



(REVIEW ARTICLE)



The deficiency of democratic principles in the evolution of the inflexible structure of albanian society during the 1990s uprisings: An examination through the lens of Rancière

Elona Mehmeti *

Department of Political Sciences, University of Tirana, Albania.

International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 2024, 11(02), 700–707

Publication history: Received on 04 February 2024; revised on 15 March 2024; accepted on 18 March 2024

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/ijrsra.2024.11.2.0446>

Abstract

This paper presents an exploration of democracy, a recurrent theme in political discourse, particularly amid socio-economic shifts in Europe and political transitions in Albania. Although the complexities of this subject, the paper was conceived, acknowledging the challenge of navigating subjective interpretations. The paper does not aim to assert absolute truths but rather offers an alternative perspective on the 1990s events in Albania. The thesis posits that the political movement of that era lacked democratic essence and was politically manipulated. Drawing heavily from Jacques Rancière's conceptual framework of democracy, the paper argues that the movements of the 1990s did not align with Rancière's notion of a "field of battle", but rather transpired at the negotiation table.

Moreover, the actors lacked consciousness of their roles, did not pursue socio-political equality, and remained oblivious to institutional change.

Ultimately, the paper suggests that this lack of awareness allowed the oligarchy to exploit the movement to perpetuate power without altering its fundamental composition.

Keywords: Democracy; Battlefield; Promotion of equality in the socio-political hierarchy; Manipulation; Societal structuring

1. Introduction

The topic of democracy is frequently revisited in both political and media arenas, often due to socio-economic developments in Europe and political turnover in Albania. It remains a hotly debated issue, often veering away from objectivity, as was challenging for the completion of this brief paper/presentation at the conclusion of the 'Normative Dimension of Politics' course.

I have chosen to discuss an issue that has been the subject of debate throughout the course and, in my understanding, will continue to be so for many years to come, as the passage of time erases the shadows of subjectivity that accompany it. It must be noted from the outset that initiating this discussion has been both easy and difficult.

Nonetheless, the thesis I am to defend here does not seek to encompass or extract absolute truths, but rather is a modest attempt to provide an alternative perspective on the events of the 1990s, which turned into a political movement for changing the political, social, and economic system in Albania.

* Corresponding author: Elona Mehmeti

The thesis we aim to defend is that: 'the political movement in the early 1990s in Albania was not an expression of a democratic moment and as a result of developments, it was instrumentalized by politics'.

The main author upon which we have relied to establish the logical framework of this paper is Jacques Rancière, with his concept of democracy.

Based on the analysis of facts and research in the literature on the concept of democracy, this paper relies on arguments that show that the movements of the 1990s were not a democratic moment - according to Rancière's concept - as they did not occur in the "field of battle", but at the negotiating table; the actors involved in this movement were not conscious of their role; they never, from the facts found and illustrated in the paper, sought equality in the socio-political hierarchy; and even less were they aware of changing what was entrenched in institutions. In conclusion, the argument is supported that this lack of awareness among the actors left room for the oligarchy of the time to use this movement to maintain power by changing the contours of its form, but not its composition.

2. Methodology

In terms of methodology, both direct interviewing methods with key informants in the events under analysis and literature research have been used in the preparation of this paper. Primarily, the materials utilized are literature from authors covered such as J. Rancière, G. Deleuze, political analysis in written and electronic media. However, the logical framework upon which the main thesis of this paper is based is built upon Jacques Rancière's concept of democracy.

According to Rancière, true democracy is that which occurs in the field of battle, when a group of people assert their rights to representation. Rancière wishes to see the realm of democracy defined as an excess which, as a specific political form, aimed to promote equality in the socio-political hierarchy. Democracy according to Rancière was only that moment of popular upheaval that changes what is entrenched in institutions.

On the other hand, Rancière argues that there is a continuous effort by some individuals with power to find ways to suppress it. It is precisely from this point that our argument for the movements of December 1990 begins. This movement was not a fervent movement for democracy, but on the contrary, it was an imposed movement to achieve a gradual change of power. In the following sections, it will be illustrated with examples and facts why and how this movement was used to still hold power by changing the rigid form, but not the composition of power.

3. Reasons for the Change in the Contour of the Rigid Form of Albanian Society

"The rigid contours or the frame was the structuring that Albanian society had before the movements of the 1990s."

The factors that compelled the oligarchy [in Rancière's language] of the pre-1990s to change the form of the system in order to maintain their power form, can be listed as follows, among the most significant:

- The economy of the communist dictatorship state had long been in a spiral of crisis and recession (e.g., unemployment, liquidity shortages, etc.).
- The economic model had consumed itself due to incompetence and lack of long-term vision according to the country's conditions (mismatch with the market, failure in industrial, agricultural, and livestock sectors).
- On the other hand, historians have analyzed that Mr. Alia, despite remaining loyal to his leader until the end, had been more pragmatic than him, presenting more liberal forms in economy and social life (the beginning of diplomatic relations with Western European countries, adoption of some free market measures, reduction of the power of the State Security, religious freedom, etc.).

Unlike the majority of Albanians who were in the information vacuum, regarding the political changes taking place in Eastern European countries and few of them (mainly intellectuals) who might have been aware of the need for change in the economic system and then the political and social one, Mr. Alia as a pragmatist, had the information and awareness to understand the domino effect of the fall of communist regimes in Europe and which were the 'mistakes to be avoided' in this process of liberalization (although the process had problems). This can be interpreted as an attempt to maintain power in a more moderate form but fundamentally the same, as long as he believed in 'holding onto power of the working party' (Tarifa, 2006).

From a social perspective, although the events of 1990-1991 were promising for the creation of a healthy and vital civil society, it quickly became clear that state/society relations had not changed much from the old days. Analysts estimate that 'political authority continued to resist rational-critical public debate and relied on methods similar to those of the period of state socialism. (e.g., 'whenever political leaders addressed the "public," the goal was not to seek its help in shaping public policies but simply the manipulation of the "public" to generate political support and legitimacy') (Fatos Tarifa & Lekë Sokoli, 2006).

In conclusion, it can be said that the state elite before the '90s, dependent on difficult economic conditions, burdened by the difficult financial situation, a situation that became evident in the daily life of the people, most likely acted as intermediaries to impose on Albanians the will of the interstate (state) power to give birth to a desire, a will for change in the situation. This feeling and desire that was real for Albanians, felt by themselves (true), was in fact imposed by the elite, depending on the change and the needs of changing the situation from the inability to manage the situation (the communist system) by the elite (imposition of the people's will).

4. The Rigid Form of Albanian Society Before the 1990s Movements: Restructuring and Related Issues

Societies today, as well as yesterday, are organized through the interaction of oligarchies, where the minority governs the majority, so the power of the minority acts upon that of the majority (Rancier, 2012) This parallelism also applies in the case of pre and post-1990s movements, with the difference being that the imposition on the people, in the case of the pre-90s, was more visible, more tangible, and consequently, society's sensitivity to this action was higher.

While after the '90s this kind of power changed its form of exercise, but fundamentally remained the same, to say those same oligarchs who exercised their power over the majority. With the difference that society's sensitivity to this power was lower, imagining a truth that it acted on the basis of its desires and will. Thus, the second form of exercising power or manipulating society comes more sophisticated, softer, and more cunning for society, which believed that it made its own decisions.

Quoting the political science researcher Prof. Feraj in his book 'Sketch of Albanian Political Thought', he would say that during the fifty years after World War II, standard schemes of thought were created in Albania, especially in political thought. Creators of these schemes were institutions bearing scientific and creative names - artistic, and political, such as the institutes of sciences (and the Academy of Sciences) in general, the Central Committee of the PLA, and the institutes created within it, the Writers' and Artists' Union of Albania. Some of the boundaries of permissible thinking were also formalized legally, e.g., Marxist-Leninist ideology, in the fundamental laws of the state, in the constitution, in the Penal Code, etc. However, this does not mean that thinking based on these laws had its public existence assured by the fact that it was based on them; legality in Albania did not constitute any stable criterion (Feraj, 2006).

The construction of a rigid framework (homogeneous form) for the entire society (except the elite) implied a scenario where education and upbringing were inseparable from the moral dictates imposed on them. From childhood, all members of society were educated in the same manner, had the same information, wore the same clothing, possessed the same household goods, etc., thus they could be considered as clones of each other. These clones were produced by a governing elite. Without denying in this case, as in genetics, that even in a series of clones there may be defects, yet these defects (e.g., information leaks, dissatisfaction, etc.) were controllable and easily suppressible. However, before the movements of the 1990s, it was precisely these "defects" within the framework that were multiplied to such an extent that they erupted and gave rise to another form of the framework. Not only citing Feraj, but also relying on Rancière, it would be stated that the geometric equality of power was applied, meaning that it was clear that the communist party had the greatest power (information, economic, political, military power, instilling fear) to exercise over the majority, which had less power.

From the above, under this reasoning, we conclude that the "framework" the rigid form of thinking in Albania was under the influence of the elite's interpretation of the truth. By turning the people into a society with false post-materialistic values (equality, happiness, faith, norms, Albanian identity, etc.), because they were not internalized by the individuals of the people, the appropriate expression would be "without social values." This is clearly confirmed in the movements of the 90s, with a disoriented and valueless society, reaffirmed throughout the subsequent years and up to the present day, when this society has increasingly adopted materialistic values, instead of post-materialistic ones (the basis of which decades should be laid and internalized as such by the individuals of a society). This indicates that it is highly likely that this society has come since before the 90s without social values. Thus, in the movements of the 90s, these individuals, without having internalized a value system, had no basis for a normative system, and most importantly, almost without identity (or with disoriented feelings), in which they felt falsely that they had an identity, which they did not confirm as such in these movements.

According to Deleuze, "truth is a specific imagination which assumes that it has the truth within itself, which carries it within itself, I am the truth, what is outside me is false." The way we understand reality, "each interprets it according to the power he/she has" (an ordinary person, an oligarch), but in fact, this is a false reality, an application by society of the hidden rules of the oligarchic power game. Imaginations, feelings, are determined by our sensitivities, which are not only determined by the senses but by a certain way of feeling. Having a certain imagination of reality, the people's sensitivity was the feeling that made them desire that they had the truth within themselves. But the senses caught what was served to them (that amount of information) by the communist party in the 90s. Thus, the people's knowledge logically came from their knowledge of the situation, the problems, etc., which in most cases were served to them by the communist elite based on its interests in retaining power. Consequently, even the understanding of society had somewhat defined boundaries, calculated in the game of retaining the power of the communist elite.

This is precisely evidenced by the "Student Movement in the 90s", where their perception of democracy was served by the oligarchic elite of the time. Quoting Kristo Frashëri (Frasheri, 2012) "students were not the only ones who overthrew the communist system - the system itself had changed." With this statement, on the one hand, he refers to the demands for changes, whether basic for improving living conditions in their dormitories, improving food, administration, etc., and on the other hand emphasizes that the change of regime itself had started much earlier and became apparent with the event called "the embassy explosions", during which 'to the amazement of the police and security organs, undoubtedly by order from above, they stood as spectators in front of the stream of citizens entering the embassies - Frashëri says - at a time when anyone who illegally crossed the state border, if not arrested, was shot on the barbed wire. According to the historian, the founding of the Democratic Party itself was also evident, which was accompanied by a passive attitude of the Labor Party, leading to the triumph of party pluralism in Albania. Similarly, according to the same historian, international events, occurring for a year in Eastern Europe, also had a strong influence on convincing even the dome of the communist regime in Albania that the use of violence against anti-government demonstrations could produce that phenomenon that happened with Ceausescu in Romania. In conclusion, it can be said that "the fear that had gripped the mass of the population for decades as a collective, had departed from it and had taken refuge in the offices of the Political Bureau of the Labor Party".

4.1. The lack of democracy in the movements of the 1990s?

As emphasized above, true democracy for Rancière is what occurs in the field of battle, where a group of people assert their rights to represent themselves then and there. Rancière wishes to view the realm of democracy defined as excess, a particular form of politics aimed at promoting equality in the socio-political hierarchy.

Based on this definition, the question arises as to whether the movements of 1990 were democratic according to Rancière. In fact, it pertains to a temporal period where several movements were initiated from the first months of 1990. Based on the data, declarations, and numerous interviews gathered, it appears that the movements of 1990 were "controlled" and organized in a certain way not by the masses but by the oligarchy of that time. Even though opinions exist within this group of the population [In conversations with former students participating in the December '90 movement] that took part in the movements of that time and are of a certain well-defined sensitivity, it is observed that at the moment they rose up to protest, they did not truly know what they were seeking. This is best confirmed by the aforementioned facts. This moment is further followed by the involvement of a small number of students, meeting with Ramiz Alia, where based on sources, the conversation with Mr. Alia was "simply" a discussion, but nothing was mentioned regarding new reforms, changes in the ideological or political system.

From this fact, it is apparent that the institution comes into play here because at this moment, a certain group of the population to establish democracy does not act there and then in the field of battle. In the specific case, students protested, but not with the aim of reform (but because the transformer of the building of engineering construction was broken), and they did not conclude their action with a change of the system, but institutionalized their actions by meeting with the elite of the time, which is undemocratic according to Rancière. This moment does not conclude at this point. It is further confirmed after a very short period of time in the meeting between Mr. Ramiz Alia and the students, where from the published interview it appears that the students did not truly know what political pluralism was (or in the other case, were afraid to openly demand it, which further confirms the lack of the moment of democracy) in that particular period, indeed, they were deeply involved in the process they sought to change at that time.

In the context of analyzing the movements of the 1990s in Albania through the lens of Rancière's definition of democracy, there appears to be a true lack of democracy according to this principle. According to him, true democracy manifests itself in a field of battle, where a group of people immediately assert their rights to represent themselves. In this interpretation, it is important for participation in the democratic process to be free and independent, and to represent an act of citizens freely expressing their interests.

In the case of the movements of 1990 in Albania, it appears that the participation of the population was different from this vision. Although there may have been certain sentiments and desires for change, the participation did not express itself in a manner that aligned with Rancière's true meaning of democracy. For example, the students who participated in the December '90 movements did not organize themselves in a way to represent themselves as a battlefield for seeking and defending their rights. Meanwhile, the meeting with Ramiz Alia turned into a formal discussion that did not bring about any substantial changes.

This behavior indicates a true lack of democratic institutions and the free and independent participation of citizens in the political process. Instead of actively engaging to change the system and represent their interests, the population became involved in a dynamic that was more controlled by the higher elites. This true lack of democracy explains why the movements of 1990 in Albania may be perceived as a period of change, but not necessarily as a true expression of democracy according to Rancière's definition.

- Arben Imami: What about the last point, the final decision, regarding political pluralism. Could you explain something more clearly and in detail, that is, what does the party mean by this?
- Ramiz Alia: Now, we understand political pluralism based on this decision that, in addition to the named subjects in the law on elections, other subjects can also be presented, which of course must respect the existing legal norms. Other subjects can be you, seeking to be an independent subject, for example, even the student youth can be an independent subject, you understand, whether you want to be within the Youth Union Organization, or if you don't want to be, outside the Youth Union Organization. So, as an independent political subject. That's it.
- Arben Imami: What currently prevents our party from proposing the formation of new parties to the People's Assembly?
- Ramiz Alia: This does not prevent it.
- Skënder Gjinushi: The Constitution allows it.
- Arben Imami: The Constitution does not allow it from one perspective, which says that the constitutional law that you yourself proposed to be repealed in the future.
- Ramiz Alia: Which law?
- Arben Imami: The law on leadership and the role of the sole leader of the party. As long as we do not have a sole leader role in the party, or hope in the near future not to have one. As long as we do not have a law, as far as I know, our knowledge is limited.
- Ramiz Alia: That's also true. Your knowledge is also lacking.
- Arben Imami: Generally, we lack information. So, we do not have a law that explicitly says it is forbidden...
- Ramiz Alia: There is no law that explicitly says a political party is prohibited. [DOSSIER, December '90/Alia's uncensored dialogue with Students [Panorama 8-14 December 2011]]
- Blendi Gonxhe: Mr. President, please forgive us for troubling you a bit, but please listen to us once more. We have come here from the Student City and let's speak the truth and be specific. Please forgive us for taking more time than necessary, because you are very busy at this time. We have come from there, and there are over 2,000 or 3,000 people waiting, Tirana, our relatives, young men and women (Ramiz intervenes: that's why it's good for you to go). We came from there and we were divided by these words, the bus broke down, asking for democracy and asking us to represent our comrades properly, for what they sent us for. Cheering your name as well. There was a hand with two fingers up, but it was lowered again. But there is no problem, we lowered them too.

This conversation in a way reaffirms that the students rose up "spontaneously" and were organized from the top down, due to a lack of information and not because they genuinely felt the need for political pluralism. Furthermore, it becomes clear that there is a consensus to deal with the oligarchy of the time. Therefore, a form of agreement is sought with the great power of those who do not have power (who in fact should be seeking to seize power rather than having it bestowed upon them by the greatest power). It is observed that this kind of consensus is not at all democratic according to Rancière. It is also emphasized somewhere in the conversation that they have gone to represent other individuals, even though according to Rancière 'democracy and representation' are two different things. When claiming to represent a specific group of individuals, one cannot claim to speak for democracy. So in a way, this was the aim of that group of students who had gone to the meeting with Ramiz Alia, to speak on behalf of other students who were not present at that meeting (representing a small group for the majority of other students, which in itself constitutes a kind of representation (representative democracy according to Rancière) is another argument that contradicts Rancière's democracy.

- Tefalin Malshyti: What are the consequences of allowing the establishment of an independent political organization for students and young intellectuals?
- Ramiz Alia: Yes, we are creating it.
- Tefalin Malshyti: Its statute, which we will submit to the Ministry of Justice.

- Ramiz Alia: Very well. Present your statute to the Ministry of Justice, as an organization as you say. There's nothing here, just go ahead.
- Tefalin Malshyti: Is it true that we may be allowed to do so tomorrow?
- Ramiz Alia: Yes, tomorrow. Present yourselves to the Ministry of Justice.

Based on these illustrations, it appears that the 'movement' was actually a negotiation conducted at the table, between a group of individuals and the oligarchy of the time (a transfer of power from those who had power to those who did not, rather than a seizure of power by the conscientious group). In fact, Ranciere emphasizes the battlefield, which should be determined then and there, rather than engaging in preliminary negotiations to transition from one form of governance to another. Here, the students "were granted the appropriate permission" by the oligarchy of the time to create an independent political organization and to address the relevant institution, the "Ministry of Justice," in order to formalize their movement, which once again undermines the idea that this moment was democratic.

Based on Ranciere's definition of democracy, the elements that emerge from this definition are:

- True democracy occurs in the field of battle;
- When a group of people immediately assert their rights to represent themselves;
- Democracy as excess, which as a distinct political form aimed to promote equality in the socio-political hierarchy;
- 'Democratic society' is always just a product of fantasy;
- Democracy is not the power of the populace that will be placed at the head of a state; democracy is an institution of the people as such, exercising its freedom and manifesting equality;
- The feeling of taking a specific action;
- It does not consist of a set of institutions, as they can be used in a contradictory manner for which they were created (e.g., the constitution can be interpreted differently);
- It should not have been a movement conducted at the table;
- It should not be directed by anyone.

Regarding point 1, we can say that as a result of the interview conducted by Ramiz Alia with the students, but not only with them, and with intellectuals in a slightly earlier period, it turns out that 'this process did not occur on the battlefield, but happened at the table', hence negotiated, which at this point undermines the argument of having a true democracy.

Regarding point 2, we can say that Ranciere emphasizes that a group of people must immediately assert their rights to represent themselves. The question arises: Did the students actually assert their rights to represent themselves immediately, or were institutional mechanisms used to "represent" them, even though the latter remains a question mark as to whether this group actually managed to represent themselves? Based on the interview conducted between the two parties, it appears that the movements of 1990 did not manage to assert their rights immediately, thus they were not on the battlefield, but rather these rights were obtained through the consensus reached at the "table" between a group of individuals and the oligarchy of the time.

Point three aimed primarily to promote equality in the socio-political hierarchy. According to Rancière, democracy is based on the idea of equal competence for all individuals (Ranciere, 2012). The case that best illustrates this element, according to Rancière, involves a scenario where a person of color refuses to sit in a designated part of the bus. They reject the division of designated spaces in that manner, refusing the natural categorization and the assigned portion. If a person of color, implying they are predetermined by their nature, cannot sit in a certain part of the bus, then their place has been determined by police order, and thus they are not equal to others. This is precisely the scenario where democracy is instituted, by placing the logic of equality against the unequal logic of the police order (Baxhaku, 2012)

Based on this, it can be argued that the primary motive, or more accurately its origins, which led students to rise during the 1990s, were the difficult economic conditions, lack of electricity, and clean water, which culminated as a pretext with the state of blackout in student dormitories in the city. Thus, this group of individuals did not seek to be equal among themselves as an arithmetic equality, but rather rose in protest for an entirely different motive, which according to Rancière, does not qualify as a democratic moment. Rancière emphasizes that "Every politics is democratic precisely in this sense: not in the sense of an institutional community, but in that of the forms of expression that confront the logic of equality with that of the police order."

Fourthly, according to Rancière, "The word democracy thus does not connote either a form of society or a form of governance. 'Democratic society' is always only a product of fantasy." From this, it follows that based on the facts mentioned above, Albanian society in the 1990s did not have a fantasy product to create a democratic society. The

fantasy of these individuals was shaped by the oligarchy of the time, and it was the latter that intervened to produce the fantasy of the population.

Fifthly, it is emphasized that democracy is not the power of that people which will be placed at the head of a state; democracy is an institution of the people as such, exercising its freedom and asserting equality [Democracy and Republic according to Jacques Rancière]. As quoted above, it becomes clear from the words of Blendi Gonxhe: "we came from there and we were divided with these words, the bus wanted to shake us, asking us for democracy and asking us to represent our comrades straight, for what they brought us. Cheering your name. There was a hand with two fingers, but it sat down again. But there is no problem, we also sat down those." From this, it follows that the aim was for the power of this people to be placed at the forefront, and not the aim of instituting the people as such, exercising its freedom and asserting equality. After a very short period, it turns out that several people were placed at the helm of the student movement with the aim of directing it in a more "efficient" and "organized" manner. From the gathered facts, it turns out that in those years, the individuals who will remain at the helm of these movements were determined by "someone" to place individuals who had ties or had contributed before the 1990s. This, according to Rancière, is not at all democratic.

Sixthly, according to Rancière, there must be a sense of performing a specific action. The declared success by democracy is then accompanied by reducing it to a specific state of social relations. The success of democracy would lie in its discovery, within our societies, of a random correlation between its political form and its emotional being (Rancière, 2012). (This element is explained above in a specific way in the section on the lack of awareness, identity, norms, and values of Albanian society).

The question arises, did the students of the 1990s feel such a change or not? We are in a time when the majority of the Albanian population before the 1990s was from rural areas, and only a small number of the population lived in cities. As mentioned above in the factors of breaking the rigid form, theoretically individuals during the communist regime were deprived of any uncensored information, although in practice, with the coming to power of Ramiz Alia, it was "softened" in a way the regime. Given that the majority of individuals did not receive information about what had happened in other former communist countries and how the Iron Curtain had been breached, they, in a way, had no awareness to achieve the change of this situation. The other part of the population, a part that had received information secretly, did not have the necessary capacity to understand what was really happening in other countries, or was not interested in changing the "good" positions they held until that time (intellectuals, high managerial positions, etc.).

Seventhly, democracy does not consist of a set of institutions, as they can be used in a contrary sense for which they were created, for example, constitutions can be interpreted in different ways. This actually happened in the '90s when students did not rise spontaneously without the approval of the oligarchy of the time, but they previously received its approval through Ramiz Alia's declaration, informing students to address the Ministry of Justice for the necessary procedures to create various organizations. Unlike Hannah Arendt, who emphasizes the use of institutions, Rancière emphasizes that institutions should not intervene at the moment of the democratic process, which happened in Albania.

Eighthly, the movements of the 1990s were tabletop movements. A democratic moment according to Rancière is going out into the square not prompted by institutions but driven by the masses. In the 1990s, the masses actually did not know what they wanted. According to Rancière, the democratic moment was the achievement of results in the field of battle and not planned. As mentioned above, in Albania, it did not happen in the battlefield but in the corridors, so it was negotiated to achieve a certain form of change.

Ninthly, it should not be directed by anyone. In Albania, it happened quite differently. It was directed by individuals determined by an "invisible hand" to enlighten a specific group of individuals in changing the system as peacefully as possible. According to Rancière, if it were not directed, it would be considered democratic, which did not happen in Albania. Not only were the initial moments manipulated, but even several months later, they were manipulated. For example, the protest of February 21, 1990, was manipulated because there were individuals directing the crowd, and this in itself did not bring about the democratic process.

It becomes apparent from the above discussion that the movements of the 1990s are compared to a moment where, according to Rancière, it should be considered democratic. Based on this, we have referred to the "Arab Spring", the movement of the "Indignados", and the Occupy "Wall Street", which highlight the existence of the fundamental political act, which has to do with the manifestation of the power of those who have no title or badge to exercise power. Such movements once again reminded us that democracy is alive when it invents its own forms of expression and materially gathers a people who are no longer divided into opinions, social groups, or corporations but are the people of everyone and anyone.

Seen from a completely different perspective than what we have outlined above, naturally, the question arises, what would happen if what happened in the movements of the '90s were real?

If the thesis were to be upheld that the movements of the '90s were not controlled by the oligarchy of the time but occurred from the feeling and production of the fantasy of the people to overthrow a system and create another reality, if the popular uproar had changed what was entrenched in institutions, if it had been a battlefield movement made there and then where the people as a whole took their rights, if it were not directed by anyone and it was the entire people who simultaneously made decisions, if they had been very clear about what they would demand differently from what had been previously presented by another regime, then according to Rancière, this would be considered a truly democratic process. Since these elements were not found in the movements of the 1990s, we cannot say that they were democratic according to Rancière.

5. Conclusion

The state elite prior to the 1990s, influenced by difficult economic and financial conditions, a situation that became evident in the daily lives of the people, likely acted as intermediaries to impose the will for change on Albanians. Society's understanding had somewhat defined boundaries, calculated in the game of preserving the power of the communist elite, and people's perceptions grasped what was served to them (that amount of information) by the communist party in the 1990s because even thinking in Albania was under the influence of the ruling elite's interpretation of the truth. Society appeared with false post-materialistic values (equality, happiness, trust, norms, Albanian identity, etc.). This is clearly confirmed in the movements of the '90s, with a disoriented society and without values. Thus, in the movements of the '90s, these individuals, not having internalized a value system, consequently did not have a system of norms, and most importantly, they were almost without identity (or with confused feelings in which they falsely felt they had an identity, which they did not confirm as such in these movements).

Therefore, as a conclusion of the analysis, whether the movements of the '90s were democratic according to Rancière, it turns out that they were not democratic for the reason that it did not happen on the battlefield but on the table, they were not conscious of what they wanted, they did not have the feeling and did not know what they were seeking, they did not seek socio-political equality but simply initially wanted electricity, water, food, and later fervently sought political pluralism, and they were not left outside the institution but were used for their own purposes to "legitimize" their movement by the oligarchy of the time.

References

- [1] Rancière, J. (2012). "Mosmarreveshja". Zenit Editions.
- [2] Rottiers, F. (2010). The Hatred of Democracy Revisited. In *Problems of Democracy: Probing the Boundaries* (pp. 11-17). Brill.
- [3] Davis, O. (2010). Rancière. Polity.
- [4] Hysamedin Feraj (2006) "Outline of Albanian Political Thought" Tirane, Pegi pp 2-9
- [5] Karadaku, D. (2012) A Philosophical Polygraph 1, Sketch and Analysis of Desire Deleuze and Guattari, Emal , Tirana,
- [6] Tarifa, F., & Sokoli, L. (2006). Applying Sociology to the Construction of a Democratic Public Sphere in Albania. *Journal of Applied Sociology / Sociological Practice*, 23
- [7] Rancière, J. (2012, May 6) Elections are not democracy, Bota & Rajoni,
- [8] DOSSIER. (2011, December 8-14): December 90: Alia uncensored dialogue with students, Panorama.
- [9] Baxhaku, E. (2012) Democracy and Republic according to Jacques Rancière
- [10] Rancière, J. (2012, December 24). Democracy or consensus: Disagreement
- [11] Rancière, J. (2006) Democracy, republic, representation
- [12] Frasheri, K. (2012, September) Who overthrew the communist regime in Albania, Gazeta Tema.
- [13] Tarifa, F. Albanians' Road from Communism: Political and Social Change 1990 - 1993.