

# In Search of a Journal: Caillois and *Diogenes*

*Alexandre Pajon*

To commemorate the fortieth anniversary of *Diogenes* is, above all, to honor Roger Caillois. From 1952 until his death in 1978, this periodical was the heart of his working life. In July 1948 Caillois had become an international public servant, working for a brand new institution, UNESCO, as a member of its "ideas office" responsible for program planning. UNESCO and the nongovernmental organizations clustered around it adopted a grand and magnificent objective: to promote peace through education and culture. One avenue to pursue this goal was the publication of books and periodicals. *Diogenes* was therefore the fruit of the interaction between the plans of UNESCO and the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies and the life experience of Roger Caillois.

There was certainly some risk in attempting to involve Caillois in the official plans of international institutions. The new periodical could have turned out to be just another journal attempting to popularize the world of science for the layman. In the end, it managed to be original and innovative while retaining its broad appeal. Much of *Diogenes's* identity came from the interest it took in post-war intellectual life. But could the initial project, based on a general humanism, long survive new and often critical viewpoints without losing its *raison d'être*?

## I. *Diogenes* and the UNESCO Project

UNESCO was created in November 1945. At a general meeting held in Beirut in 1948, it set itself some substantive goals. Julian Huxley, who was its first director general, advocated and finally saw adopted a plan to produce a "history of the world chronicling the progress of science and achievements in the realms of literature, culture and the arts, rather than political and military events."<sup>1</sup> In

this Huxley remained faithful to the concepts he had set forth in his unpublished study *UNESCO – Its Goals and Philosophy*, in which he defended its vision of a global, evolutionary, and scientific (but not materialistic) humanism.

A nongovernmental organization, the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies (ICPHS), emerged in 1949 in UNESCO's orbit to extend the work of this international body into the realm of experts and specialists. The ICPHS would be the human sciences' counterpart of the International Council of Scientific Unions or ICSU. In this capacity, it was asked at Beirut to study what would be needed to publish an international journal of the human sciences. UNESCO's director general, Dr. Torres-Bodet, stated in particular on 3 May 1949 that the periodical *Nature*, dealing with the exact and natural sciences, could serve as an example. The learned Belgian periodical *Erasmus* was contacted about possible collaboration, but without success. It seemed that the best option would probably be to create an entirely new publication, which is in fact what Roger Caillois proposed at an ICPHS meeting in February 1952. He provided sufficient details about his plans for such a journal to gain the immediate support of those present. An interdisciplinary approach would not suffice: what was needed were transdisciplinary studies. The topics would be broad, and the articles would not be esoteric monographs. In addition, summaries would provide a survey of the research and a few reflections. The reason *Erasmus* had originally been contacted was that it specialized in high-level reviews. Dr. R.P. McKeon, a professor of philosophy at the University of Chicago, quickly suggested a title for the new periodical: "Diogenes," after the Greek philosopher pictured with a lantern in his hand "searching for man." Roger Caillois accepted this suggestion with a certain amusement. Diogenes was famous for his non-conformity, and, a matter not to be overlooked, his name could be easily rendered in all languages. However, Caillois had to reach an agreement with ICPHS.

ICPHS had its own reputation to consider. It considered itself to be the intellectual heir of the International Institute of International Cooperation sponsored by the League of Nations before the war. It was a federative, multidisciplinary, international body. UNESCO set the objectives, but ICPHS was the natural intermediary between UNESCO and groups of experts, the national academies. The nascent periodical would therefore have to respect the wishes of an international institution eager to allow all its members an opportu-

nity to showcase their scholars and culture while at the same time respecting the critical and scientific standards of experts in their fields. How could this be done?

UNESCO was founded on a basic proposition: all cultures of the world are equally worthy, bearing witness to the grandeur of the human spirit. Once all people are convinced that they are participating in the same endeavor – with varying results of course but all equally praiseworthy – they will cease regarding one another as potential enemies. UNESCO was built on knowledge of others, their traditions and thoughts, and on working together toward peace, progress, and truth. Confidence in human beings was accompanied, particularly in the case of Julian Huxley, by an equal confidence in science. This positivist optimism was consistent with the convictions informing ICPHS, the mandate of which was to overcome the barriers between nations and disciplines in order to “place the treasures of science at the disposal of mankind.”<sup>2</sup> Humanism was the basic belief on which all these endeavors rested.

*Diogenes* first saw the light of day in November 1952, published under the auspices of the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies with the support of UNESCO. The first edition boasted many prestigious contributors, and the periodical was defined in an unusual way. John U. Nef, a professor of economic history at the University of Chicago, addressed an “open letter to *Diogenes*” in which he emphasized the pitfalls of too much specialization in university research. He recalled the need for a holistic approach to the problems facing science. With the need for the periodical thus set forth with concrete examples, an article on the fourth page recalled the origins and objectives of *Diogenes*. The article was unsigned, but it is not hard to discern the fine hand of Caillois. He repeated all the sponsoring institutions’ hopes for the journal, while at the same time affirming its originality. *Diogenes* would be “a great organ of broad scientific information and international synthesis” for “the cultivated man of the twentieth century.” Its primary concern was ensuring the circulation of new ideas among nations and experts in various fields. This undertaking was predicated on the belief that the extreme compartmentalization of disciplines prevents them from being stimulated by insights produced by innovators elsewhere. The use of phrases such as “stimulate” and “scientific fertility” bears witness to this aspiration. *Diogenes* reminded its readers that although semantics and demography, epistemology and political economy, psychiatry and the history of commerce or

literature may be very different fields, they all have "one basic point in common: man." The periodical's "non-conformity" aimed to remind the various disciplines that they needed to cooperate and exchange information with one another. The articles, freed of the dross of heavy critical apparatuses and detailed discussion, ranged freely across the human sciences in an attempt to captivate and surprise. A periodical of general culture at a time when knowledge was becoming increasingly compartmentalized and research horizons were shrinking, *Diogenes* clearly hitched itself in its inaugural manifesto to the tradition of Roger Caillois himself.

Caillois brought to *Diogenes* his experience in the world of letters and, most particularly, in periodicals. He had joined the Surrealists in 1932 and published texts in their journals proclaiming his desire "to discredit if possible all of literature" in order "to substitute instead the study of impulses and instincts."<sup>3</sup> The Surrealists always adopted a peremptory, emphatic tone, and daring young minds felt at home with its non-conformist philosophy. Surrealism itself was a kind of Diogenic philosophy, a subversive impulse expressed in striking gestures and concrete actions. However, Caillois was not satisfied with mere bluster and proclamations; he had a concern about cohesion and coherence that in the end alienated him from André Breton. The split took place in December 1934. Caillois turned to the *Cahiers du Sud*, university journals, and the *Nouvelle Revue française*. He was influenced by his encounter with J. Paulhan and the advice he provided. Caillois's university career also escaped the usual trajectory. Having graduated from the *École normale supérieure* in 1933 and passed the *Agrégation de grammaire* in 1936, he studied under G. Dumézil and M. Mauss at the *École Pratique des Hautes Études en sciences religieuses*. At the same time, he participated in anti-Fascist rallies. But periodicals were his first love.

Like many of his contemporaries, he found here a flexible, comfortable source of support, a place to meet like-minded people and discuss new ideas. He launched three different projects: the first, *Contre-Attaque*, escaped from him, and he relinquished it to A. Breton and G. Bataille. The second, *Panique*, which he put together with A. Chastel, never really got off the ground, while the third, *Inquisitions*, managed to bring forth only a single edition in June 1936. *Inquisitions* was supposed to be the organ of the *Groupe d'études pour la phénoménologie humaine*, directed by L. Aragon, R. Caillois, J.M. Monnerot and T. Tzara. The latter, in a manifesto summarizing the discussions of the group, emphasized that "the concerns of today,

largely generated by a variety of disciplines, tend toward a certain cohesion. The universalization process, accomplished by the sciences that are basically mathematical, requires us to consider all intellectual activities from a definite viewpoint that enables us to see man in his natural place, or to return him there, so that what he accomplishes serves his interests and does not cast him into solitude." The *Inquisitions* team supported the efforts of the Popular Front to overcome partisan differences and attempted to surmount "a certain doctrinal sectarianism." They aimed to "give to the discoveries made by the human sciences their true value, clear the way, denounce false problems, and establish new relationships between the specialities, previously imprisoned within their little boxes and their overweening pride, even at the risk of bursting the bounds of 'university' science – without ever forgetting the unique value of human action, which, in turn, influences it."<sup>4</sup> Both Marxists and non-Marxists attended the meetings, and all debated the best method of employing the progress of science to advance the cause of revolution.<sup>5</sup> The periodical appeared without any contributions from J. Prévert, M. Leiris or, most importantly, L. Aragon, who was the first to break with the group in February 1936. Caillois imposed the title *Inquisitions* and, together with J.M. Monnerot, fought to keep the group from falling into the orbit of the Communist party. By now, Caillois had made his basic choices in life. His views changed, but he remained committed to the world of periodicals. During the war, he launched *Les Lettres françaises*.<sup>6</sup> In 1945–46 he replaced R. Aron as editor of *La France Libre*, while writing numerous articles in newspapers and new publications such as *Confluences* or *La Licorne*. Caillois was now too busy on too many fronts to write the thesis that would have opened the gates of university life to him. In any case, it is hard to believe that he really would have been attracted by a milieu whose aims and work could never satisfy him. While collaborating with the Surrealists, with G. Bataille, J. Paulhan, and V. Ocampo, he had learned how difficult it is to publish a periodical, and he recognized that ICPHS was offering him a unique opportunity. *Diogenes* was born therefore of the meshing of his interests with those of a particular nongovernmental organization. In UNESCO's employ at the time, he was seconded from the General Secretariat to ICPHS, where he found a young collaborator who was also a graduate of the *École normale supérieure*, Jean d'Ormesson. After his *agrégation* in philosophy, d'Ormesson had been recruited in 1950 by J. Rueff, the president of ICPHS.

How could a periodical financed by an international institution ever establish a strong identity for itself under the title of the master cynic, Diogenes? Only its editor-in-chief, long a friend of paradox, could solve this puzzle. The new periodical had to distinguish itself from a galaxy of other journals, both French and foreign. The end of the war had stimulated the renewal of old journals and the birth of new. Some of these publications seemed quite close in spirit to the new UNESCO project. For instance, the already venerable *Revue de synthèse* aimed to provide a synthesis of scientific knowledge. In June 1946, G. Bataille's *Critique* appeared, with the express purpose of gathering commentary on books and articles published in France and abroad. It would "provide an overview, as little lacking in completeness as possible, of the various activities of the human mind in the areas of literature, philosophy, history, science, politics, and economics." It would provide a meeting place for ideas, from which knowledge could be disseminated. However, Bataille never based the articles in his periodical on any explicit philosophy.

How did Caillois understand his project? A man of great culture, he may well have read some of the various publications under the same title that preceded his own. *Diogenes* was a choice title for publications eager to distinguish themselves. Beginning in 1828, it had been utilized by a biweekly that, with particular satiric verve, reviewed Paris shows and reported on events. Under the title itself appeared a vignette of Diogenes before his tub and a broken column, the lantern in his hand illuminating a dog. The inscription below was taken from Béranger's *Nouveau Diogène*:

J'aime à fronder les préjugés gothiques  
Et les cordons de toutes les couleurs;  
Mais étrangère aux excès politiques,  
Ma liberté n'a qu'un chapeau de fleurs.<sup>7</sup>

This *Diogenes* survived until the mid-nineteenth century. Then three others emerged, subtitled respectively: "Satiric Portraits and Biographies of Nineteenth-Century Men" (beginning in 1856); "Journal of International, Political and Literary Affairs" (beginning in 1864); and "Politics, Sociology, Finance, Industry – A Radical Republican Journal" (beginning in 1882). Between March and October 1946, the title *Diogenes* was taken up once again by a magazine defining itself as a "Great Paris Political, Literary and Social Weekly." Under the management of Lucien Janson, it ran articles by J. Feuga, Cl. Mauriac, R. Armand, and Y. Audouard – though not R. Caillois. In an article entitled "Are we right?" the magazine pro-

claimed that it wished "to confront all forms of servility. . . . It is called *Diogenes* because it seeks through ideas, people and things one great truth: 'French humanism, the French soul'."<sup>8</sup>

Although they may not have had any direct influence on the *Diogenes* born in 1952, these French antecedents help us to grasp what such a title might have evoked in its readers. Besides the anecdote about R.P. McKeon's proposal of this title, we can attempt to deduce the reasons why Caillois would embrace it. *Diogenes* freely chose the "liberty of asceticism," rejecting all the normal social conventions. By doing so, this "delirious Socrates" provoked a scandal. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, he became a symbol of free speech that fears neither institutions nor the powers that be. This kind of cynicism is far removed from the trivialized ordinary understanding of the word. Far from being immoral, it is based on the conviction that the search for truth involves liberating oneself from all prejudices and questioning all structures.

Caillois may have thought as well of some gazettes that appeared in Holland in the late seventeenth century: *Les Nouvelles de la République des lettres* by Pierre Bayle, *Bibliothèque universelle et historique* by Jean Le Clerc, and *Histoire des ouvrages des savants* by Basnage de Beauval. Paul Hazard has called them "three periodicals written in French that sought a European readership." As cross-border and already (still) lateral periodicals, "they are non-conformist; they make the voice of heterodoxy heard."<sup>9</sup> After the Second World War, there was no shortage of political and intellectual orthodoxies in need of challenge. To some extent, the fleeting *Inquisitions* had foreshadowed this effort with its attempt to expose the preconceptions of the times. The Surrealists had already demonstrated the power of derision in their texts. They had also attempted to gather together articles on esthetics and ethnology, poetry, photographs, and reproductions of art works, particularly in *Minotaure*. The path they followed had already been blazed by *Documents*. These publications therefore prefigured the search for lateral thought, although they lacked the international dimension.

## II. An International Multidisciplinary Project

*Diogenes* was expected to meet UNESCO's objectives without becoming too bulky and expensive. As a member of UNESCO's General Secretariat, Caillois was paid and retained his status as an international civil servant. He was supposed to divide his time

between *Diogenes* and *Oeuvres Représentatives*, which was also published by UNESCO; in actual fact, however, more and more of his time was devoted to the former. Jean d'Ormesson acted as a part-time sub-editor while serving as secretary to the president of ICPHS. Seconded from his original position, he remained in the service of the French Department of National Education. The only other member of the team was a secretary responsible for typing and various administrative duties. This key position was occupied from 1951 to 1990 by Jacqueline Gallay, who became sub-editor and then assistant editor-in-chief in 1983. As a result, the operating budget was never comparable to that of the other publications directly dependent on UNESCO.

Each year ICPHS's budget is provided by UNESCO, and the amount to be allotted to *Diogenes* is then open for discussion. Sometimes assistance has been provided by various governments, universities, and individuals. The periodical is published in France by Éditions Gallimard, which prints on average 2,000 copies each quarter (never fewer than 800). The number of unsold copies fluctuates between 15 and 30 percent. Compared to similar French periodicals, therefore, *Diogenes's* results are quite satisfactory. However, its audience has also expanded enormously thanks to editions in English, Arabic, and Spanish (which produce a thousand copies of each edition) and to annual or biannual anthologies in Chinese, Hindi, Japanese, and Portuguese. As a result, the periodical's total circulation is now about 5,000, apart from the anthologies. This is exceptionally high for a periodical like *Diogenes*. The figures have fluctuated somewhat as a result of some reprints but are generally valid for the entire period to the present.<sup>10</sup>

*Diogenes* placed a flexible team at UNESCO's disposal, and the agency used its status as the source of funding to impose three constraints on the editors: first, contributors had to come from various continents, and their contributions had to reflect their various cultures, without any exceptions. Second, the editors needed to show considerable reserve and refrain from publishing articles that were too polemical or political. Finally, the periodical had to be accessible to educated people in general and not become too esoteric and erudite. With his path thus laid out for him, the editor-in-chief's margin of maneuver may have seemed rather small.

However, Caillois was ever ready to defend his prerogatives at the periodical and remained, until his death, responsible for the reviews. How could he possibly assert the originality of a periodical



that was not specialized in any particular area, nor deeply engaged, nor even aimed at France in particular? All these institutional restraints failed to hobble the flight of his imagination. There was nothing insurmountable for him in developing an international, multidisciplinary periodical. His native curiosity and conception of knowledge and research were consistent with a periodical of high scientific quality but appealing to a general readership.

### Openness to the World

Like many other sociologists and ethnologists, Caillois had adopted a strong anti-colonial position before the war. A sojourn in Latin America had opened his eyes to the extremely rich cultures there. In many cases, the authors and creators were still alive. He was therefore open from the outset to very diverse articles from many different authors, whether Indian, Chinese, Russian, or African.

From 1952 to December 1978, there appeared 104 editions of *Diogenes* containing 791 articles and reviews by 620 authors. It certainly seemed to be concerned about diversity, but was this diversity genuine? Even to enter the debate in such a forum, the contributors had to have a great deal in common. They needed a certain education, and they had to be open to other cultures, making at least some acculturation inevitable. In the end, the question of the extent to which *Diogenes* succeeded in taking many different cultures into account is not very telling. How would it have been possible in 1952 – when decolonialization had barely begun and elites throughout the world participated strongly in Western culture – to expect a spontaneous, worldwide outpouring of quality studies to meet *Diogenes's* needs? How could such an aim be met, while remaining at least a little candid?<sup>11</sup> *Diogenes* could not be simply a collage of eye-witness reports; it was not a new anthropology or comparative ethnology journal.

Caillois and his team attempted with some success to solicit contributions from nontraditional sources, but in the end most came from countries where the human sciences were firmly established and where questions were being posed about the relations between the various human sciences and between them and other realms of knowledge. From the first to the seventieth editions (November 1970), 130 contributions or 30 percent of the total came from French-speaking areas (France, Belgium, and French-speaking Switzerland), and eighty contributions or about 20 per cent of the total

came from English-speaking countries. Contributors from the Latin countries followed, trailed in turn by Germanic and Slavic authors. It should be noted that there were very few Soviet contributors (four articles). This was a consequence of the Cold War, and even more of Zhdanovism, the prevailing dogmatism in the USSR at the time which left little place for non-conformity. In all, 95 percent of the authors came from the West. There were eleven Indian contributors, but only three Arab, three Chinese, and two Japanese. They provided, in all, twenty-three articles, or 4 percent. From July 1970 to December 1978, *Diogenes* published five Arab authors (six articles), three Indian (six articles), four African (four articles), and six Japanese (six articles); but no Chinese. These authors accounted for nearly 10 percent of all authors and articles. The progress in the number of non-Western contributors was clear, and the ability to throw open the pages of *Diogenes* to thinkers from the four corners of the world has only increased, especially since 1978.

Another way to appreciate the openness of the periodical to the entire world is to consider the article titles. Particular emphasis was placed on intercultural influences, for example between the Islamic and Christian worlds (F. Gabrieli, "Dante and Islam," no. 6, April 1954). These studies were very often quite general, if only to avoid the approach typically taken in monographs. It is striking to see how seldom titles on European countries appear, except for historical subjects (e.g., "Venice and Genoa: Two Styles, One Success" by Robert S. Lopez, no. 71, July–September 1970). However, when no geographic location is indicated in the title, the article usually deals with the West (e.g., "Philosophers Have Avoided Sex" by William M. Alexander, no. 72, October–December, 1970). The concept of the Third World appears only three times in the titles, but references to development and economic progress are frequent enough to indicate a continuing desire to do justice to the "South" and non-European civilizations. There are more articles about these subjects than the list of authors' names would indicate. The Orient was discussed eighty-four times during this period (10 per cent of all articles), with a clear predilection for India (discussed thirty-six times). Black Africa was discussed thirty times, Islam and the Arab world twenty-six times, Latin America thirty-one times, and North America eight times.

*Diogenes* always sought to include non-European cultures. Apart from the Americas, one-fifth of the articles were devoted directly to these cultures. As the number of countries that were members of UNESCO increased, this organization increased the pressure in this

direction. The quasi-diplomatic status of the periodical compelled it to consider particular sensitivities and avoid wounding certain feelings. At the same time, it suffered a backlash from international tensions. The UN's condemnations of Israeli policies after 1967 prompted Israeli authors and others who sympathized with Israel to cease contributing for a short time in order to express their disapproval of the UN through UNESCO.

The openness of *Diogenes* to different disciplines and geographic horizons was not based solely on the origins of its contributors. It depended above all, in fact, on the curiosity of contributors: whether they were Hurons or Persians was always of secondary importance.

### **A Multidisciplinary Meeting Place**

*Diogenes's* objective as always to publish lateral, transdisciplinary studies rather than monographs; it may therefore seem strange to see academic boundaries reconstituting themselves in the pages of the periodical. Although contributors attempted to escape the walls of their discipline, they always wrote primarily in the name of the field in which they were highly competent. *Diogenes's* transdisciplinary ideals were therefore always more evident in the reviews than in the articles themselves.

The titles of the articles reveal certain privileged subjects. Somewhat more than a third are devoted to sociology and anthropology, especially myths and religions. Philosophy, history, and literature share another third of the titles about equally. Epistemology and the exact or natural sciences also occupy a relatively important place, especially as many articles are accompanied by methodological reflections. Economics and psychology, however, play only a minor role (each about 5 percent of all articles). There are twenty-five articles on music and cinema, but none on any of the other arts. In addition, very few illustrations appear. This hierarchy of interests reflects those of the editors. Psychology and economics, in particular, suffered from Caillois's aversion to allegedly "infallible" disciplines with a tendency to want to explain everything.

A glance at the reviews reveals many of the same concerns. Publication of reviews ceased with the April–June edition (no. 34) of 1961. Their numbers had been declining for some time, and Louis Renou, who had contributed so much with his summaries of works on Indian culture, wrote the final contribution to this section of the

periodical. The reasons for abandoning reviews could perhaps be sought in time constraints and the lack of reviewers or space. But in the end the emergence of other periodicals specializing in international reviews had rendered this aspect of *Diogenes* superfluous. Not only did *Critique* aim specifically at reviewing new publications, but every discipline developed its own periodicals to review new works. UNESCO could hardly remain indifferent to all these initiatives, because it was sponsoring several of them.<sup>12</sup> Social science reviews mushroomed in many countries at the same time that the number of article-length pieces in periodicals was declining. As a result, it was easier for *Diogenes* to distinguish itself by putting its effort into articles. Since 1962, more attention had been paid to special editions. Before edition no. 37 in January–March 1962, entitled “Looks at Africa,” only one special edition had been published: “The Contribution of Arnold Toynbee” (no. 13, January 1956). However, from no. 37 through no. 104 twenty-three special editions appeared. They seemed to disappear for a time between special edition no. 83 in July–September 1973 (“The Situation of Islam”) and special edition nos. 101–102 in January–June 1978 (“Aspects of Money”). However, from 1956 until 1973 they seemed to appear almost biannually (see Appendix C).

These various changes never called into question, however, the basic philosophy at *Diogenes*. The fourth page was always there to remind everyone of the journal’s objectives. The page was always fashioned around a quotation emphasizing the virtues of synthesis, for instance the following taken from the philosopher Yvon Belaval: “The trouble is that we have various histories – philosophy, the sciences, literature – that never impinge on one another. And yet everything does touch, everything does hold together. It is not the references that count; it is the interaction” (no. 28, 1959).

*Diogenes* pursued two objectives: to provide information about non-European cultures and to regularly survey new developments in the human sciences. The human sciences were put to the test for every issue that arose, but was there a surreptitious overall design?

### III. The Evolution of *Diogenes*

#### *A Broad Array of Contributors*

*Diogenes* did not begin with a great manifesto setting forth a strict program. Mme Gallay remembers Roger Caillois commenting that he was “navigating by sight.” Reading the reviews and lists of con-

tributors soon convinces one of the diversity of the journal. There was no reigning orthodoxy, and contributors were not all devotees of any particular creed. Nevertheless, the titles have a certain intimate feel to them; they reveal at least a proximity of concerns from one author to the next.

*Diogenes* published an impressive number of renowned authors. While respecting the principles outlined above, Caillois succeeded in attracting both leading lights in their fields, such as J. Piaget, G. Dumézil, E. Benveniste, K. Jaspers, P. Rivet, and C. Clark, as well as brilliant researchers on their way up, such as C. Lévi-Strauss, M. Eliade, J. Fourastié, and his friend A. Chastel. Caillois was also always eager to recruit young authors among those whom various institutions had already recognized. The associations affiliated with ICPHS could also recommend their best scholars, such as Uberto Pestalozza or Lewis Mumford. Indeed, ICPHS passed along many authors. Sometimes long biographical notices speak volumes about the function of a periodical. With its prestigious sponsor and ability to publish in many different languages, *Diogenes* could provide a stamp of recognition by the international intellectual community. It should be added, as well, that aspiring contributors could simply submit their work "on spec" if they wished.

Caillois had expressed the need to continually renew the periodical. He himself could make the link between the generation of 1890–1900 and those born between the wars. Claude Delmas was thirty-five when he was published in 1959. Nikki R. Keddie was twenty-nine in 1959. The editors of *Diogenes* also solicited articles, and Caillois used his position as a reader at the *Nouvelle Revue française* to spot new authors. This is how he discovered Michel Foucault and obtained an article from him, "The Prose of the World," for edition no. 53 in January–March 1966.<sup>13</sup> He found many excellent writers among former *normaliens*: Étienne, G. Friedman, A. Chastel, and J. de Bourbon-Busset. Like Jean d'Ormesson, he was assigned to reading and finding new authors. One could not go so far, however, as to say that all those who marked their era appeared in the pages of *Diogenes*. It defined itself as well by those whom it rejected – and who in some cases rejected it. Noteworthy for their absence are A. Camus, R. Barthes, J. Derrida, P. Clastres, J. Lacan, and J.-P. Sartre.

#### *The Never Ending Concern with Synthesis*

Most of the articles revolved around certain large questions raised by the periodical. Contributors pondered the methods that should

be followed in order to investigate in a relevant – i.e., synthetic – fashion various social and human phenomena, for instance the relationship between myth, religion, and society (articles by G. Scholem and M. Eliade). Particular attention was paid as well to the nature of history and of progress.

Before the war, Caillois had employed philology, onomastics, zoology, psychology, comparative mythology, ethnology and sociology to plumb the depths of the myths he was studying. In so doing, he attempted to bring together the methods and vocabularies of various disciplines. This search for a “sociological synthesis” led him into the realm of epistemology. Inspired by the examples of Carnap and Wittgenstein, he utilized the concepts of syntax and system in *L’Homme et le Sacré*, published in 1939. Caillois’s devotion to a rational explanation of the world (his positivist convictions, shared by Vienne’s circle) was predicated on a belief in a certain universality in the methods that societies use to imagine themselves, or the divine, as well as in the linear genesis of societies. It all led, in the end, to his project for “an active sociology,” propagated by the *Collège de sociologie*.<sup>14</sup> In his “Description du marxisme” (1950) and “Infaillible psychanalyse” (1957), he demonstrated the flaws in these supposedly infallible systems.<sup>15</sup> These critical works also enabled him to free himself from his own illusions. *Diogenes*, then, could be understood in terms of this project and the debates to which it gave rise: the encouragement of “lateral” thought to reveal the hidden logic. This approach, with its positivist overtones, reflected to some extent the desire of the periodical’s initial sponsor, Julian Huxley, to see an evolutionary humanism emerge. Caillois remained dedicated to this conviction, regularly repeating it for the rest of his life. It was summed up in his “Reconnaissance à Mendeleïev,” published in 1969: “The world is not a dense, tangled wilderness but a stately forest whose rhymical columns reflect the spare, lean architecture underlying the general confusion.”<sup>16</sup> Very early, Caillois had perceived the affinities between the Surrealists and the German Romantics. His own conception of the relations between the sciences had the same lineage.

Although Caillois did not write regular articles in *Diogenes*, we can gather from the fifteen or so texts stemming from his hand some indication of the role he wished the periodical to play and the way in which he hoped to accomplish its goals.<sup>17</sup> Three times – in 1953, 1959, and 1977 – he took pen in hand as editor-in-chief. His first article, entitled “*Diogenes* and Neo-Humanism: A Letter from the Edi-

tor" (no. 4), was a response to reactions indicating some misunderstanding of the aims of the periodical. He reiterated his desire to avoid "studies brought to bear upon pinpoints" and research projects based solely on institutional concerns and prospects for career advancement. *Diogenes* was to be neither a learned periodical nor a popularizing magazine. According to Caillois, it spurned "the compartmentalized study of facts and events, which I believe to be inevitably misleading and illusory, in order to focus on the relations which these points may have among themselves, as part of a living, historical, inextricable whole." The adventure of this approach always seemed much more attractive to him than "isolated knowledge . . . detached from the context which alone invests it with meaning." *Diogenes's* mission would be to "encourage the proliferation of a new race of intellectuals," eager, like Tacitus's ancient Germans, "for the welfare others, disdainful of their own." To this primary concern, Caillois added the examination of non-Western cultures in order to develop a new humanism that would transcend the old Greco-Roman foundations by encompassing "the civilizations of an age-old Orient and of a rising America." Once the idea of "a linear development of history" focused on the West had been discarded, *Diogenes* would be free to move beyond championing humanism to championing humanity itself in all its diversity. "*Diogenes* has no choice. This review could not be a fortress, a monastery or some acropolis, still less a 'reservation' like those created for Indians. It must be a crossroads, or in the worst of cases, a bazaar; in any event, a gathering-place, a place of meeting and of big and little exchange, an orientation chart showing where man stands today among many disciplines and all the fraternal cultures of which he can be equally proud to have been the author."

An advocate of a reborn general culture, Caillois did not escape the widespread infatuation with "humanism" after the war. In 1940 he had gone through an abrupt reversal and begun to defend the culture he had hitherto scorned. His return to a more classical style of expression in "*Athènes devant Philippe*,"<sup>18</sup> reflected a widely held attitude. The only response to barbarism was humanism. However, the broad banner of humanism cloaked much uncertainty and ambiguity. According to J.-P. Sartre, M. Merleau-Ponty, and the Marxists, humanism gathered together all those who believed in an all-powerful subject. The Hegelian tradition was very much to the fore. Caillois's humanism, however, was not so much based on Hegel as on the Renaissance. However, his related concept of

knowledge insisted on the unity of the subject: several disciplines were not needed to account for this. This conception was not far from the desire expressed in the 1930s to take "all of man" into account. What else was G. Gusdorf saying when he pointed to the existence of human nature in order to justify the unification of all human sciences? Was Caillois, influenced at least implicitly by this line of thought, setting his periodical off on a promising path for the future? How could this call for a synthesis of knowledge be compatible with the mounting success of disciplines that divided the subject into smaller and smaller pieces?<sup>19</sup> The decline, after 1960, of existentialism, phenomenology, and Marxism coincided with the rejection of the subject, representation, and identity, as structuralism moved to the fore.

At the same time, the possibility of, and the necessary conditions for, transplanting the discoveries of one discipline to another was addressed. In 1959 Caillois published "After Six Years of a Doubtful Combat," which was a "more focused and ambitious statement" of *Diogenes's* aspirations.<sup>20</sup> Here Caillois insisted once again on the pitfalls of "blind, obstinate science," and explained in greater detail his concept of "lateral science." For him, a scientific attitude was predicated on "universal curiosity," which alone can liberate science from rigid classification systems. In place of his intrepid political views of the prewar era, Caillois now called for "intrepid imagination." This arose from a conviction, which had largely passed unnoticed, set forth by M. Foucault in *Les Mots et les Choses*: in every historical epoch in human history, men rely on particular bodies of knowledge and concepts (M. Foucault's "epistemological basis"). To ignore this fact and consider the borders between the sciences definitive, absolute, and unshakable would therefore be restrictive and even counterproductive. This enabled Caillois to reverse the roles: "The keyboard of nature abounds with many parallels and analogies, and it would be foolhardy to claim that they all mean nothing, that they are capable of inspiring day-dreams but not rigorous research" (p. 6). His criticism of specialization grew ever more refined, and he raised various concepts and problems for skeptics to ponder. The historical changes in the taxonomies developed by naturalists are obvious; so have we now reached the end? What about the productiveness of the concept of cicatrices when applied to minerals, or of asymmetry when applied outside the field of physics? Caillois denied that he wished to return to the "superficial, qualitative analogies of the philosophy of the Middle Ages and



the Renaissance . . . a distraction that is all the more dangerous because it responds to an inborn predilection in the mind, now kept largely in check, for analogies which seem to offer quick, fascinating solutions to minds which have already been seduced in advance." Far from clinging to appearances (something which artists can still enjoy), scientists must seek "unusual" relationships that are "unthinkable for the layman." Such relationships "bring together unanticipated aspects which reveal, among very different things, the effects of a single principle, responses to a common challenge. Heterogenous solutions effectively hide from naive investigators the various steps of a profound organization or structure, whose basic principle, however, remains identical throughout. It is this principle which we should be attempting to discover" (p. 8).

Caillois's desire not to cut *Diogenes* off from developments in the natural or exact sciences or the human sciences was expressed even more forcefully in the "Introduction" he wrote to the one-hundredth edition of *Diogenes*. Here he recalled the initial objectives of the periodical and attempted to measure the distance already traveled. He also stated his vision of interdisciplinarity. The appeals in *Diogenes* on behalf of "lateral science" had succeeded in prompting clashes between specialists in various fields. However, these encounters "consisted all too often in a succession of mutually impenetrable monologues" (p. 4). This was the opposite of what the periodical and its editor-in-chief hoped to achieve, namely "to discover a sort of common denominator to all this data, with which just about everything seems incompatible, except the hidden essence." *Diogenes* advanced, then, by promoting a dialogue among the disciplines. At the same time, Roger Caillois had some militant preoccupations of his own. These preoccupations found particular expression in the *Diogenes* Prize.

#### *The Experience of the Diogenes International Prize*

The desire at *Diogenes* to rival the universities was very evident in the plan developed in 1954 to award a prize. The goal was to honor "work that gets to the crux of the matter, that is able to lay out an idea in just a few pages, or that eschews exposition of all the subsidiary learning in order to cut to the essence." At a time when universities were encouraging more and more voluminous work of less and less general interest, *Diogenes* resolved to confer a prize "on the best unpublished work concerned with a synthesis of knowledge and the contribution of views both new and valid to any discipline

whatsoever of humanistic studies" (article 1 of the rules, *Diogenes*, no. 6, April 1954). The prize, valued at \$1,000, would be awarded by a prestigious international jury composed of well-known academics and thinkers (D.W. Brogan, L. Febvre, A. Malraux, L. Mumford, then C. Clark, Daya, J. Ebbinghaus, A. Rüstow), and would be one element in ICPHS's strategy to attract researchers to the approaches it advocated. ICPHS gave the award its full support, but it is easy to discern Caillois's hand as well. Not a university professor himself, he found in this way a method to reward the approaches in which he believed. The prize would encourage transdisciplinary thought and, once launched, would recognize the best advances in this field. However, the initial enthusiasm soon encountered unexpected logistical problems. Too many texts were submitted for consideration. The resulting work could have provided an opportunity to confront in a productive way the analyses of the members of the jury with the diversity of the texts submitted. Instead, it became a quagmire that was impossible to manage effectively. It was difficult to arrange meetings of the jury, leading to exchanges of correspondence instead, and the jury composition was often in flux. Originally planned for 1955, the prize was not awarded until 1957. It went to Wladimir Weidlé, whose "Biology of Art: Initial Formulation and Primary Orientation" had been among the twenty-six works pre-selected from the 235 received.

Weidlé's brief essay of only thirteen paragraphs states why works of art could be considered in the same way as living beings. The often very abstract line of argument borrows heavily from gestalt theory. Caillois must have found this very interesting, especially as he himself was always fascinated by the designs in rocks or in the wings of butterflies and their relationship with the art of humans. In 1962 he published *Esthétique généralisée*, whose aims, demonstrative style, and conciseness are reminiscent of Weidlé's text.<sup>21</sup> Caillois attempted "once again to examine things in their entirety . . . to state the possible categories." However, the weariness that the establishment of this prize caused, without sequels for the periodical, proved that it was not easy to attempt to rival the universities.

#### IV. Diogenes and the Controversies of the Times

The 1930s had prepared the ground for many of the controversies of the postwar era, and especially for the rise of the human sciences. Between 1952 and 1978, *Diogenes* took part in the debates of the

times without becoming fully engaged on any particular side.

Because of the way it operated, *Diogenes* escaped the intellectual fads sweeping Paris and the universities. Its distrust of exclusive paths to the truth was based on an outmoded conception of knowledge. At a time when it seemed urgently necessary to make a choice between East and West, between dialectics, phenomenology, existentialism and idealist, bourgeois philosophy, *Diogenes* maintained its reserve. After the war and especially in France, the intellectual debate revolved around Marxism, existentialism, and the *engagement* of intellectuals. It was not *Diogenes's* vocation, however, to venture into political debates, and Caillois did not feel terribly constrained, in any case, by this limitation. He had written that although he had nothing against "edifying literature," it still had to be "literature," and the "edification proper to literature emanates from the style."<sup>22</sup> Caillois believed that the challenges facing intellectuals lay outside partisan engagement or support for any particular dogma. By the 1960s, the controversies swirling around intellectuals and French periodicals had changed direction. Dialectics was out, and structuralism was in. But *Diogenes* maintained its detachment.

Periodicals are often seen as mirrors of their era, reflecting the thought, research, and creativity of a particular time. They leave it to books to concern themselves with posterity in order to immerse themselves in the controversies of the day. *Diogenes* certainly echoed many of the debates of the times, but always with a certain aloofness. Although it was very much a creature of its own times by virtue of its predilection for the human sciences and its openness to non-European cultures, the delays entailed in producing a quarterly whose summaries appear several months in advance contributed to its detachment from the latest intellectual fads and fashions.

*Engagement on the Side of Critical Distance*

All this does not mean that Caillois renounced opportunities to publish texts likely to stimulate controversy. The October–December 1968 edition, "Marxism Today," contained contributions by T. W. Adorno, H. Marcuse, J. Hyppolite, E.J. Hobsbawm, M. Rodinson, R. Ingarden, A. Laraoui, K. Papaioannou, and R.C. Tucker. In the end, the only particularly important authors lacking from this issue were J.-P. Sartre and L. Althusser. The posture adopted by *Diogenes vis-à-vis* the debates of the day was by no means that of the omniscient sage contemplating the skirmishes of the minor pundits

from the heights of its unshakable convictions; instead, the journal remained curious at all times, eager for sparks of insight that would expedite its own pursuit of a coherent overview. Nor did it adopt a pragmatic relativism. Readers were left free to refine their own views without feeling that they were being dictated to.

None of the great discussions of the 1950s and 60s was overlooked, neither the problems posed by the definitions of ethnology and anthropology (see Claude Lévi-Strauss: "Panorama of Ethnology, 1950–1952," no. 2; "The Problem of Invariance in Anthropology," no. 31; and "Anthropology," no. 90; P. Rivet: "Letter to *Diogenes* on the Meaning of the Word 'Anthropology'," no. 13), nor those posed by cybernetics (S.K. Saumjan, no. 51; S. Ceccato, no. 53; Hutten, no. 72; Losano, no. 76; Delobelle, no. 91), nor those posed by the changes in black Africa (H. Deschamps, nos. 15 and 37; A. Gérard, no. 48; P. J. Hountondji, no. 71). These echoes of the controversies of the day were always related to *Diogenes*'s initial mission: the development of a science able to subsume in a coherent way the various branches of knowledge about mankind. At the same time, *Annales*, founded by L. Febvre and M. Bloch, was attempting to lend a new legitimacy to the study of history by encompassing a broad array of disciplines. However, as Éditions Plon stated in advertising for their publications in psychology, sociology, and ethnology, "If the nineteenth century was the century of history, the twentieth century will be that of the social sciences" (*Diogenes*, no. 6, 1954). New sociology periodicals adopted the aims of *Revue de la synthèse* and *Annales* – quite explicitly in the cases of *L'homme et la société* and *Revue internationale de recherches et de synthèse sociologiques* after 1966, and in a de facto way in the case of *La Revue française de sociologie* (CNRS).

Although *Diogenes* contained many articles on the nature of a synthesis of the human sciences, it is not possible to detect the periodical's own preferences. However, some articles which seem to reflect its own vocation and style more strongly make it possible to determine the main concerns of the periodical. Among the most problematic and frequently debated issues was the question of the future of the social sciences and humanities. It was first necessary to agree on the boundaries of these disciplines, on their relations among one another, and possibly on a hierarchy. The scientific claims of Marxism and the equally strong pretensions of quantitative history, model economics, and structural anthropology seemed to leave little room for a critical discussion of their foundations, their relations, and their future.

In view of the training Caillois had received, one might expect to find sociology enjoying pride of place in *Diogenes*. However, it was constantly cut down to size, despite the widespread tendency at the time to exalt it over all disciplines. Various series of articles reveal the polyphony arising from the pages of *Diogenes*. G. Gusdorf, for example, denied that sociology was the driving force that Caillois had claimed in *L'Homme et le Sacré*.<sup>23</sup> This professor of philosophy worried about the "absurd scientific and technological inflation from which the western world suffers," while forgetting the virtues of reflection on "the problem of human existence, the problem of values" (no. 26, pp. 59 and 60). According to him, the "total disarray" in which the human sciences found themselves relative to their so-called pure or experimental cousins was "rooted in the indefiniteness of their condition and of their significance" (p. 66). In order to escape the crisis, it would be necessary to renounce "scientific positivism [which] nurtures the strange ambition of creating a science of man without man himself" (p. 71). "Man is not a question that can be resolved" by undertaking "a few calculations . . . after developing a sufficiently astute equation, facilitated by a cybernetic apparatus after the fashion of the day" (p. 60). Gusdorf thus restored to philosophy the basic synthesizing role that sociology had denied it in defining itself. In the footsteps of G. Gurvitch (p. 76), Gusdorf maintained that the human sciences were "sciences of liberty" "in the service of lucidity." Furthermore, "metaphysicians only ask them, beyond the limits of their specialization, to practise the virtues of curiosity and sympathy" in the investigation of man by man, "this immense, never-ending adventure" (p. 81).

Another polemical contribution helps one to appreciate the function of the periodical. P. Veyne, a specialist in ancient history and historiography took umbrage, in his "Contestation of Sociology" (no. 75), at the "excesses of structuralism, in other words of realism" which lends an autonomous, impassive existence to abstractions such as structures or *epistémê*.<sup>24</sup> Sociology was allegedly "old wine" with a "sophistic scientific aftertaste," a "myth" (pp. 14–15). The virulence of this attack on the leading apostles of the era, Claude Lévi-Strauss, M. Foucault, or P. Bourdieu, was in the nonconformist tradition adopted by the periodical since its inception. The importance of the criticism and the attempt to place the relations between sociology and history in perspective also carried on the tradition of reflection on the relations among the various human sciences. According to Veyne, "if sociology, in its turn, appears more intelli-

gent, more explanatory and more powerful than the old-fashioned narrative history that focuses on events, if it is a continuously reborn temptation, this is because sociology is really history sliced up by items and because the study of an item only reaps its complete significance within a study of the plan of History relative to this item. To make a theory of the types of grouping or of the ideal types of authority is to hope to grasp, in the absence of the essence itself, the complete inventory of the incarnations of this essence; or, in other words, to hope to know the plan of History as it is realized in matter." Nevertheless, Veyne was not trying to restore a position of hegemony to his discipline; he was attacking a fashion, an illusion.

*Roger Caillois and Claude Lévi-Strauss*

In December 1954 and January 1955, Caillois published two articles in the *Nouvelle Revue Française* in which he strongly criticized the views expressed by Claude Lévi-Strauss in *Race and History*, which was commissioned by UNESCO and published in 1952. Caillois's "Reverse Illusions," subtitled "To Win a Debate You Don't Just Have to Admit You Are Wrong," was countered by an equally venomous reply from Lévi-Strauss entitled "*Diogenes Fast Asleep*."<sup>25</sup> The quarrel led to further verbal broadsides, but we will confine ourselves here to noting that, besides more personal motivations, the dispute revolved around the nature of the history of mankind and the place of the West in this history. Like Lévi-Strauss, Caillois eschewed a linear conception of history in favor of a more pluralist conception in which "the West appears no longer as the end of history but as an accident of history" ("Reverse Illusions" (I), p. 1011). He also rejected all forms of racism and insisted on the equality of all "races, peoples or cultures" (p. 1019). On the other hand, he accused the author of the *Elementary Structures of Kinship* of having created "a veritable system of what was previously little more than a diffuse sentiment, implicit, without consistency or rigor" (p. 1019). The basic argument of Lévi-Strauss's book was that "cultures are equivalent and cannot be compared"; however, by some curious twist of logic, he ended up by claiming that certain cultures were indeed superior to others, for instance the Australian Aboriginal to the Western. Caillois saw in this contradiction and in this mania to denigrate Western culture a sign of "a general crisis of conscience" ("Reverse Illusions" (II), p. 58). Self-denigration, even when based on apparent objectivity, he said, sprang from the "same diffuse

remorse, the same collective will to depreciate oneself [which] motivated people to humiliate themselves" (p. 60). Caillois rejected the "conviction, rooted in the passions, that one's own civilization is hypocritical, corrupt and repugnant." He thought it was "unreasonable to attribute the prosperity achieved by various civilizations to chance." There are "particular factors for deciding between the competitors. Most important among them are: the method of research and the desire to invent, the conjugated power of reason and scientific ambition" (p. 63). Caillois recognized the extortions and violence of the West and denied that it would survive forever. He knew full well that China and India had had their moments of grandeur as well. Nevertheless, he concluded that "the West has not only unified history and planet Earth; it has not only brought all the civilizations together through the progress of its technology, through its commerce, its conquests and its wars. It invented archeology, ethnography and museums, and it would be ill-mannered of archeologists or ethnographers not to admit as much." Finally, it was the West that "gave those who now scorn it the material and spiritual support they needed in order to express their ingratitude" (p. 70). The strength of Caillois's analysis and its demystifying power were, however, somewhat vitiated by certain excesses and confusions. In his eagerness to settle accounts with certain ideas, including some he himself had defended before the war, Caillois gave Lévi-Strauss an opportunity to counterattack in force.

"Diogenes proved that there was movement by progressing; but R. Caillois goes to sleep so as not to see." Lévi-Strauss responded in part to the criticisms leveled by Caillois, but generally speaking the controversy lacked the necessary composure to escape misunderstandings. Lévi-Strauss painted his challenger as a champion of one civilization: the Christian West. His comments were "barroom nonsense," the "ranting of a preacher," or the "moaning of penitents" ("*Diogenes Fast Asleep*," p. 1202). Lévi-Strauss reiterated his rejection of a linear conception of history and insisted on its random, fortuitous nature. The diversity of cultures, he said, must be respected. However, Lévi-Strauss did not seem to recognize the point of the other criticisms and did not address them, recommending instead that Caillois re-read his text and examine in depth his own beliefs.

The unusually high number of articles devoted to history, its irreversibility, meaning, and esteem in which it is held, attest to the importance which *Diogenes* attached to the problem which animat-

ed to some extent the debate between Caillois and Lévi-Strauss. To locate cultures in relation to each other presupposes a conception of universal history. It may be cumulative, evolutionary, reasonable, cyclical, or driven by a particular necessity – or totally fortuitous. The various quarrels among historians or between historians and sociologists are part of a crucial debate: what is the causality at work in the universe, in history, and which discipline can best reveal it – or prove that it does not exist. Did *Diogenes* champion any particular view, and could this view be identified with its editor-in-chief?

When contemplating the first hundred issues of the periodical, Caillois had the feeling that it had not only contributed to the general culture of its readers, identified “lateral” approaches, and criticized the spreading hegemonic, “authoritarian” views of sex (complexes), philosophy (dialectics), and society (structure); it had also, because of its emphasis on epistemology and scientific logic, “accompanied, illustrated, commented upon, and encouraged . . . a radical shift” in the scientific approach. What had first been announced by the crisis of determinism was now confirmed. The sciences appeared to be interested only in what was “stable,” “general,” and well-ordered, and had “excluded what was occasional or unusual, not to mention turbulent or extraordinary.” An examination in 1977 of the work honored by the Nobel Academy indicated that scientific concerns had indeed changed. The transition from disorder to order had become a problem, and attempts to explain it required “the study of deeper levels where states of matter are more restless, turbulent and undisciplined.” This “more meticulous vision of phenomena, which now included their individuality,” made it necessary to take into account the contributions of “statistical causality, asymmetries, and the Brownian turmoil.” Caillois had been greatly impressed by Ilya Prigogine, but unfortunately the consequences of the Six Days War made it difficult for Prigogine to contribute to *Diogenes*. In 1977 the periodical awaited in vain an article on dissipative structures, an article which Prigogine in the end never wrote because of all the requests arising from his increased notoriety. Caillois believed that Prigogine could have provided an ideal continuation of the line of thought initiated in articles by H. Margenau, J. Nicolle, E.H. Hutten, B. Kouznetsov, M.J. Carella, N. Dallaporta and P.G. de Gennes.<sup>26</sup> The work of chemists and of the Brussels School modified theories of the organization of life and, by extension, of ecology and social systems. The role of “sure guide” that *Diogenes* ascribed to the exact sciences was justified by their



rigor compared with the reigning confusion in the human sciences. The legitimacy of the human sciences and the methods they employed were at the heart of the periodical's concerns, and in this way *Diogenes* helped to illuminate their weaknesses.

In this article, Caillois offered for the first time a justification of the name selected for the periodical. He pointed to the master cynic's claim that movement can be proved through progress, writing "progress remains the essential, like the bearing point for the conceptual lever Archimedes had deemed necessary to lift the world." These are "the two rules which govern and will continue to govern our publication: the highest priority to evidence, but a severe, implacable examination of that which has routinely been accepted as evidence but which on closer examination proves to be nothing more than fallacious though deeply rooted prejudice." Does "progress" still leave any room for "evidence"? Can it set a goal and remain faithful to it?

Caillois's retrospective examination insisted on the constancy of *Diogenes's* mission, understood in a fairly general way: to encourage exchanges between the various human sciences regarding nature and themselves. What he absorbed from recent discoveries in the field of thermodynamics seemed to justify his "lateral" approach. Since the laws of the evolution of matter and those of the biological world no longer conflicted, how could the related sciences be opposed? Caillois could argue that the beliefs on which *Diogenes* had been founded were confirmed by the shift of direction in the exact sciences. However, even leaving aside the problems raised by the transformations that occur when the discoveries of physicists are transplanted to other fields of study, Caillois certainly had abandoned some of his initial aims. Was not his original conviction that it would be possible to discover a hidden logic or a broad coherence refuted by increasing evidence of an infinity of causes depending on the level of observation and analysis, from the microscopic to the macroscopic? To abandon preconceptions about the boundaries between the mineral and biological worlds did not necessarily mean the advent of a new common order. The methods and ideas that fascinated Caillois actually tended more to contradict his own conceptions of the world. This highlights the contrast between the jumbled diversity of views found in the pages of *Diogenes* and the constancy of the vision expressed by its editor-in-chief. Not only did the periodical escape psychoanalytical and structuralist dogma; it also escaped the positivist ambitions of its own founder.

Roger Caillois fashioned the periodical and marked it with his choices and convictions. To a certain extent, one could even say he induced others to conduct the studies that he himself no longer had the time to do. In the end, he might appear as a kind of demiurge manipulating the people in his orbit, an orchestra conductor imposing his own score on talented but submissive musicians. But *Diogenes* took on a life of its own, its identity affirmed slowly and gradually. The mission and means given to it by UNESCO and ICPHS made it an important player in international scientific exchanges. *Diogenes* therefore outgrew France alone. The personality of Caillois could explain this development, but it also goes back to the guidelines on which *Diogenes* was founded. The debates in which it became involved always reflected Caillois's own interests, but it never embraced a particular viewpoint. Periodicals become known by the source of their identity, whether a particular ideology, a political program, a scientific discipline, an esthetic view, the personality of the editor-in-chief, or a particular institution. Caillois conceived of *Diogenes* and directed it, but the institutions that fostered it were equally influential. The need for reticence could have made *Diogenes* dull and insipid if it were not for a strong sense of curiosity and great diversity. Caillois might have hoped to turn the periodical into a war horse in his personal battle against universities and certain dogmas; however, he was too scrupulous to pursue such a course. He continued to write outside the periodical, and also wrote occasional articles in *Diogenes* without ever trying to impose a strict point of view on it. For him, *Diogenes* was seeking less a particular man than a science of man, and this science could not be an all-encompassing sociology or history. Although Caillois opposed any discipline that claimed to explain everything, he remained an apostle of a unified, holistic notion of science. The periodical, reflecting its times, tended toward studies that emphasized diversity and complexity. In this way, it escaped Caillois's own ambitions for it in order to remain more faithful to him. Caillois was not a philosopher with a system to explain all; he regularly denounced all dogmas in the name of curiosity and rigor. At the helm of his periodical, he navigated by sight. His humanism and his convictions were undoubtedly rooted in an outmoded *epistêmê*; but curiosity and rigor nevertheless remain the cornerstone of scientific discourse.

*Diogenes* was able to survive the passing of Caillois precisely because it had achieved a life of its own. His successor, who had

*In Search of a Journal: Caillois and Diogenes*

worked on the periodical since the earliest days, ensured the maintenance of its openness to the world and to knowledge, as well as the adherence to seriousness and readability that had ensured its success. The 1980s highlighted the need for reflection on complexity and for a comparative analysis of scientific methods. Epistemology returned to favor, after the idols of the times had lost their luster. *Diogenes* therefore escaped anachronism, and its strong constitution would continue to enable it to escape intellectual conformity.

*Translated from the French by Bruce Little*

**Appendix A**

Texts by Roger Caillois published in *Diogenes* :

- "*Diogenes* and Neo-Humanism: A Letter from the Editor," no. 4, October 1953.
- "The Structure and Classification of Games," no. 12, October 1955.
- "Foreword" to the special edition, *The Contribution of Arnold Toynbee*, no. 13, April 1956.
- "Unity of Play: Diversity of Games," no. 19, July 1957.
- "After Six Years of a Doubtful Combat," no. 26, April–June 1959.
- "Generalized Esthetics," no. 38, April–June 1962.
- "Circular Time, Rectilinear Time," no. 42, April–June 1963.
- "The Logic of Imagination," no. 69, January–March 1970.
- "Dynamics of Dissymmetry," no. 76, October–December 1970.
- Introduction to the special edition: *African Literature in the Age of Criticism*, no. 80, October–December 1972.
- "Metamorphoses of Hell," no. 85, January–March 1974.
- "Science Fiction," no. 89, January–March 1975.
- "Stone Men of the Canadian Arctic," no. 94, April–June 1976.
- "Introduction," no. 100, December 1977.
- "Concerning Poetry: A Resumé," no. 100, December 1977
- "The Myth of the Unicorn," no. 119, July–September 1982.

Appendix B

The summary for no. 6, April 1954, provides a good example of the balance among the various concerns of *Diogenes*, although any other edition from the 1950s would provide equally convincing evidence.

FRANÇOIS PERROUX	<i>The Gift: its Economic Meaning in Contemporary Capitalism</i>
OSCAR HANDLIN	<i>American Views of the Past</i>
JEAN BAYET	<i>Cosmic Science in Classic Philosophy</i>
FRANCESCO GABRIELI	<i>New Light on Dante and Islam</i>
HENRY MARGENAU	<i>Causality in Quantum Electrodynamics</i>
GORDON CHILDE	<i>The Position of Old-World Prehistory (Conclusion)</i>
LOUIS-ARNAUD REID	<i>A New Theory on Art</i>

CORRESPONDENCE

Letter from Professor MOHAMED SAÏD EL SAFTI  
to the Editors of *Diogenes*

*Diogenes International Prize*

STUDIES, NOTES AND REVIEWS

by G. COÈDÈS AND A.W. MACDONALD  
of works by

R. LINGAT, I.H.N. EVANS, J.F. ROCK AND P. DEMIÉVILLE

**Appendix C**

List of Special Editions of *Diogenes* through 1978

- No. 13: *The Contribution of Arnold Toynbee*
- No. 37: *Looks at Africa*
- No. 38: *Esthetic Problems: Past and Present*
- No. 39: *New Problems in Sociology*
- No. 41: *Problems of the Sociology of Religion*
- No. 42: *Man and the Concept of History in the Orient*
- No. 43: *Problems of Latin America*
- No. 45: *The Culture of India*
- No. 47: *Spontaneity and Adaptation in the Development of Civilizations*
- No. 50: *Art and Play*
- No. 51: *Problems of Language*
- No. 52: *The Meaning of Models*
- No. 60: *Dialectic and Experience*
- No. 64: *Marxism Today*
- No. 68: *Mass Communication and Culture*
- No. 70: *The Prediction*
- No. 71: *A Crossroad of Civilizations: The Mediterranean*
- No. 74: *Images of Time*
- No. 75: *A Dilemma (sociology and history)*
- No. 78: *Myths and Realities of Africa*
- No. 80: *African Criticism in the Age of Criticism*
- No. 83: *The Situation of Islam*
- Nos. 101–102: *Aspects of Money*

## Notes

1. *L'Histoire du développement culturel et scientifique de l'Humanité* finally appeared in the 1960s. Robert Laffont published the French version from 1967 to 1969.
2. Formula of Dr. Torres-Bodet, director general of UNESCO in 1949, cited in ICPHS's presentation booklet, 1989, p. 10.
3. The evolution of Roger Caillois can be seen clearly in his correspondence: G. Bataille, *Lettres à Roger Caillois*, presented and annotated by J.-P. Le Boulter (Romillé, Éd. Folle Avoine, 1987); *Correspondance Jean Paulhan–Roger Caillois*, presented and annotated by Odile Felgine and Claude-Pierre Pérez; *Cahiers Jean Paulhan*, v. VI (Paris, Gallimard, 1991). Information can also be found in the references provided by the bio-bibliography of *Cahier pour un temps: R. Caillois* (Paris, Centre G. Pompidou, 1978), p. 250–59, as well as in the "Notice biographique," written by O. Felgine in *La Pensée aventurée*, L. Jenny (ed.) (Paris, Belin, 1991), p. 271–77.
4. *Contre-Attaque*, A. Breton and G. Bataille (eds.), was published in the spring of 1936; *Inquisitions* was reissued by H. Béhar, *Inquisitions. Du surréalisme au Front Populaire* (Paris, CNRS, 1990); T. Tzara, "Introduction" in *Inquisitions*, June 1936, no. 1, p. 65.
5. A. Pajon, "L'intrépidité politique de R. Caillois avant-guerre," in *Les Cahiers Chronos*, "Roger Caillois" (Paris, La Différence, 1991), pp. 165ff.
6. Dominique Rabourdin, "Roger Caillois et les *Lettres françaises*: points de repère, suivis d'exemples," in *Sud*, special edition. "Roger Caillois ou la traversée des savoirs" (1981), pp. 165ff.; Odile Felgine, "Lettres françaises: le virage américain," in *Les Cahiers Chronos*, *op. cit.*, p. 314–27; Laura Ayerza de Castilho and Odile Felgine, *Victoria Ocampo* (Paris, 1991), p. 346.; Denis Rolland, "Politique, culture et progaganda françaises en Argentine. L'univers de R. Caillois entre 1939 et 1944" in *Les Cahiers Chronos*, *op. cit.*, p. 404–22.
7. *Diogène: A Historic, Philosophic And Literary Paper*. August 1828, no. 1. Arsenal: 4° Jo. 10.031.B
8. *Diogène: Satiric Portraits and Biographies of Nineteenth Century Men, 1856–1864*. Arsenal: Fol. Jo. 375.J. Takes the subtitle *International Political and Literary Periodical after 1864; Diogène, Politics, Society, Finance, Industry*, from 1882 to 1910. Arsenal: Fol. Jo. 281.C.
9. Paul Hazard, *La Crise de la conscience européenne* (Paris, Boivin et Cie., 1935), vol. 1, pp. 100–13.
10. The editors of *Diogenes* provided us with the figures they had. More copies were printed of the first editions in French before various translations were adopted.
11. R. Caillois, "Illusions à rebours," NRF (I) December 1954, no. 24, pp. 1010–24 and (II), January 1955, no. 25, pp. 58–70.
12. In 1949 UNESCO launched the *Bulletin international des sciences sociales* and the *Index Translationum*. Beginning in 1952, researchers in the social sciences had their own *Bibliographie internationale*. Bibliographies for political science and economics appeared in 1954. One could add as well *Sociological Abstracts*, CNRS's *Bulletin signalétique. Sociologie. Ethnologie*, created in 1947. In France as well, *L'Année sociologique* published numerous reviews.
13. M. Foucault, *Les Mots et les Choses* (Paris, Gallimard, 1966).
14. For all these questions see the work of D. Hollier on *Le Collège de sociologie* (Paris, Gallimard, 1979).
15. R. Caillois, "Description du marxisme" (1950) and "Infaillible psychanalyse" (1957) were reprinted in *Approches de l'imaginaire* (Paris, Gallimard, 1974).
16. R. Caillois, "Reconnaissance à Mendeleïev" (1969), reprinted in *Cases d'un échiquier* (Paris, Gallimard, 1970), pp. 74–81.
17. For texts by Caillois published in *Diogenes*, see Appendix A at the end of this article.

## In Search of a Journal: Caillois and Diogenes

18. R. Caillois, *Le Rocher de Sisyphe*, "Athènes devant Philippe" (Paris, Gallimard, 1946), pp. 27–54.

19. C. Rosset, *Le Même et l'Autre. Quarante-cinq ans de philosophie française, 1933–1978* (Paris, Éd. de Minuit, 1979).

20. R. Caillois, "Nouveau plaidoyer pour les sciences diagonales" in *Cases d'un échiquier*, *op. cit.* pp. 53–59. This text repeats in part "After Six Years of a Doubtful Combat," *Diogenes*, no. 26, April–June 1959, disseminated as well by NRF under the title "Les sciences diagonales" in April 1959, no. 76, pp. 679–83, and in a text published in Italy in 1965. Caillois's desire to give this manifesto the broadest possible distribution reveals once again a certain militancy on his part and his attachment to periodicals for spreading his ideas.

21. R. Caillois, *Esthétique généralisée* (Paris, Gallimard, 1962).

22. R. Caillois, an article that appeared in *Terre des Hommes*, 8 December 1954.

23. Sociology, ethnography, ethnology, and anthropology defined themselves only gradually in comparison with one another and other disciplines. Furthermore, the discussions of their ambit and that of the social sciences and humanities are still continuing. G. Gusdorf published in *Diogenes*, "For a History of the Sciences of Man," no. 17, January 1957; "The Ambiguity of the Sciences of Man," no. 26, April–June 1959; and "Project for Interdisciplinary Research," no. 42, April–June 1963.

24. P. Veyne, "Contestation of Sociology" in *Diogenes*, no. 75, July–September 1971.

25. The references in the article by R. Caillois are given in note 11. Claude Lévi-Strauss, "Diogène couché" in *Temps Modernes*, no. 110, May 1955, pp. 1187–1220. The choice of J.-P. Sartre's journal to mount this counterattack had a sting of its own. Roger Caillois, "À propos de 'Diogène couché'"; Claude Lévi-Strauss, "Réponse à Roger Caillois" in *Les Temps Modernes*, no. 111, April 1955, pp. 1553–56.

26. H. Margenau, "Causality in Quantum Electrodynamics" in *Diogenes* no. 6; J. Nicolle, "On Symmetry," no. 12; E. H. Hutton, "Symmetry Physics and Information Theory," no. 72; B. Kouznetsov, "Einstein and Epicurus," no. 81; M.J. Carella, "Heisenberg's Concept of Matter as Potency," no. 96, October–December 1976; N. Dallaporta, "The Crisis of Contemporary Physics," no. 95; P.G. de Gennes, "Chance and Necessity in Cooperative Phenomena," no. 100.