Research Article

Mahendar Kumar*

Intellectocracy: A 21st Century Political Ideology

<https://doi.org/10.1515/openps-2021-0004>

received September 2, 2020; accepted October 22, 2020.

Abstract: The research was conducted in order to understand how democracy has been unable to solve current potential issues of the world and what needs to be changed in this regard. A new political system of Intellectocracy has been introduced based upon the philosophy of Szellemiism- which promulgates that an individuals' right to vote should be decided as per his/her education, experience and knowledge of the environment around him/her whether national or global. The philosophy determines that, individuals are equal by birth but they do create a difference because of their acquired ability to perform in this world. The concept of Intellectocracy understood as a new political system in which, political leaders at any low or higher level must be elected not just based upon one's personal preference and judgment equally but, through the weighted voting of individual's understanding, knowledge and experience of the outside world by using the latest technology. The study concluded at the end that the globe is moving towards a difficult terrain hence it needs wise, patient and intelligent leaders in order to solve native and global issues collectively.

Keywords: Intellectocracy, Szellemiism, Political Leaders, Democracy, Technology.

1 Introduction

It is a reality, not an assumption by any way that the world is sliding through crucial and challenging terrains whether socially, economically or politically. The outburst of new technologies and the sudden changes in the way things are done has challenged the internal socio-political structure of one's individual self and that is why fascism or authoritarianism is on the rise all over the world. The uncertainty of the future has evoked the idea of closing your eyes and goes back to the past rather than to keep the eyes open and accept the change, while making essential institutional and ideological changes in order to accommodate the change for the well-being of the wider global community, as it happened in last two centuries, with the acceptance of capitalism and democracy as the only two key pillars of the modern economic and political structure. Democracy was not considered a viable form of governance but, just as the nature of the state until the First World War in 1914(Shumpeter, 1962). The First World War preceded by American and French revolution along with the American civil war changed the notion of democracy as being mob-governance into the governance of the civility or elite. Democracy was lifted from its Athenian roots- which was basically a direct form of governance and considered unstable into long run- into a constitutional form of governance, especially after the formulation of the American constitution. Democracy as a new form of governance was not widespread in the world until the American president Woodrow Wilson during and after the First World War assigned it a new meaning and promoted it as the only form of governance that can promulgate the best interests of any nation.

Wilson promoted democracy based on the assumption that it is a kind of system which can provide stable government while taking into account the desires and wishes of its populace (Hobson, 2015). But, Riker (1982) and Tocqueville (1835) thought otherwise, claiming that democracy can unknowingly become a victim of demagoguery and a system of mediocrity in political leadership respectively. Hence, Riker (1982) argued that demagoguery can lead towards populist sentiments and those can misguide the citizens of state, hence citizens should be educated in a way that they can make informed and rational choices. Similarly, Tocqueville (1969) emphasized good political leadership. He argued that allowing all the citizens to participate in the political process is not beneficial because it can give a chance to those who

*Corresponding author: Mahendar Kumar, Greenwich University, Karachi, Pakistan, E-mail: mahendarbajaj101@gmail.com

are not competent enough to hold public office. Dahl (1982) rejected Riker by arguing that if democratic means are the only way to solve dilemmas of democracy, more democracy is the only solution. He further mentions that the democratic system should ensure that no single interest group represents the whole population but that many of them must come into power. But, Tocqueville (1969) highlighted that political parties are engrossed with their own narrow self-interest; therefore, it increases the chance of polarization in society, which eventually exacerbates multiple conflicts among different interest groups. He further argued that democracy mostly produces mediocre leaders because of its inherent procedures that allowed the public to change its opinion every now and then. Hence, this research is focused on the role of political leadership and its characteristics while taking into account the procedures used to select those who ultimately hold public office. Aristotle was not actually fond of democracy because he believed that it can degenerate into self-serving leadership (Cunningham, 2002). Therefore Kellerman (1986) argued that those who are enthusiastic to become political leaders are actually power-hungry. They are most of the time not interested in serving the public to the best of their abilities, but to enhance their own interest or wealth. While Weber (1919) argued otherwise called a political leader as one “who can exploit the emotion of the masses”. However Kellerman distinguished between good and bad political leaders based on their personal characteristics and ability. He highlighted that good leaders are those who are capable to create vision, mobilize the masses for the collective good and provide order in the society through cohesion (Masciulli et al., 2016). Kellerman further argued that bad political leaders are often those who are lacking in their skills and ability to understand a situation and make decisions accordingly, they are rather harsh, immoderate and narrow-minded (Langlias, 2014). The concept of Intellectocracy is focused upon the democratic procedures of choosing the political leadership and the type of leadership being chosen by the eligible citizens of the state. Hence, *It is emphasized that, in order to have better political leadership, the process of choosing the political leadership should be changed because, it is not possible to have intelligent, sober and broad-minded leadership systemically without changing the procedures used to select them.*

2 Different Political Ideologies:

Ideology is defined as a doctrine that provides the guidance for certain actions to be carried out by individuals in anticipation of certain outcomes. It is a way to define social order and evaluate it on the basis of some common criterion (Seliger, 1976). Hence, there are different political ideologies existing in the history of humankind but this study will focus on the political ideologies related to democracy or in contest with democratic norms and beliefs. Hence, four ideologies will be discussed through this paper, Socialism, Communism, Fascism and Liberalism. The three philosophies (Socialism, Communism and Liberalism) got the most attention in 19th century and that is because of the great intellectuals of that era giving more importance to scientific methodologies in order to understand the relationship between individuals and state through the concept of positivism. However, Socialism emerged after the first industrialization process of mid-18th century in order to highlight the negative impacts of rapidly growing capitalism. It was not associated at that time with Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels as it is today because it was not directly connected with the revolutionary concept until 19th century (Esenwein, 2004).

There were different types of socialism concepts that emerged from the late 18th century till late 20th century; those termed as historic socialism, revolutionary socialism, reformist socialism, Fabian socialism and the most recent democratic socialism. However, the historic socialism was defined by Robert Owen and his colleagues in the late 18th century as a system that can promote economic and social equality and pledge welfare to all its members through a great social organization, however, not necessarily emerging through conflict between proletariat and bourgeoisie. Mass-education and rapid industrialization were two key factors behind socialism in the 18th and 19th centuries (Esenwein, 2004). The revolutionary socialism first appeared in the Communist Manifesto promulgated by Marx and Engels in 1848 that changed the notion of socialism from being a system that contradicted capitalism without class distinction, to a system resulting from the constant conflict between the two classes in an industrialized society: proletariat and bourgeoisie. They eventually transformed the concept of socialism into communism (Kyambalesa, 2019). The third type of reformist socialism emerged in the late 19th century due to a belief by some scholars like Eduard Bernstein of Germany and Jules Guesde and Jean Léon Jaurès of France that revolution is not necessary to change the system but it can be changed through economic and social reforms by the means of democracy. At the same time, Bernard Shaw and

Annie Besant, two middle-class intellectuals, promoted a different kind and called it Fabian socialism. The concept was conceived in order to develop a Fabian society in which all members of society should be granted equal economic and political rights, and that equality of rights must be for all, not for only workers as argued by Marx and Engels. The last but not the least, is the latest version of socialism and that is democratic-socialism. Socialism was on the back-foot after the formation of the Soviet Union in 1922 and its policy of expanding communism to the wider world pushed the socialists either to take the side of Russian revolutionary socialism or remain reformist socialists. As a result, most of the socialists in Europe remained reformist socialists. Although the choice was hard to make because, in both cases there were consequences, hence socialism was on the retreat for more than 50 years until a new era of socialism emerged in the 1980s when the socialists of France and Spain adopted the doctrine of neo-liberalism and focused on social justice and equality through the democratic channel, hence the concept of democratic-socialism emerged. It is still prevalent as in the famous example of Britain's Labour Party that called itself as "Democratic-Socialist" party. However, whether one likes or dislikes socialism, it has benefited the world through its emphasis on social welfare, free-education to all and economic equality (Esenwein, 2004).

However, it was in February 1848, when one document emerged on the world horizon entitled as "Communist-Manifesto" authored by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels together- two German philosophers though Marx was an enthusiastic economist and Engels was a philosopher and businessman. Marx argued that, it is not easy to detach economics from politics because the economic system drives the relationship between individual and state and that is why it is the cornerstone of any political system (Morgan, 2015). Marx in his famous work "Das capital" mentioned that the difference between capitalism and socialism is the difference between the concept of real value and exchange value; he further argued that, real value is the true denominator of one's efforts as labour, while exchange value is the real value plus the surplus earned by the capitalist. The Marx idea of communism was also based upon the idea of real wages where an individual can earn according to his/her efforts and not adding any surplus into the equation (Prychitko, 1988). Furthermore, he argued that, as labour becomes a commodity of exchange, it creates the phenomenon of "Self-alienation". He added that self-alienation occurs due to the individual being forced to work in order to survive, hence he has no time for himself and even for the community he dwells, hence that self-alienated individual would be urged to rebel against the system and to achieve his true potential, the individual must "return to himself" and it is not possible without the system being changed because the ending of private property, money and competition would not make much difference without changing the system of market economy with ex-ante coordination of economic activity (Prychitko, 1988). Communism was however, not considered a suitable form of governance until Lenin came to the fore and pushed ahead the ideology of Marxism through his concept of creating a "Vanguard Political Party" (Morgan, 2015). But, Marx also articulated different stages of communism to happen and his first stage was initial economic condition of any country. He mentioned a transition period, when capitalism is dismantled in order to put the new system into its place. In that time, he emphasized on the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat- which means that, in the transition period, there is a chance of dictatorship but that remains only for a short time until and unless, the final and last stage of communism occurs with the disappearance of social classes and eventually the state, because state in his opinion, is considered as an emblem of class conflict. However, Leninism focused more on the transition period and argued that, the Vanguard party or the "Bolshevik- Russian Communist Party" is responsible for creating a whole society; something similar to as "one office- one factory".

Lenin postulated Marxist ideology by suggesting a political structure needed to realize a real socialist system or communist society (Prychitko, 1988). But unfortunately he died in 1924 after the creation of the Soviet Union in 1922, giving Stalin an opportunity to take over. But, instead of advancing the cause of Lenin; he indulged in self-adventurism and using communism as a tool to increase his territorial power in the European states (Janos, 1996). Another enthusiastic leader of communism was Mao Zedong of China, who gave a new dimension to Marxism through his concept of the state being responsible for each and every action of its individuals living within its territory and he introduced a new war strategy used in China and Vietnam termed as "Guerilla war strategy" in order to displace the current system of China with the new concept of Communism. There were quite considerable differences between Mao and Lenin, however, they both tried to realize the dream of communism through political organization (Morgan, 2015).

An ideology that used some of the concepts of communism and is popular again even today was called "Fascism". It was a word derived from the Italian language and used mostly in the first half of the 20th century but, it's relevant in the world political dialectic until this day. The fascist ideology by its function can be traced back to the American civil war in late 1860s. However, it re-emerged in the earlier 20th century by its function after the First World War and

then remained quite popular until the Second World War when Hitler and Mussolini came to power in Germany and Italy respectively (Paxton, 1998). It is an ideology that refers to a political system in which the individual is recognized through his/her historic and cultural identity rather than on the identity pre-imposed by the state. It is the ideology that promotes an ethnic identity and argues that, some ethnic races are historically more valuable than others due to those being superior (e.g. intellectually, physically and morally). Therefore, the philosophy doesn't believe in the superiority of individual freedom (e.g. Liberalism) and social organization (e.g. Communism) but, on a single communal or ethnic superiority and emphasizes an individual's constant fight for maintaining that superiority (Mussolini, 1932). Interestingly, the fascism usually popular through their mass popularization strategy doesn't occupy the political scene in world politics without the help of their conservative partners, and in some cases fascism is also developed through conservative politics (e.g. recent India).

Some authors argue that Liberalism is one of the oldest philosophies, and it re-emerged practically again in 19th and 20th century as "Modern Liberalism" after modifying some of its core concepts (Bell, 2014). Others, like Stanton (2018) consider Hobbes or Locke to be the founding fathers of Modern Liberalism as they postulated the theory in the 17th century. Moreover, Liberalism is often placed within the sphere of democracy although it was specifically in the 19th century when some scholars tried to merge the two concepts, liberalism and democracy, together. But, Shklar (1957) argued that liberalism's main purpose is to create a legal environment in which maximum personal freedom is guaranteed in order to achieve financial, political and social gains. However, it was also the idea that was usually talked about and celebrated during an era of enlightenment and functioned as a primary ideology over which other ideologies in last 200 years have conceptualized like Socialism, Communism and Fascism (Alexander, 2014). It is the doctrine that emphasizes individuals being independent in their interpretation of the world around them and fulfilling their desires as per the individual right assign to them.

But Liberalism is different from Socialism or Communism that alludes to an individual actually being a social entity and freedom being a socially constructed phenomenon. Liberalism owes to individual rights and consider it as an independent agent who can make his/her own decisions without external influence, however socialism owes to the same right but, emphasizes that an individual action is influenced by his/her environment (Alexander, 2014). Another definition provided by Kant in 1991 in which he argued that, each liberal society would have three characteristics, first "freedom for all members of the society", second "common legislation" and third "all the members of the society are equal by law, hence, the legal equality". However, several authors from the last 300 years have conceptualized the concept of liberalism and the most prominent among them were Hobbes, Locke, Friedrich von Hayek, Milton Friedman, John Rawls, John Maynard Keynes, Laski, Sabine, Mill and Kant (Harrison & Boyd, 2018). As this research is going to focus upon the future of liberalism, it will only highlight few definitions and concepts discussed by those above mentioned authors. Hobbes was the first one who talked about the natural rights endowed to the human beings and because, they are humans, they are free to make informed choices about their lives; hence the concept of individual freedom emerged. Locke through his two semantic works entitled *Letter Concerning Toleration* (1689) and *Two Treatises on Government* (1690) supported the concept of capitalism through the emphasis on private property rights and social contract (Locke, 1967; Stanton, 2018).

Liberalism was basically founded upon the main ideas of freedom, the individual as the supreme decision maker, equality and pluralism. There were actually three transitions that occurred in the conceptual development of liberalism, classic liberalism, new liberalism and nowadays neo-liberalism (Harris & Boyd, 2018). Locke was a proponent of classic liberalism and argued that the state should provide a mechanism under which, the maximum individual freedom and rational choice-making can be assured with equality among all members of the state. Laski and Sabine followed Locke, hence Laski (1936) argued that liberty is an obligation of government in the liberal society and that government formation is the direct outcome of the consent between who is governing and who is being governed. It is actually governance through consent. But, Sabine (1939) argued that self-interest is supreme in liberal society, hence Locke considered individual rights as being higher in value and the state should refrain from interfering in the matters of private property and individual liberty (Stanton, 2018). However, the critics of classic liberalism argued that liberalism promotes negative liberty rather than a positive one. Hence, T.H Green and L.T Hobhouse gave the idea that unchecked self-interest and the promotion of capitalism is going to increase poverty and unequal wealth distribution in society, hence the state should interfere and promote positive freedom through the taxation on the rich and welfare for the poor and investment in public services. That was the era, when the concept of welfare society emerged; Britain started welfare government schemes for its citizens first time in its history (Harris & Boyd, 2018).

The latest version of liberalism called “Neo-liberalism” is actually in the middle between classic and new liberalism. Classic liberalism abhorred the state intervention and emphasized to put it at the minimum. While new liberalism greeted state intervention and assigned it the task of redistribution and welfare. Neo-liberalists argue that state must provide welfare as it can afford and it should not interfere in the capitalist process other than when is needed. Hence, the main state function is to regulate the economy in terms of monetary and fiscal policy nowadays, than to run the economy through demand management as argued by Keynes in 1940s. Therefore, all the societies in the world today accept most of main tenants of liberalism, like the concept of consent between who is governing and who is being governed, the individual as the supreme decision maker, pluralism, toleration and resolution of conflict through dialogue rather than by force (Harris & Boyd, 2018). However, the ideologies discussed above were all suited for past centuries due to their relevance to the environment of that time in which they emerged and flourished. But, those all have now become obsolete or are going to become irrelevant in one way or another due to new challenges resulted from the latest technological breakthroughs and rapid globalization. Therefore, the next mentioned ideology is going to reflect upon the current situation in order to fill the vacuum created by the developments of 21st century.

Szellemiism (derived from Hungarian language) is somehow taken from liberalism and socialism alike because, it emphasizes upon individual liberty and also the role of state as the ultimate guardian to take care of its citizens living inside its territory. The basic tenets of this doctrine are rationality and objective evaluation of people, things and events happening rather than on emotional feelings or one’s conscience. It adheres to the values of positive freedom (as per law), justice to all, economic and political equality (as per one’s qualification), state welfare to the poor, individuality and a focus on global thinking rather than national thinking.

It is the philosophy that is focused upon creating a new political system in which leaders at any level whether organizational, sub-national or national should be elected based upon rational choice-making and by giving political equality to the individuals as per their objective understanding and knowledge of the issues happening at the national or international level.

Szellemiism- which means that an individuals’ right to vote should be decided as per his/her education, experience and knowledge of the environment around him/her whether national or global. This philosophy determines that individuals are equal by birth but they do create a difference because of their acquired ability to perform in this world. Hence, they all must receive political rights as per their ability to contribute into the political system. It further argues that, corporate merit is the best example of this system as its success presently mainly depends upon its human resource contribution and they are valued as per their talent and skills not their license of being only adult human. The ideology’s main tenet is the intellect and capability of the individual rather than his/her conscience or gut feeling.

3 What is Intellectocracy?

Intellectocracy is not actually a new political system but, it is somehow a new wine in the same bottle of democracy. The linguistic meaning of democracy is “a form of government by the people or rule by the people”, Similarly, Intellectocracy is defined as “a form of government by those who are intelligent or productive not equally by all the eligible citizens of the assigned territory” and is based on the philosophy of Szellemiism. It is a kind of a government run by those who understand the challenges imposed by the national and international environment and have enough mental, intellectual and physical capacity to solve some of those challenges if not all. It is a kind of governance in which politicians are not just chosen due to their speaking and propagandist skills but based on their intelligence, wisdom and personal capacity and capability to solve current public and global issues. However, there are basically two types of democratic systems mainly used by current states to choose their present-day leaders; presidential and parliamentary democracy, and both involve three main functions of the state: executive, legislature and judicial. The first two functions, executive and legislature, are performed by the politicians through political and bureaucratic procedures but the problem is that their appointment is not based on their inherent intelligence, past experience and extra-ordinary understanding of state challenges but on the appropriation of voting by the majority. That can be attributed to tyranny of the majority as argued by (Tocqueville, 1835) when majority preferences can be aggregated to make decisions for all, including the minority. Majority voting is the process of collective preferences rather than the majority understanding of the current challenges faced by the state (Levine, 1981).

This makes Intellectocracy different from democracy because, it emphasizes that there should be no equal voting right to each citizen of the state and voting should be weighted as argued by John Stuart Mill in 1976 when he mentioned that the educated and those who are professionally proficient should have more votes in the political system. But the problem with the argument by Mill is that he challenges the very basic tenet of democracy and the individual as a rational agent. This also defies the authorities of those believing in liberal-democratic and catallaxy theories (Cunningham, 2002). This problem is solved by the theory of Intellectocracy by highlighting that political leaders are produced through the political process conducted by political entities or simply parties. Those parties whether believing in liberal-democratic theories by Mill (1976), Locke (1967), Sartori (1987), Macpherson (1965) or classic pluralism by Schumpeter (1962), should recognize that, there must be an intelligent system in place and that it should be democratic as well in order to nominate future leaders as in the case of parliamentary or presidential democracy. The system inside the political parties must take into account the nominees' education, experience and social work (not just political career and standing) and hence, based on his/her personality type, choose him or her for any particular contest through the use of technology and then, the democratic process takes its charge. Afterwards, once the democratic process has culminated inside political parties, it should be brought into the arena of national politics. It means that the leaders, when selected by a majority of political workers, should then be nominated to perform at the national or sub-national level.

Riker (1982) argued that voting is not a way to aggregate voter preferences but it is the way to get rid of those leaders who have not performed as per expectations. However, this is not the case as voting has just become either the way to promote one's self interest without rendering any importance to the public good or just to show a sentimental opinion of an individual (Elster, 1998b). Hence, Intellectocracy focuses on the very core problem of democracy and that is the voting procedures when equal voting rights have been given to all residents of one's territory. It is not fair to give equal voting rights to each individual in a given territory because it is like giving equal importance to a peon and a head of any state.

Therefore, Intellectocracy agrees with the John Stuart Mill idea of weighted voting rights when the voting is weighted against each person's contribution to the society through his/her education, profession or welfare activities. The Intellectocracy however, is not against individual rights or a liberal democratic stance on individualism and it doesn't believe in distinguishing between two humans, calling one superior to the other, but it just emphasizes on the distinction between those who have achieved their full potential and those who haven't. It focuses on the complexity of world issues due to globalization and rapid technological progress. It has now become evident that world leaders need to be extraordinary, in order to solve the issues collectively rather than individually. This points out that, political leaders at any junior or senior level must be selected through a rigorous process of selection and weighted voting, rather than through the majority vote as in the case of simple democracy. *The weightage voting rights should not be assigned to more than 20% of the electorate population and one vote must be counted at least 1 and maximum 3. Technology can help develop a system in which voting rights can be granted but, if the total election turnover is more than 60% then, the weighted average should be reduced in order to justify the election procedure.* Intellectocracy is a system in which the system would make sure that each individual in society has the right to vote for their leaders at any junior or senior level but, according to their true potential. Intellectocracy will prefer the representative form of government whether similar to constitutional democracy or otherwise in nature (as in the famous example of British democracy). It will adhere to the same principles of individual liberty, collective security and welfare as augmented by democracy but it would focus more on the procedures used to elect political leaders at any level and the system of the majority vote in order to revamp the current political system in a way that can meet with the 21st century challenges and don't pave the path for authoritarianism or fascism. Intellectocracy would argue in favour of strong federalism and rational checks and balances to ensure the stable system of governance in the future.

4 Why Intellectocracy is necessary?

It is an established fact that a society needs good leaders whether in an arena of politics, business, technology or any other fields in the world. Leaders in those fields mostly decide the present and future of their fields as the best examples can be visualized in the form of Ibrahim Lincoln of 19th century, Woodrow Wilson of 20th century, Henry ford of 19th

century and Steve Jobs of 21st century. Leadership is dependent mainly upon two factors: personality and context, and those two determine the nature and type of the leadership style as well. Therefore, traditional, rational and charismatic types of leadership as argued by Weber (1964) emerge in different social and political situations. However, Tucker (1981) argued that the world needs enlightened leaders, those who can understand the national and global issues and have enough capacity to solve them with their skills, vision and innovative ideas. Hildebrand (2019) recently argued that, democracy is not a suitable form of government in 21st century because; it has no mechanism to elect smart people as we do have the mechanism in other fields (e.g. bureaucracy, judiciary, etc.). Hildebrand (2019) further argued that, the environmental complexity, internet and fake news are a few of the factors influencing the democratic mechanism at its core, hence making it unsuitable for this century.

Moreover, democracy in 21st century mainly rests on the constitutional framework as argued by Rawls (1993) but, the problem is that the constitution itself, that was made decades ago, can't be exercised to solve the current challenges and present day problems if it is not modified in order to reflect the current challenges and issues. Hence, Intellectocracy also advocates radical changes in the constitutional framework in order to pave the way for the global coordination and collective decision making rather than the territorial one, through the formation of a global constitution. Ferrara (2013) argued that, democracy has survived for so long especially because of its capability to respond effectively to environmental challenges (e.g. social, economic, and political). But the 21st century has presented itself as a jigsaw in which different parts of the environment are finding it difficult to align with one another. Helbing et al. (2017) mentioned that after the Second World War, the technological advancement promoted the idea of automation of economics and the controlling of society but, the problem was that, there were not enough mechanisms to make that happen. This situation has been changed recently due to the introduction of artificial intelligence that not only understands the patterns of data but, has the capability to interpret on its own- it was the job of a human before. Helbing et al. (2017) further added that this is going to change political systems in the future because massive manipulation of human decision making would become possible through use of artificial intelligence, hence, democratic basic principles of individual reasoning and discretion in the political process would be under immense scrutiny. They further argued that, from the point of view of smart computers, now we are moving towards smart society in which technology will control not only a part of your being but, the complete being.

As artificial intelligence and bio-engineering are focusing on the use of the latest technology in order to either understand or control the emotional self of human being or to give birth to those individuals, who are genetically superior to others. In this situation, the distributed system of making political decisions like democracy is under uncontrollable pressure and therefore results in poor outcomes that can easily be evaluated through the candidates who won the most recent elections in the world's two biggest democracies, USA and India. Intellectocracy, in my opinion is the only option available for a world political system in future because, it is the system that is based on intellectualism in which the decisions are not made equally, only by those who can be easily manipulated through the use of social media campaigns (e.g. USA, India) and other manipulating gimmicks, but as a systematic amalgamation of two separate eligible voter groups, consisting of those who can be simply manipulated and those, who are hard to maneuver as per wishes and desires of those willing to manipulate them.

In the 21st century, the threat of nuclear weapons is not as visible as in the previous century, but the use of biological weapons, artificial intelligence to infiltrate into the personal matters of the citizens whether in one's state territory or not, and most importantly, the collection and use of immense amount of data in order to make political and social decisions, will create a situation that can be only handled by those, who are capable enough (mentally, intellectually and physically) to visualize and comprehend comprehensively as much as possible, the world's future. Hence, the process of choosing leaders must be changed in order to pave the path for those, who not only understand the complexity of events in the present but, have a vision to solve present and future challenges with innovative strategies. Because the complexity of climate change, global terrorism, networked multinationals and the intricacies of inter-territorial trade, movement of people and information has made this world just like a bigger spider-web where one web is joined with another and it is hard to find the source of the original web. In this situation, where the complexity and processing of new information with each passing minute is new normal, it is not possible to elect leaders with a centuries old political mechanism. Hence, Intellectocracy is providing a new mechanism and promulgating the idea of choosing leaders not just because of their popularity or voting expediency but, on the basis of their education, experience and understanding of the national and global issues, however by using the latest technology. The leaders of the leading nations (USA, UK, Germany, France etc.) should also be held accountable through the process of Intellectocracy for

global peace and stability. This can only happen if the people of the world understand the need for a global constitution and the urgent modifying of their existing constitutions or other alternatives in order to pave the path for those capable enough to not only rule and share vision with their fellow citizens, but with global citizens as well.

4.1 Key Takeaways

- Intellectocracy can possibly be an alternative to democracy in the future
- Intellectocracy has no problem following values promulgated by liberalism (individual human rights, freedom of speech, individual decision making, etc.).
- Intellectocracy is actually based upon the doctrine of Szellemiism- which narrates that the individual political voting right must be based upon his/her education, experience and knowledge
- Intellectocracy is the most suited political system in 21st century because the challenges are hard to be addressed by those political leaders who are elected through the current political system
- Intellectocracy promulgates an idea of granting political rights based upon one's intrinsic and extrinsic qualification and not just of being human
- Intellectocracy follows the idea that, the voting right must be weighted as per one's qualification and experience, however, weightage voting rights should not be assigned to more than 20% of the eligible electorate population and one vote must be counted at least 1 and maximum 3
- Intellectocracy believes in global leadership, a global constitution and the idea of solving global issues collectively by electing intelligent and emphatic leaders
- Intellectocracy has an inherent mechanism to address and solve technological and environmental issues by electing those, who can best understand those issues.

5 Conclusion

This research has focused upon the concept of Intellectocracy and how that concept has been derived from the older doctrine of democracy and why it is essential to exercise that new political system in the near present and possibly in the future. Moreover, it has also shed light upon different older political philosophies including Socialism, Communism, Fascism and Liberalism, thereby introducing a new political doctrine- Szellemiism, which basically emphasizes upon the need for rendering voting political rights as per one's education, experience and understanding of the external environment. The research has provided a detailed account of Intellectocracy and how that political system is beneficial and takes into account the challenges and issues faced by the population of 21st century by electing political leaders intellectually through the latest technology. In addition to that, it has also highlighted caveats in the current influential political system, and that is democracy. Subsequently, the researcher has evaluated the current world circumstances that have evolved due to an emergence of artificial intelligence and bio-engineering and then linked those with present-day world political leadership. In the end, the researcher has thoroughly investigated the process of electing political leaders currently and how those, who came to power as the result of that process, are unable to understand, comprehend and solve innovatively the national and global issues. Hence, the researcher has introduced a new political process of electing leaders through their intellectual, physical and political capacity to perform and lead not only the citizens of their assigned territory but, the global citizens.

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'Éditions, Paris.
- Weber M. (1964). *The Theory of Social Economic Organization*. The Free Press, New York.