Democracy and Governance in Islam: A Sunni Perspective

Biography:

Dr. Ziyad Motala is a Professor of law at Howard University School of Law and the former Director of the Comparative and International Law Program conducted at the University of Western Cape since 1995. He served as an Honorary Professor of Law at the University of Western Cape School Of Law in South Africa. Prior to his teaching at Howard, he also taught at Northwestern Law School as an Adjunct Law Professor and a visiting Professor at Chicago-Kent College of Law. Motala is a native of Durban, South Africa, and was active in the struggle for liberation in South Africa. He received his B.A. and LL.B. degrees from the University of Natal (South Africa). He has an LL.M. and an SJ.D degree from Northwestern University in Chicago. He is an authority on international law, constitutional law, and comparative constitutional law.

Abstract:

This article examines the compatibility of democracy with Islamic governance from a Sunni perspective, arguing that the foundational principles of Islam—justice, consultation (Shura), and accountability—align closely with democratic values. It explores historical precedents such as the Rashidun Caliphate to highlight Islamic traditions of participatory governance, while contrasting these ideals with the dynastic and authoritarian tendencies that emerged in later caliphates. The analysis critiques the misuse of religion by modern authoritarian regimes to suppress democratic aspirations, emphasizing the inconsistency between their practices and core Islamic values. Through case studies of Muslim-majority democracies like Tunisia, Indonesia, and Malaysia, the article demonstrates the potential for integrating democratic frameworks with Islamic principles. It further explores the role of women, the importance of freedom of speech, and the application of Islamic economic ethics in fostering equitable governance. Ultimately, the article asserts that Islam and democracy are not inherently incompatible and proposes that an

authentic Islamic governance model must incorporate democratic mechanisms to uphold justice, reject corruption, and ensure accountability.

Keywords:

Islam and Democracy, Islamic Governance, Shura (Consultation), Rashidun Caliphate, Islamic Political Thought, Justice and Accountability, Authoritarianism in Muslim-Majority Countries, Women in Islamic Politics, Islamic Economic Principles, Globalization and Islamic Movements, Freedom of Speech in Islam, Sunni Perspective on Governance, Dynastic Rule vs. Democratic Values, Muslim-Majority Democracies, Political Reform in Islam.

Introduction[1]

Islamic governance, as derived from the teachings of the Quran, the Prophet Muhammad, and early Islamic history, places significant emphasis on principles of justice, accountability, consultation, and the welfare of the community (Abou El Fadl, 2004, p. 22-24). However, many Muslim-majority countries have veered away from these values, particularly in the face of authoritarianism, corruption, and nepotism (Kuru, 2014; see also Feldman, 2008, pp. 45-50). These deviations raise the question of whether Islamic governance is inherently incompatible with democratic principles or whether the core values of Islam can, in fact, support democratic governance that respects both divine law and the rights of the people.

This article explores the intersection of Islam and democracy, challenging the notion that Islamic governance is antithetical to democracy (Mawdudi, 1993 p.10). While democracy and Shura (consultation) share many common values, such as accountability and collective decision-making, key differences remain, particularly in terms of the concept of sovereignty. In Islamic governance, ultimate sovereignty belongs to God, while in Western liberal democracies, sovereignty lies with the people (Voll, 2007, p.172).

Despite this distinction, many Islamic scholars and political thinkers argue that democratic principles can be adapted to an Islamic context without undermining divine law. The article examines historical precedents, particularly the governance of the Rashidun Caliphate, to demonstrate how Islamic principles of justice, consultation, and accountability align with democratic values. Furthermore, it critiques the use of religious justifications by authoritarian

Muslim regimes to suppress democratic movements and maintain power, highlighting the inconsistency between these regimes' practices and Islamic teachings.

In addition, the article draws attention to the role of Islamic political movements in advocating for justice and democratic governance, as well as the challenges posed by globalization and economic inequality in the modern Muslim world. Ultimately, it argues that authoritarianism, corruption, nepotism, and the denial of popular participation are inconsistent with the core values of Islam, and that an authentic Islamic governance model must incorporate the voices of the people, uphold justice, and reject corruption.

Historical Context and Precedents in Islamic Governance: The Rashidun Caliphate

The development of governance in Islamic history offers a rich tapestry of political thought that can be compared to modern democratic principles. The governance of the Rashidun Caliphate, often referred to as the "golden era" of Islamic leadership, is widely cited by Sunni scholars as a model of just and consultative governance (Husain, 1997, p. 252; Lewis, 1995, pp. 120-123). However, after the era of the four rightly-guided caliphs, the Islamic political landscape evolved in a direction that increasingly emphasized dynastic rule and authoritarianism, particularly during the Umayyad and Abbasid Caliphates.

The Rashidun Caliphate (632–661 CE) is considered the ideal era of Islamic governance due to its emphasis on justice, consultation (Shura), and accountability. The requirement for Shura is a Quranic injunction that was given to the Prophet. The Quran ordains "consults with them upon the conduct of affairs. And when thou art resolved, then put thy trust in Allah" (Quran 3:159). This Shura was mandatory for the Prophet and followed vigorously by his immediate successors. The first four caliphs—Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman, and Ali—were chosen through consultative processes, reflecting a form of collective decision-making (Husain, 1997; Madelung, 1997, pp. 65-67). Abu Bakr's humility in leadership is often highlighted in Islamic history. Upon being chosen as caliph, he declared, "cooperate with me when I do right; correct me when I err" (Brohi, as cited in Gauhar, 1978, p. 183). This statement exemplifies the democratic nature of early Islamic governance, where leaders were accountable to the community. His successor, Umar, institutionalized Shura by creating a council of advisors that helped him govern, further embedding consultation into the Islamic political framework. Umar's rule is frequently cited as a model of just governance, where decisions were not made arbitrarily but through discussion and consensus (Husain, 1997, pp. 86-91).

Uthman ibn Affan and Ali ibn Abi Talib, the third and fourth caliphs, faced significant internal strife during their reigns. Uthman's tenure was marred by accusations of nepotism, which ultimately led to his assassination. Ali's reign was defined by internal divisions within the Muslim community, culminating in civil wars. Despite these challenges, both caliphs are remembered for their commitment to justice and their efforts to preserve the principles of Shura amidst political turbulence.

The Umayyad and Abbasid Dynasties: A Shift Toward Dynastic Rule

Al Mawardi provides his theory of the state where he stated the Khalifah must be appointed by the ummah (Al Mehdi, as cited in Gauhar, 1978, p. 124). The agency for running the affairs of the state must be formed by consensus. Mawdudi asserts that no individual or dynasty can rule over the people without being put in authority through Shura (Mawdudi, 1993, p. 10). The rise of the Umayyad Caliphate (661–750 CE) marked a significant shift in the Islamic political landscape, with the introduction of dynastic rule, the elimination of all opposition and a movement away from the Islamic mandate of Shura (BenabdeljalilI, 2022; Kennedy, 2004, pp. 172-175). Mu'awiya, the first Umayyad caliph, established a hereditary monarchy, breaking with the precedent set by the Rashidun Caliphate (Hawting, 2000, pp. 110-112). Mu'awiya's decision to appoint his son Yazid as his successor marked a departure from the previous practice of selecting leaders through consultation. Hawting observes that Mu'awiya's establishment of a hereditary monarchy was a significant innovation in Islamic governance and that this move away from the principle of *Shura* led to increased centralization of power (Hawting, 2000, pp. 110-112).

It is argued below that nepotism is an anti-Islamic concept. The Umayyads centralized power in the caliphate, leading to an increasingly autocratic form of governance. While the caliphs maintained a semblance of consultation through advisors, the process was often symbolic, and the ruling family held significant control over political decisions.

The transition from the Umayyads to the Abbasids in 750 CE did little to reverse the trend toward dynastic rule. The Abbasids, though initially more inclusive of non-Arab Muslims and more inclined toward intellectual and cultural developments, continued to operate within a monarchical framework. While Shura remained an ideal in Islamic jurisprudence, its practical application was largely diminished during this period.

Under the Abbasids, the caliphate's political power became increasingly symbolic as real control shifted to regional governors and military commanders (Berger, 2022, pp. 281-291; Robinson, 2016, pp.196-193). The reliance on military power and the decentralization of authority further entrenched dynastic rule, moving Islamic governance away from the consultative principles that characterized the Rashidun Caliphate. This era witnessed the rise of sultans and emirs, who wielded significant political authority while the caliphs retained religious legitimacy.

The Ottoman Empire: A Complex Bureaucratic State

The Ottoman Empire (1299–1922), which succeeded the Abbasid Caliphate in claiming the mantle of Islamic leadership, introduced a complex bureaucratic system that combined elements of dynastic rule with bureaucratic governance (Barkey, 2016, pp. 102-126). The Ottomans centralized power under the sultan, who was both a political ruler and the caliph, the religious leader of the Muslim world.

While the Ottoman system allowed for some consultation, particularly through the Divan (imperial council), decision-making was largely controlled by the sultan and his court. The Shura tradition, which had been central to the Rashidun Caliphate, became more symbolic, with real power concentrated in the hands of a few elite rulers (Barkey, 2016, pp. 102-126; Inalcik, 2000, pp. 75-78). Despite this, the Ottomans made significant contributions to Islamic governance, particularly in terms of legal and administrative structures, which continued to influence Muslim-majority states long after the empire's collapse.

The Ottoman Empire's legacy continues to influence political thought in the Muslim world. Many modern Islamic political movements draw on Ottoman history to justify various forms of governance, from constitutional monarchies to more centralized authoritarian models. The complex relationship between consultation and authoritarianism in Ottoman governance reflects the broader tension within Islamic political thought regarding the balance between divine sovereignty and popular sovereignty.

Comparative Reflections

The evolution of Islamic governance from the Rashidun Caliphate to the Umayyad, Abbasid, and Ottoman dynasties demonstrates a gradual shift away from the consultative and accountable governance models that characterized early Islam. While the principle of Shura remained a theoretical ideal, the practical realities of governing vast and diverse empires often led to more centralized and authoritarian systems (Barkey, 2016, pp. 102-126; Crone, 2004, pp. 155-160). This historical evolution highlights the challenges of maintaining democratic principles within an Islamic framework, particularly in the face of political, social, and economic pressures (Abdel Razek, 2013, pp. 74-77).

Modern Islamic political thinkers often look to the Rashidun Caliphate as a source of inspiration for integrating democratic values into contemporary governance (Hallaq, 2013, pp. 83-89). The emphasis on consultation, accountability, and justice during this period serves as a model for those advocating for the compatibility of Islam and democracy.

Shura in Islamic Jurisprudence

The concept of Shura (consultation) is central to Islamic governance, drawing directly from the Quran and the practices of the Prophet Muhammad (Abou El Fadl, 2004, pp. 16-17). The Quran states: "and those who have responded to their lord and established prayer and whose affair is [determined by] consultation among themselves" (Quran 42:38). This verse highlights the importance of collective decision-making in Islam, indicating that leaders should consult with their communities on matters of governance.

During the life of the Prophet Muhammad, Shura was a fundamental component of his leadership style (Watt, 1961, pp. 131-134). He regularly consulted his companions on matters of both spiritual and temporal importance. One of the most famous instances of this was during the Battle of Uhud, where the Prophet sought the opinion of his companions on whether to defend the city of Medina from within its walls or to engage the enemy in open combat. Despite his personal preference to defend the city, the majority favored open combat, and the Prophet adhered to the collective decision. This moment demonstrates the Prophet's respect for consultation and collective decision-making, even when it went against his own judgment.

Following the Prophet's death, the Rashidun Caliphs institutionalized the principle of Shura. Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman, and Ali all relied on consultation with their advisors and the broader community to make important decisions (Madelung, 1997, pp. 65-67). Abu Bakr's appointment as the first caliph, following the Prophet's death, was itself a result of Shura. The companions of the Prophet gathered at Saqifah, where they debated who was best suited to lead the Muslim community. Although the process was informal, it emphasized the role of community consensus in leadership selection.

Umar, the second caliph, took this a step further by formalizing Shura through the creation of a council of advisors (Husain, 1997, p. 190). This council, composed of prominent companions of the Prophet, helped guide Umar's decisions on matters of state. Umar is often praised for his accessibility to the people and his willingness to accept criticism and advice. He instituted public assemblies and accountability for the governors during Hajj where grievances could be aired (Husain, 1997, p. 191). He was known to walk the streets of Medina in disguise to better understand the needs of the people.

This tradition of consultation continued during the reigns of Uthman and Ali, though both caliphs faced significant challenges that complicated their governance. Uthman's tenure was marked by accusations of nepotism and growing internal dissent, while Ali's reign saw the first Muslim civil war, the Fitna. Despite these difficulties, both caliphs adhered to the principle of Shura as a fundamental aspect of their leadership (Husain, 1997, pp.106-119, 137-152).

Distinction Between Shura and Western Democracy

While Shura and democracy share several common principles—such as consultation, participation, and accountability—there are key distinctions that differentiate Islamic governance from Western democratic models. One of the most significant differences lies in the concept of sovereignty (Mawdudi, 1993, p.10). In Western liberal democracies, sovereignty rests with the people, who exercise their authority through elected representatives. The people are considered the ultimate source of political authority, and they possess the right to legislate on matters of governance.

In contrast, Islamic governance views ultimate sovereignty as belonging to God, with human rulers acting as stewards of God's law (Abou El Fadl, 2004, pp. 5-6; Mawdudi, 1993, p. 10; Esposito & Voll, 1996, pp. 34-38). This theological distinction is rooted in the Quran, which emphasizes that all authority originates from God, and that rulers are accountable to both God and the people in upholding justice and adhering to divine law. As the Quran states: "the command is for none but Allah: He has commanded that you worship none but Him" (Quran 12:40). This divine sovereignty implies that human legislation cannot contradict Islamic law (Sharia).

Some scholars argue that this theological framework poses a challenge for the full adoption of Western-style democracy in Islamic governance, since the people cannot legislate in contradiction to Sharia (Feldman, 2008, pp. 67-69). However, this distinction does not preclude the incorporation of democratic mechanisms into Islamic governance (Ghannouchi, 2022, pp. 108-114). The principles of justice, accountability, and consultation, which are central to Islamic teachings, can serve as the foundation for a democratic system that is consistent with Islamic values.

For instance, elections, representative bodies, and legal frameworks that promote accountability and protect individual rights are not inherently at odds with Shura. In fact, many Islamic scholars argue that these democratic mechanisms are aligned with the Islamic emphasis on collective decision-making and the rule of law. Various Islamic scholars posit that Shura provides a framework for integrating democratic practices into Islamic governance, as long as these practices do not contravene divine law (Ghannouchi, 2022, pp. 108-114). Yusuf Al-Qaradawi, a prominent Islamic scholar, has articulated that *Shura* (consultation) offers a framework for integrating democratic practices into Islamic governance, provided these practices do not contravene divine law. In his work, "Shura and Democracy," Al-Qaradawi emphasizes that while Islam encourages consultation and collective decision-making, it does so within the boundaries set by Sharia (Islamic law). He asserts that democratic practices are acceptable in Islamic governance as long as they align with Islamic principles and do not permit what is prohibited or prohibit what is permitted in Islam (IslamOnline, undated). Thus, while the theological distinction regarding sovereignty remains, the shared values of justice, consultation, and accountability offer significant common ground between Shura and democratic governance.

The Case Against Democracy: Muslim Dictators and Their Scholars

Despite the growing support among scholars for the compatibility of Islam and democracy, certain Muslim rulers and their affiliated religious scholars have actively opposed democratic reforms, arguing that democracy undermines Islamic governance (Engineer, 2003). These rulers often claim that democracy threatens the authority of Islamic law, promotes secularism, and introduces Western values that are incompatible with Islamic teachings. However, such arguments are frequently used by authoritarian regimes to maintain power by discrediting democratic movements and portraying them as foreign or un-Islamic. And there is no inward reflection on the nature of these regimes that rule in ways that contradict the core tenets of Islam including corruption and widespread human rights abuses.

Saudi Arabia is a prime example of this dynamic. The Saudi monarchy, long allied with the Wahhabi religious establishment, has consistently opposed democratic reforms, using religious justifications to legitimize its autocratic rule (Motala, 2022; Al-Rasheed, 2010, pp. 200-204). Prominent Saudi scholars have issued fatwas asserting that democracy is a Western invention that contradicts Islamic governance (Anjum, 2016, p. 2). Preachers in many Muslim majority countries use the pulpit to propagate that in Islam, authority derives from God, not the people, and that democracy's emphasis on popular sovereignty conflicts with the Islamic belief in divine sovereignty (Wiktorowicz, 2001, pp. 56-58).

These clerics provide religious legitimacy to the Saudi regime, framing democratic movements and public dissent as threats to Islamic governance (Lacroix, 2011, pp. 176-180). However, their arguments serve to protect the interests of the ruling elite rather than upholding Islamic principles of justice, accountability, and consultation. In reality, Saudi Arabia's political system, characterized by hereditary monarchy and repression of dissent, stands in stark contrast to the values of justice and consultation emphasized in Islamic teachings (Rahman, 2020, p. 17).

Similarly, in Egypt, the governments of Hosni Mubarak and Abdel Fattah el-Sisi co-opted religious scholars to support their authoritarian rule. Scholars affiliated with Al-Azhar, the preeminent Sunni religious institution, endorsed the government's stance against democratic movements, particularly those associated with the Muslim Brotherhood (Brown, 2013, pp. 13-15). The use of religious justifications to suppress democratic aspirations was a common tactic under both regimes, as they sought to preserve their grip on power by portraying democracy as un-Islamic.

Critics of these regimes argue that their actions contradict Islamic values of justice, accountability, and transparency (Motala, 2022). Islamic scholars who oppose authoritarianism emphasize that Islam demands that rulers be accountable to the people and governed by ethical standards (Ghannouchi, 2022, pp.115-122). The Prophet Muhammad's leadership model, which emphasized consultation, justice, and service to the community, stands in stark contrast to the autocratic rule justified by these modern regimes. While some authoritarian leaders and their scholars claim to uphold Islamic governance, their actions often contradict the core values of Islam. Authoritarianism, corruption, nepotism, and the denial of popular participation are

inconsistent with Islamic teachings, which demand that rulers be accountable to both God and the people (Rahman, 2020, pp.19-20).

Contemporary Interpretations of Islamic Democracy

The debate over the compatibility of Islam and democracy has intensified in modern times, particularly as Muslim-majority countries grapple with issues of governance, human rights, and political participation. Many contemporary Islamic scholars such as Yusuf al-Qaradawi argue that democracy is not only compatible with Islam but is, in fact, rooted in Islamic principles such as Shura, justice, and accountability (Rahmah, 2020, p. 17; Al-Qaradawi, 1997, pp. 58-61). Yusuf al-Qaradawi, one of the most influential Islamic scholars of the 20th and 21st centuries, has been a vocal proponent of the compatibility of Islam and democracy. In his writings, Al-Qaradawi argues that while Shura is not identical to Western democracy, it embodies the spirit of democratic governance. According to Al-Qaradawi, both Shura and democracy emphasize collective decision-making, accountability, and the protection of individual rights. He asserts that leaders in an Islamic system, much like in a democratic system, must act in the best interests of the people and remain accountable to them (Rahman, 2020, pp. 18-19).

Al-Qaradawi also stresses that Shura is not merely a recommendation in Islamic governance; it is a binding obligation (Rahmah, 2020, p. 17). Muslim rulers are required to consult with their communities, and failure to do so is a violation of Islamic principles. This interpretation aligns closely with the democratic values of participation, representation, and transparency.

Rashid Ghannouchi, the founder of Tunisia's Ennahda Party, is another prominent advocate for Islamic democracy. Ghannouchi's political philosophy is based on the belief that Islam and democracy are not only compatible but are mutually reinforcing (Alisakun, 2020, pp. 27-28). He argues that the principles of Shura align with democratic values such as participation, representation, and the protection of individual rights. Ghannouchi's vision of Islamic democracy is one that respects the rule of law, promotes social justice, and safeguards the rights of minorities. He contends that Islamic governance, when properly understood, is inherently pluralistic and inclusive (Ghannouchi, 2022, pp. 294-312). Ghannouchi has pointed to Tunisia's democratic transition prior to the Kais Saied as an example of how Islamic principles can coexist with modern democratic governance.

Under Ghannouchi's leadership, prior to his incarceration by President Kais Saied, Ennahda played a key role in drafting Tunisia's post-revolution constitution, which guaranteed fundamental rights such as freedom of speech, gender equality, and the separation of powers (Ghannouchi, 2022, pp. 92-94; Johnson, 2024). Ghannouchi's approach to governance demonstrates that Islamic values can be harmonized with democratic principles, creating a political system that is both faithful to Islamic teachings and responsive to the needs of a modern, diverse society.

Case Studies of Muslim-Majority Democracies

The experiences of Muslim-majority countries with democratic governance offer valuable insights into the practical application of Islamic principles in a modern political context (Esposito & Voll, 1996, pp. 114-118). Countries like Tunisia, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Pakistan provide case studies of how Islam and democracy can coexist, though with varying degrees of success.

Tunisia for a brief period was hailed as a success story in the context of Islamic democracy. Following the 2011 revolution that ousted longtime dictator Zine El Abidine Ben Ali, Tunisia embarked on a democratic transition that included the drafting of a new constitution. The process was heavily influenced by Islamic values, particularly through the involvement of the Ennahda Party, which is rooted in Islamic political thought.

Tunisia's 2014 constitution enshrined key democratic principles, such as the separation of powers, freedom of expression, and gender equality. At the same time, it affirms Tunisia's Islamic identity, balancing modern democratic governance with Islamic values (Riyanika 2018, pp. 7-10). Ennahda's role in this transition demonstrates that Islamic political movements can be instrumental in promoting democracy.

Indonesia, the world's largest Muslim-majority country, is another example of a functioning democracy that integrates Islamic values. Indonesia's political system is based on Pancasila, a state ideology that emphasizes belief in one God, humanitarianism, national unity, democracy, and social justice (Hefner, 2000, pp. 134-136). While Indonesia is a secular state, Islam plays a significant role in its political and social life. Islamic political parties, such as the National Awakening Party (PKB) and the United Development Party (PPP), participate in Indonesia's democratic process, advocating for policies that align with Islamic teachings. However, Indonesia's democracy also accommodates religious pluralism, with protections for the rights of non-Muslims and minority groups.

Malaysia presents a unique case of balancing Islam with secular governance. The country's political system is based on a constitutional monarchy, with Islam as the official religion. However, Malaysia's constitution guarantees freedom of religion, and its legal system incorporates both Islamic and secular laws. Islamic political parties, such as the Pan-Malaysian Islamic Party (PAS), have long been part of the political landscape, advocating for the implementation of Islamic law (Gani, 2021). At the same time, Malaysia's government has sought to maintain a delicate balance between Islamic governance and secularism, ensuring that the rights of all citizens are protected.

Pakistan's experience with democracy has been more tumultuous. Since its creation in 1947, Pakistan has oscillated between civilian rule and military dictatorship, with Islam playing a central role in its political identity. Pakistan's constitution declares the country an Islamic republic, and its legal system is based on a combination of Sharia and secular laws. Despite these challenges, Islamic political parties, such as Jamaat-e-Islami, continue to play an influential role

in the country's politics, advocating for governance based on Islamic principles (Kuma, 2001). However, Pakistan's democracy remains fragile, with ongoing tensions between religious and secular forces.

Freedom of Speech, Political Dissent, and Governance under the Prophet and the Rashidun era versus the current reality

The Quran demands from the faithful to enjoin good and forbid evil (Quran 9:71). The Quran speaks about the hypocrite who proclaims what is improper and forbids what is proper (Quran 9:67). The right to freedom of speech and the ability to dissent against rulers are fundamental to both democratic governance and Islamic principles. Islamic teachings emphasize the importance of speaking out against injustice, with the Prophet Muhammad declaring that "the best form of jihad is to speak a word of truth before a tyrannical ruler" (Motala, 2022). The well knows hadith of the prophet "if any of you comes across an evil, you should try to stop it with his hand using force; If he is not in a position to stop it with his hand then he should try to stop it by means of his tongue meaning he should speak against it. If he is not even able to use his tongue then he should at least condemn it in his heart. This is the weakest degree of faith" (Mawdudi, 1993, p. 29). This sentiment is echoed in the practices of the Rashidun Caliphs, who encouraged public criticism and held themselves accountable to the people.

During the time of the Prophet and the Rashidun Caliphs, freedom of speech and political dissent were integral to governance. Prophet Muhammad regularly allowed his followers to voice their concerns, even in public settings. One well-known example is when a man interrupted the Prophet during a sermon to inquire about the unlawful detention of his neighbor (Motala, 2022; Esposito, 1999, pp. 102-105). Rather than rebuke the man for speaking out of turn, the Prophet ordered the neighbor's release, demonstrating his commitment to justice and the importance of addressing grievances publicly.

Abu Bakr, the first caliph, famously declared that the Muslim community had the right to correct him if he erred (Brohi, as cited in Gauhar, 1978, p.183). Similarly, Umar, the second caliph, was known for his accessibility to the people and his encouragement of public criticism (Madelung, 1997, pp. 58-56). During Umar's reign, it was not uncommon for ordinary citizens to confront him with grievances, and he welcomed such interactions as a necessary part of just governance.

In contemporary Muslim-majority countries, the issue of freedom of speech and political dissent remains contentious. Muslim majority countries with authoritarian regimes, such as Saudi Arabia and Egypt, freedom of speech is severely restricted, and political dissent is often met with harsh repression (Motala, 2022).

Saudi Arabia, for example, has long been criticized for its suppression of free speech and its use of religious justifications to silence political opposition. The government's alliance with the Wahhabi religious establishment has allowed it to frame dissent as un-Islamic, effectively stifling any meaningful debate on governance or human rights. Similarly, Egypt, under the regimes of

Hosni Mubarak and Abdel Fattah el-Sisi, has cracked down on free speech, particularly in the wake of the Arab Spring, which saw widespread calls for democratic reforms. These practices contradict the injunctions of the Prophet and the examples under the Rashidun caliphs.

Women's Role in Islamic Governance and Democracy

The role of women in Islamic governance has been a topic of significant debate both historically and in contemporary Muslim-majority societies. While some interpretations of Islamic law have limited women's participation in politics and governance, there is a growing body of scholarship that argues for a more inclusive understanding of women's roles within Islamic frameworks, particularly in democratic contexts.

In the early days of Islam, women played vital roles in both social and political spheres (Hibri, 2015, p. 107). Aisha bint Abu Bakr, the wife of the Prophet Muhammad, is one of the most prominent examples of a woman who exerted political influence. Aisha was not only a religious scholar but also a political leader. Her involvement in the Battle of the Camel—a conflict over the leadership of the Muslim community—demonstrates that women were active participants in governance during the early Islamic period (Brown, 2014, p. 140).

Another significant figure is Umm Salama, another wife of the Prophet, who was known for her wisdom and counsel (Mernissi, 1991). She offered advice on several political and religious matters, which was often heeded by the Prophet and his companions. Women also participated in war (Brown, 2014, p. 198). These examples indicate that women's involvement in governance during the formative years of Islam was accepted and respected.

In the modern context, women in many Muslim-majority countries are increasingly taking on leadership roles in politics and governance. Countries like Pakistan, Indonesia, and Bangladesh have all seen women hold the highest office of the land—examples include Benazir Bhutto in Pakistan and Megawati Sukarnoputri in Indonesia (Rolland, 2015, pp. 1-17). These leaders have navigated the political landscape by drawing on both Islamic principles and democratic norms.

In Tunisia, women played a crucial role in the democratic transition following the Arab Spring. The new Tunisian constitution, drafted with significant input from female lawmakers, guarantees gender equality and enshrines the rights of women to participate fully in political life (McCarthy, 2018, pp. 210-213). This is a landmark achievement, particularly in a region where women's political participation has historically been limited.

Malaysia also presents a case where women have made significant inroads in politics. The country's constitution guarantees the right of women to participate in political life, and several women have held key ministerial positions. In 2018, Wan Azizah Wan Ismail became Malaysia's first female Deputy Prime Minister, marking a significant moment for gender equality in the country's political sphere.

While there have been significant strides in women's political participation in Muslim-majority democracies, challenges remain. In many countries, conservative interpretations of Islamic law continue to limit women's roles in governance. In Saudi Arabia, for example, women were only recently granted the right to drive, vote and run for office in 2015. In many Muslim majority countries, women's participation in politics remains constrained by deeply ingrained social norms.

Nevertheless, the increasing involvement of women in politics in countries like Tunisia, Indonesia, and Malaysia demonstrates that Islamic principles can be harmonized with democratic ideals to support gender equality. As more women take on leadership roles, they are not only reshaping the political landscape but also challenging traditional interpretations of Islamic law that have excluded them from public life.

Islamic Economic Principles and Democratic Governance

Economic justice is a fundamental aspect of both Islamic governance and democratic theory. Islamic economic principles, such as Zakat (obligatory almsgiving), Riba (prohibition of interest), and Waqf (endowment), aim to create a just and equitable society by promoting the redistribution of wealth and the protection of the poor. These principles play an essential role in fostering social welfare and justice, which are core components of democratic governance.

Zakat is one of the five pillars of Islam and requires Muslims to give a portion of their wealth to those in need. This form of wealth redistribution is designed to reduce inequality and ensure that the basic needs of all members of society are met (Husain, 1997, pp. 197-198; Kahf, 1978, pp. 55-58). In an Islamic democracy, Zakat could be institutionalized through a public welfare system, ensuring that the state takes responsibility for the well-being of its citizens.

Islamic scholars argue that Zakat promotes social solidarity and economic justice, which are also key principles of democratic governance. By mandating that wealth be shared with the less fortunate, Islam seeks to prevent the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few, a concept that aligns with democratic ideals of fairness and equality.

The prohibition of Riba (interest) is another cornerstone of Islamic economic theory (Husain, 1997, p. 197). Islam forbids the charging of interest on loans, as it is seen as exploitative and unjust. Islamic economics advocates for a system where loans are based on profit-sharing rather than interest, ensuring that both parties share in the risks and rewards of financial transactions.

This principle of economic justice can be integrated into a democratic framework by promoting financial systems that prioritize fairness and social welfare over profit maximization. Islamic banks, which operate on profit-sharing models rather than interest, provide a modern example of how Islamic economic principles can be applied in today's financial systems.

Waqf, or charitable endowment, is another important Islamic economic institution that contributes to social welfare (Dzuljastri, 2019, p. 38). Historically, Waqf has been used to fund public goods such as schools, hospitals, and infrastructure. In a democratic context, Waqf can be seen as a form of civil society involvement in the provision of public services, complementing the role of the state. The concept of Waqf aligns with the democratic principle of civic engagement, where individuals and organizations contribute to the common good. By encouraging voluntary contributions to social welfare, Waqf helps to build a more inclusive and participatory society.

Several Muslim-majority countries have incorporated Islamic economic principles into their governance frameworks. Malaysia, for instance, has developed a dual banking system that includes both conventional and Islamic banks (Gani, 2021; Mohammed, 2021). Islamic banks operate according to Sharia law, offering financial products that comply with the prohibition on Riba and promote profit-sharing.

In addition to banking, Zakat institutions in countries like Indonesia and Pakistan play a crucial role in social welfare (Dzuljastri, 2019, pp. 40-41). These institutions collect and distribute Zakat to those in need, helping to alleviate poverty and promote economic justice. By integrating Islamic economic principles into their governance structures, these countries demonstrate that Islamic values can coexist with modern economic and democratic systems.

The Impact of Globalization on Islamic Governance

Globalization has had a profound impact on governance in Muslim-majority countries, influencing political, economic, and social systems (Hassan, 2003). As Muslim nations interact with global political trends and economic forces, they are increasingly exposed to democratic ideals and practices. This has led to both opportunities and challenges for Islamic governance.

One of the most significant effects of globalization has been the rise of global Islamic movements, which have sought to redefine the relationship between Islam and governance. Movements such as the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt and Ennahda in Tunisia have drawn on global democratic ideals while advocating for governance based on Islamic principles.

The Muslim Brotherhood, founded in 1928, has long advocated for a political system that integrates Islamic law with democratic governance. The movement gained significant influence during the Arab Spring, particularly in Egypt, where it played a leading role in the democratic uprising that ousted Hosni Mubarak (Wickham, 2013, pp. 198-202). While the Muslim Brotherhood has faced repression in many countries, its vision of Islamic democracy continues to resonate with large segments of the population in the Arab world.

Similarly, Ennahda in Tunisia has successfully navigated the challenges of integrating Islamic values with democratic governance (Yilmaz, 2024, pp. 209-248). The party's role in drafting

Tunisia's post-revolution constitution, which balances Islamic identity with democratic principles, is a testament to the influence of global Islamic movements on modern governance.

The rise of technology and social media has played a pivotal role in fostering democratic movements in Muslim-majority countries. During the Arab Spring, social media platforms such as Facebook and Twitter were used to mobilize protesters, share information, and coordinate activities (Smidi, 2017, pp. 196-209). These platforms allowed ordinary citizens to challenge authoritarian regimes and demand democratic reforms, often in the face of government censorship.

Social media has also provided a platform for Islamic scholars and activists to engage in public discourse on governance and democracy. Islamic scholars have used digital platforms to reach global audiences, advocating for interpretations of Islam that support democratic values (Zaid, 2022, pp. 3-15). This has helped to create a global community of Muslim scholars and activists who are committed to advancing both Islamic and democratic principles.

Globalization has also brought economic challenges to Muslim-majority countries, particularly in terms of balancing Islamic economic principles with participation in the global market (Kuran, 2004, pp. 112-115). Many Muslim countries have embraced global trade and investment, which has led to economic growth but also to increased inequality and social unrest.

Islamic economic principles, such as the prohibition of Riba and the promotion of wealth redistribution through Zakat, offer an alternative to the neoliberal economic policies that dominate the global market. By integrating these principles into their governance frameworks, Muslim-majority countries can address the social and economic challenges posed by globalization while remaining true to Islamic values.

Islamic Opposition to Authoritarianism and Corruption

One of the central themes of Islamic political thought is the rejection of authoritarianism and corruption. Islamic governance is based on principles of justice (Adl), accountability, and consultation (Shura), all of which stand in stark contrast to the practices of many modern authoritarian regimes in the Muslim world (Hyder, 2018, pp. 4-15).

The Prophet Muhammad emphasized the importance of just governance and the accountability of rulers. He is reported to have said: "the most severely punished people on the Day of Judgment will be the unjust ruler." This Hadith together with Quranic injunctions underscores the Islamic belief that rulers must govern with fairness and integrity, and those who abuse their power will face divine retribution (Yunus, 2017, p. 217).

During the Prophet's lifetime, he practiced what he preached, consistently advocating for justice and transparency in governance. He regularly consulted with his companions on matters of state, ensuring that decisions were made in the best interest of the community. This model of

consultative governance was continued by the Rashidun Caliphs, who also emphasized the need for justice and accountability (Husain, 1997, pp.163-184).

Islamic Teachings Against Corruption

The Quran unequivocally condemns corruption, stating: "do not consume one another's wealth unjustly or send it [in bribery] to the rulers in order that [they might aid] you [to] consume a portion of the wealth of the people in sin, while you know [it is unlawful]" (Quran 2:188). Corruption, in Islamic thought, is not only a moral failing but a betrayal of the trust that rulers and officials hold. It undermines justice and erodes the social fabric of society.

Throughout Islamic history, there have been numerous examples of rulers who were held accountable for corruption and abuses of power. Umar ibn al-Khattab, for example, was known for his strict oversight of public officials, ensuring that they did not use their positions for personal gain. He famously instituted a system of public accountability, where officials had to declare their assets upon taking office and were subject to investigation if their wealth increased disproportionately during their tenure (Husain, 1997, pp. 190-191).

In modern times, the fight against corruption has become a central issue for Islamic political movements that seek to promote governance based on Islamic principles. Movements like the Muslim Brotherhood and Ennahda have campaigned against corruption in their respective countries, arguing that Islamic governance must be transparent and accountable.

Contemporary Examples of Islamic Resistance to Authoritarianism

In the modern era, several Islamic political movements have positioned themselves in opposition to authoritarian regimes, drawing on Islamic principles to advocate for justice, transparency, and accountability in governance. One of the most prominent examples is the Muslim Brotherhood, which has historically resisted authoritarianism in Egypt and other parts of the Arab world.

The Brotherhood's political ideology is rooted in the belief that Islamic governance must be just, inclusive, and accountable to the people. Throughout its history, the Brotherhood has called for political reforms that align with Islamic values, such as the implementation of Shura, the rejection of corruption, and the protection of individual rights. In Egypt, the Brotherhood played a pivotal role in the 2011 uprising that toppled Hosni Mubarak's regime, advocating for democratic governance based on Islamic principles.

Another example is Tunisia's Ennahda Party, which emerged as a leading political force after the 2011 revolution that ended decades of authoritarian rule under Zine El Abidine Ben Ali. Ennahda's commitment to democratic governance and its rejection of authoritarianism is deeply

rooted in Islamic teachings. The party has consistently called for political reforms that promote justice, transparency, and human rights, all of which are central to Islamic governance.

Islamic Jurisprudence on Accountability and Governance

Islamic jurisprudence, or Fiqh, provides a framework for understanding the responsibilities of rulers and the rights of the governed. Islamic scholars, such as Al-Mawardi, have written extensively about the duties of rulers and the principles of good governance (Al-Mawardi, 2000, pp. 22-26). Al-Mawardi, in his work Al-Ahkam as-Sultaniyyah, emphasizes that rulers are entrusted with the responsibility of ensuring justice and protecting the rights of their subjects. He argues that a ruler's legitimacy is contingent upon their adherence to these principles, and if they fail to uphold justice, they can be removed from power.

Al-Mawardi's writings are significant because they highlight the importance of accountability in Islamic governance. He asserts that rulers are not above the law and must be held accountable for their actions. This is in stark contrast to modern authoritarian regimes in many Muslim-majority countries, where rulers often use religious justifications to maintain their grip on power while stifling political dissent.

Islamic political thought also rejects the notion of absolute power. The Quran warns against tyranny and the concentration of power in the hands of a few, stating: "those who, when given authority in the land, establish prayer, give Zakat, enjoin what is right and forbid what is wrong" (Quran 22:41). This verse underscores the idea that political authority in Islam must be exercised with justice and in the service of the people.

The era of the Rashidun Caliphate (632–661 CE), during which the first four caliphs—Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman, and Ali—ruled, is often referred to as the "golden age" of Islamic governance. This period is frequently cited by Islamic scholars as a model for just and accountable governance, where leaders were chosen through consultation and held to high ethical standards (Ul Ashikeen, 2022, pp.17-31).

Abu Bakr, the first caliph, is remembered for his humility and his commitment to justice. Upon assuming the caliphate, he addressed the Muslim community, saying: "you have made me your leader, though I am in no way superior to you. Cooperate with me when I do right; correct me when I err" (Brohi, as cited in Gauhar 1978, p. 183). This statement reflects Abu Bakr's understanding of leadership as a position of service, not of privilege. He emphasized the importance of accountability and encouraged the community to hold him to account if he deviated from the path of justice. Abu Bakr's leadership was characterized by his dedication to preserving the unity of the Muslim community and his efforts to ensure that the principles of justice and equity were upheld. His reign set a precedent for future Islamic rulers, who were expected to govern with humility and fairness.

Umar ibn al-Khattab, the second caliph, is widely regarded as one of the greatest administrators in Islamic history. His reign was marked by significant reforms aimed at improving governance and ensuring justice for all members of society (Husain, 1997, 85-91; Madelung, 1997, pp.61-77). Umar established a number of administrative institutions, such as the Diwan (administrative office) and the Bait-ul-Mal (public treasury), which helped to centralize the management of public resources and ensure that they were distributed fairly.

Umar is also known for his commitment to accountability. He instituted a system of public accountability where government officials were required to declare their assets upon taking office and were subject to investigation if their wealth increased disproportionately during their tenure (Husain, 1997, p. 191). Umar's insistence on justice and transparency earned him a reputation as a just ruler who put the welfare of his people more than anything else.

Uthman ibn Affan, the third caliph, faced significant challenges during his reign, particularly accusations of nepotism. Uthman was criticized for appointing members of his own family to key positions of power, which led to growing dissent within the Muslim community (Madelung, 1997, pp. 140). Despite these criticisms, Uthman's tenure saw the compilation of the Quran into a single, authoritative text, which was a monumental achievement for the preservation of Islamic teachings. Uthman's reign ultimately ended in his assassination, which marked the beginning of significant political turmoil within the Muslim community. His death highlighted the dangers of nepotism and the importance of maintaining justice and fairness in governance.

Ali ibn Abi Talib, the fourth caliph, is remembered for his unwavering commitment to justice, even in the face of immense political challenges. Ali's reign was defined by his efforts to address the divisions within the Muslim community that had escalated during Uthman's tenure. Ali's insistence on justice and his refusal to compromise on matters of principle made him an enduring symbol of moral leadership in Islam (Husain, 1997, p.186).

Ali's legacy is particularly important in discussions of Islamic governance because he consistently upheld the principles of justice and accountability, even when it came at great personal and political cost. His leadership during the Fitna (the first Muslim civil war) is a testament to his dedication to the Islamic ideals of justice and equity.

Challenges to Islamic Governance in the Modern Era

The historical model of the Rashidun Caliphate, with its emphasis on justice, accountability, and consultation, offers valuable lessons for contemporary Muslim-majority countries. However, the modern era presents unique challenges to Islamic governance, particularly in the context of globalization, political authoritarianism, and economic inequality.

In many Muslim-majority countries, authoritarian regimes have come to dominate the political landscape, often using religious rhetoric to legitimize their rule. Leaders in countries such as

Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and the Gulf states have invoked Islam to justify their authority while suppressing political opposition and curtailing democratic freedoms.

The alliance between authoritarian rulers and religious scholars in these countries has often stifled debate about the role of Islam in governance. In Saudi Arabia, for example, the Wahhabi religious establishment has provided religious legitimacy to the monarchy, discouraging any meaningful discussion about political reforms. Similarly, in Egypt, the government has used religious justifications to suppress the Muslim Brotherhood and other political movements that advocate for governance based on Islamic principles.

The alliance between authoritarian rulers and religious scholars in certain countries has often stifled debate about the role of Islam in governance. In Saudi Arabia, for example, the Wahhabi religious establishment has provided religious legitimacy to the monarchy, discouraging any meaningful discussion about political reforms. Similarly, in Egypt, the government has used religious justifications to suppress the Muslim Brotherhood and other political movements that advocate for governance based on Islamic principles portraying it as a threat to national security and social stability (Wickham, 2013, p. 5).

Conclusion

The compatibility of Islam and democracy continues to be a topic of significant debate within the Muslim world. While some argue that democracy undermines divine sovereignty and introduces foreign values, others contend that democratic principles such as justice, accountability, and consultation are deeply rooted in Islamic teachings. The concept of Shura, as practiced during the Rashidun Caliphate, provides a framework for integrating democratic values into Islamic governance.

Throughout Islamic history, from the early days of the Prophet Muhammad to the modern era, there has been a continuous emphasis on justice, accountability, and the welfare of the community. These values align closely with democratic principles, suggesting that Islam and democracy are not inherently incompatible.

Muslim-majority countries such as Tunisia for a brief period, Indonesia, and Malaysia offer contemporary examples of how Islamic principles can be harmonized with democratic governance. These countries have shown that it is possible to create political systems that respect both Islamic values and democratic ideals, providing a model for other Muslim-majority nations to follow. At the same time, the challenges posed by authoritarianism, corruption, and economic inequality remain significant obstacles to the full realization of Islamic democracy. However, the growing influence of Islamic political movements that advocate for justice, transparency, and accountability offers hope that Islamic democracy can continue to evolve and thrive in the modern world.

Ultimately, the lessons of the Rashidun Caliphate and the teachings of Islamic scholars provide a strong foundation for the development of democratic governance in Muslim-majority countries. By drawing on the principles of Shura, justice, and accountability, Islamic democracy has the potential to offer a more just and equitable system of governance, one that is true to both Islamic values and the needs of modern societies.

List of References

1. Abdel Razek, A. (2013). *Islam and the foundations of political power*. Saqi Books.
2. Abou El Fadl, K. (2004). *Islam and the challenge of democracy*. Princeton University Press.
3. Alisakun, S. (2020). Islam and democracy: A study on Rachid Ghannouchi's views. *Tafhim: IKIM Journal of Islam and the Contemporary World, 13*(2), 27–54.
4. Al-Mawardi, A. H. (2000). *Al-Ahkam As-Sultaniyyah: The laws of Islamic governance.* Ta-Ha Publishers Ltd.
5. Al-Qaradawi, Y. (1997). *Fī fiqh al-dawlah fī al-Islām* [The jurisprudence of the state in Islam]. Maktaba Wahba.
6. Al-Qaradawi, Y. (1997). *Islam and democracy*. Maktaba Wahba.
7. Al-Rasheed, M. (2010). *A history of Saudi Arabia*. Cambridge University Press.
8. Anjum, O. (2016). Salafis and democracy: Doctrine and context. The Muslim World, 106(3), 448-473.
9. Barkey, K. (2016). The Ottoman Empire (1299–1923): The bureaucratization of patrimonial authority. In P. Crooks & T. H. Parsons (Eds.), *Empires and bureaucracy in world history: From late antiquity to the twentieth century* (pp. 102–126). Cambridge University Press.
10. Benabdeljalil, I. (2022). The Umayyad Caliphate: The largest Islamic state. Retrieved from https://www.thecollector.com/umayyad-caliphate-empire-largest-islamic-state/.
11. Berger, L. (2022). From universalism to regionalism: The question of the break-up of the Abbasid Empire revisited. *The End of Empires.* Springer VS, Wiesbaden.
12. Brown, N. J. (2013). *Islam and politics in the new Egypt*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
13. Brown, J. A. C. (2014). *Misquoting Muhammad.* Oneworld.
14. Crone, P. (2004). *God's rule: Government and Islam*. Columbia University Press.
15. Engineer, E. A. (2003). *Islam: Compatible with democracy and modernity?* YaleGlobal Online. Retrieved from https://archive-yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/islam-compatible-democracy-and-modernity.
16. Esposito, J. L. (1999). *The Islamic threat: Myth or reality?* Oxford University Press.
17. Esposito, J. L., & Voll, J. O. (1996). *Islam and democracy*. Oxford University Press.
18. Feldman, N. (2008). *The fall and rise of the Islamic state*. Princeton University Press.
19. Gani, I. M., & Bahari, Z. (2021). Islamic banking's contribution to the Malaysian real economy. *ISRA International Journal of Islamic Finance, 13*(1), 6–25. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJIF-01-2019-0004.
20. Gauhar, A. Editor (1978). *The Challenge of Islam*. Islamic Council of Europe.
21. Ghannouchi, R. (2022). *Public freedoms in the Islamic state*. Yale University Press.
22. Hallaq, W. B. (2013). *The impossible state: Islam, politics, and modernity's moral predicament*. Columbia University Press.
23. Hassan, R. (2003). Globalization's challenge to Islam: How to create one Islamic community in a diverse world. Retrieved from https://archive-yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/globalizations-challenge-islam.
24. Hawting, G. R. (2000). *The first dynasty of Islam: The Umayyad caliphate AD 661-750.* Routledge.
25. Hefner, R. W. (2000). *Civil Islam: Muslims and democratization in Indonesia*. Princeton University Press.
26. Hibri, A. (2015). *The Islamic worldview: Islamic jurisprudence—An American Muslim perspective.* Islamic Worldview Series.
27. Husain, A. (1997). *The Glorious Caliphate. Darul Ishaat Urdu Bazar Karachi.*

28. Hyder, M., & Iraqi, K. M. (2018). Islamic perspective of governance and judiciary: A literature review. *Journal Usooluddin, 2*(2).

29. Inalcik, H. (2000). *The Ottoman Empire: The classical age 1300–1600*. Phoenix.

30. Johnson, D. L. (2024). *Muslim Democracy: Charting the evolution of Rached Ghannouchi's political and theological ideology.* Middle East Eye. Retreived from https://www.middleeasteye.net/discover/muslim-democracy-charting-evolution-rached-ghannouchis-political-and-theological-ideology.

31. Kahf, M. (1978). *The Islamic economy: Analytical study of the functioning of an Islamic economic system*. Brill Academic.

32. Kennedy, H. (2004). *The prophet and the age of the caliphates*. Routledge.

33. Kuma, S. (2001). The role of Islamic parties in Pakistani politics. *Strategic Analysis: A Monthly Journal of the IDSA, 25*(2). Retrieved from https://ciaotest.cc.columbia.edu/olj/sa/sa_may01kus01.html.

34. Kuran, T. (2004). *Islam and mammon: The economic predicaments of Islamism*. Princeton University Press.

35. Kuru, A.H (2014) *Authoritarianism and democracy in Muslim countries: Rentier states and regional diffusion. Political Science Quarterly*.

36. Lacroix, S. (2011). *Awakening Islam: The politics of religious dissent in contemporary Saudi Arabia*. Harvard University Press.

37. Lewis, B. (1995). *The Middle East: A brief history of the last 2,000 years*. Scribner.

38. Madelung, W. (1997). *The succession to Muhammad: A study of the early caliphate*. Cambridge University Press.

39. Mawdudi, A. (1993). Human Rights in Islam. The Islamic Foundation.

40. McCarthy, R. (2018). *Inside Tunisia's al-Nahda: Between politics and preaching*. Cambridge University Press.

41. Mernissi, F. (1991). *The veil and the male elite: A feminist interpretation of women's rights in Islam*. Basic Books.

42. Motala, Z. (2022). Freedom Of Speech And Protest In Islam: The Distorted Saudi View. Muslim Matters. Retrieved from https://muslimmatters.org/2022/05/13/freedom-of-speech-and-protest-in-islam-the-distorted-saudi-view/.

43. Rahman, H (2020). *Toward a Wise Political Fiqh: The Perception of State in the Political Thought of usuf Al-Qaradawi. Asbider.*

44. Riyanika, C. Luthfi, M. Hannase, (2018). *Role of Rachid Ghannouchi On Democratization In Tunisia After Ben Ali Regime.* Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Social Sciences (ICSS 2018).

45. Robinson, C. F. (2016). *Islamic civilization in thirty lives: The first 1,000 years*. University of California Press.

46. Rolland, A. M. (2015). Muslim women political leaders and electoral participation in Muslim-majority countries. *What All Americans Should Know About Women in the Muslim World, 5.* Retrieved from https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/islamandwomen/5.

47. Smidi, A., & Shahin, S. (2017). Social media and social mobilisation in the Middle East. *India Quarterly, 73*(2), 196–209. https://doi.org/10.1177/0974928417700798.

48. Ul Ashikeen, S. (2022). *The Rashidun Caliphate.* Sultan ul Faqr Publications.

49. Voll, J.O. (2007). *Islam and Democracy: Is Modernization a Barrier.* Religion Compass Blackwell Publishing.

50. Watt, W. M. (1961). *Muhammad: Prophet and statesman*. Oxford University Press.

51. Wickham, C. R. (2013). *The Muslim Brotherhood: Evolution of an Islamist movement*. Princeton University Press.

52. Wiktorowicz, Q. (2001). *The management of Islamic activism: Salafis, the Muslim Brotherhood, and state power in Jordan*. SUNY Press.

53. Yilmaz, I., & Shukri, S. (2024). *Islamist parties and power in democratic nation-states*. Palgrave.

54. Yunus, M. I. B. M. (2017). Good governance according to Islamic perspective. *Fiat Justisia, 11*(3), 217.

55. Zaid, B., Fedtke, J., Shin, D. D., El Kadoussi, A., & Ibahrine, M. (2022). Digital Islam and Muslim Millennials: How Social Media Influencers Reimagine Religious Authority and Islamic Practices. *Religions*, *13*(4), 335. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel13040335.