



(RESEARCH ARTICLE)



## Rethinking Human Democracy: From Majoritarianism to Meritocracy

Nasip DEMİRKUŞ \*

*Department of Biology, Faculty of Education, Van Yüzüncü Yıl University, Tuşba, Van, Turkey.*

World Journal of Advanced Engineering Technology and Sciences, 2026, 19(01), 117-124

Publication history: Received on 28 February 2026; revised on 05 April 2026; accepted on 08 April 2026

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjaets.2026.19.1.0203>

### Abstract

This study examines the "Human Democracy" model, grounded in the corpus of Prof. Dr. Nasip Demirkuş, as a comprehensive response to the deepening governance crises of the twenty-first century. The model criticizes the current majoritarian and secular liberal democracy understanding as "Quantitative Majoritarian Democracy" and simultaneously as "Defective/Incomplete/Natural (Savage) Democracy" due to its moral vacuum, lack of meritocracy, and quantitative hegemony. In contrast, it proposes a merit-based and radical governance paradigm that places "Humane Ethics" (universal virtues derived from the Prophet Muhammad's attribute of 'al-Amin' and the Hanif tradition of Abraham) at the center of politics. (Demirkuş, 2008; Demirkuş, 2025a; Demirkuş, 2025e) The study analyzes the model's epistemological foundations (the distinction between Science and *Ilm* [Wisdom], the dual-winged human nature, the difference between Reason and Intellect), its theoretical framework (the integrity of religion-morality-politics, the concept of Humane Secularism), and its practical application mechanisms (Moral Score System, Behavior Archive, Synergic Assembly, Seven Oaths system, State-Funded Elections). Subsequently, the model is evaluated in the context of contemporary political philosophy (communitarianism, virtue ethics, epistemic democracy, epistocracy) and Islamic political thought (the *Shura* tradition, Al-Farabi's *Al-Madina Al-Fadila* theory). While the model is seen as a strong contribution in terms of its radical critique, emphasis on virtue, and concrete proposals, it is open to serious criticism regarding applicability, pluralism, individual liberties, and the risks associated with an absolute understanding of morality. In response to these criticisms, this study presents a revised version of the model, a gradual transition strategy, and the "Universal Human State" goal, which is the ultimate vision of the model.

**Keywords:** Human Democracy; Humane Ethics; Meritocracy; Synergic Assembly; Political Epistemology

### 1. Introduction: Seeking an Answer to a Paradigm in Crisis

The twenty-first century faces a multi-layered and existential governance crisis on a global scale. While liberal democracies grapple with fundamental challenges such as populism, deep polarization, institutional distrust, and injustice in representation, authoritarian tendencies are gaining strength. (Page, 2011; Fricker, 2007) Contrary to Francis Fukuyama's thesis of the "end of history," liberal democracy is shaken by a crisis of legitimacy and efficacy rather than achieving universal victory. (Grönund et al., 2015) In response to this crisis, deliberative (discussion and debate-based) democracy research has focused on improving the quality of citizen participation and refining social deliberation processes. (Estlund, 2008; Habermas, 1992)

This study discusses and analyzes the "Human Democracy" model, developed based on the writings of Prof. Dr. Nasip DEMİRKUŞ, within the context of these pursuits. The model criticizes the current system as "Quantitative Majoritarian Democracy" or "Defective/Incomplete/Natural (Savage) Democracy," proposing instead a radical alternative centered on "Humane Ethics," based on merit, and observing universal human values. (Demirkuş, 2008; Demirkuş, 2025a; Demirkuş, 2025b) The main objective of the study is to present the Human Democracy model not merely as a proposal for regime change, but as a holistic "civilization construction project" extending from epistemology to pedagogy, and

\* Corresponding author: Nasip DEMİRKUŞ

from economics to law. In this renewed version, improvements addressing the criticized aspects of the model and mechanisms to increase applicability are proposed. The model is a comprehensive socio-political system proposal that brings a new vision of human nature, information theory, state structure, and global order, going beyond a mere electoral reform proposal.

---

## 2. Epistemological and Ontological Foundations

Every political regime rests on an implicit or explicit conception of humanity and knowledge. While liberal democracy is founded on the "rational individual" and "secular science," the Human Democracy model is grounded in the "dual-winged human" (nature-spirit duality) and the "Hierarchy of *Ilm*-Science." (Demirkuş, 2008; Demirkuş, 2025d) This epistemological and ontological distinction constitutes the philosophical ground for all the model's practical proposals.

### 2.1. The Distinction Between Science and *Ilm*: Repositioning Truth

The model makes a sharp distinction between "Science" and "*Ilm*" (Wisdom/Divine Knowledge): (Demirkuş, 2008; Demirkuş, 2025b)

Science (Positive Knowledge): It is a "tool" produced by human intellect (*Zeka*) and the natural/instinctual personality (nature-personality), used to recognize the environment and survive in temporary worldly life. Science is transient, relative, and instrumental; it serves human biological needs but cannot answer the ultimate questions of purpose and meaning.

*Ilm* (Wisdom/Divine Knowledge): These are eternal and absolute truths grasped by human reason (*Akıl*) and spiritual personality, originating from the Creator's attribute of *El-Alim*. *Ilm* encompasses science; science is merely a "worldly" and "technical" subset of *Ilm*.

The fundamental ontological error of the current system is "positioning the human *within* science." This reduces the human to merely biological and statistical data, like a laboratory rat. However, in the epistemology of Human Democracy, science is *within* the human; the human is intellectually and spiritually greater than science and transcends it. This ontological shift requires the restructuring of all institutions, from education to politics.

### 2.2. The Duality of Human Nature: Angelic and Animalistic Wings

Prof. Dr. Nasip DEMİRKUŞ 's political theory is built upon the dynamic and conflicted structure of human nature: (Demirkuş, 2008; Demirkuş, 2025d)

Angelic Wing: This wing consists of "Angelic Reason," "Prophetic Spirit," "Prophetic Conscience," and "Humane Ethics." It prioritizes human elevation, working for the good of society, justice, and mercy. Through this wing, humans possess the capacity for responsibility, sacrifice, honesty, and long-term thinking.

Animalistic Wing: This wing consists of "Intellect" (*Zeka*), "Ego" (*Nefs*), "Savage Conscience," and "Animalistic Morality." Selfishness, greed, the desire to dominate, cunning, and short-term interest calculations are products of this wing.

Modern capitalist society systemically encourages this animalistic wing. Demirkuş draws a sharp line between "Reason" (*Akıl*) and "Intellect" (*Zeka*): Reason is directly proportional to Humane Ethics and accounts for death, the afterlife, and long-term responsibility. Intellect, however, is the "operating system" of the ego; it finds quick solutions and manipulates, but lacks moral criteria. The current education system is structured to develop "intellect" while causing "reason" to atrophy. Human Democracy reverses this balance, placing "education of reason" at the center.

### 2.3. Autistic Scientific Personality" and Mental Immunity

The human type produced by the modern education system is defined as the "Autistic Scientific Personality." (Demirkuş, 2008; Demirkuş, 2025b) This type may be competent in their field of expertise (medicine, engineering, economics) but experiences blindness regarding social issues, moral evaluations, and consciousness of long-term responsibility. This separation of technical knowledge from human wisdom prepares the ground for "expert despotism" and "techno-fascism." Against this, Human Democracy develops the concept of "Mental Immunity." (Demirkuş, 2013) Education and politics must establish an immune system that renders individuals resistant to pathogenic ideas, cultural assimilation, and "rubbish morality."

### **3. The Reintegration of Religion, Morality, And Politics**

#### **3.1. The Role of Religion in the Public Sphere**

The most distinct feature of the Human Democracy model is its insistence on basing politics on a moral and religious foundation. According to Demirkuş (2008; Demirkuş, 2025e), religion "deciphers the ruthless and immoderate rules of interest based on politics, economics, and administration, and constitutes the source for revealing more humane-merciful rules." Humane Ethics is defined as a whole of universal virtues—such as honesty, consciousness of trust (*amanah*), justice, and mercy—embodied in the Prophet Muhammad's pre-prophetic attribute of "al-Amin" (the Trustworthy) and the Hanif tradition of Abraham. (Demirkuş, 2008) This approach creates points of contact with certain contemporary approaches that center on "Moral Revelation" rather than "Political Revelation" in Islamic political thought, interpreting Sharia as an ethical framework rather than merely a legal code. (Soroush, 2000; Abou El Fadl, 2004)

#### **3.2. "Humane Secularism": Critique of Secularism and an Alternative Concept**

The model rejects the rigid French-type secularism ("Natural Secularism"). According to DEMİRKUŞ, "Natural Secularism" has turned science and secular ideologies into a new "religion," evolving into a process that assimilates the beliefs of the public. In contrast, the concept of "Humane Secularism" is proposed: (Demirkuş, 2008; Demirkuş, 2025f)

Operation: The state is like a "father" standing at an equal distance to different faiths and cultures ("tribes"). It does not allow any group to assimilate another and constitutionally guarantees the "authenticity" of each group.

Reference: The reference of the state is not dogmatic Sharia rules, but "universal human virtues" such as honesty, justice, and loyalty to the trust.

This partially overlaps with discussions of "positive secularism" or "openness to public religion" in the Anglo-American tradition. (International Islamic Fiqh Academy, 2015; Casanova, 1994)

---

### **4. Structural analysis and critique of the current system: "quantitative and savage democracy"**

#### **4.1. Quantitative Hegemony and the "Tyranny of the Majority"**

From the perspective of Human Democracy, the greatest weakness of existing democracies is the understanding of legitimacy based on "numerical majority." DEMİRKUŞ, terms this system "Quantitative Majoritarian Democracy" or "Savage Democracy" because the principle "might (numerical quantity) makes right" prevails. (Demirkuş, 2008; Demirkuş, 2025b) The current system is characterized as "divisive" and "savage" because it turns numerical superiority into the sole criterion of truth and justice, whereby "the majority governs with votes that outstrip the minority." (Abizadeh, 2021)

#### **4.2. "Minority Party Democracy" and the Illusion of Representation**

DEMİRKUŞ characterizes existing parliamentary systems as "Party (Minority) Democracy." (Demirkuş, 2008; Demirkuş, 2025b) Politics is founded on "begging for votes." Parties, when they come to power, obtain the right to rule the entire society with a minority vote share, such as 30-40%. Elections have turned into arenas of manipulation for professional politicians and capital groups rather than a reflection of the public's will.

---

### **5. Practical Model and Implementation Mechanisms**

Human Democracy is a comprehensive system proposal offering detailed practical mechanisms. The table below summarizes the model's key implementation tools:

**Table 1** Key Implementation Mechanisms of the Human Democracy Model

Mechanism	Operation	Intended Effect	Enhanced Safeguards / Potential Criticisms
Moral Score System	Individuals are evaluated from preschool onwards by a Multi-Evaluator Commission ('Seven Oaths' teachers) based on criteria of compliance with 'Humane Ethics,' responsibility, and honesty. The score becomes determinant in university entrance and career selection.	To objectify moral merit, entrust governance to virtuous individuals, and link social status to moral performance.	Multi-evaluator system; Transparent algorithm; Objection and appeal mechanism; Records deleted over time; Criticism regarding subjectivity risk and privacy violation.
Behavior Archive	A confidential database managed by experts and 'Seven Oaths' sages, tracking the moral development of individuals. Scores are confidential, but there is a right to query for specific criteria.	Long-term tracking of moral behaviors, providing objective data for merit evaluation; Creating mental immunity.	Data security and privacy standards; Independent audit board; Limited access protocols; "Surveillance state" risk.
Synergic Assembly	Creating synergy between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches through the principle of 'cooperation of powers' instead of separation of powers. The brain lobes metaphor is used.	To reduce conflict and encourage productive cooperation, building a culture of humane ethical consensus instead of inter-institutional animosity.	Judicial independence protection; Constructive Audit Assembly; Qualified majority decision mechanism; Risk of weakening checks and balances.
Seven Oaths System	Voters, students, and deputies take an oath to accept merit, protect diversity, and adhere to honesty (Humanity Oath, People's Deputy Oath).	To strengthen accountability by increasing the metaphysical and conscientious cost of breaking one's word; making politics a sphere of moral responsibility.	Oath ethics board; Violation detection mechanism; Graduated sanction system; Risk of instrumentalization of religious sentiments.
State-Funded Election	Election expenses are covered by the state through a special election tax. Private spending and donations are prohibited.	To cut off the influence of capital power in politics, ensuring equal playing field conditions; combatting "Parapalaz" (Money-magnates).	Independent election finance institution; Transparent expenditure tracking; Quota system for small parties; Concerns regarding freedom of expression restrictions.

**5.1. Synergic Assembly and the "Brain Lobes" Metaphor**

Human Democracy rejects conflict-based parliamentarism. Instead, it proposes a "Synergic Assembly" structure modeled on the working principle of the human brain. (Demirkus, 2008; Demirkus, 2025b) The different lobes of the brain do not "oppose" each other; each performs a different function serving the common goal (the life and development of the organism).

Enhanced Structure:

- Legislative Lobe: Proposing and approving laws.
- Executive Lobe: Implementation and administration.
- Judicial Lobe: Legal review and interpretation.
- Audit Lobe: Independent audit and suggestion (the opposition function is integrated into the system).
- Advisory Lobe: Expert opinion and consultation.

This structure reduces antagonism. Decisions are made through "synergy" (consensus or qualified majority) rather than simple majority vote.

## 5.2. Council of Moral Pluralism

To address the model's lack of pluralism, a Council of Moral Pluralism is proposed:

- Representatives from different religious, sectarian, ethical, and philosophical traditions.
- The task of blending the universal aspects of Humane Ethics with other traditions.
- Advisory role in public morality policies.

## 5.3. Global Vision: The Universal Human State

DEMİRKUŞ, states that the ultimate goal of the Human Democracy model is the "**Universal Human State.**" (Demirkuş, 2025c) It rejects the veto power in the UN Security Council, defining it as an "unmerited, temporary marauder divinity authority." The model advocates for a "**space-faring, legitimate and viable single world state**" vision. This state:

- Is based on the foundation of equality and justice between tribes (Humane Secularism).
- Possesses merit-based global governing bodies.
- Entrusts humanity's common interests (climate, space, resources) to a central authority while protecting national sovereignties.
- This vision indicates that the model is a project of global "civilizational transformation" rather than a local regime change.

## 5.4. Gradual Transition Strategy

Pilot Implementation Phase (0-5 Years): Synergic Assembly trials in local governments; "education of reason" curriculum in selected schools; Voluntary Moral Score pilot project.

Institutional Transformation Phase (5-15 Years): Constitutional amendments and legal infrastructure; Gradual transformation of the education system; Reform of political party structures.

Social Expansion Phase (15-30 Years): Ethics education at all educational levels; Full transformation of political participation mechanisms; International dialogue and model sharing.

---

## 6. Evaluation in Academic Context

### 6.1. Relationship with Contemporary Political Philosophy

- **Communitarianism and Virtue Ethics:** The Human Democracy model bears strong parallels with communitarian thought. (Sandel, 2009; MacIntyre, 1984) Communitarianism emphasizes the importance of social bonds and common values against liberal individualism. Demirkuş finds the "lost tradition of virtue" sought by MacIntyre in Islamic sources (specifically the Hanif tradition of Abraham).
- **Epistocracy and Epistemic Democracy:** Jason Brennan advocates for Epistocracy against voter ignorance. (Brennan, 2016) DEMİRKUŞ makes a similar diagnosis, but the solution is not technical knowledge, but "moral wisdom." While epistemic democracy theory (Estlund, 2008; Landemore, 2013) emphasizes democracy's capacity for correct decision-making, Human Democracy highlights moral unity.
- **Similarities with Confucian Meritocracy:** Daniel Bell proposes the Confucian Meritocracy model, advocating for modern societies to be ruled by "virtuous elites" (*Junzi [virtuous elite]*). (Bell, 2015) DEMİRKUŞ 's model shows great parallels with this structure but relies on the Islamic tradition as its reference frame.

### 6.2. Perspective of Islamic Political Thought

- **Al-Farabi's Theory of *Al-Madina Al-Fadila*:** Human Democracy serves as a 21st-century adaptation of Al-Farabi's theory of *Al-Madina Al-Fadila* (The Virtuous City). (Fishkin, 2009) The "prophetic qualities" Al-Farabi seeks in the head of state parallel DEMİRKUŞ 's emphasis on "Humane Ethics."
- **The *Shura* Tradition and Contemporary Interpretations:** *Shura* is accepted as the fundamental principle of collective decision-making in Islam. Contemporary Islamic thinkers (Parray, 2024; International Islamic Fiqh Academy, 2015) have interpreted the relationship between *shura* and modern democracy in different ways, and Human Democracy offers a "merit"-focused contribution to this debate.

### 6.3. Strengths and Contributions

- Radical Epistemological Critique: The Science-*Ilm* distinction and Reason-Intellect difference question the foundations of modern secular epistemology.
- Holistic System: It offers a comprehensive transformation project from education to economics, not just electoral reform.
- Emphasis on Virtue Ethics: It revives classical perspectives that view politics as the construction of collective virtue and the good, rather than a struggle for power and interest.
- Concrete Mechanisms: Unlike many utopian theories, it proposes detailed and applicable institutional structures.
- Gradual Transition Strategy: The revised model offers a realistic transition plan.

### 6.4. Criticisms and Dilemmas

- Applicability and Scalability: Systems like "Moral Score" and "Behavior Archive" are difficult to implement on a large scale.
- Pluralism and Freedom Issue: Basing public morality on the interpretation of a single tradition is problematic. The risk of epistemic injustice is high.
- Risk of Concentration of Power: The risk of corruption of the "Seven Oaths" sages class. The "Who will guard the guardians?" problem.
- Static Understanding of Morality: The presentation of "Humane Ethics" as an unchanging standard.
- Surveillance State Risk: The Behavior Archive could turn into a totalitarian surveillance tool resembling China's "Social Credit System."

### 6.5. Responses to Criticisms and Improvements

- Response to Pluralism Issue: Representation of different traditions is ensured through the Council of Moral Pluralism. The universal aspects of Humane Ethics will be enriched through dialogue with other ethical systems.
- Response to Concentration of Power: Members of the Seven Oaths institution will be determined through multiple selection mechanisms and audited by independent ethics boards.
- Response to Surveillance Risk: The Behavior Archive will be protected by strict data security protocols and limited access principles, and individuals will have the right of control over their data.

---

## 7. Conclusion

The "Human Democracy" model by Prof. Dr. Nasip DEMİRKUŞ is an effort to redefine politics not as a technical management job, but as a "civilization construction" suitable for the human purpose of existence on earth (vicegerency [*khilafah*], virtue, reconstruction). This revised version aims to improve the criticized aspects of the model and make it more applicable.

The greatest contribution of the model is that it forces us to ask the question "**In what kind of society do we want to live?**" Rather than reducing democracy merely to procedural concerns (how decisions are made) or the pursuit of truth, it proposes a governance vision grounded in morality and fundamental values. not merely in procedural or material terms, but in epistemological, ontological, and moral terms. Surpassing the procedural concerns of contemporary deliberative democracy theory and the search for truth of epistemic democracy, it offers a management vision grounded in morality and metaphysics. However, the model's practical mechanisms must be implemented carefully regarding freedom, pluralism, scalability, and the limitation of power. The gradual transition strategy and enhanced safeguards aim to minimize these risks.

The effort to build bridges between Islamic values and modern political theory is valuable for comparative political philosophy. Its ultimate value lies not in the definitive solutions it offers, but in its call for an epistemological transformation that shakes our basic assumptions—placing "not the human within science, but science within the human"—and in its critical power that fervently raises the search for a "more humane" politics

---

## Compliance with ethical standards

### *Acknowledgments*

This article was prepared with partial support from artificial intelligence tools (Claude by Anthropic, Google Gemini) in literature review, text editing, citation formatting, and section development. I wish to express my gratitude to all engineers who have contributed to this technology.

### *Disclosure of conflict of interest*

The author declares no competing interests.

---

## References

- [1] Abizadeh, A. (2021). Counter-Majoritarian Democracy: Persistent Minorities, Federalism, and the Power of Numbers. *American Political Science Review*, 115(3), 919-934. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055421000368>
- [2] Abou El Fadl, K. (2004). *Islam and the challenge of democracy*. Princeton University Press. <https://press.princeton.edu/books/hardcover/9780691116471/islam-and-the-challenge-of-democracy>
- [3] Bell, D. A. (2015). *The China Model: Political Meritocracy and the Limits of Democracy*. Princeton University Press. <https://press.princeton.edu/books/hardcover/9780691166483/the-china-model>
- [4] Brennan, J. (2016). *Against Democracy*. Princeton University Press. <https://press.princeton.edu/books/hardcover/9780691162607/against-democracy>
- [5] Casanova, J. (1994). *Public religions in the modern world*. University of Chicago Press. <https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/P/bo3642048.html>
- [6] De Brasi, L., & Warman, J. (2016). Deliberative democracy, epistemic injustice, and epistemic disenfranchisement. *Social Epistemology Review and Reply Collective*, 5(10), 1-9. <https://philpapers.org/rec/DEBDDE>
- [7] Demirkuş, N. (2008). Dinle ilgili beyin fırtınası ve nadası soruları [Brainstorming and fallow questions regarding religion] [Lecture notes]. Nadidem.net. <https://nadidem.net/ders/soru/din.htm>
- [8] Demirkuş, N. (2013). Dinle ilgili beyin fırtınası ve nadası soruları [Brainstorming and fallow questions regarding religion] [Lecture notes]. Nadidem.net. <https://nadidem.net/ders/soru/din.htm>
- [9] Demirkuş, N. (2025a). Demokrasiyle ilgili beyin fırtınası ve nadası soruları [Brainstorming and fallow questions regarding democracy] [Lecture notes - To be published]. Nadidem.net. <https://nadidem.net/ders/soru/demokrasi.htm>
- [10] Demirkuş, N. (2025b). Siyasetle ilgili beyin fırtınası ve nadası soruları [Brainstorming and fallow questions regarding politics] [Lecture notes - To be published]. Nadidem.net. <https://nadidem.net/ders/soru/siyaset.htm>
- [11] Demirkuş, N. (2025c). Bilimsellik ile ilgili beyin fırtınası ve nadası soruları [Brainstorming and fallow questions regarding scientificity] [Lecture notes - To be published]. Nadidem.net. <https://nadidem.net/ders/soru/bilimsel.html>
- [12] Demirkuş, N. (2025d). Fen Teknoloji ve Toplum (FTT) ders notları [Science Technology and Society (STS) lecture notes] [Lecture notes - To be published]. [Author Website]. [Hidden URL]
- [13] Demirkuş, N. (2025e). Laiklikle ilgili beyin fırtınası ve nadası soruları [Brainstorming and fallow questions regarding secularism] [Lecture notes - To be published]. Nadidem.net. <https://nadidem.net/ders/soru/laiklik.htm>
- [14] Demirkuş, N. (2025f). Devletle ilgili beyin fırtınası ve nadası soruları [Brainstorming and fallow questions regarding the state] [Lecture notes]. Nadidem.net. <https://nadidem.net/ders/soru/devlet.htm>
- [15] Dryzek, J. S. (2000). *Deliberative democracy and beyond: Liberals, critics, contestations*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/019829610X.001.0001>
- [16] Estlund, D. M. (2008). *Democratic authority: A philosophical framework*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400831548>

- [17] Estlund, D., & Landemore, H. (2018). The epistemic value of democratic deliberation. In A. Bächtiger, J. S. Dryzek, J. Mansbridge, & M. Warren (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of deliberative democracy* (pp. 113-131). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198747369.013.26>
- [18] Farabi. (1985). *Al-Farabi on the Perfect State* (R. Walzer, Ed. & Trans.). Oxford University Press.
- [19] Fishkin, J. (2009). *When people speak: Deliberative democracy and public consultation*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:osobl/9780199604432.001.0001>
- [20] Fishkin, J., & Luskin, R. (2005). Experimenting with a democratic ideal: Deliberative polling and public opinion. *Acta Politica*, 40(3), 284-298. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.ap.5500121>
- [21] Foa, R. S., & Mounk, Y. (2016). The danger of deconsolidation: The democratic disconnect. *Journal of Democracy*, 27(3), 5-17. <https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/articles/the-danger-of-deconsolidation-the-democratic-disconnect/>
- [22] Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic injustice*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198237907.001.0001>
- [23] Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The end of history and the last man*. Free Press.
- [24] Grönund, K., Herne, K., & Setälä, M. (2015). Does enclave deliberation polarize opinions? *Political Behaviour*, 37(4), 995-1020. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-015-9304-x>
- [25] Gutmann, A., & Thompson, D. (2004). *Why deliberative democracy?* Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400826339>
- [26] Habermas, J. (1992). *Faktizität und Geltung: Beiträge zur Diskurstheorie des Rechts und des demokratischen Rechtsstaats*. Suhrkamp. <https://www.suhrkamp.de/buch/juergen-habermas-faktizitaet-und-geltung-t-9783518287620>
- [27] Habermas, J. (2008). Notes on Post-Secular Society. *New Perspectives Quarterly*, 25(4), 17-29. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5842.2008.01017.x>
- [28] International Islamic Fiqh Academy. (2015). *Shūrā (consultation) and democracy: An Islamic perspective [Resolution No. 205 (1/22)]*. <https://iifa-aifi.org/en/33086.html>
- [29] Lafont, C. (2019). *Democracy without shortcuts: A participatory conception of deliberative democracy*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198848189.001.0001>
- [30] Landemore, H. (2013). *Democratic reason: Politics, collective intelligence, and the rule of the many*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400848515>
- [31] Lijphart, A. (1977). *Democracy in Plural Societies: A Comparative Exploration*. Yale University Press.
- [32] MacIntyre, A. (1984). *After virtue: A study in moral theory* (2nd ed.). University of Notre Dame Press. <https://undpress.nd.edu/9780268035044/after-virtue/>
- [33] Mill, J. S. (1859/1991). *On Liberty*. Oxford University Press.
- [34] Min, S. J. (2018). Epistemic approaches to deliberative democracy. *Philosophy Compass*, 13(5), e12497. <https://doi.org/10.1111/phc3.12497>
- [35] Mounk, Y. (2018). *The people vs. democracy: Why our freedom is in danger and how to save it*. Harvard University Press. <https://www.hup.harvard.edu/catalog.php?isbn=9780674976825>
- [36] Page, S. E. (2011). *Diversity and complexity*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400835140>
- [37] Parray, T. A. (2024). *Islam and democracy in the twenty-first century*. Routledge. <https://www.routledge.com/Islam-and-Democracy-in-the-Twenty-First-Century/Parray/p/book/9781032310626>
- [38] Sandel, M. J. (1996). *Democracy's Discontent: America in Search of a Public Philosophy*. Harvard University Press.
- [39] Sandel, M. J. (2009). *Justice: What's the right thing to do?* Farrar, Straus and Giroux. <https://us.macmillan.com/books/9780374532505/justice>
- [40] Soroush, A. (2000). *Reason, freedom, and democracy in Islam: Essential writings of Abdolkarim Soroush* (M. Sadri & A. Sadri, Eds.). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/019513743X.001.0001>
- [41] Tocqueville, A. de. (1835/2000). *Democracy in America*. University of Chicago Press. <https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/815>