Democracy Reconsidered: Epistemic Challenges, Digital Disruption, and the Deliberative Path Forward *

G. Anbarjafari
ORCID: 0000-0001-8460-5717
3S Holding OÜ
Tartu 51011, Estonia
shb@3sholding.com

Abstract

Democracy has long been celebrated as the most legitimate form of governance, yet it rests on a foundational tension that remains unresolved: should democratic authority derive from the will of the majority, or from the quality of the decisions it produces? This paper examines the classical debate between popular sovereignty and epistemic governance through the lens of contemporary digital media, arguing that platforms such as TikTok and Instagram have introduced unprecedented challenges to the epistemic foundations of democratic decision-making. Drawing on democratic theory from Plato to Habermas, and engaging with contemporary scholars including Jason Brennan, David Estlund, and Hélène Landemore, the paper traces how algorithmic content curation, viral misinformation, and engagement-driven platform design systematically distort the conditions necessary for informed democratic participation. However, the paper also demonstrates that epistemic alternatives to democracy—including epistocracy and technocratic guardianship—inevitably confront the problem of self-legitimating authority, as illustrated by the Iranian theocratic model. The paper proposes that deliberative democratic innovations, such as citizens' assemblies and structured public deliberation, offer a viable middle path that improves the epistemic quality of collective decisions without sacrificing democratic legitimacy. The paper concludes by outlining a framework for democratic resilience in the digital age that centres on institutional design, platform accountability, and civic epistemic infrastructure.

Keywords democracy · epistocracy · social media · deliberative democracy · digital governance

1 Introduction

In January 2024, a viral TikTok challenge encouraged teenagers to steal cars and post footage of their exploits online, accumulating millions of views and spawning copycat incidents across multiple countries. The challenge was not merely a juvenile prank; it was a product of algorithmic amplification, where platform design rewarded the most sensational and transgressive content with the widest distribution. At the same time, political misinformation circulated freely on the same platforms, with deepfake videos of political candidates and fabricated news stories reaching millions of users who had no reliable means of distinguishing fact from fiction. These episodes are not aberrations. They represent the ordinary functioning of digital media ecosystems that now serve as primary information sources for hundreds of millions of citizens worldwide.

These developments raise a question that is as old as democracy itself but has acquired new urgency in the digital age: what is the relationship between popular opinion and good governance? Democracy, in its most basic formulation, is the rule of the people—the idea that political authority derives its legitimacy from the consent and participation of those who are governed. But the concept has always contained an internal tension. Does democracy mean that

---

whatever the majority decides is, by definition, the right course of action? Or does it mean that the people should govern themselves *well*—that democratic legitimacy depends not only on popular participation but also on the quality of the outcomes it produces?

This tension has been a central preoccupation of political philosophy since its inception. Plato's *Republic* famously argued that democracy was a deficient form of governance because it placed power in the hands of those who lacked the knowledge to exercise it wisely, proposing instead a regime of philosopher-kings guided by reason and truth [1]. Aristotle offered a more nuanced assessment, distinguishing between democracy as the rule of the many in the common interest and its degenerate form, mob rule, in which the majority governs in its own narrow self-interest [2]. These classical debates have never been fully resolved; they have simply been reframed in each successive era.

The digital age has reframed them with particular force. The rise of social media platforms—and especially algorithmically driven platforms such as TikTok and Instagram—has fundamentally altered the information environment in which democratic citizens form their preferences, evaluate evidence, and make political judgments. When viral challenges and conspiracy theories achieve mass engagement through the same mechanisms that distribute political news, the question of whether popular opinion can be trusted as a basis for governance acquires a new and uncomfortable specificity.

Consider the phenomenon of viral social media challenges. The "Skull Breaker Challenge," the "Blackout Challenge," and numerous car theft challenges have not only resulted in physical harm and death but have demonstrated a fundamental feature of algorithmic platforms: content that is dangerous, transgressive, or emotionally extreme consistently outperforms content that is thoughtful, accurate, or constructive. These are not isolated failures of content moderation; they are the predictable outputs of systems designed to maximise engagement. When we observe that the same algorithmic architecture that promotes a dangerous physical challenge also determines which political messages, policy arguments, and candidate profiles reach the widest audience, the implications for democratic self-governance become impossible to ignore. The question is not whether social media affects democracy—it manifestly does—but whether the specific forms of influence it exerts are compatible with the epistemic preconditions that democratic theory requires.

This paper examines this foundational tension through a dual lens. First, it considers the case for popular sovereignty and the challenges that digital media pose to its epistemic assumptions. Second, it examines the alternative—the idea that governance should be guided by "correct" opinion rather than merely popular opinion—and the grave dangers this approach entails, as illustrated by real-world cases of epistemic authoritarianism. The paper then argues that deliberative democratic theory offers a promising, if imperfect, resolution to the dilemma, and proposes a framework for sustaining democratic legitimacy under the conditions of the contemporary information environment.

2 What Is Democracy? Conceptual Foundations

Before examining the specific challenges that digital media pose to democratic governance, it is necessary to establish that the concept of democracy is itself contested and multifaceted. There is no single, authoritative definition of democracy; rather, the term encompasses a family of related but distinct political theories, each of which offers a different account of the relationship between popular participation and good governance.

2.1 The Majoritarian Tradition

The most straightforward conception of democracy is majoritarianism: the idea that legitimate political decisions are those that reflect the preferences of the majority. This tradition has deep roots in Enlightenment political thought. Jean-Jacques Rousseau's concept of the "general will" proposed that when citizens deliberate on matters of common concern, the majority's decision reflects not merely the aggregation of individual preferences but a collective judgment about the common good [3]. The Condorcet provided a formal mathematical basis for this intuition through his celebrated jury theorem, which demonstrates that if each individual voter has a better-than-chance probability of reaching the correct decision, the probability that the majority will be correct approaches certainty as the number of voters increases [4, 5].

The majoritarian tradition thus rests on an optimistic epistemic assumption: that the aggregation of many imperfect judgments will, on balance, produce better outcomes than reliance on the judgments of a few. This assumption undergirds much of modern democratic practice, from electoral systems based on one-person-one-vote to the legitimacy accorded to legislative majorities and popular referenda. As Robert Dahl [6] argued in his influential defence of democratic procedures, the principle of political equality—the idea that each citizen's preferences should count equally in collective decisions—is not merely a procedural commitment but a substantive moral claim about human dignity and autonomy.

However, the majoritarian tradition has always faced a serious challenge: the possibility that majorities can be wrong, biased, or manipulated. John Stuart Mill [7] warned of the "tyranny of the majority," in which the will of the most numerous class could oppress minorities and stifle dissent. Alexis de Tocqueville [8] observed a similar tendency in American democracy, where the pressure for social conformity could be as oppressive as any legal constraint. These classical warnings have acquired new force in the digital age. Where Mill and Tocqueville worried about social pressure and legal coercion, contemporary critics point to algorithmic manipulation as a novel mechanism through which majority opinion can be manufactured rather than organically formed. The crucial question is whether popular opinion retains its democratic legitimacy when it is shaped by opaque algorithmic processes designed to serve commercial rather than civic interests.

2.2   Epistemic Democracy

A second tradition, epistemic democracy, holds that democratic procedures are valuable not merely because they respect political equality but because they tend to produce good or correct outcomes. David Estlund's [9] theory of "epistemic proceduralism" argues that democracy's legitimacy derives from its modest but real tendency to produce just laws at a better-than-chance rate, combined with the fact that no alternative regime can claim superior epistemic credentials that would be acceptable from all reasonable points of view. Hélène Landemore [5] has developed this line of argument further, contending that cognitive diversity—the variety of perspectives, heuristics, and problem-solving approaches that a large and diverse electorate brings to collective decision-making—is a genuine epistemic asset that gives democracy an advantage over rule by experts.

The epistemic tradition thus provides a bridge between popular sovereignty and outcome quality. It acknowledges that democracy is not infallible—the majority can and does make mistakes—but argues that democratic procedures, properly structured, are more reliably truth-tracking than the alternatives. This is an important distinction: epistemic democrats do not claim that the majority is always right, only that democratic processes are more likely to approximate correct outcomes over time than concentrated forms of authority [10].

2.3   Deliberative Democracy

A third tradition, deliberative democracy, shifts the focus from voting outcomes to the quality of the process by which citizens form their preferences. Jürgen Habermas's [11] theory of communicative action argues that legitimate political decisions are those that emerge from processes of rational public deliberation in which all affected parties can participate as free and equal partners. On this view, what matters is not simply what the majority prefers but *how* those preferences were formed—whether they are the product of genuine reflection, exposure to diverse viewpoints, and reasoned argument, or whether they are the result of manipulation, ignorance, or emotional contagion.

Deliberative democracy thus introduces an important qualification to the majoritarian principle: popular opinion is legitimate only to the extent that it emerges from conditions conducive to genuine deliberation. As Joshua Cohen [12] argued, the democratic ideal is not simply majority rule but "the authorization of the exercise of political power through collective reasoning among equal citizens." This qualification has profound implications for the digital age, where the conditions under which citizens form their political judgments have been radically transformed.

These three traditions—majoritarian, epistemic, and deliberative—are not mutually exclusive, and most contemporary democratic theorists draw on elements of all three. But they do differ in how they understand the relationship between popular participation and decision quality, and these differences become critical when we consider the impact of digital media on the epistemic environment of democracy.

3   The Case for Popular Sovereignty—and Its Vulnerabilities in the Digital Age

The case for popular sovereignty rests on several powerful arguments. First, there is the intrinsic argument: that self-governance is a fundamental human right, and that denying citizens an equal voice in the decisions that affect their lives is a form of domination regardless of the quality of outcomes it produces [13]. Second, there is the instrumental argument: that democratic procedures tend to produce better outcomes than the alternatives because they incorporate a wider range of information, perspectives, and interests than any elite group can possess [14]. Third, there is the epistemic argument noted above: that under the right conditions, the aggregation of many imperfect judgments is more reliable than reliance on a few supposedly expert ones [5, 15].

These arguments have considerable force, and the historical record provides substantial support for them. Amartya Sen's [14] celebrated observation that no functioning democracy has ever experienced a major famine illustrates the information-aggregating and accountability-enforcing properties of democratic governance. The democratic peace

thesis—the empirical finding that democracies rarely go to war with one another—provides further evidence that democratic procedures tend to produce outcomes that are, on balance, more just and stable than autocratic alternatives [16].

3.1   The Digital Disruption of Democratic Epistemology

However, all of these arguments depend on a crucial assumption: that citizens have access to reliable information and are able to form their preferences through a process of genuine reflection and engagement with diverse perspectives. It is precisely this assumption that the rise of algorithmic social media has placed under severe strain.

The transformation of the information environment brought about by platforms such as TikTok, Instagram, Facebook, and YouTube is not merely quantitative—more information available to more people—but qualitative. The fundamental innovation of these platforms is that they interpose an algorithmic curation layer between citizens and the information they consume. Unlike traditional media, where editorial judgments about newsworthiness and accuracy serve as imperfect quality filters, social media algorithms optimise for engagement: likes, shares, comments, and time spent on the platform. Content that provokes strong emotional reactions—outrage, fear, amusement, tribal solidarity—is systematically promoted over content that is accurate, nuanced, or important but emotionally unremarkable [17, 18].

TikTok represents a particularly significant development in this regard. Unlike earlier social media platforms that distributed content primarily through social networks—users saw what their friends shared—TikTok's algorithm is almost entirely recommendation-driven, surfacing content based on machine-learning models that predict what will hold individual users' attention [19]. This means that political content on TikTok is distributed not through networks of trust or shared community but through algorithmic calculations of engagement potential. A study of over 51,000 political videos on TikTok during the 2024 United States presidential election found that toxic and highly partisan content consistently attracted greater user engagement than moderate or nuanced political commentary, suggesting that the platform's algorithm systematically amplifies the most divisive forms of political expression [20].

The scale of TikTok's influence is difficult to overstate. With over one billion monthly active users worldwide and 170 million in the United States alone, TikTok has become a primary news source for young adults, with some surveys indicating that 40% of Generation Z users in the United States use the platform as a search engine. The average TikTok user spends approximately 34 hours per month on the platform—significantly more than on any competing service—and the vast majority of that time is spent consuming algorithmically recommended content rather than content from accounts the user has actively chosen to follow. A Google-commissioned study found that a substantial proportion of TikTok search results contain misinformation, yet the platform's visual and short-form format creates what researchers describe as a "realism heuristic": users perceive video content as more authentic and trustworthy than text-based information, making them more susceptible to misleading visual narratives. The platform's role in the 2024 Indonesian presidential election, where it was widely credited as a decisive factor in the victory of President Prabowo Subianto, further illustrates its growing political significance globally.

The consequences for democratic epistemology are profound. When the same algorithmic logic that makes a dangerous prank go viral also determines which political messages reach the widest audience, the link between popular opinion and informed judgment is severed. The viral success of a political claim becomes a function not of its accuracy or importance but of its capacity to provoke engagement—and misinformation, conspiracy theories, and emotionally manipulative content are frequently more engaging than truthful, complex, or context-dependent reporting [21].

3.2   Manufactured Consent in the Algorithmic Age

This problem goes beyond the classic concern about misinformation—the deliberate dissemination of false claims. More fundamentally, algorithmic curation shapes *what people care about* and *how they think about it*. The filter bubbles and echo chambers that have received extensive scholarly attention [22, 23] are symptoms of a deeper structural problem: the colonisation of the public sphere by commercial incentives that are systematically misaligned with the epistemic requirements of democratic self-governance.

Research on Instagram's impact on political attitudes illustrates this dynamic. Unlike TikTok, Instagram distributes content primarily through social networks, but its algorithmic feed nonetheless privileges content that generates high engagement, creating incentive structures that reward political polarisation and sensationalism among both ordinary users and political actors [24, 25]. The platform's visual emphasis and short-form format further compress complex political issues into images and slogans that are optimised for emotional impact rather than informational content.

The problem is not that social media makes people "stupid"—a patronising and empirically dubious claim. Rather, the problem is that algorithmically curated information environments systematically undermine the conditions that Condorcet's jury theorem and other epistemic arguments for democracy require: that individual judgments be at least

weakly independent and at least slightly better than random. When a significant proportion of the electorate forms its views on the basis of algorithmically amplified content that is selected not for accuracy but for engagement, the mathematical foundations of democratic epistemology begin to erode [5, 26].

4 The Case for Epistemic Governance—and Its Dangers

If popular opinion can be manufactured, distorted, or algorithmically manipulated, the natural response is to ask whether governance should instead be guided by those who possess genuine knowledge—by "correct" opinion rather than merely popular opinion. This idea has a long and distinguished intellectual pedigree, from Plato's philosopher-kings to contemporary proposals for epistocracy.

4.1 The Epistocratic Challenge

The most prominent contemporary advocate of epistocracy is Jason Brennan, whose book *Against Democracy* [26] mounts a systematic critique of democratic governance on epistemic grounds. Brennan categorises citizens into three types: "hobbits," who are largely ignorant of and indifferent to politics; "hooligans," who are politically engaged but deeply biased and tribal in their reasoning; and "vulcans," who approach political questions with rational disinterestedness and genuine knowledge. Since most citizens are either hobbits or hooligans, Brennan argues, democracy amounts to government by the incompetent, and citizens have a right not to be subjected to the consequences of collective ignorance.

Brennan proposes several epistocratic alternatives, including restricted suffrage, in which voting rights are conditional on passing a basic competence examination, and plural voting, in which citizens who demonstrate greater political knowledge receive additional votes. He argues that these arrangements need not be discriminatory in principle; unlike historical literacy tests, which were designed to disenfranchise racial minorities, epistocratic assessments could be designed to be demographic-blind and focused purely on factual political knowledge [26].

There is a surface plausibility to Brennan's argument, particularly in light of the digital media dynamics described above. If significant portions of the electorate form their political views on the basis of algorithmically curated mis-information and engagement-optimised content, the case for weighting political power toward those who are better informed appears correspondingly stronger. However, the epistocratic proposal confronts a series of objections that are not merely practical but deeply structural.

4.2 The Problem of Epistemic Authority: Who Decides What Is Correct?

The most fundamental objection to epistocracy is what might be called the *authority problem*: any system that distributes political power on the basis of knowledge must first determine what counts as knowledge and who possesses it. This is not a merely technical challenge; it is a political and philosophical problem of the first order. As Estlund [9] argued in his critique of epistocracy, even if it is true that some citizens are more knowledgeable than others, this fact cannot be used to justify concentrating political power in their hands unless their epistemic superiority is acceptable from all reasonable points of view—a condition that, Estlund contends, can never be met in a pluralistic society.

The authority problem is not hypothetical. It manifests concretely in every proposal to vest political authority in a class of epistemic gatekeepers. Who designs the competence examinations? Who decides which facts are relevant and which interpretive frameworks are legitimate? Who guards the guardians? These questions have no neutral answers; every proposed answer embeds political and ideological commitments that are themselves contestable. As Anderson [27] has argued, the history of supposedly meritocratic and knowledge-based institutions—from colonial administrations to technocratic planning agencies—is replete with examples of epistemic authority being used to entrench existing power structures and marginalise dissenting voices.

4.3 The Iranian Model: A Case Study in Epistemic Authoritarianism

Perhaps the most instructive real-world illustration of the dangers of epistemic governance is the political system of the Islamic Republic of Iran. The Iranian constitution establishes a system in which ultimate political authority rests not with the elected government but with a clerical establishment headed by the Supreme Leader, who is selected by the Assembly of Experts—a body of senior clerics who, in turn, are vetted by the Guardian Council, a body whose members are partly appointed by the Supreme Leader himself [28, 29]. The Guardian Council exercises the power to disqualify candidates for elected office on the basis of their ideological and religious credentials, effectively ensuring that only those who meet the clerical establishment's criteria for "correctness" can participate in governance.

The Iranian system is, in a precise theoretical sense, an epistocracy: it distributes political power on the basis of a claimed epistemic authority—in this case, religious knowledge and moral discernment—and justifies the restriction of democratic participation on the grounds that ordinary citizens cannot be trusted to make decisions that accord with truth and justice as the clerical establishment understands them. The results are instructive. Far from producing wise governance, the concentration of power in the hands of a self-certifying epistemic elite has produced systemic corruption, the suppression of dissent, economic mismanagement, and widespread human rights abuses [30, 31]. The clerical establishment's claim to epistemic authority has functioned not as a check on popular ignorance but as a mechanism for insulating the ruling class from accountability.

The Iranian case is particularly instructive because the Islamic Republic does not entirely abolish democratic procedures. It retains elections, a parliament, and a presidency. What it does is subject these democratic institutions to the oversight of an epistemic elite—the clerical establishment—that claims the authority to determine which candidates are qualified, which policies are permissible, and which forms of public expression are acceptable. The Guardian Council regularly disqualifies hundreds of candidates from standing for election, including sitting members of parliament, on the basis of ideological criteria that are neither transparent nor contestable. The result is a hybrid system that maintains the outward forms of democracy while hollowing out its substance—a pattern that should give pause to anyone who proposes concentrating political authority on the basis of claimed epistemic superiority. The 2022–2023 protest movement in Iran, triggered by the death of Mahsa Amini in the custody of the morality police, demonstrated the depth of popular frustration with a system that claims to govern in the name of moral and spiritual truth while systematically suppressing the voices of its citizens. The movement's rallying cry—"Woman, Life, Freedom"—was not merely a demand for specific policy changes but a fundamental rejection of the principle that any self-appointed elite has the right to determine what is true, good, and correct on behalf of the population.

One might object that the Iranian case is an unfair comparison—that Brennan's proposals for epistocracy are quite different from theocratic rule. But the structural logic is the same: once you establish the principle that some group of people has the right to rule on the basis of their claimed epistemic superiority, you create an irresistible incentive for that group to define "knowledge" and "correctness" in ways that entrench their own power. The Iranian mullahs did not set out to create a corrupt authoritarian regime; they set out to create a just society guided by those who knew best. The Soviet Union's Communist Party made precisely the same claim, with equally catastrophic results. As the philosopher Karl Popper [32] argued, the question "Who should rule?" is less important than the question "How can we design institutions that prevent rulers from doing too much harm?"—and this is a question that epistocracy, by its very structure, cannot adequately answer.

4.4 The Technocratic Variant

A softer version of epistemic governance—technocracy—proposes not the replacement of democratic institutions but their supplementation by expert bodies insulated from popular pressure. Central banks, constitutional courts, and regulatory agencies are all examples of technocratic institutions that exercise significant political power on the basis of claimed expertise. These institutions have often produced valuable outcomes—effective monetary policy, the protection of minority rights, the regulation of complex industries—and they serve as evidence that some forms of epistemic governance are compatible with democratic legitimacy [33].

However, technocratic institutions derive their legitimacy precisely from the fact that they operate within a democratic framework that subjects them to ultimate popular accountability. When technocratic authority exceeds its democratic mandate—as has occurred in the European Union's handling of the Eurozone crisis, where unelected institutions imposed austerity policies on democratically elected governments—the result is a legitimacy crisis that undermines both technocratic authority and democratic governance [34, 35]. The lesson is that epistemic governance can complement democracy but cannot replace it without forfeiting the legitimacy that makes governance effective.

5 The Deliberative Middle Ground

If pure popular sovereignty is epistemically vulnerable in the digital age, and epistemic governance is structurally prone to authoritarian capture, the question becomes whether there is a third path—one that improves the quality of democratic decision-making without sacrificing its legitimacy. Deliberative democratic theory offers the most promising candidate for such a path.

5.1 The Deliberative Promise

Deliberative democracy proposes that the quality of democratic decisions can be improved not by restricting who participates but by improving the conditions under which participation occurs. The core insight is that preferences

formed through structured exposure to diverse viewpoints, expert testimony, and reasoned argument are more likely to be informed, considered, and oriented toward the common good than preferences formed in the absence of such conditions [36, 37]. This is not a hypothetical claim; it is supported by a growing body of empirical evidence.

James Fishkin's [36] research on deliberative polls has consistently shown that when randomly selected citizens are given access to balanced information and structured opportunities for small-group deliberation, their preferences shift in measurable and predictable ways: they become more informed, more nuanced, and more willing to consider the interests of others. These shifts are not random; they consistently move in the direction of better-informed and more considered judgment, suggesting that deliberation genuinely improves the epistemic quality of collective decisions.

5.2   Citizens' Assemblies: Ireland as a Model

The most striking real-world demonstration of deliberative democracy's potential is the Irish Citizens' Assembly of 2016–2018. Tasked with making recommendations on the deeply divisive question of abortion, the Assembly brought together 99 randomly selected citizens who deliberated over five weekends spanning five months. Members heard from medical, legal, and ethical experts, received personal testimonies from women affected by Ireland's restrictive abortion laws, and engaged in structured small-group discussions with their fellow assembly members [38, 39].

The results were remarkable. The Assembly recommended amending the Irish constitution to repeal the Eighth Amendment, effectively legalising abortion. When the question was subsequently put to the Irish people in a referendum in May 2018, 66.4% voted in favour of repeal—a result that closely matched the Assembly's own 64% vote in favour of termination without restrictions [40]. Politicians of all parties had been unwilling to engage with the issue for decades, fearing electoral consequences; it took 99 ordinary citizens, given the conditions for genuine deliberation, to break the deadlock and build a political consensus that elected representatives had been unable to achieve.

The Irish experience illustrates several crucial principles. First, it demonstrates that ordinary citizens, when given adequate information and structured deliberative conditions, are capable of engaging with complex and divisive issues in a thoughtful and responsible manner. Second, it shows that deliberative processes can produce outcomes that are both epistemically sound and democratically legitimate—the Assembly's recommendations were not imposed by experts but arrived at through the informed deliberation of randomly selected citizens. Third, and perhaps most importantly, it demonstrates that the wider public is capable of reaching similar conclusions when exposed to the same quality of information and argument that the Assembly members received during the referendum campaign [41]. The deliberative process did not merely produce a good recommendation; it modelled a form of public reasoning that the broader citizenry could recognise as legitimate and authoritative.

5.3   Limitations and Challenges

Deliberative democratic innovations are not a panacea. They face significant challenges of scale, representativeness, and institutionalisation. Citizens' assemblies typically involve small numbers of participants—99 in the Irish case—and their recommendations carry weight only to the extent that political institutions choose to act on them. The risk of capture—by the experts who present evidence, by the facilitators who structure discussion, or by the political actors who set the terms of reference—is real, and the Irish model is not immune to it. Furthermore, deliberative processes are slow, expensive, and ill-suited to the rapid pace of political decision-making in a crisis [42].

More fundamentally, deliberative democracy addresses the quality of preference formation but does not, by itself, resolve the problem of algorithmic distortion in the wider information environment. A citizens' assembly operates within a carefully controlled epistemic environment—balanced expert testimony, structured discussion, insulation from media noise—but the vast majority of democratic participation occurs outside such controlled conditions, in the algorithmically curated information ecosystems of everyday life. The deliberative ideal thus needs to be complemented by broader reforms to the information environment if it is to have a transformative effect on democratic governance.

One promising approach to this challenge is the concept of "connected deliberation"—the idea that mini-publics such as citizens' assemblies can have effects that extend well beyond their direct participants. Research on the Irish experience suggests that the Citizens' Assembly influenced public opinion not only through its formal recommendations but through the broader public conversation it catalysed. Media coverage of the Assembly's deliberations, the publication of expert submissions and personal testimonies, and the public visibility of ordinary citizens engaging seriously with complex issues all contributed to a shift in the quality of national discourse on abortion. In this sense, the Assembly functioned not merely as a decision-making body but as a model of democratic reasoning that the wider public could observe and emulate. This suggests that deliberative innovations need not remain confined to small groups of participants; they can, under the right conditions, transform the broader epistemic environment in which democratic politics operates. The challenge is to create institutional structures that reliably produce this kind of radiating effect,

connecting the carefully structured deliberation of mini-publics to the messy, algorithmically mediated reality of mass democratic participation.

6 Democracy in the Digital Age: Toward a Framework for Democratic Resilience

Drawing on the preceding analysis, this section proposes a framework for sustaining democratic legitimacy and epistemic quality under the conditions of the contemporary digital information environment. The framework rests on three pillars: institutional innovation, platform accountability, and civic epistemic infrastructure.

6.1 Institutional Innovation: Embedding Deliberation in Democratic Governance

The first pillar involves the systematic integration of deliberative processes into existing democratic institutions. This means moving beyond one-off citizens' assemblies toward permanent or semi-permanent deliberative bodies that operate alongside elected legislatures. Several models have been proposed: Fishkin's [36] "deliberation day" concept, in which a national holiday is dedicated to structured citizen deliberation before major elections; the inclusion of randomly selected citizen panels in legislative review processes; and the establishment of standing citizens' assemblies with the power to set referendum agendas [43]. These innovations do not replace representative democracy; they supplement it with a layer of informed public judgment that can serve as a corrective to both populist excess and technocratic overreach.

The Belgian region of Ostbelgien has pioneered a particularly innovative model: a permanent Citizens' Council composed of randomly selected residents, with the power to set the agenda for citizens' assemblies on specific topics. This model addresses one of the key limitations of ad hoc assemblies—that their terms of reference are typically set by elected officials, who may use agenda-setting power to limit the scope of deliberation. By giving citizens control over which issues are subjected to deliberative scrutiny, the Ostbelgien model creates a genuinely participatory layer of governance that operates in tandem with representative institutions. Similarly, France's Citizens' Convention on Climate, which brought together 150 randomly selected citizens to develop policy proposals for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, demonstrated that deliberative assemblies can engage productively with highly technical issues—though its experience also illustrated the risk that elected officials may selectively implement or discard assembly recommendations to suit their political convenience. These experiences suggest that the institutionalisation of deliberative processes requires careful constitutional design to ensure that assembly recommendations receive meaningful consideration rather than serving as democratic window dressing.

6.2 Platform Accountability: Reforming the Algorithmic Public Sphere

The second pillar addresses the information environment directly. If algorithmic content curation systematically undermines the epistemic conditions for democratic deliberation, then the regulation of digital platforms becomes a matter of democratic necessity, not merely consumer protection. Several reform proposals deserve serious consideration.

First, algorithmic transparency: platforms should be required to disclose the principles and parameters of their recommendation algorithms, and to submit to independent audits of their effects on political information distribution [44]. Second, alternative feed architectures: platforms could be required to offer users chronological or editorially curated alternatives to engagement-optimised algorithmic feeds, giving citizens meaningful choice over the epistemic environment in which they consume political information. Third, researcher data access: legislation such as the proposed Platform Accountability and Transparency Act would require platforms to share data with independent researchers, enabling ongoing empirical assessment of social media's impact on democratic deliberation [45].

These proposals do not require governments to determine what is "true" or "correct"—a task that would reproduce the authority problem identified in the critique of epistocracy. Rather, they aim to ensure that the structural conditions for informed democratic deliberation—access to diverse and reliable information, exposure to opposing viewpoints, freedom from systematic algorithmic distortion—are maintained in the digital public sphere.

6.3 Civic Epistemic Infrastructure: Media Literacy and Public Knowledge Institutions

The third pillar focuses on building the epistemic capacities of citizens themselves. This includes comprehensive media literacy education that equips citizens to navigate algorithmically curated information environments critically and independently; the strengthening of public knowledge institutions—public broadcasting, libraries, universities, and independent journalism—that provide alternatives to commercially driven information ecosystems; and the development of civic technology tools that facilitate informed citizen engagement with political issues [46, 47].

The concept of "prebunking"—pre-emptively building resilience against misinformation by exposing citizens to weakened forms of common misleading arguments—has shown promising results in experimental settings and could be scaled through educational institutions and public media [47, 48]. Similarly, the practice of "lateral reading"—evaluating information by checking external sources rather than relying on surface cues—has been shown to improve citizens' ability to assess information quality in digital environments [49].

Taken together, these three pillars—institutional innovation, platform accountability, and civic epistemic infrastructure—constitute a framework for democratic resilience that respects both the majoritarian principle and the legitimate concern for decision quality. The framework does not resolve the tension between popular sovereignty and epistemic governance—this tension is constitutive of democracy and cannot be eliminated. Rather, it proposes a set of institutional, regulatory, and educational interventions that can help democratic societies manage this tension productively under the specific conditions of the digital age.

7   Conclusion

This paper has examined the foundational tension at the heart of democratic theory—the relationship between popular sovereignty and the quality of collective decisions—through the lens of the contemporary digital information environment. The analysis has yielded several conclusions.

First, the rise of algorithmically driven social media platforms, particularly TikTok and Instagram, has introduced genuinely novel challenges to the epistemic foundations of democratic governance. By systematically privileging engagement over accuracy, these platforms distort the conditions under which democratic citizens form their preferences and political judgments. The viral success of dangerous challenges, conspiracy theories, and emotionally manipulative content is not a bug in these systems; it is their ordinary mode of operation.

Second, however, the alternative of epistemic governance—the idea that political authority should be vested in those who possess superior knowledge—is both philosophically incoherent and empirically dangerous. Every proposal to concentrate political power on the basis of claimed epistemic authority confronts the insoluble problem of who certifies the certifiers. The Iranian theocratic model provides a vivid illustration of the endpoint of this logic: a self-legitimating elite that defines "correctness" in terms that serve its own power and suppresses all challenges to its authority as ignorance or deviance.

Third, deliberative democratic theory offers the most promising path through this dilemma. By focusing on the conditions under which preferences are formed rather than on who holds power, deliberative democracy addresses the epistemic concerns that motivate the critique of popular sovereignty without surrendering the principle of political equality. The Irish Citizens' Assembly demonstrates that this approach is not merely theoretical but practically viable: ordinary citizens, given the conditions for genuine deliberation, are capable of engaging with the most complex and divisive political questions in a manner that is both epistemically sound and democratically legitimate.

Finally, sustaining democratic governance in the digital age requires not only deliberative innovations but also structural reforms to the information environment in which democratic participation occurs. Algorithmic transparency, platform accountability, media literacy education, and the strengthening of public knowledge institutions are all necessary components of a comprehensive framework for democratic resilience.

It is worth emphasising that the framework proposed here does not seek to eliminate the tension between popular sovereignty and epistemic quality—a tension that, as this paper has argued, is constitutive of democracy itself. The Athenian democrats who instituted sortition, the Enlightenment philosophers who defended universal suffrage, and the twentieth-century theorists who championed deliberative democracy were all grappling with the same fundamental question: how can collective self-governance be made compatible with wise collective action? Each generation has answered this question in ways appropriate to its technological, social, and political circumstances. The digital age demands a new answer—one that takes seriously both the transformative power of algorithmic information systems and the enduring importance of political equality and popular self-determination. The deliberative democratic tradition, supplemented by targeted reforms to the digital information environment, offers the most promising foundation for constructing such an answer. It recognises that democracy is not a fixed institutional arrangement but an ongoing project of collective self-improvement—one that requires constant attention to the conditions under which citizens think, deliberate, and decide together.

Democracy's greatest strength has never been that it always produces the "correct" answer. It is that it contains self-correcting mechanisms—elections, free press, public deliberation, the peaceful transfer of power—that enable societies to recognise and remedy their mistakes over time. The genuine threat that digital media pose to democracy is not that they make people foolish but that they erode the very mechanisms of self-correction on which democratic

governance depends. The task for democratic theory and practice in the twenty-first century is to rebuild those mechanisms for the conditions of the digital age.

Future research should pursue several avenues opened by this analysis. Empirically, there is a pressing need for longitudinal studies that track the effects of algorithmic content curation on political attitudes, knowledge, and participation across different demographic groups and national contexts. The interaction between platform design and existing political cultures—how the same algorithmic architecture produces different effects in different democratic contexts—remains poorly understood. Theoretically, the relationship between epistemic quality and democratic legitimacy deserves further elaboration, particularly in light of the growing role of artificial intelligence in both content curation and, potentially, democratic deliberation itself. The possibility that AI systems could be used not merely to distort democratic discourse but to enhance it—by facilitating access to balanced information, identifying areas of factual consensus, or structuring online deliberation—raises novel questions that democratic theory has only begun to address. Practically, comparative research on deliberative innovations across different political systems is needed to identify which institutional designs are most effective at improving the epistemic quality of democratic decisions while maintaining broad public legitimacy. The stakes could not be higher: the capacity of democratic societies to govern themselves wisely in an age of algorithmic information will determine not only the quality of governance but the survival of democratic governance itself.

Acknowledgements

References

[1] Plato. *The Republic*. Penguin Classics, London, 2003. D. Lee, Trans.

[2] Aristotle. *Politics*. Hackett Publishing, Indianapolis, 1998. C. D. C. Reeve, Trans.

[3] Jean-Jacques Rousseau. *The Social Contract and The First and Second Discourses*. Yale University Press, New Haven, 2017. S. Dunn, Ed.

[4] Nicolas De Condorcet. *Essai sur l'application de l'analyse à la probabilité des décisions rendues à la pluralité des voix*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.

[5] Hélène Landemore. *Democratic Reason: Politics, Collective Intelligence, and the Rule of the Many*. Princeton University Press, 2012.

[6] Robert A. Dahl. *Democracy and Its Critics*. Yale University Press, 2008.

[7] John Stuart Mill. *On Liberty*. Cambridge University Press, 1989. Original work published 1859.

[8] Alexis de Tocqueville. *Democracy in America*. University of Chicago Press, 2000. Original work published 1835.

[9] David M. Estlund. *Democratic Authority: A Philosophical Framework*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2009.

[10] Elizabeth Anderson. The epistemology of democracy. *Episteme: A Journal of Social Epistemology*, 3(1):8–22, 2006. doi: 10.3366/epi.2006.3.1-2.8.

[11] Jürgen Habermas. *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. Polity Press, 2015. W. Rehg, Trans.

[12] Joshua Cohen. Deliberation and democratic legitimacy. In Alan Hamlin and Philip Pettit, editors, *The Good Polity: Normative Analysis of the State*, pages 17–34. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1989.

[13] Philip Pettit. *Republicanism: A Theory of Freedom and Government*. Oxford University Press, 1997.

[14] Amartya Sen. *Development as Freedom*. Knopf, New York, 1999.

[15] James Surowiecki. *The Wisdom of Crowds*. Vintage, 2005.

[16] Michael W. Doyle. Kant, liberal legacies, and foreign affairs, part 2. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 12(3):323–353, 1983.

[17] Chris A. Bail. *Breaking the Social Media Prism: How to Make Our Platforms Less Polarizing*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2022.

[18] Shoshana Zuboff. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. Profile Books, London, 2019.

[19] Paolo Gerbaudo. TikTok and the algorithmic transformation of social media publics. *New Media & Society*, 2024. doi: 10.1177/14614448241304106. Advance online publication.

[20] Kosar Karimi and Richard Fox. Scrolling, simping, and mobilizing: TikTok's influence over Generation Z's political behavior. *Journal of Social Media in Society*, 12(1):181–208, 2023.

[21] Soroush Vosoughi, Deb Roy, and Sinan Aral. The spread of true and false news online. *Science*, 359(6380): 1146–1151, 2018.

[22] Eli Pariser. *The Filter Bubble: What the Internet Is Hiding from You*. Penguin, London, 2011.

[23] Cass R. Sunstein. *Republic: Divided Democracy in the Age of Social Media*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2018.

[24] Pablo Barberá. Social media, echo chambers, and political polarization. In Nathaniel Persily and Joshua A. Tucker, editors, *Social Media and Democracy: The State of the Field, Prospects for Reform*, pages 34–55. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2020. doi: 10.1017/9781108890960.004.

[25] Joshua A. Tucker, Yannis Theocharis, Margaret E. Roberts, and Pablo Barberá. From liberation to turmoil: Social media and democracy. *Journal of Democracy*, 28(4):46–59, 2017.

[26] Jason Brennan. *Against Democracy*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2017.

[27] Elizabeth Anderson. An epistemic defense of democracy: David Estlund's democratic authority. *Episteme*, 5(1): 129–139, 2008. doi: 10.3366/E1742360008000269.

[28] Asghar Schirazi. *The Constitution of Iran: Politics and the State in the Islamic Republic*. I.B. Tauris, London, 1997.

[29] Ervand Abrahamian. *A History of Modern Iran*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008.

[30] Nikki R. Keddie and Yann Richard. *Modern Iran: Roots and Results of Revolution*, volume 3. Yale University Press, 2006.

[31] Karim Sadjadpour. *Reading Khamenei: The World View of Iran's Most Powerful Leader*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, 2009.

[32] Karl Popper, Ernst H. Gombrich, and Václav Havel. *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Routledge, 2012.

[33] Frank Vibert. *The Rise of the Unelected: Democracy and the New Separation of Powers*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.

[34] Jürgen Habermas. *The Crisis of the European Union: A Response*. Polity Press, 2012. C. Cronin, Trans.

[35] Wolfgang Streeck. *Buying Time: The Delayed Crisis of Democratic Capitalism*. Verso, London, 2014.

[36] James S. Fishkin. *When the People Speak: Deliberative Democracy and Public Consultation*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2009.

[37] John S. Dryzek. *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals, Critics, Contestations*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002.

[38] Jane Suiter, David M. Farrell, and Eoin O'Malley. When do deliberative citizens change their opinions? Evidence from the Irish Citizens' Assembly. *International Political Science Review*, 37(2):198–212, 2016. doi: 10.1177/0192512114544068.

[39] Hélène Landemore. *Open Democracy: Reinventing Popular Rule for the Twenty-First Century*. Princeton University Press, 2020.

[40] Clodagh Harris. Bridging representative and direct democracy? Ireland's citizens' assemblies. Hansard Society Blog, 2018. URL https://www.hansardsociety.org.uk/blog.

[41] Johan A. Elkink, David M. Farrell, Theresa Reidy, and Jane Suiter. The death of conservative Ireland? The 2018 abortion referendum. *Electoral Studies*, 65:102142, 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.electstud.2020.102142.

[42] Cristina Lafont. *Democracy Without Shortcuts: A Participatory Conception of Deliberative Democracy*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2019.

[43] John Gastil and Erik Olin Wright, editors. *Legislature by Lot: Transformative Designs for Deliberative Governance*. Verso, London, 2019.

[44] Nagadivya Balasubramaniam, Marjo Kauppinen, Kari Hiekkanen, and Sari Kujala. Transparency and explainability of AI systems: Ethical guidelines in practice. In *International Working Conference on Requirements Engineering: Foundation for Software Quality*, pages 3–18, Cham, 2022. Springer International Publishing. doi: 10.1016/j.infsof.2023.107197.

[45] Nathaniel Persily and Joshua A. Tucker, editors. *Social Media and Democracy: The State of the Field, Prospects for Reform*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.

[46] Eszter Hargittai. Digital na(t)ives? Variation in internet skills and uses among members of the "net generation". *Sociological Inquiry*, 80(1):92–113, 2010. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-682X.2009.00317.x.

[47] Jon Roozenbeek and Sander van der Linden. Fake news game confers psychological resistance against online misinformation. *Palgrave Communications*, 5(1):1–10, 2019. doi: 10.1057/s41599-019-0279-9.

[48] John Cook, Stephan Lewandowsky, and Ullrich K. H. Ecker. Neutralizing misinformation through inoculation: Exposing misleading argumentation techniques reduces their influence. *PLOS ONE*, 12(5):e0175799, 2017. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0175799.

[49] Sam Wineburg and Sarah McGrew. Lateral reading and the nature of expertise: Reading less and learning more when evaluating digital information. *Teachers College Record*, 121(11):1–40, 2019.