

APPEAL OF 18 SEPTEMBER

Thinking About Men in the Twenty-First Century

Editorial working version - reading at several depths

For several years now, something has taken hold in our societies and in our conversations.

Something that deserves to be faced, not in order to identify new culprits, not to add another war to those from which men and women have already suffered too often, but precisely because we wish to prevent a logic of confrontation from becoming our common horizon.

Relations between women and men are increasingly described as relations between two camps. Social media encourages categorical formulas, generalizations and invective. Caricatures answer caricatures. The wounds of some sometimes become a pretext for contempt toward others. And the excesses of one camp too easily serve to excuse those of the opposing camp.

Is this supposed war of the sexes inevitable?

Are men and women condemned to look upon one another as adversaries?

Must we accept misogyny, misandry, contempt and collective guilt as ordinary ways of speaking about the other sex?

Must we accept that understanding one form of suffering requires indifference to another?

Has the last word been spoken?

Must hope disappear?

No.

We do not believe that there is a natural war between women and men whose outcome must be the victory of one over the other.

But we do believe that there are men who suffer, male difficulties that remain insufficiently studied, words that must be recovered, realities that must be named, histories that must be transmitted, and questions to which men must be able to seek answers together.

The available data are enough to rule out indifference. In France, three quarters of deaths by suicide are men; DREES notes in particular that mortality by suicide is around three times more frequent among men.¹

Men also live, on average, significantly shorter lives: in 2025, INSEE estimated life expectancy at birth at 80.3 years for men and 85.9 years for women.²

At school and in higher education, certain differences also deserve our attention. Data published by the French Ministry of Education now show substantial gaps in favor of girls on several indicators of academic achievement and qualifications: in 2026, for example, 85% of a generation of girls held the baccalaureate compared with 75% of boys, and 29% of girls left education with a master's degree or higher compared with 22% of boys.³

None of these statistics can, by itself, tell the whole story of the male condition. Nor can any of them erase the particular difficulties experienced by women.

They simply tell us something we consider essential:

Men have problems too.

Men have vulnerabilities too.

Men too need to be studied, listened to and understood.

And yet masculinist reflection is sometimes approached in institutional debate less through the questions it might raise than through the dangers associated with it.

We do not wish to deny those dangers when they exist. We will defend no call to violence, no hatred of women, no glorification of rape, no harassment, no ideology that turns domination or cruelty into a virtue.

Violence does not become respectable because its perpetrator claims to act on behalf of men.

Hatred does not become masculinist simply because it is expressed by a man.

And the masculinism we wish to build will never find greatness in hatred of women.

But precisely for that reason, we must be able to discuss the meaning of words.

In January 2026, France's High Council for Equality devoted its annual report to what it calls "the masculinist threat" and presented certain expressions of hostile sexism as part of processes of collective ideological adherence and mobilization.⁴

We hear that concern.

But we also ask a question.

Must the same word necessarily designate both someone who calls for hatred of women and someone who wishes to study men's health, their history, their rights, their vulnerabilities, their representations, their sexuality or their relationship to fatherhood?

If the word "masculinism" can cover realities this different, should we not examine its history, its successive definitions, its competing uses and the struggles that now surround its meaning?

That is also why words interest us.

Not as curiosities detached from reality.

Not in order to create a universal dictionary of every neologism that appears each year.

But because words relating to men, masculinity, their rights, their bodies, their health, their sexuality, their relationships, their representations and masculinism itself form part of the ground on which our understanding of the world is built.

AIMEncyclopaedias is a masculinist association.

Lexicography is one of its instruments.

It is not its end.

We want to recover certain forgotten words.

We want to compare old and contemporary definitions.

We want to observe words whose meanings have shifted.

We want to study new concepts concerning men and, where their meaning remains contested, contribute to rigorous reflection on their definition.

We want to know where words come from.

Who uses them.

What they meant yesterday.

What they mean today.

And sometimes what they no longer allow us to say.

Certainly, we have been overwhelmed.

Overwhelmed not by tanks or aircraft, but sometimes by the quantity of discourse, images, slogans, categories, injunctions and instant reactions that the digital universe sends into our pockets every day.

What characterizes our age may not be only the power of an idea, but the *tactics* of its repetition: a sentence reproduced a thousand times, a caricature turned into an ordinary joke, an expression turned into a reflex, a category applied to millions of individuals until we almost cease to notice what it contains.

We must therefore learn to slow down.

Read.

Compare.

Verify.

Define.

And sometimes doubt.

It is also in this light that we wish to consider certain words spoken from institutions that belong to everyone.

In 2015, the new president of France Télévisions stated that television was made up of "white men over 50" and that this had to change, in remarks about her wish to diversify the profiles represented on air. The existence and substance of this statement were later recalled in the work of the French National Assembly.⁵

We must report this statement honestly: she did not say that there should no longer be "old white males". She had spoken of "men", not "males"; she later explained that she was not seeking to attack white men over fifty but to describe what she regarded as a reality of television representation.⁶

But restoring the context does not forbid the question.

On the contrary, it makes the question more interesting.

How is a man over fifty supposed to hear a sentence in which his age, his sex and his color become precisely the three characteristics of a category whose predominance must "change"?

Would we have accepted with the same indifference a comparably constructed statement about another category of the population? What, for example, would we think of a public official declaring: "Our judiciary is 72% female and that has to change"? Women do indeed currently make up 72% of judges in France. This hypothetical sentence obviously does not express our position: it is a thought experiment intended to test the symmetry of our reactions when one sex becomes very strongly represented in a profession.⁷

Further development - representation, occupations and explanatory factors

The same question can be extended to the world of work. Women account for only 14% of workers in the building and public works sectors.⁸

Does this mean that perfect parity should mechanically be sought in every occupation? We do not wish to decide that in advance. But we do want to ask whether all disproportions between the sexes are viewed in the same way depending on whether they concern positions of power or prestige, or, conversely, difficult, dangerous or physically demanding jobs.

And we want to be able to study the causes of these distributions without imposing a single explanation. Education, socialization, economic and family constraints, actual working conditions, individual preferences and aspirations may all contribute to these differences.

Nor should we exclude biological factors in principle when their influence is supported by solid evidence. Research in behavioral neuroendocrinology shows, for example, that hormones such as testosterone can modulate certain social behaviors. Their action, however, is neither simple nor mechanical.

A controlled experiment involving 173 men found that testosterone administration increased motivation to compete for status among participants placed in a low and unstable status position, but not uniformly among all participants.

The authors therefore interpret the effect as dependent on social context rather than as a simple relationship between testosterone and behavior.⁹

Another randomized double-blind experiment found that testosterone administration could lead participants to punish unfair offers more strongly, but also to reward generous behavior more strongly. The authors conclude that its effects cannot be reduced to a general increase in aggression and may, depending on the context, promote both antisocial and prosocial status-enhancing behaviors.¹⁰

Such findings obviously do not allow us to infer an individual's behavior from his sex or hormone level. They do show, however, that it would be scientifically imprudent to exclude a priori any biological contribution to certain average differences in behavior, preferences or life trajectories. Biological factors should be studied together with educational, social, cultural, economic and individual factors, not set against them.

A statistical difference is not in itself proof of injustice. But it never prevents us from asking whether injustice exists.

We do not ask that question in order to judge a person.

We ask it because public institutions bear a particular responsibility for the words they use.

Words matter.

All the more when they come from those who speak in the name of institutions shared by all.

All the more when they designate human groups.

All the more when they can be received as the designation of those who have become "too many" or "surplus".

We will therefore not say that public authorities have "betrayed men".

The word would be too heavy and the historical parallel too easy.

But we have the right to ask whether men's concerns have always received the attention their importance deserves.

We have the right to question public policies when their categories appear asymmetrical.

We have the right to study how male suffering is measured, named, prevented, researched, treated and taken into account in public policy - and, where relevant, to ask what human, scientific and financial resources are devoted to that response.

We have the right to examine men's health when men die, on average, several years earlier than women.²

We have the right to question suicide prevention when nearly three out of every four people who die by suicide are men.¹

We have the right to examine educational trajectories when girls' and boys' results show persistent differences across fields: girls perform better on several indicators of general academic success and qualification attainment, while boys retain an average advantage in certain mathematics assessments. These differences deserve to be studied without assuming in advance either their causes or whether they are just or unjust.³

We have the right to ask why some of these findings occupy relatively little space in the spontaneous representations our society forms of inequalities between the sexes.

And, reciprocally, we have a duty not to turn every statistical difference automatically into proof of discrimination.

That is where the work begins.

Distinguish.

Verify.

Compare.

Understand.

We do not want to replace one dogma with another.

We do not want to replace a caricature of women with a caricature of men.

We do not want to answer indifference with resentment.

Nor do we want to build a male identity solely from the wounds men have received.

We want to be able to love being men.

And to reflect on what that means.

What is a man in the twenty-first century?

The question appears simple.

It no longer is.

I do not want man to be reduced to an abstract category of "person", as though masculine and feminine had to become indifferent or interchangeable.

On the contrary, I want a man to be recognized as a man: with his body, his history, his aspirations, his strengths, his vulnerabilities, his qualities and his flaws.

Recognizing this male reality means neither confining every man within a single model, nor claiming that all men are alike, nor establishing any hierarchy whatsoever between the sexes.

It simply means refusing the idea that equality requires undifferentiation.

Equal does not mean identical.

Different does not mean unequal in dignity.

Men differ profoundly from one another.

Women do as well.

And this individual diversity does not require us to pretend that sex has no reality or no consequences.

This question inevitably leads us to certain contemporary debates about identity.

We must be able to distinguish sexual orientation from trans identity. Being homosexual or bisexual primarily concerns the direction of emotional or sexual attraction; trans identity raises other questions, particularly concerning identity, the body, sex and social recognition.

These realities can of course meet in the life of the same person.

But they are not conceptually identical.

Further development - identity, language, freedom and consultation criteria

Contemporary transformations of identity have also produced changes in language. Here again, precision is required. This does not always involve creating an entirely new grammar: some forms predate their contemporary uses. What is more recent is, in particular, the importance given to individual choice of pronouns, certain non-binary usages and their integration into activist, social or institutional practices. Human-rights institutions have thus attached particular importance to names and pronouns as forms of expression of gender identity.¹¹

This evolution also contains a lexical tension worth considering. In law and ordinary social usage, "discrimination" denotes unfavorable or unjust treatment; but "to discriminate", in its original sense, also means to distinguish. Thus some of these linguistic innovations seek to combat discrimination in the first sense by making it possible to distinguish identities more precisely in the second. Some see this as finer recognition of persons; others may see it as a multiplication of categories that end up assuming increasing importance in social relations. These two perceptions deserve to be distinguished before they are judged.

There is also a fundamental difference between the freely chosen use of a term as a courtesy and its imposition. A person may perfectly well choose, out of respect or consideration, to use the name or pronoun another person wishes to hear, while retaining a different conception of sex or identity. The intellectual difficulty arises when that courtesy ceases to be entirely voluntary and becomes a social, institutional or legal injunction. Someone who resists such an

injunction may then consider that he is no longer merely being asked to be polite, but to state or endorse a conception of reality or identity that he does not share.

A Canadian controversy that became particularly prominent from 2016 onward illustrates this difficulty. A psychology professor at the University of Toronto publicly opposed what he regarded as the compulsory use of certain pronouns and criticized federal Bill C-16 within a broader argument about "compelled speech". The matter quickly became a conflict extending far beyond a grammatical discussion: it concerned academic freedom, the rights of trans people, the limits of linguistic obligation, and the possibility that a choice of words might imply adherence to a conception of reality or identity that the interlocutor does not share. The professor was later heard in 2017 by the Senate committee examining the bill; there he set out, among other things, his opposition to certain non-traditional pronouns and his interpretation of Ontario policies.¹²

The law must nevertheless be described accurately. Bill C-16 itself prescribed no particular pronoun. It added gender identity and gender expression to the prohibited grounds of discrimination under the Canadian Human Rights Act and extended certain provisions of the Criminal Code relating to hate propaganda and aggravating circumstances. The Minister of Justice told the Senate that the legislation did not require anyone to use a particular pronoun. It received Royal Assent on 19 June 2017.¹³¹⁴

The Ontario situation was more nuanced still. The Ontario Human Rights Commission expressly states that its Code does not prescribe any particular pronoun. It nevertheless considers that, in areas covered by the Code - such as employment, housing or certain services - a deliberate refusal to use a person's chosen name or a pronoun corresponding to that person's gender identity may likely constitute discrimination. At the same time, it acknowledges that whether a person can require a particular gender-neutral pronoun is less clearly established in law and mentions use of the chosen name as a possible respectful solution.¹¹

The controversy also had a much less abstract dimension. In October 2016, a rally on the University of Toronto campus concerning freedom of expression, Bill C-16 and university policies descended into confrontations. The review conducted for the university concluded that individuals on both sides had contributed to conflict and violence. It noted, among other things, the use of loudspeakers broadcasting noise to disrupt the rally; Toronto police had to intervene and two students were later charged in connection with alleged assaults. But the report also recalled that students had reported verbal and physical assaults from the other side and had criticized security services for failing to protect them adequately.¹⁵

In the same context, the university also reported online threats directed at some members of its trans community and contacted the police. This reality prevents the episode from being reduced to a simple story in which one side was entirely violent and the other never was.¹⁶

We can nevertheless draw from it a principle to which we intend to hold ourselves: violence, intimidation and the desire to silence someone do not change in nature according to the cause they claim to serve. If we rightly demand that violent speech, threats and conduct that may appear in some masculinist circles be documented, we must apply the same standard to violence, intimidation or attempts at silencing that may appear among their opponents.

The converse is equally important: a few violent acts committed by certain individuals are not enough to define an entire movement, community or cause. This principle must apply to masculinists, feminists, trans activists, their opponents and, more generally, all groups whose ideas we may be called upon to study. Our rejection of collective guilt would be incoherent if it ceased to apply as soon as we disapproved of those concerned.

The interest of this episode for AIMEncyclopaedias is also lexicographical. It shows that a pronoun, a definition or a grammatical construction is not always merely a technical object. In periods of social transformation, choosing a word may simultaneously become an act of courtesy, an identity claim, a philosophical choice, a social norm and sometimes a legal question. It is precisely when several of these dimensions overlap that words deserve the greatest care in their study.

We want to be able to acknowledge the intention of inclusion behind certain linguistic innovations without therefore treating every question about their effects as illegitimate. Respecting a person and debating a proposition about language are not necessarily contradictory acts. Protection against humiliation should not exempt us from carefully examining the boundary between freely chosen accommodation, social pressure and institutional constraint.

Disagreements over sex, identity or language should not, however, become principles of exclusion.

AIMEncyclopaedias is intended to welcome anyone who wishes to contribute to its work, provided that person respects the principles, rules of discussion and values defined by the association. Trans people must therefore be able to take part in its debates, propose sources or entries, contribute to the Masculinist Encyclopaedic Dictionaries and participate in the life of the association on the same basis as other members.

This openness also requires a certain delicacy in relations between people. Using the name someone wishes to use or, where possible, a form of address that allows that person to participate comfortably may be a matter of courtesy and respect. Such courtesy does not necessarily mean that all participants must share an identical conception of sex, gender or identity. AIMEncyclopaedias should precisely enable people who do not think exactly alike to work together, discuss and sometimes contradict one another without turning disagreement into personal hostility.

We therefore wish to defend a masculinism that is open in participation while remaining methodologically precise in certain consultations. This distinction is essential. The openness of an association concerns the people who may participate in it; the definition of a surveyed population concerns the question an inquiry is intended to answer.

Certain consultations may indeed be organized on a single-sex basis when their sociological value requires us to collect specifically the experience of persons whose trajectory of male sexual development began at conception and continued throughout the prenatal period, and who then grew up and were socialized as boys before living as men. Male development, understood more broadly, is not reducible to this biological dimension: it also emerges at the intersection of personal, bodily, educational, family, social and cultural factors. It is precisely the interaction of these different dimensions over a lifetime that some of our consultations may seek to document. Biologically, chromosomal sex is established at fertilization, while anatomical and gonadal sexual differentiation unfolds progressively during the prenatal period.¹⁷

Within this framework, a trans man may participate fully in AIMEncyclopaedias, its work, its discussions and consultations open to all members, while not being counted in a consultation whose methodological object is specifically the experience of persons who have followed a trajectory of male sexual development from conception and then grew up and were socialized as boys before living as men. Conversely, if a study were specifically concerned with the experience of trans men, trans women or any other defined population, it would be equally necessary to respect that population's own criteria rigorously.

An inquiry would lose part of its value if, out of fear of displeasing, it ceased to define clearly the population it claims to study. Methodological precision is not a hierarchy of human worth. It is a condition for the quality of the data produced and for the interpretations that can reasonably be drawn from them.

It therefore seems possible to us to uphold two principles simultaneously: to welcome people broadly and to define certain study populations rigorously. One concerns intellectual and associative hospitality; the other concerns method. Confusing them would either close the association unnecessarily or make certain consultations sociologically difficult to interpret.

For my part, I consider that a transition, however profound it may be in a person's life and identity, does not fully reproduce the biological, bodily and developmental history of a person born as the other sex.

That conviction does not require me to despise anyone who experiences this question differently.

It takes away no one's dignity.

It justifies no humiliation.

It justifies no violence.

And we must be especially attentive to this point: reflection on sexed realities would gain nothing by becoming an obsession directed against trans people.

AIMEncyclopaedias was not founded for that purpose.

The question exists.

We will address it when it genuinely intersects with our subjects.

Then we will continue on our way.

For our inquiry is infinitely broader.

It concerns what it means to be a man.

To be a son.

To be a father.

To be a brother.

To be a friend.

To be a lover.

To be alone.

To grow old.

To work.

To fall ill.

To love.

To fail.

To succeed.

To pass things on.

To die.

It concerns rights and duties.

Freedom and servitude.

The body and health.

Desire and sexuality.

Fatherhood.

Cultural representations.

The words used to speak about men.

The words men use to speak about themselves.

And the words we may have to invent when the old ones are no longer enough.

Nothing is lost for men.

I want deliberately to take up this phrase here because some readers will recognize its echo.

Nothing is lost for men because men are not alone.

They are not alone.

And above all, masculinism is not alone.

It has no *empire* behind it.

So much the better.

It can have behind it something far more precious: free men and women.

There are women capable of hearing male suffering without thinking that such listening takes anything away from female suffering.

There are women who know that defending a son, a brother, a partner, a father or simply an unknown man when he is treated unjustly is not a betrayal of women.

There are women who reject the simplifications of their own camp when they judge them unjust.

And that sometimes takes courage.

With an acknowledged touch of whimsy, we might call them the empresses of empathy and reason.

Not because they need to be decorated by men.

But because a serious appeal also has the right to smile.

And because resisting the prejudices of one's own milieu often requires more strength than denouncing those of the opposing camp.

These women have a place among us.

Not as auxiliaries.

Not as tokens.

As interlocutors.

As contributors.

As critics too.

For disagreement is part of our project.

Our adversary, then, is not woman.

Nor is our adversary this or that man, feminist, civil servant, journalist, researcher or public figure.

The enemy we identify here has no face, no sex and no nationality.

It is made of ideas.

It is hatred; hatred, whatever causes it claims to serve, whatever justifications it invokes and whoever it targets.

It is contempt; contempt, whoever it is directed against and whatever reasons are used to make it seem acceptable.

Collective guilt.

Caricature.

Dehumanization.

The refusal to listen.

The idea that an individual could be morally diminished by having been born into one sex rather than the other.

The idea that a man or woman living today should bear moral guilt for wrongs committed by other men or other women simply because they belong to the same sex.

And, symmetrically, the idea that an injustice suffered by a man would give him any right to despise women.

That is our true dividing line.

It does not run between men and women.

It runs through men.

It runs through women.

Perhaps it runs through each of us.

For it is always easier to generalize when one has been hurt.

We must therefore preserve a particular place for those who challenge us because their personal history has taught them something different.

A woman deeply wounded by a man may find it difficult to hear some of what we say.

A man deeply wounded by a woman may as well.

Their pain deserves to be heard.

But it must not become our common constitution.

It is in this sense alone that our reflection extends beyond our borders.

Not because a "*world battle*" should set men against women.

But because everywhere there are men and women facing the same choice: to regard the other sex as an opposing bloc, or to make the more difficult effort to preserve the individual behind the category.

Our *battle*, if we are to use that word in homage to the text that inspires this appeal, is therefore a battle of ideas.

A battle against simplification.

Against hatred.

Against forgetting.

Against intellectual laziness.

And sometimes against our own certainties.

The same instruments that today facilitate the spread of caricature can also become instruments of our work.

The Internet can humiliate.

The Internet can isolate.

The Internet can create instant crowds.

But the Internet can also open a library to someone living a thousand kilometers away.

It can make it possible, in a matter of minutes, to compare definitions separated by two centuries.

It can enable a historian, a lawyer, a doctor, an artist and an ordinary reader to work on the same question.

The *same means* that spread noise can therefore serve knowledge.

The same networks that carry insults can carry ideas.

Digital force can answer *digital force*. Not by reproducing the brutality, simplification or haste that digital tools can encourage, but by using their immense capacity for dissemination, archiving and connection to circulate sources, definitions, works, arguments, contradictions and knowledge. The technical power is the same; what changes is the use we choose to make of it.

Not with more noise.

With greater depth.

That is why, on this 18 September, we issue an appeal.

We, AIMEncyclopaedias, *currently in La Rochelle*, a city whose history evokes in its own way freedom, convictions, conflicts and openness to the world, invite all those who wish to take part in this intellectual adventure to *get in touch with us*.

We know the humility such an undertaking requires.

We are neither a university, nor an academy, nor a ministry.

We do not claim to possess, by ourselves, all the expertise required.

That is precisely why we issue this appeal.

To historians.

To sociologists.

To lawyers and legal scholars.

To doctors and health professionals.

To psychologists.

To demographers.

To statisticians.

To linguists.

To lexicographers.

To philosophers.
To teachers.
To librarians.
To archivists.
To visual artists.
To illustrators.
To photographers.
To musicians.
To writers.
To craftspeople.
To computer specialists.
To translators.
To collectors.
To owners of old dictionaries.
With their dictionaries or without their dictionaries.
To men who have studied a great deal.
To those who have never set foot in a university but have lived a great deal.
To fathers.
To sons.
To young men still searching for words to describe what they feel.
To older men who carry a memory we will lose if no one takes the time to listen to them.
To women who want to think with us.
To those who agree.
To those who do not.
To those who wish to remind us of a reality we may have overlooked.
To men who call themselves masculinists.
To those whom that word worries.
To those who contest it.
To those who simply wish to understand what we mean by it.
[Come and discuss.](#)
Come and bring a document.
A definition.
A statistic.
A testimony.
A work.
A contradiction.
A question.

Or simply a word.

We do not promise that every proposal will become ours.

We promise to examine them.

We do not promise agreement.

We promise discussion.

We do not promise an absence of mistakes.

We promise to try to correct them.

We do not want to build a place where everyone thinks alike.

We want to build a place where people can think.

Such a project is demanding.

Slow reflection is not always the most easily accessible thing in a world organized around immediacy.

We know that.

Yet we do not want to turn this demand into a social or intellectual distinction.

A sound idea does not become better because it was written by an academic.

A false idea does not become true because it has a bibliography.

But when we assert something, we must make every reasonable effort to know why we assert it.

That is our refuge.

Not a refuge outside the world.

A refuge from its noise.

Dispassionate reflection.

Reason.

Memory.

Contradictory debate.

Freedom.

And, when all these things become too heavy, a little humor.

We do not need a new war of the sexes.

We need men capable of speaking.

Women capable of listening.

Women capable of speaking.

Men capable of listening.

We need words.

We need definitions.

We need memory.

We need history.

We need sciences.

We need arts.

We need contradiction.

We need freedom.

And we need a freedom strong enough to withstand someone saying to us:

"You are wrong."

Then we will discuss.

Nothing is lost for men.

Men are not alone.

Nor are women.

And perhaps we will discover that part of what we thought we had to defend against one another can ultimately be defended together.

We therefore call on men in every country to reflect with us on what they are, what they have been and what they wish to become.

We call on women who wish to do so to take part in this reflection.

We call on those who know to transmit what they know.

Those who doubt, to question.

Those who disagree, to discuss.

Those who seek, to seek with us.

Those who possess, to share.

Those who create, to create.

Those who feel alone, to discover that they may not be as alone as they think.

And those who believe that certain histories, words and male experiences are at risk of disappearing, to help us preserve them.

Whatever happens, the flame of masculinist reflection must not go out.

And if we wish to carry through to the end the allusion that runs through this appeal, let us also call it, with a smile but without mockery, *the flame of masculinist resistance.*

A resistance with its own weapons: those of intelligence and the heart. Knowledge, sources, memory, reason, nuance, empathy, courage, art and creation.

Without human enemies.

Without any call to hatred.

A resistance of memory against forgetting.

Of definition against confusion.

Of discussion against invective.

Of nuance against caricature.

Of the real man against the man reduced to a stereotype.

This flame must not go out.

It will not go out.

Tomorrow, as today, we will continue to question.

To document.

To discuss.

To transmit.

To bring ideas into being.

Then to let them go.

Let ideas be born.

May the West Wind carry them!

May Zephyrus blow!!!

David Valente

Founding President of AIMEncyclopaedias

La Rochelle, 18 September 2026

LITERARY AND EDITORIAL NOTE

The "Appeal of 18 September" arose from the coincidence of its date with the Appeal of 18 June 1940. It seeks neither to parody nor slavishly imitate General de Gaulle's text. Rather, it proceeds by intertextual transposition: certain formulas, rhythms and words from the historical text are displaced into another situation and another subject. The most deliberate borrowings or echoes are indicated in italics. The historical reference text is the version published by the Presidency of the French Republic.¹⁸

The device relies in particular on a counter-use of the vocabulary of combat. Where the historical model identified a military enemy and called for the continuation of war, the present text occasionally borrows that vocabulary in order to contest the contemporary logic of a "war of the sexes". The adversary it ultimately identifies is not a human group: it is hatred, contempt, caricature, collective guilt, forgetting and the refusal of contradictory debate.

Digital publication also permits a form of reading that the radio model of 1940 could not offer. Certain long scientific, legal, documentary or methodological developments can be collapsed or expanded by the reader. This choice does not create an abridged version of the text: no development is removed. It makes it possible to preserve both the movement and accessibility of the appeal and the complexity required to examine certain questions.

We call this principle "reading at several depths". The reader may first follow the main line of the text, then freely deepen the passages that particularly hold his or her attention. On the website, this organization will take the form of expandable sections. In the Word and PDF versions, it is conveyed through a typographic hierarchy: dark blue marks the most striking passages, whether intellectually or within the movement of the appeal itself; the main body remains in the standard type; deeper developments and notes are set in a slightly smaller and more discreet type. None of these levels constitutes a separate text: all belong to the Appeal and simply allow the reader to choose the depth of reading.

Documentary references are grouped at the end of the document so as not to interrupt the reading. Their purpose is to document or support the data, events, public statements, legal elements and scientific work mentioned in the text. Their presence does not mean that the Appeal endorses all the positions expressed by their authors or institutions.

SOURCES AND DOCUMENTARY REFERENCES

The following references were used to document or support the reflection. Web pages were consulted on 18 September 2026. The numbers correspond to the source markers placed in the text.

- <https://drees.solidarites-sante.gouv.fr/publications-communique-de-presse/etudes-et-resultats/260129-suicide-hommes-modestes-france>1. DREES - Jean-Baptiste Hazo, Lucile Aubain, Manon Cadillac, "Le suicide, trois fois plus fréquent chez les hommes, deux fois plus chez les plus modestes" [Suicide, three times more frequent among men, twice as frequent among the least well-off], Études et Résultats, no. 1364, 29 January 2026. <https://drees.solidarites-sante.gouv.fr/publications-communique-de-presse/etudes-et-resultats/260129-suicide-hommes-modestes-france>
- <https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/87198242>. INSEE, "Bilan démographique 2025" [Demographic Report 2025], Insee Première, no. 2087, life-expectancy data published in 2026. <https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/8719824>
- <https://www.education.gouv.fr/depp/filles-et-garcons-sur-le-chemin-de-l-egalite-de-l-ecole-l-enseignement-superieur-edition-2026-4694183>. French Ministry of Education, DEPP, "Filles et garçons sur le chemin de l'égalité, de l'école à l'enseignement supérieur" [Girls and boys on the road to equality, from school to higher education], 2026 edition, updated September 2026. <https://www.education.gouv.fr/depp/filles-et-garcons-sur-le-chemin-de-l-egalite-de-l-ecole-l-enseignement-superieur-edition-2026-469418>
- <https://www.haut-conseil-egalite.gouv.fr/rapport-2026-sur-letat-des-lieux-du-sexisme-en-france-la-menace-masculiniste>4. High Council for Equality between Women and Men, "Rapport 2026 sur l'état des lieux du sexisme en France : la menace masculiniste" [2026 report on sexism in France: the masculinist threat], 21 January 2026. <https://www.haut-conseil-egalite.gouv.fr/rapport-2026-sur-letat-des-lieux-du-sexisme-en-france-la-menace-masculiniste>
- <https://questions.assemblee-nationale.fr/dyn/opendata/CRCANR5L17S2026PO874480N025.html>5. French National Assembly, work of the inquiry committee on public broadcasting, recalling the 2015 statement about television being made up of "white men over 50", 2026. <https://questions.assemblee-nationale.fr/dyn/opendata/CRCANR5L17S2026PO874480N025.html>
- <https://www.assemblee-nationale.fr/dyn/opendata/CRCANR5L15S2019PO419604N012.html>6. French National Assembly, Committee on Cultural Affairs and Education, hearing of the president of France Télévisions, minutes no. 12, 2018-2019: clarification concerning the terms "men" / "males" and the meaning attributed to the statement. <https://www.assemblee-nationale.fr/dyn/opendata/CRCANR5L15S2019PO419604N012.html>
- <https://www.justice.gouv.fr/actualites/actualite/1946-magistrature-souvre-aux-femmes-80-ans-dhistoire-progres>7. French Ministry of Justice, "En 1946, la magistrature s'ouvre aux femmes : 80 ans d'histoire et de progrès" [In 1946, the judiciary opened to women: 80 years of history and progress], 10 April 2026. <https://www.justice.gouv.fr/actualites/actualite/1946-magistrature-souvre-aux-femmes-80-ans-dhistoire-progres>
- <https://dares.travail-emploi.gouv.fr/donnees/les-portraits-statistiques-de-branches-professionnelles>8. DARES, "Les portraits statistiques de branches professionnelles" [Statistical profiles of occupational sectors], data published in 2026, proportion of women in the building and public works sectors. <https://dares.travail-emploi.gouv.fr/donnees/les-portraits-statistiques-de-branches-professionnelles>
- <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31884320/>9. Losecaat Vermeer A. B. et al., "Exogenous testosterone increases status-seeking motivation in men with unstable low social status", Psychoneuroendocrinology, 2020, PMID 31884320. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31884320/>
- <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27671627/>10. Dreher J.-C. et al., "Testosterone causes both prosocial and antisocial status-enhancing behaviors in human males", Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 2016, PMID 27671627. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27671627/>
- <https://www.ohrc.on.ca/fr/questions-et-reponses-sur-lidentite-sexuelle-et-les-pronoms>11. Ontario Human Rights Commission, "Questions and answers about gender identity and pronouns". <https://www.ohrc.on.ca/fr/questions-et-reponses-sur-lidentite-sexuelle-et-les-pronoms>
- <https://sencanada.ca/fr/content/sen/committee/421/lcj/29ev-53339-f>12. Senate of Canada, Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, testimony of 17 May 2017 on Bill C-16, hearing of a University of Toronto psychology professor and other witnesses. <https://sencanada.ca/fr/content/sen/committee/421/lcj/29ev-53339-f>
- <https://www.parl.ca/DocumentViewer/fr/42-1/projet-loi/c-16/sanction-royal>13. Parliament of Canada, Bill C-16, An Act to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act and the Criminal Code, Royal Assent of 19 June 2017. <https://www.parl.ca/DocumentViewer/fr/42-1/projet-loi/c-16/sanction-royal>
- <https://sencanada.ca/fr/content/sen/committee/421/lcj/28ev-53290-f>14. Senate of Canada, Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, testimony of 4 May 2017 on Bill C-16, intervention of the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada. <https://sencanada.ca/fr/content/sen/committee/421/lcj/28ev-53290-f>
- <https://www.utoronto.ca/news/new-report-calls-greater-awareness-understanding-role-campus-police>15. University of Toronto, "New report calls for greater awareness, understanding of role of campus police", 14 February 2017, summary of the review of events at the 11 October 2016 rally. <https://www.utoronto.ca/news/new-report-calls-greater-awareness-understanding-role-campus-police>
- <https://www.utoronto.ca/news/police-investigating-online-threats-individuals-u-t-s-transgender-community>16. University of Toronto, "Police investigating online threats to individuals in U of T's transgender community", 14 October 2016. <https://www.utoronto.ca/news/police-investigating-online-threats-individuals-u-t-s-transgender-community>
- <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/sites/books/NBK279001/>17. Ray R. et al., "Sexual Differentiation", Endotext / NCBI Bookshelf, updated 24 July 2025; see also StatPearls, "Embryology, Sexual Development". <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/sites/books/NBK279001/>
- <https://www.elysee.fr/front/pdf/elysee-module-3453-fr.pdf>18. Presidency of the French Republic, "18 juin 1940 - Déclaration : texte de l'Appel du 18 juin 1940" [18 June 1940 - Declaration: text of the Appeal of 18 June 1940]. <https://www.elysee.fr/front/pdf/elysee-module-3453-fr.pdf>