"LIVING TOGETHER" IN A SOCIETY, THE CASE OF TUNISIA

SABRINE MANSOURI [1], RABAH NABLI [2] and ALI ELLOUMI [3]*

[1, 2] University of Sfax, Faculty of Letters and Human Sciences of Sfax. Tunisia.
[3] LARIDIAME Laoratory, Sfax University, Faculty of Letters and Human Sciences of Sfax. Tunisia.
*Corresponding Author Email: alielloumi62@gmail.com

Abstract

Living together in today's Tunisia means defending freedom as a fundamental value and principle of the Republic. Secularism is based on the principles of freedom of conscience and equality between human beings; it allows everyone, believers or not, to live in society while respecting differences in terms of culture, sexuality and societal. We believe that it is unlikely that such a requirement can be satisfied can be satisfied by simple conviction. pure belief. It must be enshrined in the national constitution and laws to combat the inevitable corporatism, religious communitarianism and commercial clientelism that could divide the population into opposing legal factions and advance the dominant ideology. That being said, the stakes are not only political but also social and economic. The red-skinned population of big cities need real choices. It is unlikely that the country will regain stability and prosperity, even in the medium term, if the current economic policies are not revised as soon as possible to find a balance between social and economic concerns and to facilitate the integration of young people into the labor market. For Tunisian officials, the task is formidable: to know how to impose the codes of civility as the only authoritative principles, without appearing to endorse the models that privilege force as a value of use and exchange in interactions. Tunisian society has chosen its own ways of doing things with regard to the fulfillment of this task. One, attached to the principles of Islam, structures living together from the family model. The other, oriented according to secular criteria, gives a central place to education by acquiring the conditions of a "common humanity. Learning to live together for Tunisians requires an important moral distancing work. This requires considering vulnerability as a resource that would not only make it possible to rise above the instrumental constraints specific to everyday life, without losing sight of how much the major issues (emotional, social, professional, relational) depend on it.

Keywords: Living Together, Freedom, Secularism, Equal Opportunities, (Social, Economic and Cultural).

> *" Living together" is at the heart of democracy. How to deal with this question in a context that oscillates between the desire to meet the other and the withdrawal of identity?*
>
> Martin Luther King, 1962.

INTRODUCTION

In archaic and traditional societies, individuals were imbued with duty, the Forbidden, what to do or not to do. Today, we see a strengthening of individualism and a weakening of the social bond all over the world. At the same time, our cultural environment is rapidly changing and becoming more and more diverse. Cultural diversity is now a state of affairs inherent in human society, which could probably be explained by cross-border migration, the cultural effects of globalization, the increasing interdependence of all regions of the world and the progress of the means of information and communication. Indeed, more and more individuals live in a "multicultural" normality and have to manage their own multiple cultural ties. But, this diversity is not without sometimes generating fear, racism, xenophobia, fanaticism, intolerance, discrimination and violence which can threaten peace and the very structure of local and

national communities. To deal with the problem of "living together" in the Arab world, we must certainly not lose sight of the fact that this phenomenon - as for the rest of the world- must by no means be studied independently of the global context. It must be noted, however, that the behavior of individuals in this region still reveals the mark of their culture of origin. The "living together" thus proves to be a question of state of mind, of culture.

According to many social scientists, (Hichem Sharabi, & al. 1996) the pre-colonial Arab societies, which were extremely unequal and where social rank mattered a lot, would have given birth to an ideology favoring family origin and social rank. This mentality would still be at work in today's societies and would have been reintroduced into the political systems of this region, most often based on co-opting in the choice of officials. (HIBOU, Béatrice, 2006) Another, no less important phenomenon, also considered to be responsible for this state of lethargy characteristic of the situation currently prevailing in this part of the world, is in this case male domination which seems to continue to weigh with all its weight on individuals and this, pushing them to cultivate ignorance, sexual discrimination and especially submission and resignation. Moreover, according to these same researchers, if Arab societies are lagging behind Western societies today, it is because they do not allow women to fully play their role. The political structures are modeled on the family structures and the clan or family leader has the same role as the political leader.

That said, apparently "living together" in the Arab world means that we should not only take into account the problems of gender equality, but also the diversity of populations and opinions and everything that would probably create a social cohesion that is now obviously undermined in many countries that continue to ignore gender equality and deny ethnic minorities, such as the Kurds and the Amazigh, the right to use their languages and their specific cultures.

There is therefore a need to redefine the social bond because, so far, researchers in the region, as the Algerian historian Mohamed Harbi shows well, have defined it only in relation to foreign domination and left out a certain number of phenomena. They have, to Harbi's good belief, idealized the past too much when it was rather necessary to revisit it through all the problems it had generated such as sexual discrimination, clientelism, factionalism and religious fanaticism. But, it is also a question of being vigilant because the Arab world has changed enormously, it becomes imperative to change the reading grid to be able to face its new recompositions. Perhaps the sovereignty of the state and the nation should be replaced by the sovereignty of the people. (HARBI Mohamed, 2011)

But, before getting to the heart of the matter, it is necessary to note not only the numerous transformations that are modifying the planet, but also to also take stock of the tools available to think about these phenomena. In a few years, the social sciences have experienced the collapse of functionalism, the triumph, then the decline of structuralism, the apogee, then the weakening of Marxism, the successes of symbolic interactionism, the rise in power of various variants of methodological individualism, the return of the theme of the subject, etc. Which analytical instruments are the most promising today, which can best help us to understand the world in which we live?

1-The Models of Living Together

From the point of view of the practical requirements that they impose on the relations between citizens, the models of living together also nourish, despite the resistances that they address them, forms of "pragmatic composition" with the models of "living alongside" (indifferently) and "living together" (BARTHES Raymond. (2002). This is partly because citizens cannot support and respond continuously and indefinitely to these requirements. The sociological reality of a sustainable co-ownership then rather presupposes a composition between these three models (Goffman Ewining, 1973; Pattaroni Luca, 2001),

Indulgence to the other and the reluctance to give voice

The divergent positions on living well together, the inability of some to align themselves with common principles, to follow regulatory prescriptions, to assume the assigned share of responsibility (etc.), many elements feed areas of tension that can fuel both criticism and mutual resentment. However, it must be noted that if each co-ownership inevitably relies on the basis of shared principles of justice, a fundamental element that explains that it can last over time is that these principles are not constantly, with each dispute, brought together in an exchange where argued criticisms confront each other.

It seems that the temporal dimension must be considered with the greatest attention so that observation and analysis can probe what, of co-belonging, endures and summons forms of indulgence in order to be able to last durably. Indulgence is like a "given time" (Pattaroni Luca, 2001), (to learning a fair idea and a good practice of co-belonging) or the expression of the disorder or deviation caused by the newcomer, and the implementation of the sanction and judgment that should accompany it, are suspended. But the indulgence can "shrink" as time passes and the differences brought by the foreigner are read less from the cultural modalities of apprehension of his strangeness (the irreducible strangeness that would result is defeated by advances in interpersonal rapprochement) than through the prism of certain tests of integration into the very regime of co-ownership.

Indulgence must be apprehended alongside another phenomenon: the reluctance to speak publicly during a dispute and to apply a reasoned criticism. Anger as aggressiveness can appear as a public manifestation of a diffuse sanction, the refusal to express negative appreciations to the addressee is well understood as the refusal to express sanctions and a role of control agent.

The reluctance to give a voice in society has allowed us to identify two elements that characterize an infiltration of public modes of living together by the proximity of living with (EMETRSON Ralph. & CHIN Roland. T (1999):

1 / a communicational phenomenality marking a criticism but which remains non-reducible to the reasoned public speech (where very varied manifestations ranging from expressive outburst to a rant stand out, which have an understanding scope only in the familiar register that accompanies them),

2 / an essential modality of circumventing the public test in all that it has of trying for the one who engages in it.

The need to consolidate the person through co-ownership

We were able to observe, the relatively long time horizon of the investigations allowing us to do so, that the application of the models of living together, whatever they may be, imposed strong practical and reflective requirements on citizens. Requirements to appear with regard to and with regard to what defines and delimits this set. Requirements, therefore, which weigh on each citizen in principle because the personal commitment that comes from these models of living together is continuously affected and concerned by the collective devices that are being erected to stabilize them and make them perceptible and available to all (devices for evaluating actions, observation and participation, classification and qualification, etc.).

Responding to these models, thus asserting a responsibility in accordance with their principles, means both taking into account mutual expectations and assuming common duties (whether related to a regulation, a contract clause, an order, a shared political and moral idea, etc.). It is this density of trials, which can be described as "public" because they correspond to the criteria of a common model (shaping for a certain collective) and because they potentially affect each member of this set of citizens, who dispenses with a progressive fatigue, testing the latter by what it requires as a conduct and as an adjustment effort. Exhaustion is all the more sensitive as the context makes it not very favorable to the withdrawal of the inhabitants, that is to say this withdrawal where we find ourselves spared by this density of trials and where therefore we conceive a rest in routine and personalized accommodations to the close environment, in the benefit of a clean and privileged time, that is to say a time which evades accounting and "reporting". The sensitive fasteners that it allows. The surveys therefore remained attentive to the modalities of living together which are established on the basis of the affinity between citizens, the implementation of personalized action routines, or the arrangement of spaces to inscribe singular ways of being. But they have remained so insofar as, while allowing this maintenance and this consistency of the person, these own ways of living with are likely, on the horizon of the presence of a third party, to contribute to the (re)activation of critical postures, because they deviate, potentially and more or less greatly, from the forms traced by the model of living together. Thus, the investigations were all able to identify reasons for tension, in the co-apartments, relating (i) to attachment to habits that were too singular, especially when they took place in common spaces, (ii) to the too marked rapprochement between certain co-apartments, or finally (iii) to the attachment of a relative to the field of co-ownership (a family member or a boyfriend -) (capable of separating the stranger in favor of a solicitude directed towards the relative). Goffman Ewining, 1973; Pattaroni Luca, 2001)

The "pragmatic composition" of the model of living together and emerging forms of liberalism.

The resistance to the close on the one hand and the threat to (or of) indifference on the other must therefore not prevent us from thinking that co-belonging presents itself, in the horizon of a long time, in forms of composition between all the models of living with, which we have distinguished. These forms need to be considered doubly, and in the movement offered by the possible passage between the different models on which a certain biographical coherence of the cohabitant is based. On the one hand, these compositions seem to be the possible place for

the preservation and preservation of a dignity of the person, protecting him at the same time from a permanent solicitation relating to the expectations of living together and from contempt as soon as a deviation from the criteria of living well together would point out. On the other hand, pragmatic compositions also seem to contribute to revitalizing impulses relating to co-ownership, as suggested by the frequent occurrence of festive activities, where, in the close relationships that (re)form, enthusiasm relating to the common principles of living together can be reborn or take new forms. We could add a few remarks, in line with those relating to the "compounds" that take place when time is working and people assert desires or feel the need, the necessity or the desire, to diminish a model of living together that does not go without straining the relationships of these strong demands (BREVIGLIERI Marc, 1997). A trend as to the nature of the composition is emerging on the different terrains. Indeed, it appears that people agree, without having a clear thematic awareness of it, and stabilize a model of living together with which a policy of co-ownership that can be said to be liberal profiles. Nascent forms of liberalism that we intend to germinate in these cohabitations tested by time but destined to last and therefore to welcome people carried away by a biographical future which, at the same time, makes them less able to live with relatives in a state of full availability, no longer allows, or less, to support a strong involvement which increases participation as a virtue, but supposes that always, the places are embraced by a sense of belonging and managed by everyone. We then see these places being equipped with procedures and modalities for taking charge of tasks that weigh less and allow autonomy to be achieved. Nascent forms, again, when the requirement of an integration of the new on the model of a co-ownership entirely constituted by the oldest inhabitants fails to make right to its strangeness and hinders the delivery of ways, "cultural", religious that it is important for him to pursue. But neither must this transported strangeness, and this is the case when it relates his conduct to an eccentric community to that with which he must reckon, set him apart from other people. In this in-between, we then see the birth of a modality of acceptance of the difference or the scope of this "culture" (which can extend excessively when it commands customs that govern the least of its gestures) which will call to transform it as a preference looking at the person and no longer looking at this previous community, (MARGALIT Avishai, 1996),

2. Living together: TOURAINE'S approach (2022)

For Alain Touraine, one of the most famous sociologists of our time, the idea that our existence is played out on a global scale, that our employment and that our cultural references, our tastes, our values are largely shaped by planetary logics, would be the best shared idea. And at the same time, everyone would like to put forward our personal, or collective subjectivity, in order to resist all the affiliations and all the logics that can crush us. (Touraine Alain, 1997) Perhaps that is why, he believes that the current vocation of sociology, contrary to the sociological tradition,-which defined individuals and groups by their social relations, would be to emphasize the individual having become the main actor of change following the decline of institutions having lost much of their capacity for regulation and integration

The first and most important of these institutions that suffered the setback of globalization was the state. There have been many setbacks in this case. Indeed, the state, as an agent of social regulation, is today attacked on the one hand by the internationalization of the economy, on the other by the fragmentation of cultural identities. (Touraine Alain, p. 24) This dissociation of the economy and culture, according to Touraine, marks the end of the time of the modern order. In this changing world, the only point of support that we could easily grasp is the effort expended by the individual to transform lived experiences into the construction of oneself as an actor. (Touraine Alain, p.26) This change did not take long to lead in turn to a change in sociological theory, a change qualified as of very great importance since it is a question of reconstructing a conception of social life from a non-social principle. To be honest, this obviously attractive change would have made it possible to take sociology (societal holism) and economics (methodological individualism) out of their respective ghettos. These two specialties of observing society then become a collective conception of democracy.

Globalization and its corollary economic liberalism, social change and the rise of individualistic values make the mediation of the state obsolete; we have entered the era of "demodernization" to speak the language of Touraine. The confrontation between the logic of the social and that of the economic is now taking place on the ground of the individual himself and this can lead to two situations just as negative as the other: either to free oneself from social constraints, which opens the way to inequalities and violence, or to opt for withdrawal into oneself, which will produce the development of an atomized society made up of a multitude of communities.

What can be done to remedy such a situation? For Touraine, it would be necessary to build a new social link, especially since the return of the state would seem very illusory. According to him, the key to the problem is the Subject. This subject is the individual and his project. In this way, we will be able to find a new compromise that would eventually make it possible to reconcile the enemy brothers that are the economy and the social, because the Subject is finally only a synthesis between equality (everyone has a project) and difference (everyone has their project).

Traditional societies, specifies Touraine, are turned towards the cultural transmission of identity within the ethnic group or the tribe. Consequently, it is in situations where social life is organized by beliefs, myths, rules and a language, those studied by ethnologists, that "identity" can only be constituted in relation to otherness and that we can accept the principle of analysis that anthropologists have drawn from linguistics: the relationship to oneself is controlled by the relationship to the Other; communication determines identity. (Touraine Alain, p.261)

However, since the emergence of modern societies, which obviously coincided with the birth of capitalism, we have been able to note at the same time a development of economic instrumentality. To develop, capitalism needs only commodity production to triumph. It needs a market where people and capital can move freely. It must therefore gather within the same state everything that can be done: delimit countries whose population speaks the same language; territories that are politically and geographically unifiable ; to tear down the borders between the provinces; to abolish the corporatist and archaic laws in order to establish the

freedom of commerce and exchanges; to create a common currency and regulations; etc. Thus the nations are formed. (Touraine Alain, p.246)

The nation, according to Touraine, is a political Subject and not a cultural Subject. "*The identity-otherness couple is replaced by the normality-difference couple. Touraine shows rigorously well that when we move from a culture of reproduction to a culture of production, we simultaneously see the theme of difference replacing that of otherness.* " (Touraine Alain, p.262)

9) When the state believes that it can merge instrumentality and identity on the territory of a nation, it gives a nationalist state. However, on a practical level, we see him favoring either modernization or identity.

In, the Arab world, we easily switch from one form to another. There is no fixed point to build either a pure nation or an empire for a thousand years. The collective identity based on the invariant transmission certainly leaves room for an individual identity, but an identity turned towards the collective conception of things. In such a context, the individual would seem to always prefer to find refuge in the community. And the collective production apparently directed towards social justice could turn to cultural totalitarianism before exhausting itself in instrumental inefficiency. (Egypt, Nasserian, Syria of the Assad family, Saddam Hussein's Iraq). The national State cannot ensure the combination of the management unit and the diversity of affiliations. (Touraine Alain, p.256)

Today, as Touraine wisely reminds us, faced with the globalization of markets, the nation is neither a market nor a community. She is a mediator between the world of economic instrumentality and that of cultural identity. However, there is no nation that does not have an ethnic dimension. A nation is both a national state and a people. (Touraine Alain, p.263)

And, "the more we enter the internationalized economy, the more the political will for autonomy, for self-determination, is built on a consciousness of origin, cultural and ethnic identity, and not, as we have long believed, on projects of rationalizing modernity" (Touraine Alain, p.264). If the nations have advanced the ethnicities in the direction of instrumentalization, the identity crisis forces us to move from the economy to culture. Anti-racism must integrate this ethnic component of the problem in order to fight totalitarianism in other ways than with beautiful words. Because totalitarianism, especially in the Arab world, is not the instrumentalist despotism of the Enlightenment but an identity fundamentalism, a community fantasy. That is why he gives free rein to Absolute Evil. "Far from the Russian populism of the twentieth century, and especially from the Latin American national-popular regimes, this fundamentalist nationalism reacts to the growing separation of the globalized economy and national cultures by a tradition and not by a project. " (Touraine Alain, p.274)

The State is not outdated. It is the relationship between state and nation that is in crisis. We must put diversity first over unity. Should we still talk about a nation? "It is about democracy in the liberal sense of respect for economic, cultural and social diversity that we must speak here, but specifying that this democracy cannot live without the unity and integration of a territory, therefore of a nation, without a collective memory and public policies, being

recognized. "(14) Totalitarianism believed it was fighting against exploitation. Democracy must build links to avoid the double exclusion of markets and communities. Is it impossible to conceive of a democracy that protects freedom of opinion and choice but also fights inequality? (Touraine Alain, p. 279)

Touraine criticizes economic liberalism when it confuses democracy and market economy. In France, we went from the Republic to Democracy by recognizing diversity. There is a crisis of a democracy defined negatively by the absence of absolute power and the rule of the market economy. This revolutionary notion of democracy is unsuitable today. We must redefine the roles between the state and civil society, between instrumentality and culture. The positive definition of democracy presupposes a democratic spirit, social movements that defend the freedom of the Subject. The defense of property cannot be enough for democracy when appropriation systems disrupt or paralyze the production of wealth. When the rise in the stock market accompanies that of unemployment. A real democratic process is needed to expand the area of freedom for civil society actors. Faced with the chaos of the markets, with globalization, which would take place, the Subject must build a personal meaning on cultural values. Hence a cultural democracy defending rights in the face of domination. Because this problem is more real than the class struggle. Equity and secularism must contribute to dissociating private and public life in order to give each individual the chance to build himself as an actor. This is how institutions can regain their mediating role instead of being relays of domination through integration.

Also dealing with the same problem of "Living together" but in a non-Western context, that of Tunisia and at an exceptional moment, that of the revolt of an entire people, in an excellent article entitled: "What is a people? "Michel Péraldi shows how, by a very mysterious process, the humiliation of an entire population would have turned into a revolution! (Touraine Alain, p.283)

3. Living together: SHMIDTZ's approach (2022)

For David Schmidtz, the opposite is true: understanding how to live in a community is more important than understanding how to live alone. This book raises the question of whether we can defend human morality if we do not take into account the situational characteristics of the communities inhabited by political animals. Schmidtz questions the idea that timeless principles should serve as a starting point for a reflection on life. Rather, the theory of community life should be the source of contemporary moral philosophy's attempts to go beyond formalism and consider which principles have historically been demonstrated to be the organizing principles of truly prosperous communities. The idea that timeless principles should serve as a starting point for a reflection on life. Rather, the theory of community life should be the source of contemporary moral philosophy's attempts to go beyond formalism and consider which principles have historically been demonstrated to be the organizing principles of truly prosperous communities. The conclusions drawn from these studies should be a condensed version of social science knowledge based on verifiable cases of successful community development. Even if it is not in its broad outlines, what emerges from the ongoing tests in the crucible of life experience will depend on the path taken, partly because any lifestyle is a

response to challenges that are inherently contingent, dependent on the path and constantly evolving. According to him, justice has developed as a way of expressing our common commitment not to harm each other and, in addition, to jointly establish our position as contributing members of a community. That being said, any understanding of justice must be based on visible facts rather than on unprovable intuitive beliefs.

4. Living together, the tunisan case

However, it seems that, in order to better understand this process, it is necessary to take into account, according to Péraldi, two elements: two components of this people deserve to be explored, because they are inscribed in this revolutionary dynamic. The first concerns social networks which, via the web, have been an essential actor in the protest process. The second concerns these famous "upstarts" whose repugnance constituted the bulk of the crystallized anger that was expressed. (Péraldi Michel, 2011)

In a country deprived of freedom of expression, with a written press and audiovisual media at the command, the Web represented a space of freedom unknown until then, and allowed an effective dissemination of information. Not a rally, not a demonstration that has not been made public on the Facebook network, thanks to the videos recorded by mobile phones. The Tunisian authorities, who hoped that the movement would run out of steam by closing schools, quickly despaired. Young people have found themselves even more numerous on the Internet. The images of the repression, particularly fierce in the city of Kasserine, in the west of Tunisia, went around the world in a few days. Taken inside the regional hospital itself, with the complicity of the hospital staff, these photos bluntly showed the reality of the clashes with the police, the bloodied bodies of young people shot dead on side-by-side beds. The first vigilance committees, organized by Tunisians to defend themselves against policemen and militiamen loyal to the regime, were born in Kasserine, on the advice of Internet users. Immediately broadcast, immediately set up.

The commonly accepted idea that these networks most often consecrate a certain facade universalism will not be able to be retained. Because, practically, including for those who practice them, notes Péraldi, social networks are conglomerates of scattered groups of friends but also, and this is fundamental, of scattered or distant friends and relatives, (Péraldi Michel, 2011). Facebook is apparently built on a minimum rule of trust: my friends, my cousins, and distant acquaintances. Would it then be possible to grasp the extremely strategic role that migration dispersion would have played in the Tunisian case and more generally in the Maghreb and African countries? Certainly, the young Tunisian bloggers and tweeters spoke among themselves, under the protection of the anonymity of the pseudonyms. But, they also talked a lot with friends and distant cousins, from France and Europe, and it is in this interaction and this familiarity –according to Péraldi- that the values and utopias were built from which the radicalism of the street would have made sense. It is not a question of saying that there was at work any Republican "model" whose young cousins, far from the yoke, would have carried the triumph. According to Péraldi, it is more pragmatically to say that these vis-à-vis, broken to the political and cultural language of their culture (urban, European, hedonistic, globalized, quietly libertarian), have constantly brought back to this language their Tunisian friends and

cousins. Ben Ali (Sarko, Fillon, etc.) break yourself, there is nothing inappropriate or enormity in the France of blogs, it is a prerequisite. For Péraldi, it is necessary to draw a first evidence, which gives to the Tunisian revolutionary experience a part of its sociology: it is a revolution which is anchored on diasporic sociabilities, possibilities which are not local but transversal to the cultural and social space of the diaspora.

By emphasizing the essential role played by social networks, Péraldi however refutes the thesis of technological determinism to explain the revolutionary process in Tunisia. He does not underestimate in any way the role that these new modes of information have taken, in the current movement in this country. But a rigorous sociological analysis prohibits overestimating them and making them an instrument for the national liberation of oppressed peoples. In reality, these instruments are not the revolutionary process but one factor among others of political processes that only make full sense once they are placed in their historical, political and social environments.

The second explanatory social dimension of this great historical event that is the Tunisian revolution is perhaps a little more local, (Péraldi Michel, 2011).

Certainly, as we have seen, notes Peraldi, the people have gathered to put out a dictator and his clan. But the press, especially European, - to believe Péraldi - probably took up a little superficially the idea that the ruling clan was like a parasite, installed on the surface of Tunisian society to suck its blood. However, as Beatrice Hibou cleverly reminds us, the Ben Ali clan was perhaps more than we say, branched, anchored, woven into Tunisian society, (Hibou Béatrice. (2006). The upstarts are not just a clan or a clique, it is a social world, wide and branched! This is the world of big and small people who think of making social promotion through business, commerce, bizness. The world of thousands of young "suitcases" who fill the planes to Istanbul, that of importers, small and large, of Chinese products from the souk of El Jem, the world of parasitic industrialists installed on the edges of relocated industries, and on the margins of tourism to puncture bakchiches, prebends, black money, (Péraldi Michel, 2011).

In addition, there are also people like customs officers who have taken advantage of their position of surveillance and control of factories in industrial free zones, to pick up unscrupulous models or customers, and thus organize a whole sub-industry, clandestine and informal tailoring. Like, there are in Tunisia, in the back shops of hairdressing salons, in hammams, sometimes in simple garages, executive women who sell the products of their purchases in Istanbul or Dubai. Should we also talk about the clans and sub-clans of the Ben Ali system, levied on everything, including on the most miserable street shops. But the sellers, even while grumbling, lived in the same imaginary world of an economy of fluids from which we take, (Péraldi Michel, 2011).

The system, as Péraldi has well noticed, was therefore anchored in these worlds of upstarts, these worlds of the generalized bazaar, which then form a quasi-class. Those, no doubt, whose existence the street denounces today and the existence. And in front of them, who are they? The others, simply! For Péraldi, it is about the humiliated peasants, the unemployed young people, the graduates, the teachers, the lawyers, the doctors, who by difference very often feel

as if there were too many of them, useless in a world that would no longer be just governed by business. Let's name them supernumerary, proposes Péraldi, for this consciousness that they share of sometimes being witnesses of another time which they are told everywhere that it has had its time, precisely, when the protective State, on its way to a utopia of equality, of shared dignity, was the bearer of an idea of being together. And sometimes the left on the edge, the stragglers and laggards of a world that has nothing to do with skills, love of work, diplomas, knowledge, learning, (Péraldi Michel, 2011).

To tell the truth, it is not an exaggeration to say that Ben Ali's political regime ended up becoming a foreign body in his own country because it only served the family interests of his own clan and those of foreign states or groups. Yesterday, colonization subjected entire societies to its social order; for 23 years, Ben Ali's autocratic regime has not stopped colonizing the lived world of its population, reifying subjects, making its own people look like one thing, (Laacher Smaïn, Terzi Cédric, (2020).

It turns out that the Tunisian people have just come out of a whole nightmare! Of course, he straightened up against his oppressor as one man, but as soon as he got out of this nightmare, he quickly found his differences, his divides without being able to invent the right way to manage them rationally and effectively for the good of everyone. Living together is today, in this revolutionary moment, a topical question that perhaps arises more acutely than under the dictatorship. The state being in a bad position, weakened more than ever, would no longer seem able to provide society with the slightest possible cohesion.

In this context marked by the weakening of the state and faced with the chaos of the markets, and globalization, democracy must help the Subject to build links and a personal meaning on cultural values to avoid the triple exclusion of the markets, the State and communities. Hence the requirement for a cultural democracy defending rights in the face of domination. Because this problem is as important as the class struggle, especially since in this context it is difficult to get out of communitarianism. Equity and secularism must contribute to dissociating private and public life in order to give each individual the chance to build himself as an actor. This is how institutions can regain their mediating role instead of being relays of domination through integration.

The overriding question: how to ensure the construction of democracy in a fragmented society? In a nation under construction as is the case of Tunisia, "The identity-otherness couple has not yet been replaced by the normality-difference couple. The resistance to change is great, the right represented by Ennahdha and the Salafists categorically refuse such an option. But, neither the allegations of the leaders of these political-religious currents, nor even the muscular interventions of their henchmen, in the meetings organized by the various factions of the Tunisian left would seem to be able to stop a process already being carried out. Indeed, the entire Tunisian political class seems more determined than ever to move forward. Of the sixty lists running for the constituent forty-nine claim the need to separate religion from politics.

What type of union, can we found in law, for beings whose intellectual convictions are diverse? The unity of Laos, according to Greek etymology, is that of a population of which no individual differs from the others by particular rights or powers. The simple layman, from medieval times, is the man of the people, believer or not, distinct from the cleric, who for his part is the custodian of a identifiable function in the administration of the sacred. The secular principle of union of the people, as we will see, translates the undifferentiation of the simple "laity" into the founding values of the City: freedom of conscience, equality of all, indivisibility of a political body based on the universal identity of the rights held by each. Such a principle is therefore in no way contradictory to religious faith, since it constructs the political order by disregarding the spiritual positions of each other.

It should be noted that the idea of a world common to all, of a res publica, is largely outlined in this principle of indivision of the people. Certainly, the communities of faith, or of representation of the world, are not negligible. But they only concern those who freely recognize themselves in them. The whole question is therefore to know how to conceive diversity in unity, how to articulate them on the one hand without diversity being able to compromise unity, on the other hand without unity oppressing diversity. It is a question of defining registers of affirmation of one and the other in such a way that they are reconcilable. We will therefore conceive a community of law based on a concern for justice inspired by the reference to the fundamental rights of the human being.

We can of course point out that political communities were first constituted as de facto communities, which tended to favor reference factors spontaneously linked to a religion, a customary vision, an ethnic particularism. But such an observation is only opposable to the idea of a critical reappropriation of the foundations of living together if human societies are denied the possibility of evolving. From this point of view, we can understand secularism not as a cultural product, spontaneously arising from a particular tradition, but as a conquest accomplished by an effort to distance oneself from a society first subjected to the traditional theological-political organization.

To tell the truth, for today's Tunisia, without ignoring the recurring force of de facto communities and the particularities that cement them, it would be appropriate to think about the meaning of the secular construction of a community of law. And this is for three types of reasons. The first is that the diversity of spiritual convictions, religious or other, tends to take the place, in modern societies, of the uniqueness of religious reference. (Not only in France, even in Turkey) The second is that even in the case of a supposed religious homogeneity of the population, the theocratic or fundamentalist modality of the religious can only lead to an oppressive theological-political figure. (Saudi Arabia, Iran and many others) The third, suggested by history, is that the political and institutional domination of one religion over another, or even religions on atheistic or agnostic conviction, is incompatible in various ways with freedom of conscience, as with equal rights. Perhaps that is why secularism is posed as a sine qua non condition for democracy.

CONCLUSION

In summary, living together in today's Tunisia means making secularism a founding value and an essential principle of the Republic. Secularism presupposes freedom of conscience and equality between human beings, it allows everyone; believers or not to live in society with respect for cultural, sexual and social differences. We believe that such a requirement cannot be fulfilled by the force of convictions. It must be enshrined in the constitution and the laws of the country in order to counter the inevitable corporatism, religious communitarianism and business clientelism that could divide the people into competing groups of law in order to favor the dominant ideology. That said, the issue is not exclusively political, it is also social and economic. The people of the red belts of the big cities and those of the cities of the interior need real choices. If we do not revise, as soon as possible, the economic policy in force in order to find a compromise between the economic and the social and to favor the integration of young active people into the labor market, it would probably be difficult for the country to regain, even in the medium term, stability and prosperity.

Bibliography

1) BARTHES Raymond. (2002), Comment vivre ensemble: cours et séminaires au Collège de France (1976-1977), Paris, Seuil IMEC.

2) BREVIGLIERI Marc. (1997), « La coopération spontanée. Entraides techniques autour d'un automate public », in Conein B. & Thévenot L., Cognition et information en société, Paris, Editions de l'EHESS, pp. 123-148 (Raisons Pratiques, 8).

3) EMETRSON Ralph. & CHIN Roland. T (1999) « Living Together and Normal Troubles », manuscrit.

4) GOFFMAN Erving. (1973), Les relations en public, Tome II, La mise en scène de la vie quotidienne, Paris, Editions de Minuit.

5) HARBI Mohamed. (2011), « Il faut redéfinir le lien social et le vivre-ensemble », Journal algérien « Le Matin », le 27 /09/2011

6) HIBOU, Béatrice. (2006). La force de l'obéissance. Économie politique de la répression en Tunisie, Paris, La Découverte, 363 p.

7) MARGALIT Avishai. (1996), Decent Society, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.tr.fr La société décente, Paris, Editions Climats, 1999.

8) PERALDI, Michel. (2011), Qu'est-ce qu'un peuple ? Médiapart, 15/02/2011LAACHER Smaïn, TERZI Cédric. (2020), Persepolis ou la guerre des libertés ; sacrés, sacrilèges et démocratie en Tunisie, Labor Et Fides Enquetes 26 Février 2020 Sciences humaines & sociales > Sciences sociales / Société > Sociologie généralités > Essais / Réflexions / Ecrits sur la sociologie

9) SHARABI, Hisham Abed Eljabri, Abdallah Laroui et Hichem Djait. (1996), Le néopatriarcat, Mercure de France, Paris,

10) SHMIDTZ David. (2022), Living together: Inventing Moral Science. New York, NY, États-Unis d'Amérique : Oxford University Press

11) TOURAINE, Alain. (1997). Pourrons-nous vivre ensemble? Égaux et différents, Paris, Fayard, 1997, 395 p.

12) PATTARONI Luca. (2001), « Le geste morale: perspective sociologique sur les modalités du vivre ensemble », Carnets de Bord, 2, pp.67-85.