

Democracy and democratic freedom from a philosophical perspective

*Dr. Abla Xhaferi*¹

DEPARTMENT OF HUMANITIES AND COMMUNICATION,
EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY OF TIRANA, ALBANIA.
abla.xhaferi@uet.edu.al

Abstract

The system of democracy and freedom has been the ideal of human society stretching from antiquity to the present day. The purpose of this paper is, through research, to reflect within the limits of an article the concepts and attitudes of philosophers and thinkers of different periods regarding these basic elements of social life. In Antiquity, Plato, Aristotle, and Pericles did not have the same attitude towards democracy and governance. Later philosophers like Hobbes and Locke did not conclude in favor of democracy. John Locke and many other philosophers also pointed out the danger that comes to the minority from the “dictatorship of the majority”. Montesquieu supported the position of governing the people through his representatives. Rousseau initiated the theory of sovereignty as the basic condition for the creation of the democratic state, while Carl Friedrich addressed the basic requirements of democracy. Democracy in itself means a certain form of leadership or government, which is carried out in the name and interest of the majority. Democracy guarantees and harmonizes the duties and rights of the individual with those of society. The system of democracy undergoes constant changes in response to the requirements of the time. But in a true democracy, no right of a majority can be absolute. Therefore, the rules of a fair democratic

¹ Dr. Abla Xhaferi is a lecturer at the Department of Applied Social Sciences, Faculty of Law, Political Sciences, and International Relations at the European University of Tirana. She holds a doctoral degree in Political Science and her teaching is focused on subjects of Political Science, Philosophy, and Sociology.

game must be respected and the minority must, in any case, be guaranteed equal rights and opportunities so that, in the future, through free voting, in principle, a majority can be formed. The system of Western democratic standards includes not only the formal declaration of the principle of people's sovereignty but also the institutionalization of human rights and the creation of real conditions for the people's wider and more effective participation in the running of their state. The experience of democratic life raises constant demands for the deepening of democracy, which involves very important problems. People's relations with freedom have been and remain the subject of philosophical studies, about which different opinions have emerged. Spinoza did not accept the restriction of freedom of thought and speech. Loku divided it into natural freedom and freedom in society. For Montesquieu and Rousseau, freedom was the right to do everything lawfully. Kant linked the limits of freedom with the good of the general, while for Nicene, freedom is the will for the independence of unique thoughts on existence. Today's freedom and human rights theories focus on inclusive participation in social life.

Keywords: *democracy, state, people, principles, values, freedom, governance*

I. Introduction

The millennial history of mankind has proved that the desire of people to live freely and with equal

rights before the law and society have known no other system better than democracy. Although the words "democracy" and "freedom" are reminiscent of the working principles of communication vessels and have an organic connection between them, they are not synonymous with each other. And this is because the structure of democracy consists not only of the system of inherited theoretical ideas and concepts that are enriched in the living laboratory of people's lives but also of the way they are put into practice.

The notions of democracy and freedom include the way the people are governed, their division and categorization, and the choice of the form and content of the best democracy for society as a whole. However, it must be said that the principles and values that form the foundations of modern institutions, without which there is no democracy, such as political freedom, universal suffrage, political pluralism, and the representative assembly, have not been created for only one or two centuries.

Philosophers' views on democracy, freedom, and other human rights, such as the fundamental rights of man, the individual, and human society, have been

enshrined and sanctioned in treaties, various international conventions, and the Compendium of International Acts (1993). Thus, Article 25 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, a general international treaty in the field of human rights, adopted by the United Nations in 1966 and signed by a large number of states, states, *inter alia*, that every citizen has the right to participate in the conduct of public affairs directly or through freely elected representatives, through equal voting and secret ballot, to elect and be elected, as well as to perform various public functions in conditions of general equality.

This newly mentioned act and many other similar formulations of important international documents in the field of human rights serve as basic criteria for the definition of democracy and democratic freedom and are therefore recognized and respected by the member states.

II. Democracy: the political system where power is exercised by the people

Democracy, as the power of the people, is an ancient ideal with a long history. A large number of theories are known today that have tried to explain the causes of the birth of democratic regimes and the strength of civil society within certain social systems.

Although democracy has its origins in Antiquity, its most mature form is used in countries where a pluralistic society develops and the legislative, executive, and legal powers in their activities are separate and independent so that none of the state's leaders has unlimited and uncontrollable power.

Various philosophers, thinkers, and leaders have given formulations that enrich and amalgamate both the meaning and content of the term “democracy” and its application in everyday life. In Ancient Greece, there was no common position on democracy and governance. Plato pointed out that democracy exercised control over the government through those who knew how to govern, i.e., populist demagogues. Aristotle argued that government by the people meant government by the poor, who feared they might expropriate the rich.

Pericles called it democracy because the Athenian government favored the majority over the minority. He underlined that democracy was related to tolerance, but did not talk about majority rule. According to him, the laws ensured equal justice for all.

Both Hobbes and Locke imply the political equality of citizens, but neither expressly concludes in favor of democracy. John Locke and many other philosophers pointed out the danger that comes to the minority from the “dictatorship of the majority”, while for Montesquieu, in a democracy, sovereign



power should belong to the people and not a single individual, which means that the people should control the government through its representatives.

The tendency to recognize and implement the principle of sovereignty is closely related to the notion of democracy as a special form of government of the people. Therefore, according to S. Pellumbi (2013), even Montesquieu about three centuries ago declared that “important for a republic is the spirit of laws, that the right be treated as a science, that the political freedom of the citizen is seen as a guarantee for its security, and that true equality be valued as the soul of the state” (p. 31).

The theory of the sovereignty of the people, as a basic condition for the creation of the democratic state, was initiated by the greatest progressive thinker, who also preceded the French Revolution in the late eighteenth century, the eminent French philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Rusoi (2007) states: “The government regulates the relations between the state and the sovereign, taking into account the general will and the protection of civil and political freedom” (p. 80) and argues: “The government legally exercises executive power. For the state to be in balance, the power of the government must be equal to the power of the sovereign. (p. 137) The principle of the sovereignty of the people was intended to implement in practice the important democratic principle of the legitimacy of state power by the people themselves and not by another mechanism or instance outside of it. The aim was that the people should exercise sovereignty directly or through their representatives, so that the deputies remain in contact and under the control of the electorate (the people), and that the representative body should oversee the activities of the executive power. This is more or less the concept of the notion of democracy as the government of the people and under its control. The principle of the sovereignty of the people enables the concretization of the central idea of democracy, that state power is truly exercised by the people themselves.

The idea and goal of recognizing and implementing this form of democracy as a form of government closely related to the principle of sovereignty of the people have been for a long time and will remain to define ideas, although in many cases, as in the past and even today, this idea remains an illusion. But it is even worse when the illusion turns into disillusionment, especially when it is abused through conceptions and applications of the so-called systems of popular democracy or proletarian democracy by dictators such as Lenin, Stalin, Brezhnev, Enver Hoxha, Ceausescu, Milosevic, Pol Poti, Fidel Castro, et al.

Carl Friedrich (1994) has talked about the basic requirements of democracy. He divides them into three groups. The first group includes the institutional conditions of democracy, which, according to him, are: the existence of a capable and agile bureaucratic apparatus; modern legislation; effective justice;

separation of powers; effective diplomatic service; the existence of a system for resolving disputes; and the interpretation of the constitution. The second group defines social conditions, including economic development and economic well-being, conditions of information through free media, harmonization of different interests in society, etc. In the third group, Friedrich includes cultural features. In this case, he emphasizes the political traditions of the population as well as the willingness of consensus and reconciliation of interests between different groups of the population. Friedrich raises the need and necessity of establishing a kind of balance in society and politics.

Democracy means a certain form of government or government which is carried out in the name and interest of the majority. It is a state constitution of both small and large states, where power comes directly or indirectly from the citizens based on political freedom and equality, broad political rights, and the participation of all citizens in adulthood. Democracy is essentially a rule, which is a symbol of a secular order; the people are of their descent, the only thing authorized. Ownership and exercise of power must come from the citizens.

On the one hand, democracy embodies a certain philosophical and political meaning, a social condition, and a rule that touches the entire pyramid of society, from the bottom to the top. Its implementation in practice encompasses a range of forms and tools that have enabled and stimulated several abusive efforts on its behalf. However, at the forefront of the dangers is the misuse of democratic labels, theories, and seductive words by totalitarian regimes and military dictatorships, similar to those that seek popular support through democratic labels, theories, and seductive words. In essence, they are the ones who flagrantly violate the principles on which democracy is based. On the other hand, even when not used merely for propaganda purposes, the words “democracy” and “democrat” are used to adorn and cover regimes and individuals that have nothing to do with ruling on behalf of the majority. The support of the low cultural level of the working masses and the use of a powerful propaganda arsenal in defense of totalitarian and dictatorial regimes is reminiscent of the role of the iron ax, which cannot knock down even a single tree without the help of the tail of wood.

Today's theories on democracy aim to present it as a set of democratic values, not without contradiction, in short, a political system whose essence is related to the widest possible participation of people in the exercise of public affairs and in the construction of public policies for creating general well-being. A democracy is a system of government that comes from the people, works with the people, and for the people. The authors of these theories have accepted the fact that a modern regime is called democratic when most people have the right to vote to elect their leaders. “The strength of democratic ideals, the will, and the human mind have nurtured a deep and inspiring meaning in history, from Pericles in ancient Athens to Vaclav Havel in Czechoslovakia, from Thomas Jefferson's



Declaration of Independence in 1776 to Andrei Sakharov's speeches in 1989. Sh. Taipllari (2006) has defined it as "government by the people," where the highest power belongs to the people and is exercised directly by them or by their elected representatives, according to a free electoral system. (p. 53) For Abraham Lincoln (Dhamo, M. 1999), "Democracy is a government that belongs to the people, comes from the people, and serves them" (p. 18).

Democracy is the system that guarantees and harmonizes the duties and rights of the individual with those of society. Rights are the most fundamental and constructive elements of a democratic government. The demands of human society in every country for greater rights in daily life and ensuring more active and decision-making participation in the bodies of the legislative, governing, and justice systems lead to the continuous improvement of democracy.

The permanence and endless spiral of the level of democracy lead us to the conclusion that, despite the trend and the progress before it, real democracy has never existed and will never exist. This is also the reason why the system of democracy undergoes constant changes under the requirements of the time, realizing a form of government, regime, or political system where power is exercised directly by the people through elected bodies by free vote, where citizens enjoy the freedom of full and equal rights, such as, for example, intra-party and inter-party competition and alternatives, representation of different interests, fair and free elections, the opportunity for voters to make choices between different candidates and policies, the real power of parliament, separation of powers, guaranteeing the rights of all citizens, the rule of law, etc.

The concept of democratic development includes the developmental couple that consists of moving forward and developing the individual as well as society itself. Misunderstanding of democracy leads to anarchy and chaos. The content of democracy embodies the meaning given to Abraham Lincoln as a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, whose values remain inalienable. In this sense, we would argue that all socio-political systems must necessarily pass through the "scanner" of standards of demands for freedom and democracy of peoples that differ from each other by the degree of their mastery.

Democracy involves the rule of the majority and respect for minorities, for the fact that they are part of the people and, therefore, should not be treated unequally.

From this point of view, democracy is seen as a form of political organization that ensures the rule of the majority and the respect of the minority, creating spaces for the free competition of political alternatives. But democracy is also the form of political organization that enables political competition for different alternatives to economic development, which ensures free initiative and private property. History has seen cases where particular individuals, dressed in power and with authoritarian tendencies at the helm of power, have used the concept

of democracy to disguise their evil intentions, hitting or reducing fundamental human rights, distorting the essence of democracy by applying only some of its elements, to misinterpret the interests of a part as the interests of the whole society. Abraham Lincoln's later definition expresses the initial embryo of the ideal of democracy rather than its real being. Democracy can not be imposed on any society, but it is neither a gift nor can it become someone's permanent property. To protect it, it must be fought every day by all citizens, without any distinction.

Embodying several similar meanings, we note that the term "democracy" encompasses the meanings related to the people and the magic they possess in economic, political, and cultural life as producers and consumers of material goods as well as builders and implementers of all the powers of a civilized society. At first glance, the notion of "democracy" represents a harmonious harmony with the notion of "people" and its rule. But just as this notion of democracy did not include women and slaves in ancient Greek society, minors and the mentally ill are excluded today. But the term and meaning of democracy, i.e., the rule of the majority, must navigate difficult "paths" when it comes to the notion of an absolute majority, which also enjoys the right to decide. The more democracy is in a country, the more favorable economic conditions it creates for the broad masses of the population and the more the state represents the largest mass of the population. On the other hand, no right of any majority can be absolute.

It is worth noting that the application of the principle of majority decision-making in a democracy also has its limits. Under no circumstances should the regime imposed by the majority turn into tyranny for the minority. In a democratic state, the majority must govern and make decisions, always following the constitution, democratic laws, and rules. It should not be forgotten for a moment that, although it is in the direction of the state, the majority continues to compete with the minority, which has its alternatives through the political program and which, normally, in the next elections is presented as an alternative aimed at seizing political power itself through a competitive program as opposed to the program of leaders who lost elections. Therefore, the rules of a fair democratic game must be respected, and the minority, in any case, must be guaranteed equal rights and opportunities so that, in the future, through free voting, in principle, a majority can be formed. But, of course, such an ideal state in practice is difficult to find. Therefore, this always remains an objective towards which contemporary society aims.

In today's modern society, democracy embodies different features from that of ancient Athens but retains the characteristics of a representative, pluralistic democracy based on the concept of statehood. Democracy is the system that guarantees and harmonizes the duties and rights of the individual with those of society. Rights are the most fundamental and constructive elements of a



democratic government. In the implementation of representative democracy, voting citizens do not make decisions about the organization of their lives but delegate these rights to their representatives. Experience has shown that no system of government is perfect. And in this context, philosophy and political science have offered people the most acceptable system of all systems to date, with the many benefits but also the disadvantages that accompany it. Despite the great advantages of representative democracy, it has not escaped the remarks of Rousseau (2008), who noted with despair: “However, from the moment a people surrender to the representatives, they are no longer free” (p. 313).

What are the issues that are good for the people to decide and which issues should be left to individuals? Such a question reopens the debate on the relationship between the public sphere and the private sphere. Models of democracy built on the principles of individualism usually offer a limited democracy in political life. It follows from this perspective that democracy aims to build, through several processes of popular participation, a framework of laws within which individuals can do their job and pursue their interests. Consequently, democratic elections are appropriate only for specific issues related to the community, while in other cases, democracy constitutes a restriction of freedom.

Another alternative to democracy has been developed by the Socialists and the Radical Democrats. According to radical democracy, democracy is not just a framework of laws within which individuals do their jobs, but a general principle that is applicable in all areas of life. People are considered to have fundamental rights to participate in all kinds of decisions that have to do with their lives, and democracy is simply the collective process by which this is done. From this point of view, democracy is seen as friendly to the freedom of individuals and not as an enemy of freedom. Restriction of liberty occurs only when such principles are ignored, and from there, oppression and exploitation begin to flourish.

The experience of democratic life raises constant demands for the deepening of democracy, which includes very important problems. Democratic institutions must be built not only at the level of the central government but also in local government structures. Local democracy is embodied in the right of citizens to elect their representatives in local government bodies. As Elliot Bulmer (2015) writes, “To address these issues, many constitutions contain a separate chapter or series of articles on local democracy. These may include provisions for establishing local democracy structures, providing for local elections (and sometimes for local referendums and other forms of public participation), and delegating powers and duties to local authorities (p. 6).

It is critical for the functioning of local democracy that the legitimate existence of local bodies is ensured to ensure the most adequate representation in decision-making. The European Charter of Local Self-Government (2012) stipulates that the organization of free and fair elections, public participation in

the affairs of a local body, and the transparency of this process are the principles on which local democracy is based. Kakumba and Singo (2008) state that citizens and other stakeholders should be voluntarily involved in any decision-making of local structures in a functioning local democracy. Citizen participation is their involvement in administrative policy-making activities, such as setting the level of service, budget priorities, and acceptability of physical construction projects, orienting government programs according to the needs of the community, building public support, and encouraging a sense of cohesion within society. In Albania, according to the Nationwide Assessment of the Local Government Situation (2020), the involvement of stakeholders in the decision-making process receives the highest rating, while the lowest rating is for civil and civic engagement. Morina, Muçaj, Nikaj, Shasivari, and Balaj (2021) find that citizens are not active enough even in the Republic of Northern Macedonia.

For a functioning local democracy, the balance between the effective services of local bodies and the regular accountability of these bodies is also important. In Albania and other post-communist countries, the imbalance between these two indicators is also known. Local democracy is functional when all citizens, the private sector, and non-governmental organizations are involved in the decision-making and accountability processes of local bodies.

The system of Western democratic standards includes not only the formal declaration of the principle of people's sovereignty but also the institutionalization of human rights and the creation of real conditions for the people's wider and more effective participation in the running of their state. This democracy aims to be realized through the greatest possible rapprochement of citizens with state power. Among other things, citizens are given the opportunity and given an effective means not only to resist power but, most importantly, to oppose and change it. Given all this, it can be said that a free and democratic regime excludes any kind of arbitrary and authoritarian rule. Democracy means constitutional governance in a state; it means democratic legitimacy of political power; separation of state power; recognition and respect of political and civil rights; etc.

III. Democratic freedom is the absence of oppression, dependence, and restrictions

People's relations with freedom have been and remain the object of philosophical studies, about which different opinions have emerged. Freedom is certainly a fundamental value, which is widely proclaimed and defended by thinkers and all political actors. Philosophers and thinkers of different historical stages have tried to describe the possibilities of its realization.



Freedom, as a natural right, is the essence of thinking according to individual beliefs and free will. The concept of freedom is an essential indicator of the development of a society and its citizens about the constraints facing all powers: the legislature, the executive, and the judiciary. In a more practical sense, freedom is nothing but the desire to fulfill or realize our needs and desires, concerning the possibilities and reality in which we live. The Dutch philosopher Spinoza (2013) states that “a people or a public body of citizens is a majority of people, who through a social pact act as if they were led by a single mind” (p. 61).

Spinoza’s above idea openly expresses the view that the sovereignty of a state derives from the people. Individuals unconditionally obey their state, although the right of opinion cannot be restricted because they enjoy the right of reasoning and judgment according to their mind. Spinoza (2013) would warn that “when a government seeks to restrict the freedom of thought and speech of its citizens, even when they obey the law, it acts irrationally and endangers its very existence” (p. 63). By presenting such views on the values and dangers that threaten freedom, he would conclude that “the more people accept and participate in the exercise of political power, the more powerful that state is” (p. 77). This is the source of the acceptance of the principle of opposition and dissent as an expression of democracy for all members of society, regardless of party affiliation, to triumph over reason over passions in defense of common interests. For Spinoza, democracy is the most natural regime, because it embodies the freedom that nature has given to every human being and best realizes the goals of the state because, through free assemblies, the people draft for themselves the laws that will govern it.

John Locke occupies a special place in political science and philosophy because of the way he handled the concept of freedom. According to Loku (2005), freedom is divided into two types: freedom that operates under the will of the unit to decide and freedom that is subject to the unstable, insecure, unknown, and arbitrary will of the individual. Man’s natural freedom is defined as being free and unyielding from man’s major powers or powers, retaining only the law of nature as the fundamental law of law; freedom in society is defined as remaining under legislative power that has been exercised with understanding for the common good.

Montesquie (1967) saw the limit of freedom in the obligation to obey the law and demanded that others do the same. It is important to keep in mind what independence is and what freedom is. Freedom is the right to do whatever the law allows. “If a citizen can do what they forbid, there is no more freedom, because everyone else would have equal power” (p. 205).

Rousseau envisioned an ideal society of free and equal people. He considers a man free only when he is bound by the laws within which he has some influence.

According to him, the basic challenge of a democratic society is the development of man and the affirmation of his personality.

Rusoi (2017) believed that good governance should have as its basic objective the freedom of its citizens. He calls freedom more important than peace when he writes: “What makes our species truly prosperous is not so much peace as freedom” (p. 44). Therefore, according to him, the best form of government in modern society is one that affirms the individual freedom of all citizens, with acceptable restrictions due to the existence of property rights and laws. He strongly believed in the existence of certain principles of government that, if implemented, could provide members of society with a level of freedom that at least approximates the freedom enjoyed in the natural state of man.

In his philosophical works, Rusoi (2008) describes the necessary principles that social institutions must apply, at the top of which he defines the preservation of “natural” freedom. Therefore, he stressed that “to give up personal freedom means to give up personal quality as a human being, the rights of human nature, and even his duties.” (p. 195) However, his ideas about freedom and democracy were inextricably linked with the establishment of the rule of law, that is, law that is the result of the general will, where the general will is also the desire of the sovereign, the people. Demonstrating high regard for the law as a sacred value, Rousseau would extend this appreciation entirely to all the powers of laws, the prohibition of which he accepts only when it comes to saving the homeland.

Rousseau finds that many of the ideas, such as property, law, and moral inequality, that have been imposed on man have no basis in nature. The most important characteristic of the state in a state of free nature is that people enjoy complete physical freedom and are free to do essentially what they want. Rousseau alternates the pros and cons of the state in the state of free nature, but he generally values it for the physical freedom it guarantees to people, allowing them to be unencumbered by the binding influence of the state and society. Rousseau (2008) conditioned his conception of a democratic society on the demand: “To find a form of socialization which protects and preserves, using all the common force, the person and property of each member; a society in which each one, by joining all others, nevertheless obeys only himself, and remains free as before” (p. 202).

The rights of all individuals are guaranteed by the fact that they are part of the decision-making but, above all, by the existence of the general will, which, aiming at the common good, necessarily aims at the freedom of everyone, which is the basic condition of the common good. However, the concept of freedom in a democratic country is defined as a right that allows it to pass laws passed by society and bodies elected by the people. All these paths, orientations, and sanctions with philosophical, legal, and political character preserve as a sacred



and inviolable formulation the postulate that a people is free when it is governed by the laws that it has formulated for itself. Kant conceives of the restriction of freedom in the abstract. According to Kant, the limits of freedom for every human being are related to the common good.

The concept of freedom, according to the German philosopher Nietzsche (1999), enriches, deepens, and expands its boundaries; that freedom is the will that makes you responsible for yourself, that has the property to distance yourself from others and separate you from their influences for unique thought independence on existence (p. 28).

For Spinoza, freedom was perfect rationalism; for Leibniz, it was the spontaneity of intelligence; for Kant, autonomy; for Hegel, the acceptance of the necessary; for Hobbes, freedom meant the absence of external obstacles to movement; for Croce in modern times, it was the extension of eternal life; and for Rousseau in France, freedom has the same fate as laws; it rules or collapses with them. Friedrich von Hayek, a well-known economist, and political scientist, used the term “constitution of freedom” instead of the term “social democracy”. By this, he meant many elements that enabled the coexistence of the individual with society. Democracy has an organic connection to our freedom and rights. But every freedom has its own vital space organized horizontally and vertically. “Freedoms” are different, although, in essence, they remain “constitutional rights” for every individual (citizen).

Today, there is a clearer and fuller attitude to freedom. Suffice it to mention that the program of the German Social Democratic Party (Hamburger Program 2007) reads: “Every human being is called and empowered to be free. Society decides whether he can fulfill this call... Only those who know they have sufficient social security can use their freedom. “The freedom of the individual ends where it violates the freedom of others.” Anyone who expects others not to be free cannot be free in the long run.” (p. 16) Human personality also develops in society. The Hamburger Program (2007) states that “each person should be able to define his or her life in community with others.” We are striving for a free and equal society in which every person can freely develop their personality without losing their dignity and freedom. “ (p. 15) Inclusive participation in social life prevails over today’s theories of individual freedom and rights.

IV. Conclusion

Democracy and freedom cannot be understood without each other. They have been and remain the subject of discussion in the circles of philosophers and thinkers, but also in various institutions and associations. Different attitudes towards

democracy in antiquity had explicable reasons. However, in ancient Greece, this concept began to take shape with the thoughts of Plato, Aristotle, Pericles, etc. The latter was closer to today's stay.

A more complete concept was formed with the beginnings of the European Renaissance. Although they did not all hold the same views, the philosophers of this era were united by the idea that power belongs to the people in a democracy, and that power in a democracy is a government that comes from the people, belongs to them, and serves them.

The principles and values that underlie true democracy (political freedom, universal suffrage, political pluralism, and representative assembly) have been established in recent centuries. Democracy encompasses not only theoretically inherited ideas and concepts that are constantly being refined but also how they are implemented.

Democracy is constantly improving and strengthening in its demands on society for greater rights in daily life and more active decision-making participation in the bodies of the legislative, governing, and justice systems. These demands are not at the same level among different peoples, and the degree of development of democracy is not the same.

In a democracy, opportunities are created for political competition, for different alternatives to economic development, for personal initiative, and for securing private property. Ownership and exercise of power must come from the citizens. In a democratic state, the majority must make decisions following the constitution, democratic laws, and rules and must compete with the minority, which has its alternatives. Today's democracy embodies features different from those of antiquity but retains the characteristics of a representative, pluralistic democracy based on the concept of statehood. Experience has shown that no system of government is perfect. Based on this, it can be said that a free and democratic regime respects the freedom and rights of citizens, excluding any kind of arbitrary and authoritarian rule. The freedom of the individual is the fundamental value. It is the essence of thinking and acting according to beliefs and free will. It is the desire to meet the needs of the citizens.

In a democracy, the duties and rights of the individual are guaranteed and harmonized with those of society. The respect for the rights and freedoms of citizens are basic conditions of its existence.

References

- Bulmer, E. (2015). *Local Democracy*. International IDEA Constitution-Building Primer.
De Montesquieu. (1967). *Lo spirit delle leggi*, Vol.1, Rizzoli, Milano.



- Dhamo, M. (1999). Edukimi qytetar demokratik në Shqipëri,” Shtëpia botuese “AEDP,” Tiranë.
- Friedrich, C. (1994). Constitutional Government and Democracy, Boston, quoted by Erik, J. & Ersson, S. in “Comparative Politics”, Cambridge.
- Hamburger Programm, Grundsatzprogramm der Sozialdemokratischen Partei Deutschlands Beschlossen auf dem Hamburger Bundesparteitag der SPD (28 Oktober 2007).
- Kakumba, U. and Singo, S. (2008). Citizens participation in local government and the process of rural development. Journal of Public Administration, Vol.23. No. 2:
http://repository.up.ac.za/bitstream/handle/2263/6486/Kakumba_Citizen%282008%29.pdf?sequence=1.
- Karta Evropiane e Autonomisë Vendore. (2012).
- Komiteti Shqiptar i Helsinkit. (1993). Përmbledhje aktesh ndërkombëtare. Tiranë.
- Lock, J. (2005). “Traktati i dytë për qeverisjen”. Shtëpia botuese “Dita 2000”. Tiranë.
- Morina, V., Muçaj, F., Nikaj, E., Shasivari, J. & Balaj L. Vetëqeverisja lokale: Shqyrtime teorike dhe krahasimore. (2021). Fondacioni-Konrad-Adenauer, Prishtinë.
- Nietzsche, F. (1999). Vullneti për pushtet, (Përkth. Gazmend A. Baku), Shtëpia botuese “Marin Barleti”, Tiranë.
- Pëllumbi, S. (2013). Etikokracia, Botimet Morava, Tiranë.
- Rousseau, J. J. (2017). The Social Contract, Copyright © Jonathan Bennett. Retrieved from:
<http://www.earlymoderntexts.com/assets/pdfs/rousseau1762.pdf>.
- Ruso, Zh. Zh. (2008). Origjina e pabarazisë sociale mes njerëzve, Botimet “Almera”, Tiranë.
- Ruso, Zh. Zh. (2007). Kontrata sociale, Luarasi “University Press,” Tiranë.
- Spinoza, B. (2013). Traktati politik, Shtëpia botuese “Pika pa sipërfaqe” Tiranë.
- Taiplari, Sh. (2006). Fjalor, koncepte dhe autorë të filozofisë, Shtëpia botuese “Mësonjëtorja”.
- Vlerësimi mbarëkombëtar i situatës së qeverisjes vendore në Shqipëri (2020). Retrieved from:
http://www.al.undp.org/content/dam/albania/docs/LG_Mapping_al.pdf.