

POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS AND SOCIO-POLITICAL PROCESSES

**Hadi Dolatabadi, PhD in French Studies/Political Science,
Post-doctoral researcher
Tehran University, Iran**

RIGHT/LEFT DUALISM IN POLITICS: A FRENCH INVENTION

The paper studies the origin of Right/Left dualism, its characteristics and its presence in cultural, religious and finally political concepts. It begins with some theoretical concepts on dualism and the study of dualisms on politics. We examine then this correlation in cultural contexts and try to find out some signs of Right/Left. Some biological, philosophical and artistic evidences are provided to show how long this concept has been dealt in human life: as right handed vs left handed people or religious texts for example which are reflections of civilizations' beliefs. The historical context in France before and after the French Revolution in which this dualism is born and developed is also studied according to historical and journalistic documents. The paper studies also the nature of this horizontal dualism in order to understand why it was a concept that has remained intact for two centuries not just in France but also in the four corners of the world, notably in some European and Latin American countries.

Keywords: Right/Left Dualism, French Revolution, Political Parties, Political Opposition

Introduction

Dualisms are parts of political oppositions in democratic systems where two main groups of political universe dispute to have representative positions and arrive to power. Reformers vs conservatives, traditionalists vs progressives, republicans vs democrats...and right wing vs left wing are some of these political dualisms. The right/left opposition is one of the most used between cleavages which are frequent in political world. This is a French invention which has been applying in many other countries with different languages and cultures. This shows that this cleavage is a successful one with such a meaningful power that could conquer other horizons.

This paper tries to study the nature of right/left opposition and to examine which is the origin of right/left dualism in political universe. The main question of this paper is to distinguish the characteristics of this dualism from other ones and what make it such successful.

The hypothesis which leads this paper to respond to this question is the fact that one must search the reasons of this success in the nature of right-left dualism. In order to answer the proposed questions, this paper studies some theoretical and historical researches about dualism and right-left opposition and uses content analysis methodology.

This paper is based on a plan as follow. At first some theories on dualism were studied in order to have a conceptual view of this subject and then dualisms in political context were examined. A historic approach allows this paper to get information about the origin of right/left opposition in cultures and religions. French socio-historical context is explored to have some ideas about main conflicts which led the French assembly to debate constitutional monarchy and the republic. The birth of right/left opposition in this context is then examined by some historical citation in some newspapers. The last section investigates the nature of right/left opposition to identify reasons which make this dualism a universal one.

1.1. Theories on Dualism

As Italian philosopher, Norberto Bobbio says: "There are examples in all fields of thought; the all-inclusive distinction or dyad dominates every discipline. In sociology it is society/community, in economics market/planned, in law public/private, in aesthetics classical/romantic, and in philosophy transcendent/immanent¹." Then dualisms exist everywhere and influence human life by creating conflicts.

¹ Bobbio, N. (1996). *Left and Right The Significance of a Political Distinction* (Translated by Allan Cameron). Cambridge: The University of Chicago Press, 2.

Human being has been faced the dualities since the dawn of time in the very first elements of life. It was because of “danger”, that human sought a “secure” place and it was because of feeling “hunger” that he “ate”. According to Conford¹ the alternation of day and night influencing many aspects of the life of primitive man and opposing different phenomena in his eyes as light-dark, heat-cold, security-danger, etc. would be a reason for the creation of dualisms that will later be enriched particularly by Good and Evil opposition. For Mauss², it would be especially self/others dichotomy that led to these dualities and it would be the differences distinguishing one human being from another and a group from another group that would influence the oppositions based on dualities. Then conflicts of interest of any possible order which differ ones from another would feed these antagonisms. Indeed, the very fact of opposing something involves that two elements are in conflict and the brain decides then to make a choice between the two possibilities, choose one and refuse the other or doing something and not doing other thing. Dualities are therefore the basis of numerous conflicts.

Gradually, dualisms appeared in all aspects of human life, religion was an example that could represent two supreme opposed gods or powers of demonic or divine beings that created the world. Zoroastrianism and Manichaeism, two main religions of ancient Persia, have dual principles and two opposed powers of light and darkness or beneficent and destructive which came from eternity (Ormazd opposed to *Ahriman*). The god Osiris and the god Seth represent a dualism in ancient Egyptian religion and oppose fertility and life to sterility and violence. Among Greek philosophers, Heraclitus examined the conflict of opposites such as beginning-end, day-night, hot-cold and considered it as a metaphysical principle. In Chinese philosophy, for Confucius, the notion of *yinyang* represents two poles of masculinity and activity opposed to femininity and passivity³.

Obviously, dualisms are not presented in monotheist religions and the belief into two eternal opposed powers is against religious thinking. For example, in Judaism, in Christianity and in Islam, a demonic power is not considered being able to oppose to God. Although, the people are divided into blessed and damned ones according to their actions.

With the development of social life and gradually, dualisms exceed the private sphere or abstract contexts. Influenced by different powers governing societies (economic, politic, religious, etc.) some dyads as rich-poor, dominant-dominated, sacred-profane, etc., have emerged. To show and symbolize these dualities, man has used, among other things, spatial orientations based on physical experiences. The “dominant” was represented with “up to govern better the “dominated” that was in “low”. Dualisms began then their way in political contexts.

1.2. Dualism in political context

In ancient Greece where first signs of a democratic government appeared, the principle of citizenship became a criteria which led to some dualisms. Those who were not citizens, didn't have the same rights as citizens. Then man-woman, freeman-slave, Athenian and non-Athenian dualisms distinguish citizens from others (non-citizens). Although he thanked God that he was born in the age of Socrates, Plato used to thank God too that he was born “Greek and not barbarian, freeman and not slave, man and not woman.”⁴ This quote shows how much these dualities were important in the social life of ancient Greece.

During monarchical governments, the classic dualism of up-down, as mentioned, opposing king and his court against the ordinary people was common in societies. In modern age, that was in the Great Britain of 17th century where real political opposition appeared with Tories and Whigs as political forces. In United States, since 19th century, democratic party-republican party dualism is the most powerful dualism which is always vital for presidential elections. In 18th century, with the French Revolution, one of the most famous political dualism appeared and influenced lots of political systems in all over the world, for more than two centuries. The right/left opposition began his life in revolutionary context of a France that wanted a new political system: Republic. This opposition which is used nowadays in many countries worth to be studied in order to get familiar better with its characteristics that allowed it to be such successful.

1.3. Origin of Right-Left Opposition

As Robert Hertz (1928) evokes in his *Folklore and Religious Sociology*, the origin of the right/left opposition must be searched in the superiority of the right hand on the left hand: “At the right hand go honors, flattering designations, prerogatives: it acts, it orders, it takes. Instead, the left hand is despised and

¹ Conford, F.M. (1957). *From religion to philosophy*. New-York: Harper.

² Mauss, M. (1954). *The Gift, Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*. London: Cohen-West.

³ <http://www.britannica.com/topic/dualism-religion>

⁴ Durant, W. (2005) *The Story of Philosophy*, New York: Simon & Schuster paperbacks, 13.

reduced to humble auxiliary role: it can do nothing by itself; it attends, it seconds, it holds. The right hand is the symbol and model of all aristocracies, the left hand of all the plebs.¹ Sure, these characters are just valid for right handed people and the left handed people have opposite characteristics. But as studies show, the majority of human beings are right handed (between 87% and 89%), then their case is explained as a principle².

Carl Sagan thinks that since pre-industrial societies, the left hand was used to ensure the hygiene of the toilet, so its use was limited given the health risks to avoid catching diseases. Even left-handed children were forced to do the actions, such as eating with the right hand while according their nature they would do that with the left one³.

In *Right and Left: Essays on Dual Symbolic Classification*, Rodney Needham and others study the Right-Left opposition in different societies and define some common features regarding to this duality: right symbolize the good, the power and the purity⁴.

Michael Barsley states that the responsibility of the Vision of Judgment in New Testament is more important than any other statement, prejudice against left-handed; this prejudice comes from the bottom of ages and it was adopted by the inquisitors, judges, soldiers, artists, teachers, nurses and parents as the supreme example of the association between left-handed people, evil and the Devil (Barsley, 1974). In Bible, the Vision of Judgment is described as follows:

“Then will the King say to those on his right, Come, you who have the blessing of my Father, into the kingdom made ready for you before the world was.... Then will he say to those on the left, Go from me, you cursed ones, into the eternal fire which is ready for the Evil One and his angels.⁵”

As can be seen in these quotes, the Good-Evil dualism is represented by Right-Left opposition. The people who sat on the right side of Christ are blessed and those who sat on his left are damned. Then the Last Judgment scene is a context where Good and Evil are opposed by the people whose actions lead them to sit on different sides of Christ. This scene is a recurrent one which has its place in interior paintings or exterior carved stonework of churches. Overall, this theme comes from Bible teachings opposing paradise and fire for blessed people and damned ones⁶.

According to Robert Hertz: “The right is the top, the upper world, heaven; while the left came out to the lower world and the earth. It is no coincidence that, in the representations of the Last Judgment, the right hand of the Lord indicates the elected people (by their actions) their sublime stay, while the lowered left hand shows the damned gaping pole of Hell ready to swallow them.⁷”

Similar opposition based on right/left dyad leading to Heaven or Hell can be found in Koran where is stated:

“Then, as for him who will be given his Record in his right hand will say: Here! read my Record! Surely I did believe that I shall meet my Account! So he shall be in a life. In a lofty paradise.⁸”

“But as for him who will be given his Record in his left hand, will say: I wish that I had not been given my Record. And that I had never known how my Account is! Would that it had been my end (death)!⁹”

One more time, right hand is honored and the left hand is considered as a damned place. These verses and the ones of the Bible prove that right/left opposition is common between religions and cultures. As explained by Raoul and Laura Makarius (1968), even in primitive African tributes, this opposition exists with specificity: right hand is related to the man and masculinity while left hand concerns the woman and femininity¹⁰.

¹ Hertz, R. (1928). *Sociologie religieuse et folklore* (éd. 1er). Paris: Les Presses universitaires de France, 94.

² Raymond, M. et al. (1996, décembre 22). Frequency-Dependent Maintenance of Left Handedness in Humans. *Proceedings of the royal society B*, 263(1377), 1627.

³ Sagan, C. (1980). *Les dragons de l'Éden*. (Bardet, V., Trad.) Paris: Seuil.

⁴ Needham, R. et al. (1974). *Right and Left: Essays on Dual Symbolic Classification*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

⁵ Bible, New Testament, Matthew 25:34.

⁶ Dolatabadi, H. (2015) Images of Right and Left in Western and Persian Works of Art, *The International Journal of the Image*, Volume 6, Issue 3, September, 2015, pp.25-38.

⁷ Hertz, R. (1928). *Sociologie religieuse et folklore* (éd. 1er). Paris: Les Presses universitaires de France, 106.

⁸ Koran, 69: 19-22.

⁹ Koran, 69: 25-27.

¹⁰ Makarius, R., Makarius, L. (1968). Ethnologie et structuralisme: le symbolisme de la main gauche. *L'Homme et la société*, (9), 195-212.

With these examples, one knows the right/left opposition existed obviously before the political dualism emerges. The image is really powerful and opposes two extremes elements, one against the other. Now it's time to study how this cultural-religious dualism has penetrated in political sphere and has acquired a more successful and universal image.

2.1. French Socio-historical Context before the 1789's Revolution

During 18th century, France was still a monarchical government; then the French society was based on up-down dualism which determinate the differences between ordinary people and those who were related to royal court by different means. The Third Estate (*tiers état*) represent the ordinary people which was one of the classes present in General Estates composed of Aristocrats and Clerical personalities too. Convened by the king in specific situations to debate some important national questions, this institution had a consultative role and was not able to legislate laws. The session of 5 may 1789 which reunited deputies according to Louis XVI wishes to debate national debt, was the beginning of change in this assembly's function. During weeks, discussions continued about new role that the institution could acquire to control more royal decisions; they led finally to debate the problem of royal veto concerning vital questions. This question divided another time the personalities who were present in the session into two classic camps: the king's supporters composed by clerical and aristocrat personalities against ordinary people's deputies (although they were not yet elected by people and were nominated by royal order). Nougaret, a French historian who related Anecdotes about Louis XVI's reign explains about this dual opposition:

“Is the result of chance, or the identity of sentiments led the friends of the people to get closer one each other and go away from those who did not share their opinion. It appeared that they were interested in left side of the room and they never failed to meet it. Thus we saw in the National Assembly the opposite of what is seen in heaven. The righteous go to right side and the wicked people go to left side of God.”¹

As can be seen in this citation, the Third Estate (friends of the people) was on the left side while in religious image the left side is dedicated to damned people, that is why this author says there exists a contrast image in this assembly. Actually the clerical and aristocrat personalities sat on the right side because of the fact that right side is for the people who are superior and honored according to religious thinking as mentioned above. Maurice Agulhon explains this principle and thinks that it was a “protocol coming from the ancient monarchy [which] had sit on the right, deemed the most honorable, members of the privileged orders, and on the left the deputies of the Third Estate (commoners, bourgeois)”² According to Michel Winock these positions of members of same trends, are part of a “convenience and the opportunity to escape the pressures of opponents by associating geographically to those who were of the same opinion.”³ This means that the principle of getting together in a same place in the Assembly was important to show the great number of the people who join an opinion.

It was then in a revolutionary context that social orders had been impacted by deputies' discussion about king's power. Not just the royal power had been challenged in the assembly, but the Third Estate rose against the aristocracy and the clergy. That was the time for people to decide themselves for their destiny and reduce royal powers in through a democratic institution which was the French constitutional assembly.

2.2. Right/Left Opposition's birth in politics

28th august 1789 was a session where the deputies debated specifically the royal veto and then the right/left opposition emerged really in political context. Sirinelli and Vigne call this session the “founder episode” of this dual opposition. What happened during this session is explained as follow: “To the right side of the president's office are grouped constituents who are in favor of this veto; in other words the supporters of attributing extended powers to the king within this constitutional monarchy; and on the left side are found those who are hostile to such an extension.”⁴ This description is unanimous among historians and is the origin of the right/left opposition in the political universe. So this is a vis-à-vis concerning supporters and opponents of Louis XVI, French king, on a horizontal axis having as landmark the chairman of the assembly taken as referee. Basically, the supporters of king were on the left side of the room while those who were against his power, were on the right side. But, as can be seen in artistic representations of Last Judgment, the right side of painting is the left side of Christ and vice versa, the same arrangement was for assembly and its president. During this session, the chairman invites two groups to

¹ Nougaret quoted by Touchard, J. (1977). *La gauche en France 1900-1981*. Paris: Seuil, 13.

² Agulhon, M. (2005). *La gauche, l'idée, le mot*. in J.-J. B. Candar, *Histoire des gauches en France*. Paris: La Découverte « Poche/Sciences humaines et sociales », 30.

³ Winock, M. (2012). *La droite hier et aujourd'hui*. Paris: Perrin, 12.

⁴ Sirinelle J.-F.(dir.). (1992). *Histoire des droites* (Vol. 1: Politique). Paris: Gallimard, XII.

explain their opinions by calling the side where they sit. To have Third Estate's opinions, he calls "left side" and to have clerical and aristocrat personalities' opinions he calls the "right side" because they are on his right and left side as the damned and righteous people who were on these two opposed sides of Christ in the religious aspect of this dualism.

The first uses of right/left opposition in the French assembly out of this institution were limited to isolated uses by some journalists. Pierre Retat¹ presents as follows a list of the firsts uses of this vocabulary. The *Nouvelles politiques* of Berne was the first which reported: "This is how called the left side of the room where the party is usually gathers."² Or in the *Bulletin de Maret* that was reported: "[...] They ask the President to call to order and silence the part of the Assembly which is on his right."³ In *Suite des Nouvelles de Paris* was appeared: "A terrible storm rose against him (Dubois Crancé) to the right of the President."⁴ The two elements of this opposition appeared together in *Courrier de Provence*: "on the right and on the left of the President [...]"⁵.

As can be seen, these are adverbial uses of the words *right* and *left*. Desmoulin was an author who used for the first time these words as substantive in his *Revolutions*: "the left and the right oppose in the great comic scene of Consummatum Est of clergy (p. 194)⁶". He invented also "right wing" expression which takes long time to be frequent with substantive uses of these words. In January 1791, Duquesnoy writes in *L'Ami des patriotes* (Patriot's friend): "For a long time members of the right of assembly are reduced to such a nonentity that it's hard to count them in a political speculation; but the left is divided into two very distinct parties, very opposed."⁷

Obviously, during two years and even more than two decades after right/left opposition's birth in political context, the people were not so familiar with this concept. That means using the words "right" and "left" could evoke nothing for people who didn't have an image of the assembly and political opposition. That's why Marcel Gauchet (1992) considers the year 1789 as a "false start" for the right/left language⁸. Also Sirinelli & al. think the year 1815 was the moment where "the real birth" of right-left opposition happened in the period of Hundred Days (Cent-Jours) and during first months of second *Restauration*⁹.

Right-left opposition had been weakened with another dualism appearance in French political universe. Red bloc/white bloc opposition replaced for some decades this dualism and political parties used colorful flags to gather their fans. Unquestionably, colors have more vitality and could be used not just in verbal evocation but also in dress habits. During 1830-1870, members of two opposed political parties could be more identifiable by their flags and dresses while right/left dualism evokes an abstract concept for those who could not associate political ideas with the places where deputies sit in the assembly.

By the end of 19th century and with Dreyfus affair, right/left opposition got more and more powerful and one could say this dualism obtained a popular image because of a grand national line of separation between two France. Not only political parties, but a grand part of ordinary people and literary personalities had an important role in this question. Right wing party was against Dreyfus and considered him as a traitor while left wing party and some famous literary personalities as Emile Zola defended him¹⁰.

During 20th century right-left opposition went beyond French borders. With communist political movement, Second World War and the Cold War, left wing parties emerged in different political system all around the world (in Europe and Latin America) and got such strong that even with the collapse of the Soviet Union they did not really lost their power although the communist parties are now in an identity crisis.

¹ Retat, P. (1988). Partis et factions en 1789: émergence des désignants politiques. *Mots* (N°16. Numéro spécial. Langages. Langue de la Révolution française), 69-89.

² *Nouvelles politiques*, n° 73, 12 September 1789.

³ *Bulletin de Maret*, n° 108, 3 December 1789, 3.

⁴ *Suite des Nouvelles de Paris*, 12 December 1789, 7.

⁵ *Courrier de Provence*, n° 74, 2-3 December 1789, 14.

⁶ Retat, P. (1988). Partis et factions en 1789: émergence des désignants politiques. *Mots* (N°16. Numéro spécial. Langages. Langue de la Révolution française), 82-83.

⁷ Duquesnoy. (1791, janvier). *L'Ami des patriotes* (n°13, t. I. 13), 371.

⁸ Gauchet, M. (1992). La droite et la gauche. Dans P. Nora (dir.), *Les lieux de mémoire* (Vol. III, Les France. 1. Conflits et partages, pp. 394-467). Paris: Gallimard.

⁹ Sirinelle, J.-F.(dir.). (1992). *Histoire des droites* (Vol. 1: Politique). Paris: Gallimard, 13.

¹⁰ Crapez, M. (1998). De quand date le clivage gauche/droite en France? *Revue française de science politique* (48e année, n°1), 71.

This power to go beyond borders and being universal is due of some conceptual characteristics of right/left opposition that will be examined as follows.

2.3. Right/Left, a successful political dualism

As evoked above, right/left opposition was at first just a tool helping deputies' localization in the assembly and this lexicon was specific of this institution. In the first uses, the expression "...of the assembly" was always used for specify that these words concern political meanings. Because of this locator role, Jean Laponce¹ studies right/left opposition as a topology in his *Left and Right: The Topology of Political Perceptions*. These words evoke then merely the sides where two opposed political groups gather. Later, with substantives "the right" and "the left", metonymic uses explain the whole deputies who reunite in two opposed sides. In modern uses, right and left evoke not just parties or personalities, but opinions and political ideologies. Now the question is why these two words were such successful during all that period and acquired such a universal use?

At first glance, in this dualism one side is already superior to the other one according to religious teaching before political applications emerged. This religious aspect of the right/left opposition penetrated even into social orders and it was the origin of right/left arrangement in the assembly. As mentioned above, the ordinary people sitting on the left were against aristocrats and clergy who has chosen first the right side because of its advantages and considered themselves as "noble", as they wanted to be distinguished from "ignoble" people². Actually they changed then the vertical perception of society from up-down into a horizontal one. Laponce explains this procedure as follows: "As befits an egalitarian revolution, the new horizontal dimension sought to replace the traditional vertical ordering used until then to relate the subject to his priest, his king and his divinity; but the vertical, being ineradicable from our perception of politics, reentered the left/right structure; left come to signify down, while right signified what is perceived to be high³. Although according to this idea, right/left opposition seems to be based on ancient French monarchical ordering, but with a dualism on a horizontal line, equality could replace the dominant/dominated opposition.

In other terms, if right hand/left hand dualism in its religious and bodily experience is left aside, right/left opposition is a specific dual image which is different from other political dualisms such as: up-down, inside-outside, center-periphery, etc. which are all in spatial dimension too. Physically, these dualisms explain superiorities: those who are up could easily control those who are down; the people who are inside a structure are benefiting from the advantages which are out of reach for the outsiders; those who are in center have more facilities and could decide for the ones who are located in periphery. But right/left opposition is shown on a horizontal line with a mark in center which defines the separation point. None of these two sides is superior to the other according to concrete perception of this dualism. Besides, unlike other dualism, right and left are changeable in space and are then conventional. This means, with the change of the landmark's face, right and left will change their places. Accordingly the advantages are not just for one side concretely due to these possible changes of the space. Because of this egalitarian nature of right/left dualism, in spite of the superiority of the right hand, a short period of neutralization after French Revolution was sufficient for this dualism to left aside the religious perception and to acquire a new image based on assembly's topology. This natural egalitarian characteristic is one of the reasons which led to the extension of right/left dualism and its vitality after such long time.

Normally in bipolar political systems a third voice is hardly heard, especially when we talk about ancient democracies with two powerful parties. But, with a horizontal line where a central landmark which is as far as possible from the two sides, the opponents of both two parties, no-right and no-left parties, could gather in the center and thus centrists can have more chance to attract voters that right or left did not satisfy. This linear characteristic allows too different parties with some common points to be considered on a same camp; that's why right wing includes center-right, right and extreme right depending on the intensity of their ideologies.

Another reason which explains this dualism's success is the simplicity of two elements composing it. If specific political terms or parties' name are not understood by those who do not know sufficiently the political world and could not arouse people's interests during electoral periods, two simple words of "right" and "left" are such commonplace that they could stay in minds very easily for long time. People could

¹ Laponce, J. A. (1981). *Left and Right, the topology of political perceptions*. Toronto: University of Toronto.

² Sapiro, G. (2012). De l'usage des catégories de "droite" et de "gauche" dans le champ littéraire. in Le Digol, C. (dir.), & Le Bohec, J. (dir.), *Gauche / Droite. Genèse d'un clivage politique*. Paris: PUF, 285.

³ Laponce, J.A. (1981). *Left and Right, the topology of political perceptions*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 10.

simply consider some social, economic, cultural and political characteristics or images to one or other side and, knowing that the other side is against these values, they can thus easily elect their representatives who show their belonging to right wing or left wing.

One knows that political ideas can change by passing time due to different events and by different political groups or personalities. Right and left are the concepts which could evolve with time and then they could be considered as plural evolutionary concepts which lose gradually ancient characteristics and acquire the new ones. René Rémond counts thus three types of right during French history: the legitimist right (reaction and tradition), the Orleanist right (liberal), the Bonapartist right (authoritarian and sovereigntist)¹. Obviously the right wing of French Revolution period which supports Louis XVI and royal family and is against the republican forces is far from the right wing of the year 2016 which is totally different as its name (the Republicans) evokes it. On the other side, the left wing parties of early 20th century could never imagine such economic or security policies in a leftist government as can be seen with the French president, Francois Hollande, in 2016.

These characteristics made the right/left vocabulary a powerful and meaningful tool to evoke political parties, their ideas, their actions and their supporters. These two simple words are like gifts from political world for those who are not interested to difficult and complicated political jargon in some important context, the electoral periods for the most important occasion. In spite of sign of weakness with Republican-Democrat or Reformer-Conservative adversaries, this vocabulary is steel alive not just in France but in some other countries in Europe and in Latin America.

Conclusion

Right-left opposition is a dualism which has nowadays a stronger meaning with political applications that French Revolution made forget religious and physical opposition which had a direct relation with right hand/left hand dualism. This happened actually by a neutralization process which removed aristocrats and clergies from powerful institutions during French Revolution with a new type of governmental which was a republic. That was due to an egalitarian revolution which changed the up-down opposition, a monarchical perception of relation between king and people, into a democratic horizontal one. Right/left opposition acquired then new concepts opposing king's supporters against the people who wished equality. Journalists and media have an important role to develop this dualism by reporting assembly's events and using this language.

After two centuries of its creation, right/left opposition is nowadays still alive, used by politicians, journalists and people in spite of some period of weakness. The evolutionary characters of these words make them flexible with plural meanings in time. They are actually simple and comprehensible concepts which allow people to make easily right choice on occasion of elections. That's why this French invention which took its origin from a human universal concept was such successful that went beyond French borders. But, today with a change in the name of the party which represent French right, from UMP to Republicans, one could ask if this is not a sign of this dualism's weakness or disappearance. The other question is if, another time, the American model attract French pro-Americans as Sarkozy who came back to lead the French right wing and then left wing will change its name to democratic party? What will be this dualism's future if the French politicians let it go into books of history?

References:

1. Agulhon, M. (2005). La gauche, l'idée, le mot. in J.-J. B. Candar, *Histoire des gauches en France* (pp. 21-32). Paris: La Découverte « Poche/Sciences humaines et sociales ».
2. Barsley, M. (1979). *Left Handed People*. North Hollywood, CA,: Willshire Book Co.
3. Bible, New Testament, Matthew
4. Bobbio, N. (1996) *Left and Right The Significance of a Political Distinction*, (Translated by Allan Cameron). Cambridge: The University of Chicago Press.
5. Conford, F. M. (1957). *From religion to philosophy*. New-York: Harper.
6. Crapez, M. (1998). De quand date le clivage gauche/droite en France? *Revue française de science politique* (48^e année, n°1), 42-75.
7. Dolatabadi, H. (2015) Images of Right and Left in Western and Persian Works of Art, *The International Journal of the Image*, Volume 6, Issue 3, September, 2015, pp.25-38
8. Durant, W. (2005) *The Story of Philosophy*, New York: Simon & Schuster paperbacks,
9. Gauchet, M. (1992). La droite et la gauche. Dans P. Nora (dir.), *Les lieux de mémoire* (Vol. III, Les France. 1. Conflits et partages, pp. 394-467). Paris: Gallimard.

¹ Rémond, R. (1963). *La droite en France*. Paris: éditions Montaigne.

10. Hertz, R. (1928). *Sociologie religieuse et folklore* (éd. 1er). Paris: Les Presses universitaires de France.
11. Laponce, J. A. (1981). *Left and Right, the topology of political perceptions*. Toronto: University of Toronto.
12. Makarius R., & Makarius L. (1968). « Ethnologie et structuralisme: le symbolisme de la main gauche ». *L'Homme et la société*(9), 195-212.
13. Mauss, M. (1954). *The Gift, Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*. London: Cohen-West.
14. Needham, R. et al. (1974). *Right and Left: Essays on Dual Symbolic Classification*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
15. Raymond, M. et al. (1996, décembre 22). Frequency-Dependent Maintenance of Left Handedness in Humans. *Proceedings of the royal society B*, 263(1377), 1627-1633.
16. Rémond, R. (1963). *La droite en France*. Paris: éditions Moutaigne.
17. Rétat, P. (1988, march). Partis et factions en 1789: émergence des désignants politiques. *Mots* (N° 16. Numéro spécial. Langages. Langue de la Révolution française), 69-89].
18. Sagan, C. (1980). *Les dragons de l'Éden*. (Bardet, V., Trad.) Paris: Seuil.
19. Sapiro, G. (2012). De l'usage des catégories de "droite" et de "gauche" dans le champ littéraire. in Le Digol, C. (dir.), & Le Bohec, J. (dir.), *Gauche / Droite. Genèse d'un clivage politique*. Paris: PUF.
20. Sirinelle J.-F.(dir.). (1992). *Histoire des droites* (Vol. 1: Politique). Paris: Gallimard.
21. The Noble Cur'an, English translation of the meanings and commentary, by Dr. Muhmmad taqî- ud-Dîn Al-Hilâlî and Dr. Muhmmad Muhsin Khân
22. Touchard, J. (1977). *La gauche en France 1900-1981*. Paris: Seuil.
23. Winock, M. (2012). *La droite hier et aujourd'hui*. Paris: Perrin.