, you stated that from the perspective of smart computers, we are headed toward AI, where technology would control not just a portion of you, but the entire person. The use of cutting-edge technologies such as artificial intelligence and biotechnology attempts to either comprehend or regulate the emotional self of the human being or to create genetically better individuals. Under these circumstances, the distributed system of political decision-making, for example, democracy, would be subjected to unchecked pressure, resulting in poor outcomes, as candidates in the world's two largest democracies, the United States and India, could easily assess following recent elections.

Intellectocracy, I believe, is the only viable option for a future global political system, because it is an intelligent system based on the system of social media camps (e.g. India, USA, and other manipulative gimmicks), rather than on equal decision-making, but on



the systemic combination of two distinct, eligible voices. Nuclear weapons are no longer a concern in the twenty-first century, but the employment of biological weapons, artificial intelligence, and the collecting and use of massive amounts of data for political and social choices have created a scenario in which civilians within the State face a personal threat. Thus, the process of picking leaders has to be modified to open the way for people with a vision to resolve current and future issues and creative methods not simply to grasp the complexity of current events. Because climate change, world terrorism, networking and inter-territorial commerce complexities have made the globe exactly like a larger spider web where the one web is connected and the source of the original web is difficult to locate. In such a circumstance, when fresh information is newly normally processed and sophisticated at every passing minute, leaders with a centuries-old political system cannot be chosen. Through its education and experience, and its grasp of domestic and global concerns, however, the intellects utilise state-of-the-art technology to advance and promulgate the notion of picking leaders not just because of their fame and their polling expedient. Through the Intellectocracy process, the heads of the top countries (Germany, Britain, France, United States of America etc.) are also responsible for world stability and peace. This can only take place if the people of the world realise that they need a worldwide composition and that they need urgently to reform their present constitutions and alternative measures so that they may pave the way not only for their citizens but also for global citizens to rule and share visions.

Key Findings:

- Intellectocracy may be an option in the future for democracy
- Intellectocracy does not have any difficulty respecting liberal values (freedom of speech, individual decision making, individual human rights etc.).
- The philosophy of szellemiism is founded on the fact that the right to vote for individual politicians must be rooted in their education, experience and expertise.
- Why Intellectocracy in the 21st century is the most appropriate political system because those political leaders elected through the existing political system are unable to face the problems.
- Intellectocracy promotes a notion of political rights on the basis of its qualifications, both extrinsic and intrinsic, and not only human rights
- Intellectocracy follows that the voting rights should be weighted according to qualifications and experience, but no more than 20% of the eligible constituents must be allocated weightage voting rights and a vote of at least 1 and a maximum of 3 must be counted



- Why Intellectocracy trusts the global leadership and the notion of a global constitution by jointly electing intellectual, strong leaders and tackling global challenges
- Intellectocracy has a system inherent in addressing and solving technical and environmental challenges by choosing those who can best comprehend them.

Conclusion

The purpose of this research was to examine the concept of intellectocracy and how it developed from the old notion of democracy, as well as why it is critical in the near future to put that new political system into practice. It also sheds light on many of the old governmental beliefs, including socialism, liberalism, communism and fascism thereby hosting a new dogmatic doctrine-Szellemism that essentially stresses the necessity to have the right to vote on the basis of one's own experience, education and evaluation of the outside situation. This study provides comprehensive information about intellectual democracy and its advantages and barriers and challenges in choosing intellectual leaders with advanced technology, confronted by the people of the 21st century. It also highlighted precautions in today's system in terms of current political power, notably democracy. The researchers then analysed and associated those characteristics with present leadership and the current global conditions stemming from the development of AI and bioengineering. These conditions were investigated. Finally, the researcher looked at the method in which leaders are presently being elected and how those who have gone to power cannot recognise, analyse and deal innovatively with domestically and globally issues. Therefore, the investigator started a new political procedure through which leaders, not only inhabitants of the region but also people globally, are elected because of their intellectual, physical and political potential.



References

- Alexander, J. (2014). The major ideologies of liberalism, socialism and conservatism. *Political Studies*, 63(5), 980-994.
- Bell, D. (2014). What is liberalism?. *Political theory*, 42(6), 682-715.
- Cunningham, F. (2002). *Theories of Democracy: A Critical Introduction*. Routledge, London
- Dahl, R.A.(1982). *Dilemmas of Pluralist Democracy: Autonomy vs. Control*. Yale University Press, New Haven
- De Toqueville, A. (1835). *Democracy in America*. A Mentor Book from New American Library, New York
- De Tocqueville, A. (1969). *Democracy in America*, ed. Phillips Bradley, 2, 209-25.
- Esenwein, G.(2004). Socialism [PDF]. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311885000_Socialism
- Elster, J. (1998b). Deliberation and constitution making. In Elster, J. (Eds.), *Deliberative Democracy* (pp 97-122). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Ferrara, A. (2013). Judging democracy in the 21st century: crisis or transformation? [PDF]. Retrieved from <http://www.helsinki.fi/nofo/NoFo10FERRARA.pdf>
- Harper and Row Hobson, C. (2015). *The Rise of Democracy*. Edinburgh University Press, UK.
- Harrison, K., Boyd, D. (2018). Liberalism [PDF]. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327127007_Liberalism
- Helbing, D., Frey, B. S., Gigerenzer, G., Hafen, E., Hagner, M., Hofstetter, Y., & Zwitter, A. (2019). Will democracy survive big data and artificial intelligence?. In *Towards digital enlightenment* (pp. 73-98). Springer, Cham.
- Hilderband, M.(2019). Democracy Is Failing [Online]. Retrieved from <https://medium.com/@PhiJay/democracy-is-failing-2ad03247ca99>
- Janos, A. C. (1996). What was communism: A retrospective in comparative analysis. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, 29(1), 1-24.
- Kellerman, B. (1986). *Political Leadership: A Source Book*. University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, USA
-



- Kyambalesa, H. (2019). A Critique of Socialism and Marxism [PDF]. Retrieved from [file:///C:/Users/Administrator/Downloads/SSRN-id3463337%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/Administrator/Downloads/SSRN-id3463337%20(1).pdf)
- Langlais, S. (2014). The Meaning of Leadership in Political Systems [Master Dissertation]. Linnaeus University, Sweden.
- Laski, H. J. (1936). *The Rise of Liberalism: The philosophy of a business civilization*. Harper & brothers.
- Levine, A.(1981). *Liberal Democracy: A Critic of Its Theory*. Columbia University Press, New York
- Locke, J.(1689). A Letter Concerning Toleration (1689) [PDF]. Retrieved from http://oasocialstudies.tripod.com/13-Locke_Toleration.pdf
- Locke, J. (1967). *Locke: Two treatises of Government (1690)*. Cambridge University Press.
- Macpherson, C. B. (1965). *The real world of democracy*. House of Anansi, Concord, USA.
- Masciulli, J., Molchanov, M. A., & Knight, W. A. (2016). Political leadership in context. In *The Ashgate research companion to political leadership* (pp. 23-48). Routledge.
- Mill, J.S. (1976). 'On Liberty', in *Essays on Politics and Society*. In Robson, J.M. (Eds), *Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, vol. xviii (p.348). Toronto and London.
- Morgan, W. J. (2015). Marxism–Leninism: The Ideology of Twentieth-Century Communism. *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 656-662.
- Mussolini, B. (1932). The Doctrine of Fascism[PDF]. Retrieved from <https://www.sjsu.edu/people/cynthia.rostankowski/courses/HUM2BS14/s0/The-Doctrine-of-Fascism.pdf>
- Paxton, R. O. (1998). The Five Stages of Fascism. *The Journal of Modern History*, 70(1), 1-23.
- Prychitko, D. L. (1988). Marxism and decentralized socialism. *Critical Review*, 2(4), 127-148.
- Rawls, J. (1993). *Political Liberalism*. Columbia University Press, New York.



- Riker, W. H. (1982). *Liberalism Against Populism: A Confrontation Between the Theory of Democracy and the Theory of Social Choice*. W.H. Freeman & Company, San Francisco.
- Sabine, G. H. (1939). What is a political theory?. *The Journal of Politics*, 1(1), 1-16.
- Sartori, G. (1987). *The Theory of Democracy Revisited*. Catham Publishers, Catham, NJ.
- Schumpeter, J.(1962). *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. New York:
- Stanton, T. (2018). John Locke and the fable of liberalism. *Historical Journal*, 597-622.
- Seliger, M. (1976). *Ideology and Politics*. Allen & Unwin, London.
- Shklar, J. N. (1957) *After utopia: The decline of political faith*. Princeton University Press, New Jersey.
- Tucker, R. C. (1981). *Politics as leadership*. University of Missouri Press, Columbia MO.
- Weber, M. (1919). *Le Savant et le Politique*. Union Générale d'Editions, Paris.
- Weber M. (1964). *The Theory of Social Economic Organization*. The Free Press, New York