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On 9 March 1950, Alfred Métraux, a Swiss-born cultural anthropologist and former student of Marcel Mauss, wrote excitedly from New York to his librarian friend Yvonne Oddon at the Musée de l’Homme in Paris: he had finally made up his mind to accept a position at the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) as head of a new bureau on race relations, and he was wondering what books to buy to help him in his new job. Hardly an expert on race matters himself, Métraux then listed some of the most important studies by American social scientists, which he suspected were not available in French libraries. These included
Gunnar Myrdal’s 1944 monumental study of race relations in America, *An American Dilemma*, which had become an instant classic despite its recent publication; Otto Klineberg’s 1935 study *Race Differences*; and Alain Locke and Bernhard J. Stern’s 1942 collected volume *When People Meet: A Study of Race and Culture Contacts*. A month later, Métraux had officially joined UNESCO’s Social Science Department in Paris. He would run the Race Bureau, whose job was to fight racism internationally with the tools of science until his retirement in 1962.¹

Métraux’s letter raises some tantalising questions about global conceptions of ‘race’ in the shadow of the Second World War. What work did the UNESCO Race Bureau operating in France’s capital actually accomplish in the 1950s? Why was a European with no particular ‘race’ expertise invited to set it up? What relevance did Métraux imagine that studies of race relations in the United States might have beyond North American borders, and was he right? While excellent studies of different facets of UNESCO’s campaign to combat racism exist, there is still much to be learnt about the many transnational intellectual communities that this international organisation fostered in its early years. Here, Métraux’s career at the Race Bureau is illuminating. Métraux (1902–1963) had attended Mauss’ Paris seminars in the 1920s and received his doctorate from the University of Paris; he had then gone on to do fieldwork in South America and the Pacific in the 1930s. He would spend the war years in the United States before becoming an international civil servant in the late 1940s (Krebs 2016; Laurière 2005; Maurel 2017). With such extensive trans-Atlantic experience, Métraux was uniquely positioned to serve as a *passeur* between multiple national academic networks when he arrived back in Paris. What ideas about race he also ‘passed on’, however, remains an open question.²

The analysis that follows seeks to understand the extent to which UNESCO’s Social Science Department under Métraux’s watch became a productive yet forgotten contact zone between different traditions of race talk in the heart of Paris, especially between the French and American scholars who dominated UNESCO in the early 1950s. In particular, I focus on a set of publications that the Race Bureau commissioned from experts as part of a new international mass educational campaign to combat prejudice ‘in the minds of men’.³ Métraux was personally connected to the French anthropologists Michel Leiris and Claude Lévi-Strauss – also interwar students of Mauss – whom he contacted along with a number of Anglophone race specialists to participate in this campaign. Neither Leiris nor Lévi-Strauss had a track record of writing about the race question before the Second World War, but in the early 1950s each would produce UNESCO booklets on the subject alongside several American specialists on the subject.⁴ Focussing on UNESCO as a contact zone between Francophone and Anglophone anti-racist discourses highlights the challenges of finding a
common scientific ground for fighting racism amongst social scientists who could agree in the decade after the Second World War that ‘racism’ was bad, but who had different national and colonial experiences – and indeed definitions – of ‘race’, ‘racism’, and ‘race relations’.

**UNESCO, Alfred Métraux and American Anti-Racist Social Science**

The very creation of a race division at UNESCO in post-war Paris reflected the dramatically changed international landscape of the late 1940s compared with that of the 1920s. It also suggested the immense power that contemporaries imputed to science to fix the world’s wrongs. In the wake of Axis war atrocities, combatting racial crimes became a global concern on two different fronts. On the one hand, the discovery of Nazi crimes led to an international awareness that anti-Semitism in any form should not be tolerated. On the other hand, the United States, Britain and France emerged from the war with race relations transformed. The US government had appealed to African American soldiers on patriotic grounds, while the British government and the French Resistance had framed the war as a freedom struggle for their colonial troops. All three powers had promised that victory would mean the right of all peoples to self-determination. African Americans and colonial subjects were determined that this time, unlike after the First World War, the bargain – service in defence of the nation or empire in return for the full rights of citizenship – would be upheld. By the early 1950s, anti-colonial and Black liberation struggles were seeking to remake ‘the colour line’ in ways threatening to white power. Liberal internationalists at the United Nations responded to this changed race context not only by helping to draft the Human Rights Charter of 1948 and the Genocide Convention of the same year, but also by going a step further and asking that an international team of scholars at UNESCO fight the doctrine of the inequality of men and races by disseminating scientific facts disproving ‘racial prejudice’ (Conklin 2013; Gil-Riaño 2018; Maio and Santos 2015; Selcer 2012). UNESCO’s idealistic credo was that war begins in the minds of men; thus science, culture and education all had a role to play in extirpating hatred. Alfred Métraux was hired to orchestrate UNESCO’s effort when it came to using social science to combat racism.

The choice of a ‘Maussian’ for this race job was ironic. Aspiring sociologists and cultural anthropologists who had worked with Mauss in the 1920s and 1930s would not have been exposed to the relatively new field of race relations developing across the Atlantic. Yet given UNESCO’s brief to fight racism around the world, it only made sense that America’s cutting-edge scholarship in the domain would now guide the global campaign. Métraux
clearly understood both what was expected of him and his own deficiencies in the realm – hence his rush to buy certain recent books before he left New York. At the same, however, he would insist that French scholars also be showcased in UNESCO’s anti-racist efforts. Since Anglophone and Francophone social scientists belonged to two very different academic traditions, a brief comparison of these two traditions on matters of race is in order.

There can be little doubt that by 1950 the United States was the international leader in the study of race relations. The term refers to the broad interdisciplinary field of applied social science that took the coexistence of different races as its principal subject of analysis. Recent scholarship has dated the emergence of this field to the early twentieth century. On the one hand, African American social scientists at Historically Black Colleges and Universities pioneered the study of ‘race relations’ in order to fight for their rights, although only now are their analyses being fully recognised. For example, W. E. B. Du Bois published his landmark urban ethnography The Philadelphia Negro in 1899 to support the liberation struggles of African Americans. On the other hand, institutionally powerful white international relations specialists focussed on the race question for exactly the opposite reason. They feared ‘that a race war might lead to the end of the world hegemony of whites, a future that appeared to many to be in the offing’ (Vitalis 2015: 1). British colonial and Commonwealth experts shared the same anxieties, and they too began to study ‘the race problem’ to preserve white global supremacy (Lake and Reynolds 2008; Morey 2021; Vitalis 2015; for Germany, see Zimmerman 2010).

If ‘race’ became an object of study across several social science disciplines in the early twentieth century, how it was studied and who studied it had changed considerably by 1945, at least in the United States. At the risk of simplifying the situation, as late as 1900 it was possible for most scientists globally to accept that there were innate differences amongst the races and that racial antagonism was inevitable. By the early 1940s, race experts had abandoned this belief. Nowhere was this truer than in the United States, where a new generation of racial egalitarians demonstrated that so-called ‘innate differences’ were in fact culturally and socially determined. Yet this long overdue realisation only begged a new question: Since it was now proven that no meaningful differences that correlated to skin colour existed, why were African Americans so despised? In search of answers, an emerging cohort of sociologists and social psychologists turned to studying white prejudice against Blacks and its deleterious effects on African Americans. When war broke out, the need for the United States to show a united front gave these same idealistic experts a chance to make the elimination of race prejudice a matter of urgent national concern. Many social scientists began working towards the dismantling of discriminatory
institutions during the war itself (Jackson 2001: 109–198). With the return of peace, this particularly American strain of activist anti-racist social science landed in Paris with the founding of UNESCO.

Social Science and Race in France

If the social scientific study of prejudice in the United States was a rapidly developing new expertise, what about France, which boasted the second-largest empire in the world after Britain? Although Francophone Black intellectuals and anti-racist activists were certainly part of the Pan-African circuits of knowledge that had first developed in the interwar years – one has only to think of Aimé Césaire and Léopold Sédar Senghor, gifted writers in the French literary tradition – there was little interest amongst social scientists of the same generation in the ‘problem’ of the colour line in the French-speaking world. This said, it is important to underscore that the social sciences in general developed institutionally much later in France than in the United States. In the often told saga of the rise and fall of the first Durkheimians, the latter managed to introduce sociology into the university curriculum only under the banner of philosophy; when the Second World War broke out, Émile Durkheim’s heirs were dispersed and struggling to recruit a new generation of followers, since they could not create jobs for themselves in what remained a marginal field of enquiry (Heilbron 2015; Masson and Schrecker 2016). Only with the creation of the VIe Section of the École Pratique des Hautes Études in 1947, a post-war increase in enrolments across all university disciplines, and the development of a policy of bourses to bring large numbers of African students to France, did the number of both French and Francophone sociologists begin to grow (Marcel 2011; Steinmetz 2017; Tournès 2011).

Institutional inertia compounded another critical difference in France when compared to the Anglophone world on the question of the scientific study of race relations: the weight of the Durkheimian intellectual legacy, which often determined the kinds of subjects that French sociologists like Mauss and his students chose to investigate. Indeed, it is striking that despite the high number of immigrants entering France from surrounding countries and the expansion of the Empire at the end of the nineteenth century, Durkheim paid little explicit attention to issues of ethnic and cultural diversity in modern societies. It used to be argued that this was because Durkheim was writing in and about France, a country that he and his circle saw as having a single nationality, language and culture (Beaud and Noiriel 1990: 45–46; Juteau 2006; Noiriel 2007). This view has been recently re-evaluated in the context of Durkheim’s writings on nationalism (Susan Stedman-Jones’s article in this issue), and warrants
further investigation. However, it is worth noting in this context that no Durkheimian – and very few French scholars – showed up at the First Universal Races Congress, held in London in June 1911, a major international philanthropic initiative designed to promote ‘positive race relations’. The multiracial event attracted 57 reform-minded philosophers, doctors/scientists (MDs and PhDs), missionaries and jurists from most of the world’s major countries and empires, although speakers from the Anglosphere constituted almost half of those present. The racial egalitarians W. E. B. Du Bois and Franz Boas – both mid-career scholars at the time – were amongst the Anglophone social scientists present; in contrast, the 74-year-old philosopher Alfred Fouillée was one of only three speakers from France who attended. He spoke very briefly, giving a talk entitled ‘Race from the Sociological Viewpoint’, concluding that ‘for the sociologist there is but one practical means of bringing races together, and that is to spread scientific, moral, and social instruction as widely as possible’ (1911: 29). Due to the eruption of the First World War, no subsequent Universal Races Congress was ever held.

The Durkheimians’ pattern of relative neglect of the question of race relations was less true for Mauss’s students at the Institute of Ethnology in the 1920s and 1930s. Several innovatively undertook fieldwork in the colonies and recognised the destabilising impact of empire on the societies they were studying (Conklin 2013: 236–281). Mauss, moreover, encouraged all his students to problematise exchanges between groups of different ethnic origins, whether in Algeria (Germain Tillion and Thérèse Rivière), Morocco (Charles LeCoeur), Dahomey (Bernard Maupoil), or further afield in Mexico (Jacques Soustelle) (Mallard 2019: 132–133). But the fact remains that the ‘problem’ of relations between different races or ethnic groups on French territory as a topic of study did not take hold beyond the Institute of Ethnology before the defeat and Occupation, even amongst experts teaching at the École de la France d’Outre Mer. Tragically, many of the Maussians who might have continued to investigate this topic right after the war died in the struggle to liberate their country (Bernard Maupoil and Charles LeCoeur, Mauss’s favourite student); others were diverted at least temporarily to other causes in the late 1940s (Germaine Tillion). To the extent that the race question appeared in the immediate post-war decade in French social science, it was as an ancillary topic amongst demographers (Rosental 2020). This situation would only really change in 1975, when Jacques Soustelle delivered his well-known report on the status of anthropology in France to then President Valéry Giscard d’Estaing. As decolonisation brought new waves of immigrants from the former Empire, this report called on all ethnologists who had studied racial and ethnic relations in the French Union to now study these relations in the metropole (Mallard 2019: 156).
One result of this situation, as Métraux himself later admitted, was that when he was asked at UNESCO to recommend French race experts in the 1950s, only one name came to mind: the sociologist of Afro-Brazilian religions Roger Bastide. Bastide had spent much of his early career at the University of Sao Paulo, where American approaches to race relations research were influential.\(^11\) In contrast, Métraux could name a number of such specialists in Britain and its African colonies. In Britain especially, a circle of researchers and colonial administrators had become increasingly pre-occupied with fighting ‘racial prejudice’ and ‘race discrimination’ as early as the 1930s, and a school of social anthropology devoted to race relations was formed at the University of Edinburgh right after the war.\(^12\) When race riots broke out in 1958 in Nottingham and Notting Hill in response to friction between whites and the growing numbers of peoples of colour – the so-called ‘Windrush generation’ – British social scientists were thus already studying the race question. A private Institute of Race Relations with antecedents stretching back to the early 1950s was also established in 1958 to manage racial tensions associated with decolonisation.

In addition to the factors already noted that helped to make race largely invisible in France as a category of social science right after the war, one final factor deserves consideration: the recent experience of Vichy’s racial laws against Jews during the Occupation. Notions of race had circulated widely in France on both the Left and Right in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to describe certain groups and ostensibly to explain their behaviour. And, needless to say, shifting concepts of race had always been central to governance in the Empire. But because the French Revolution had celebrated the ideal of a civic community open to anyone sharing its political credo, subsequent Republican regimes had always avoided making “race” a legal category for citizenship (Chapman and Frader 2004; Hajjat 2012; Larcher 2014; Saada 2007). Then came the shock of defeat, the collapse of the Third Republic (1870–1940) and Vichy’s complicity in the Holocaust, including the passage of French decrees defining members of the ‘Jewish race’ and stripping them of their rights. Because the Vichy state had broken the long-standing taboo against racial statutes, the constitution of the new Fourth Republic explicitly affirmed a commitment to racial equality even as the regime held on to France’s colonies. One result of this disjuncture was that early post-war governments remained particularly sensitive to accusations of any form of racism and regularly denied its existence at the systemic level either in France or the new French Union (Foster 2019; Marker 2015). For this reason too, social science research on race and ethnic relations was slow to gain traction in France in the 1950s, even as new waves of colonial immigrants began arriving.
Alfred Métraux’s Path to UNESCO

A diffuse institutional, intellectual and political heritage combined with a particular wartime context, then, conspired against making race relations a specific object of empirical study in France. Yet the decision to locate UNESCO in Paris also opened up new possibilities for changing this situation. In the early post-war years of One-World idealism, the United States contributed 40 per cent of UNESCO’s overall budget and was its greatest supporter. Britain was the second most generous donor, followed by France. These three great powers initially dominated this UN intergovernmental agency to which all nations of the world could apply to join. They – and the United States in particular – provided most of the personnel of the Social Sciences Department in the early years, although the goal always was to make the staff of UNESCO as international as possible; and as higher education expanded globally, this goal was increasingly met (Selcer 2018: 27–61). Yet if Anglophone social science was over-represented when Métraux joined the Race Bureau, UNESCO’s location in Paris meant that French scholars had a unique asset of their own: they were close by, and thus easy to contact and to employ. Despite the institutionally weaker position of the study of race and ethnic relations in France, Métraux found Francophone scholars to counterbalance the over-representation of American and British social scientists. One key to understanding who he recruited to his campaign lies in Métraux’s own academic trajectory and the many contacts he accumulated en route.

By the time of his UNESCO appointment, Alfred Métraux had built an international reputation as a specialist of South American Indigenous peoples as well as an expert on Easter Island. He belonged to that first very tightly knit generation of professional ethnologists who trained in interwar Paris under Marcel Mauss and Paul Rivet. With no academic jobs yet available to anthropologists in France, Métraux ended up spending much of the 1930s in Argentina, then as a staff anthropologist at the Bishop Museum in Honolulu – where Australian and New Zealand experts also gathered; he spent the final years before the war in the Departments of Anthropology at Berkeley and Yale, which is when he acquired US citizenship. During the Second World War, he returned to South America for fieldwork, and worked for four years at the Smithsonian Institution. These American years deepened his already extensive connections with anthropologists in the United States, and allowed him to make contacts within the all-important world of American private foundations. At the same time, Métraux joined the community of expatriate French intellectuals who had relocated to New York. Amongst these was Claude Lévi-Strauss, whom Métraux had first met in Brazil and who would remain Métraux’s life-long friend. At the war’s end, Métraux joined the ethnological staff of the US Army and was sent
to Germany in 1945 as part of the bombing survey there. Demobilised, he worked next at the United Nations’ Department of Social Affairs, only to be borrowed by UNESCO to work on their first major fundamental education campaign in Haiti, where he also began a study of voodoo. He was appointed to a permanent position at UNESCO in the spring of 1950 to take charge of the new project on race problems in the Social Sciences Department.

Or was that his mandate? Métraux was not in fact the initial choice of UNESCO, nor was his mandate only to deal with race relations. The creation of a Race Bureau was the brainchild of a seasoned specialist in Brazilian race relations then heading up the brand new Social Sciences Department, the Brazilian anthropologist Arthur Ramos. When Ramos died on 31 October 1949, only three months after arriving in Paris, Métraux was hired to lead the campaign that Ramos had begun to put in place – including the publication of anti-racist booklets. Yet Métraux’s letter of hire also explained that, while ‘race problems would be the primary field to which you would make your contribution’, ‘the UNESCO program is concerning itself more and more with the non-mechanized peoples of the world’. The Social Sciences Department therefore needed a competent anthropologist to ‘give aid in the planning and direction of those areas’. This job description explains why Métraux seemed such an attractive hire to UNESCO. He had an international reputation that spanned South and North America and the Caribbean; he had transnational contacts as a European who had taken US citizenship; he was fluent in many languages; and he had already proven a passionate commitment to applied anthropology through his work on the Haiti project. It apparently was assumed that he could get up to speed on the race question quickly while at the same time continuing to deploy his deep knowledge of ‘non-mechanized peoples’ seeking to modernise. In return, Métraux embraced this dual challenge out of genuine enthusiasm but also because it would allow him to return to Paris. Throughout his American ‘exile’, he had regularly written to Yvonne Oddon about his dream of such a return; for over 20 years he had kept up his friendships with the cohort of Maussian anthropologists at the Musée de l’Homme with whom he had first trained. A social scientific neophyte in the field of race problems but with excellent French connections, Métraux helped to foster a wide variety of conversations about race in the heart of Paris’s Left Bank.

**Becoming a Race Expert**

There was, in fact, nothing automatic in 1950 about the creation of UNESCO’s campaign to remove prejudice from the minds of humankind, especially among European governments whose first priority after the
war was rebuilding materially and restoring democratic norms at home while holding on to their empires, not fighting colonial racism and extirpating anti-Semitism. The principal Nazi atrocity officially condemned in France between 1945 and 1949 was the concentration camp system, not the extermination of European Jewry – even though public discussion of the genocide began immediately, especially among Catholic intellectuals (Azouvi 2012; Kuby 2019; Rothberg 2009). Early post-war French governments did not tolerate open expressions of anti-Semitism, but they stopped short of seeing racism as a serious problem on their own soil, comparable in any way to the situation in Germany, South Africa and the United States (Debono 2016). Italy, too, shared this mindset: in 1954, the Vatican’s observer at UNESCO, Cardinal Giuseppe Sensi, told UNESCO officials seeking his help ‘that Italy was not the country most in need of anti-racist propaganda’. Métraux’s letter of hire cited above suggests, moreover, that even amongst American social scientists, fighting racial prejudice was only one part of the Social Sciences Department’s priorities; in the mid-1950s the Race Bureau was renamed the Human Rights Bureau, and fighting discrimination against women as well as minorities was added to Métraux’s tasks. At that moment, Métraux was convinced that UNESCO’s anti-racist programme, which he always ran more or less single-handedly, was seriously menaced. Fortunately for historians, Métraux was not only a workaholic and a tireless perfectionist, but also an obsessive letter-writer, self-critic and diarist whose written corpus allows unusual insight into the complex world of international anti-racism he was both constructing and navigating.

One of the first tasks that Métraux threw himself into after arriving at UNESCO was the launching of a series of popularising publications, whose goal was to bring to the wider public in plain language the findings of science that could help fight racial prejudice and the teachings of the major religions on the race question. Experts were to write these short and cheaply priced publications (each one was to be no more than 50 pages). They would be published in French and English, although translation into other languages could be commissioned if someone else paid for them. The first series was entitled *The Race Question in Modern Science*; it began in 1951, and its eleventh and final volume was published in 1960. Since American social scientists were the global leaders in the study of race relations, their scholarship dominated this series. The religion series ran between 1953 and 1958 under the somewhat misleading title *The Race Question and Modern Thought*, and included four booklets, one each on Catholicism, Ecumenism, Judaism and Buddhism; a final booklet on Islam was commissioned in this same period, but it only appeared in 1971. French, Swiss, British and Indian experts authored these.

Overseeing these publications, as we shall see below, constituted one kind of initiation for Métraux into the challenges of exporting American
race expertise to the rest of the world. He quickly began to learn what it was that UNESCO – an international body made up of national commissions which soon claimed the right to approve every publication – could and could not say on the matter of race in a context of decolonisation and hardening Cold War divisions. But another kind of initiation also took place as Métraux began to grasp more fully how discrimination worked globally and locally, as visitors to Paris sought out his help in their struggles against racism. Here, the unpublished and unfinished second volume of Métraux’s diary, which picks up in 1954 and is most complete for the year 1955, is illuminating.\(^{16}\) He filled his diary with short, sometimes acerbic, observations about those whom he saw on any given day as head of the Race Bureau. These remarks reveal the difficulty of addressing such a politically sensitive subject as race ‘scientifically’ across national, linguistic and cultural boundaries.

In June 1954, an aging Mrs Spiller, widow of the Hungarian-born British humanist Gustav Spiller who had been one of two organisers of the First Universal Races Congress in London in 1911, came to discuss the difficulties that Black students from Jamaica were experiencing in London; she hoped that they could come with their wives, and complained that the British National Commission was obstructing such projects. Soon after, Métraux noted his admiration for Prime Minister Mendès-France, but lamented the anti-Semitism in some French quarters that imperilled the politician’s future. Rather than Mendès-France being proud of the fact that a Vichy court had found him guilty of desertion, Métraux noted, the great statesman was seeking to annul ‘that awful trial’ so that his children need not be ashamed of him. Still in 1954, and working closely with two London-based representatives of the Cultural Department of the World Jewish Congress, Métraux complained about their repugnance at associating the ‘Jewish question with the Black question’. These were, they explained to him, two completely different domains, and only an accident of recent history had transformed the Jewish problem into a racial one. In 1955, one of these same two representatives, Mrs Klausner, consulted Métraux again. She wanted the British National Commission to introduce a motion demanding an intensification of the fight against anti-Semitism. Métraux advised her to not mention anti-Semitism, but to use the word racism. She replied that she was not sure that the World Jewish Congress would agree.\(^{17}\)

In April 1955, Métraux recounted a racist incident in Montpellier, where numerous students of colour resided. A ‘woman of mixed race [mûlatresse]’ was supposed to have been queen of their ball, but she was excluded because ‘her colour was offensive to French womanhood’. Four months later, he gave a short speech to a group of young Americans from the YMCA and remarked: ‘I spoke to a very friendly Negress [négresse] who is bringing the unhappy German mixed-race children [mûlatres] to the United
States’. That same day, a German schoolteacher visited his office to reassure him that Nazism was truly dead. In August 1955, a group of West African and South East Asian students came to see Métraux; what struck him was the rebellious spirit of the student from the Ivory Coast, who did not believe that researchers were impartial. Several weeks earlier, an ‘elderly and kindly bearded gentleman’ had come to discuss ‘the current state of Africa (Ruanda-Urundi), where racial and social discrimination, contempt for the whites, [and] hatred of the Blacks were the first signs of an imminent revolt’. Métraux also had a long conversation on 7 September 1955 with Mr Austen Albu, a Labour MP for Edmonton in North London, ‘who came to ask me questions’. The ‘Black problem’ was pre-occupying Albu, because it existed in his own district. Meanwhile a ‘crazy American’ had come by, pelting Métraux aggressively with questions about communism at UNESCO and the ‘statue without race’ erected in New York: ‘When I told him not to be ridiculous, he got angry, shoved me, and left brandishing threats’. ‘I experienced then and there’, Métraux added, ‘the painful side of racial discrimination: Blacks have to submit to these outrages without complaining’.

Last but not least, Métraux occasionally relayed conversations between American and French social science colleagues at UNESCO, since work and socialising very much overlapped. At this point, Claude Lévi-Strauss was indirectly attached to the Social Sciences Department, in his capacity as the Secretary of the International Social Science Council that UNESCO had inaugurated in 1953. During a dinner with the formidable Swedish sociologist Alva Myrdal (who ran the Social Sciences Department from 1950 to 1955), Métraux noted that she annoyed Lévi-Strauss to no end ‘by making fun of the French exams her daughter just had to take. Mrs. Myrdal added that field studies of German communities were showing the latter to be more democratic than their French counterparts, a remark that hardly helped the situation’. At Myrdal’s departure a year later, Métraux noted that ‘she did not hide her antipathy for France and did not miss the chance to irritate Lévi-Strauss one final time’ – alas, Métraux does not say how. And during a trip to New York in January 1955, we read the following. Referring to Chuck Wagley, one of the anthropologists at Columbia working on UNESCO’s ongoing field study of race relations in Brazil, Métraux wrote:

I’m pained by his opinion of Lévi-Strauss, whom he considers turgid, unoriginal. It is positively scary to note the abyss that separates scientific circles in America and those in Europe. It is undoubtedly the absence of a culture of philosophy and the purely mechanical concept of phenomena that is at the base of this mutual incomprehension. How to impress upon them the importance of nuances, of the play of intelligence and detached speculation, which in France ally themselves to the sense of reality and intuition?
He concluded with an anecdote about his dinner partner Cecilia Wagley, who ‘must feel isolated and frustrated among the erudite peasants who make up the Department of Anthropology of Columbia’.20

This selective list of Métraux’s visitors and comments is fascinating for what it reveals about those who sought him out – from Francophone African students to African Americans to large Jewish organisations to a fair sprinkling of British persons. In and of themselves, they suggest that the Race Bureau was ‘a success’ – an international space to which victims of discrimination around the world, as well as those who wished to help them, turned in the 1950s. At the same time, Métraux’s remarks about how Chuck Wagley perceived Lévi-Strauss underscores what clearly was seen as a particularly French barrier between Americans and Europeans when it came to forging a universal anti-racism through social science: the suspicion that Americans were ‘conditioned’ to a form of empirical thinking that contrasted with the speculative and philosophical tradition that reigned in France.

Such clichéd complaints from Métraux’s pen were hardly surprising, given his long career in straddling the two academic cultures in question; they echoed, indirectly, an ambient French insecurity in the face of the new ‘special relationship’ between the United States and Britain that was one of the war’s many legacies. But in the particular context of his role at UNESCO as a mediator or passeur between two countries with such different traditions of talking about race, Métraux’s stereotypes might also hide what was, in fact, the beginnings of a productive exchange.

**Identifying Race Experts Internationally**

As it turned out, there was a significant divide not only in how Métraux’s French authors wrote about race compared with his American ones, but also in how they were apparently received. Here, we can turn for help to other evidence beyond Métraux’s diary: the respective sales figures of the English-language and French-language editions of the Race Bureau’s early publications designed to educate the public on the race question, as tallied in 1959. These sales statistics certainly confirmed a segmented market along linguistic lines. But that is not all they demonstrated. Two structural differences between France and the Anglosphere that had little to do with different academic cultures emerge as well: on the one hand, the weakness of sales in the social sciences generally in France in this period, and on the other, the much greater willingness in the United States and Britain to discuss what they termed ‘the race question’. Both may seem obvious, but they are still worth underlining.
Upon his arrival at UNESCO in 1950, Métraux immediately had to find authors for five booklets on different scientific aspects of the race question whose topics had already been decided by Ramos; at the same time, Métraux had to commission more such publications, always from an internationally diverse a pool of authors as possible. Not surprisingly, Métraux’s first instinct was to turn to several North American authors as well as to two of his closest French colleagues: the author-poet cum ethnographer Michel Leiris (1901–1990), and Claude Lévi-Strauss (1908–2009), who was not yet world-famous; his breakout best-seller *Tristes Tropiques* would only be published in 1955. Neither author had much in common with the new generation of American race experts, but Leiris had done fieldwork in West Africa and was firmly anti-colonial. Lévi-Strauss had spent the war years in New York at the École Libre, where several French Jewish intellectuals had found a safe haven. Leiris was the first to complete his contribution to the series *The Race Question in Modern Science*. The booklet *Race and Culture (Race et civilisation)* was published in April 1951 (Leiris 1951). Using data from ‘archaic’ societies, Leiris claimed that so-called ‘racial differences’ were civilisational ones, and he attributed racism to capitalism’s ugly offshoots: slavery and colonialism. Later that year, Métraux wrote that he found the publication ‘remarkable, as much from the point of view of content as style’ and the ‘best’ of the first five to be released.21

Amongst the other experts who produced early race publications in the UNESCO series, three were American and one Mexican; the former represented a cross-section of innovative American social and biological scientists. The young sociologist Arnold Rose (1918–1968), who penned *The Roots of Racial Prejudice* (Rose 1951), had worked with Gunnar Myrdal on his 1944 landmark study of race relations, *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Democracy*. Rose demonstrated how prejudice served the material interests of the group that held them. L. C. Dunn (1893–1974) was a leader in the field of population genetics that had discredited nineteenth-century biological notions of race; Métraux wrote that his booklet *Race and Biology* (Dunn 1951) was the most important publication on which the others would be implicitly or explicitly based.22 Then there was Canadian-born Otto Klineberg (1899–1992) from Columbia University, author of *Race and Psychology* (Klineberg 1951) and who, like Rose, was part of the new generation of experts specialising in prejudice; Klineberg’s path-breaking interwar work in testing mental abilities had shown that intelligence was socially, not racially, determined. In contrast to these North American trend-setters, Métraux tapped the physical anthropologist Juan Comas (1900–1979), a Spaniard who had fled the Spanish Civil War for Mexico in the 1930s, to write a volume entitled *Racial Myths*. Comas represented an older tradition of racial science, in that he considered ‘race’ as a biologically valid object of study; but he also saw race as malleable and
had spent his life contesting prejudice. Métraux asked him to deconstruct ‘Nordic theories, the conception of Jews as a race, and other fantasies that stoke ideological prejudices and racial discrimination’. While regretting that Comas had not written more on Arthur de Gobineau, Métraux reported in 1952 that *Racial Myths* (Comas 1951) was extremely popular in Latin America and had been banned in Franco’s Spain. As Métraux surveyed the results of his first year’s work pulling this team of five authors together, he joked to Klineberg: ‘I have more Anglo-Saxons than Latins, but I could not possibly cut one man in two’. Indeed, he did not have to. By 1952, Lévi-Strauss had agreed to write a booklet that he proposed to call *Contribution of Races to Universal Civilisation* – a title ultimately rejected by UNESCO in favour of *Race and History* (Lévi-Strauss 1952). This volume broke decisively with evolutionary thinking by arguing that cultural progress in history was arbitrary rather than biologically determined, and depended on the diversity and number of cultures in contact at a given point in time. Like Leiris, Lévi-Strauss attacked the very notion of Western civilisation, and the work can be seen as an early engagement with whiteness as a racial ideology. When the volume appeared in 1953, Métraux wrote to his director of publications that the ‘release of this new title constitutes an important event, not merely from the point of view of the prestige of our collection *The Racial Question*, but also because of the interest that the name Lévi-Strauss cannot help but elicit. So I want your services to make a special effort to advertise this event’. Taken together, these six UNESCO publications from 1951 to 1952 on the question of race and modern science suggest that when Métraux thought of race experts in France, he turned to colleagues who like himself worked in cultural anthropology, but who were also aspiring or entrenched public intellectuals on the Paris literary scene.

After the ‘special effort’ accorded to the launch of Claude Lévi-Strauss’ booklet, the only other publication about which Métraux made a fuss was the inaugural one released in 1953 for a second series dedicated to what the major religions had to say about race. One of the most important twentieth-century theologians of the Catholic Church and ecumenism, the French Dominican and former resister R. P. Yves Congar – very much a public figure at the time – launched the series with his *The Catholic Church and the Race Question* (Congar 1953). Métraux had high hopes for its sale, too, in France and America. A special attempt to advertise it was accordingly prepared in both places. In his booklet, Congar denied any existence of racism in the Bible and insisted that Pope Pius XI (1922–1939) had been a shining example of the Church’s irreducible opposition to Nazi racism, proving that modern racism had its roots in colonialism. A representative of the American Jewish Congress in Paris protested against Congar’s statement ‘that Jewry is characterized by a certain particularism’ and that
‘a restless and enterprising attitude is characteristic of the Jews’. What would happen, the letter concluded, if a liberal society decided to impose a *numerus clausus* on Catholics because of their ‘restlessness’?  

**Atlantic Crossings?**

Despite Métraux’s enthusiasm for certain of his publications, when the sales figures were tabulated in 1959 for both of UNESCO’s race series, they revealed some disappointments. Amongst the best-selling titles in both English and French (see Table 1), those which Éric de Dampierre (Métraux’s interim replacement in 1959) referred to as addressing the ‘psychology’ of race led the pack:

| UNesco race publications                        | English | French |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------|--------|
| Otto Klineberg, *Race and Psychology*        | 28,000  | 4,100  |
| Arnold Rose, *Roots of Prejudice*             | 24,000  | 4,400  |
| Juan Comas, *Racial Myths*                    | 20,000  | 5,000  |
| Michel Leiris, *Race and Culture*             | 18,500  | 4,300  |
| Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Race and History*       | 13,000  | 3,700  |
| Yves Congar, *Catholic Church and the Race Question* | 7,000  | 2,000  |

*Figures rounded up

In English, 28,000 copies of Otto Klineberg’s *Race and Psychology* and 24,000 of Arnold Rose’s *The Roots of Racial Prejudice* had sold. They were followed by the duo Comas’s *Racial Myths* and Dunn’s *Race and Biology*, which had each sold around 20,000 copies. In each case, the next most popular volumes were those by Leiris and Lévi-Strauss, with Leiris edging out his compatriot: 18,500 copies of Leiris’s *Race and Culture* sold in English, and 4,300 in French; 13,000 copies of Levi-Strauss’s *Race and History* sold in English and 3,700 in French – the same number as *Race and Biology*.

One way to look at these figures is to conclude that overall the ratio of books in French that sold compared to their English counterparts was roughly one to five. This was at any rate how Dampierre read them. He added, moreover, that this ratio reflected ‘an extreme disparity compared to the usual proportions [for UNESCO publications]’, suggesting right there
a relative resistance overall to reading much about race amongst educated French speakers – the target audience. But we can break these figures down even further. Overall, the ‘best-sellers in English’ were those that reflected the newest American social science devoted to understanding racial prejudice: *Race and Psychology* and *Roots of Prejudice*. But these same books had no such commanding lead in the French-language market. For Francophone readers who chose to read something on race published by UNESCO, the books on race, culture and history were almost as popular.

If Dampierre was dismayed by the unfavourable ratio of sales, he also registered a second disappointment. With regard to the first series, the total of some 215,000 booklets sold overall was ‘respectable’. By comparison, the sales for the second series on ‘modern thought’ launched in 1953 were ‘very disappointing, especially with respect to the French language market’. The fate of Congar’s *The Catholic Church and the Race Question*, for which there had been such high hopes, was positively inexplicable: instead of the anticipated 15,000 to 20,000 volumes sold, the total was closer to 2000 in French (7,000 in English). In his round-up report on these sales figures, Dampierre, however, was most concerned about the atypical ratio of one to five French to English that characterised the whole enterprise. Like Métraux, he too reflected on the differences in sensibilities of ‘Anglo-Saxons’ and ‘Latins’, but where Métraux had blamed a division between philosophical and empiricist traditions, Dampierre pointed to something else: French publishers and distributors had absolutely failed ‘in their efforts to create a “social sciences” readership, assuming that they even wanted such a readership’. Dampierre knew of what he spoke. As a former editor at the leading French publisher Plon, he had created in 1952 a first-ever series called *Recherches en sciences humaines*. This is a very telling commentary about the relative contempt in which all the social sciences in France were held in this period, compared to the ‘queen sciences’ of philosophy and literature more generally.

The archives contain one other indicator of how Métraux’s French-authored booklets were doing compared to their Anglophone competitors. A 20-page assessment was completed in 1954 by an American team of social psychologists on the effectiveness of the first five booklets in ‘adding to knowledge and reducing prejudiced attitudes of American students’. It noted that first- and second-year university students could understand the material presented in the three brochures authored by Anglophones. Leiris’s pamphlet *Race and Culture*, in contrast, was deemed accessible only to a university graduate, hence to five per cent of the US adult population. It also concluded that these students felt that they came to university already well versed in the idea that ‘racial differences’ were due to socio-economic factors and not heredity. By comparison, these same students admitted ‘to considerable ignorance about the roots and uses of prejudice’. To quote
the report’s summary: ‘Thanks to the highly effective (prewar) work of Klineberg and others . . . the average college student is by now aware that differences in IQ between Negroes and whites is not likely to represent differences in native intelligence but can be attributed to educational and social handicaps’. The reviewer went on to recommend that heavier stress be placed on the economic, social, psychological and educational causes of prejudice and discrimination ‘as well as ways in which prejudice harms the majority as well as the minority’. 33 He ended with some pertinent observations about the differences between American and European societies. In Europe, with their much smaller racial minorities, ‘there is reason to believe that Europeans know less about the information in the pamphlets’. And ‘while the dissemination of information concerning racial differences in Europe would be less important from an internal domestic point of view, it would be valuable as a factor influencing public opinion in regard to international relations’. 34

This statement brings us finally to the title of this article: ‘Nothing is less universal . . . than the idea of race’ (Viet 1958: 7). These words actually came from the pen of another French anthropologist, Jean Viet, who in 1958 took on the task of compiling for UNESCO perhaps the first international ‘trend report’ of studies of race and race relations as part of the anti-racist campaign. It was inspired by the Inventory of Research in Racial and Cultural Relations, which the University of Chicago had stopped publishing in 1952, and which had exclusively listed studies of race relations in the United States. The book was entitled Selected Documentation for the Study of Race Relations, and its introduction was in fact a plea for how difficult it had been to gather a representative sampling internationally of relevant books, articles, journals, and institutions working on the general problem of inter-racial relations. A major challenge was the lack of sufficiently precise definitions for both the notion of ‘race’ and the expression ‘race relations’. Another was the imagined quality of ‘race’ – that is to say, its symbolic power to mobilise hatred regardless of whether ‘races’ really existed. Despite universal use of the idea of race, Viet noted, we should properly speak of ideas of race in the plural. Political propaganda tarred a variety of incidents as racist, without recognising that German racists, South African racists and American racists each mobilised a different idea of race. Perhaps someday, Viet concluded, the comparative study of race relations would be sufficiently advanced to determine the universal characteristics of all forms of racial prejudice (1958: 5–9).

Meanwhile, the sections on Africa and Europe in the bibliography revealed the following. In Africa, only South Africa had institutions to study race relations, although one other regional centre looked promising: the Rhodes Livingston Institute in ‘Northern Rhodesia’. As for continental Europe, unlike in the United States, there were no ‘centres specialized in
the matter of race relations’ (Viet 1958). This said, a few French organisations were listed because they occasionally took up the race question as part of different investigations. For example, Alfred Sauvy’s demographic institute INED appeared on the list because of its 1952 ‘inquiries into the sociological aspect of the assimilation of foreigners in France’ (Viet 1958: 52, 74–81). Yet in contrast to Britain, where eight major universities were listed for their ongoing work in race relations, no French university was named.

Conclusion

In December 1962, Alfred Métraux reached the official retirement age at UNESCO. His application to stay on was turned down, and a few months after leaving the Race Bureau that he had largely created Métraux took his own life. During his 12 years at UNESCO in charge of the anti-racist campaign, he had often despaired of accomplishing anything, as budgets were whittled away, member states complained about his ‘biased’ race publications, and the presence of the United States meant that its racism (unlike that of South Africa after 1955 when it withdrew from UNESCO) could never be directly attacked.

And yet the UNESCO archives are full of tantalising traces that suggest that Métraux’s work did not sputter out even in France. Certainly, in Paris, the progressive anti-racism of American social scientists such as Arnold Rose and Otto Klineberg met with a muted response initially, for all the reasons outlined in this article. Most European intellectuals at mid-century continued to draw on restrictive national, ethnic, religious and cultural understandings of identity in which concerns over racism had little resonance, and France was no different. Racism, moreover, was perceived as a profoundly American problem, since the whole world knew how badly the United States treated its ‘Negro’ minority. This was a point that Soviet propaganda and all political shades of the French press during the Cold War never tired of making. Even French men and women who sought a new attitude toward Jews in the wake of genocide exhibited troubling limits to how much difference they were willing to accept in their own country. After his initial engagement with UNESCO’s anti-racist campaign, Claude Lévi-Strauss did not develop any further professional expertise in the ‘race question’. Michel Leiris (1955) undertook only one more study, in 1952, for UNESCO on ‘civilisation contacts’ in Martinique and Guadeloupe.

But it would be a mistake not to look further down the road and in other directions. Métraux would turn repeatedly to France’s ‘lone’ race expert, Roger Bastide, at specific points in his anti-racist campaign; indeed, he commissioned him to do a pioneering study on African students in
Paris in the mid-1950s. Like Lévi-Strauss, Bastide began his career in the social sciences at the University of Sao Paulo; in 1952, he started splitting his time between teaching in Brazil and France, and in 1954, he moved back permanently to Paris. Bastide would start to see and analyse ‘inter-ethnic’ relations in France as African students began attending his seminars, adapting the racial knowledge he had acquired in the Americas to the metropole (Bastide 2000). Meanwhile, Otto Klineberg would leave Columbia University to begin teaching social psychology in Paris in 1960. In 1965–1966, race relations finally became a recognised subject of scientific research in France, when both a Centre International d’Études des Relations entre Groupes Ethniques attached to the VIe Section of the École Pratique des Hautes Études and a Centre d’Études des Relations Inter-Ethniques was formed at the Université de Nice. Bastide and Klineberg were closely associated with the first and active in the second. Both scholars were part of the trans-Atlantic network focussed on race, racism and anti-racism that Métraux had been hired to foster in UNESCO’s Social Sciences Department. The same network brought the prominent Black sociologist E. Franklin Frazier to the Left Bank as well in the early 1950s, a trajectory that in turn led him to Africa and to publish his Black Bourgeoisie in French before it appeared in English. In sum, America’s critically engaged sociology of race relations may not have gained much institutional traction in an officially colour-blind French Republic in the post-war decade. But thanks in part to UNESCO’s anti-racist internationalism, Paris now hosted a global conversation among social scientists on the ‘race question’ that would later bear fruit in France itself.
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Notes

1. Beinecke Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Yale University, Gen Mss 350, Alfred Métraux to Yvonne Oddon, 9 March 1950.
2. For a different aspect of the circulation of ideas of race between France and Brazil in this same period, see Merkel (2020).
3. This phrase comes from the preamble of the Constitution of UNESCO, adopted in London on 16 November, 1945: ‘That since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed’.
4. Like all interwar French ethnologists doing fieldwork under Mauss in France’s African empire in the 1930s, Leiris complained about the racism of many colonial administrators; but he did not study race relations. Lévi-Strauss famously spent the Second World War in intellectual exile in New York, where he met race scholars such as Otto Klineberg and spent time in Harlem clubs. Yet as Vincent Debaene has noted, already during his Brazil years Lévi-Strauss seemed to view ‘racial discrimination as vestigial, rather than a political or social question’ (Lévi-Strauss 2019: 14, n.3).
5. The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide was unanimously adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 9 December 1948, and entered into force on 12 January 1951. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted the next day, 10 December 1948.
6. On Du Bois’s pioneering race sociology, see Morris (2015) and Saint-Arnaud (2009).
7. On the precocious growth of the social sciences in the United States generally, see Ross (1991) and Jewett (2012). By way of comparison, in interwar Britain the social sciences were much weaker than in the United States but more institutionally secure than in France, thanks to the creation of the London School of Economics and Political Science in 1919; see Panayotova (2019).
8. France was better represented in the sphere of international law, where two of the five papers were delivered by French experts. The ageing anti-racist reformer and Dreyfusard Jean Finot (1858–1922) was the honorary secretary representing France, although he did not deliver a paper.
9. An exception who proved the rule was the eclectic René Maunier, a professor at the Faculté de Droit in Paris and peripheral Maussian. In 1932, he published the first of a three-volume series on colonial sociology (Maunier 1932). Maunier did not analyse discrimination, and his references were overwhelmingly to British colonial scholarship (see Maunier 1932; Callède 2011; Dimier 2004).
10. Andrée Michel (1920–) was a pioneer with her 1956 study, *Les travailleurs algériens en France* (Michel 1956). She cited a mostly Anglophone bibliography in her 1962 article on race relations in France (Michel 1962).
11. UNESCO archives (UNESCO hereafter), 323.12 342.7, Part I, Alfred Métraux to Pierre A. Visseur, 20 October 1958. Bastide was teaching in Brazil in 1950 when Métraux joined UNESCO. Métraux soon invited him to join another one of UNESCO’s early anti-racist initiatives, also inherited from Arthur Ramos: a series of studies in Brazil designed, or so it was hoped, to explain the secret of that nation’s apparent racial harmony.
12. See Tilley (2014). The Royal Empire Society also commissioned studies on discrimination in the 1950s. Early British race scholars included sociologists Kenneth Little, Anthony H. Richmond, Michael Banton and Chatham House Director (1952–1958) Philip Mason. All of these experts became part of Métraux’s early anti-racist network.

13. Maurel (2010) sees an ongoing hostility between ‘Anglo-Saxon’ and ‘Latin’ camps more generally at UNESCO.

14. UNESCO, Personnel file Alfred Métraux, Walter H. C. Laves to Alfred Métraux, 7 February 1950.

15. UNESCO, 3 A 31, Guy de Lacharrière to Émile Delavenay, SS/Memo/5053, 12 February 1954.

16. Métraux’s much better-known first volume (Métraux 1978) is also rich on this score. I am citing from his second volume to illustrate his thoughts several years into the job.

17. Métraux [n.d.]. 8 June 1954, 17 June 1954, 4 November 1954, 6 September 1955.

18. Ibid, 9 April 1955 and 19 Aug. 1955. On African-American efforts to adopt German children fathered by African-American occupation soldiers, see de Faria (2003).

19. Métraux [n.d.]: 10 June 1955, 30 August 1955, 7 September 1955, 14 September 1955.

20. Métraux [n.d.]: 24 September 1954, 27 October 1955, March 25, 1955.

21. UNESCO, 3 A 31, Race Pamphlets, Part I, Alfred Métraux to Jean Chevalier SS/Memo/51/241, 11 April 1951; 323.12 A 102, Statement on Race, Part II, Alfred Métraux to Dr. Enstcher SS/249.045, 16 August 1951.

22. UNESCO, 3 A 31, Race and Biology, Alfred Métraux to L. C. Dunn SS/166.713, 22 May 1950.

23. UNESCO, 3 A 31, Racial Myths, Alfred Métraux to Juan Comas SS/166.718, 24 May 1950; SS/195.940, 30 October 1950; and SS/341.006, 3 November 1952.

24. UNESCO, 323.12 A102, Part I, Alfred Métraux to Otto Klineberg SS/169.267, 14 June 1950.

25. Race and History would go on to become a classic; it was reissued by Gallimard in its Folio collection in 1987 and 2007. See Loyer (2015: 399 and 819 n. 77) and Stoczkowski (2008: 23–42, 185–212 and 243–285).

26. 3 A 31, Race and History, Alfred Métraux to D. H. Schneider, Dir. du Dept. de l’Information SS/Memo/52/1913 [May 1952].

27. Jean-Paul Sartre volunteered in 1952 to do a pamphlet, tentatively entitled Race et Economie, which never materialised.

28. UNESCO, 3A 31, Race Pamphlets Part I, Alfred Métraux to R. P. Yves Congar, SS/347.876le, 5 December 1952, SS/408.966, 21 September 1953, and SS/408.986, 22 September 1953.

29. UNESCO, 3A 31, Race Pamphlets Part I, 3 pg. typescript [n.a. n.d.] from the American Jewish Committee, 30 rue de la Boétie, Paris 8e.

30. UNESCO, 3 A 31, Race Question in Modern Science – UNESCO/SS Publications, ‘La question raciale devant la science moderne. Situation au 9 Octobre 1959’. This document also includes the figures for the number of free copies of each booklet that were distributed (which were much lower).
Nothing Is Less Universal than the Idea of Race

31. UNESCO, 3 A 31, Race Question in Modern Science – UNESCO/SS Publications, ‘La question raciale et la pensée moderne. Situation au 22 Octobre 1959’.
32. UNESCO, 3 A 31, Race Question in Modern Science – UNESCO/SS Publications, E. de Dampierre to T. H. Marshall, 30 October 1959.
33. UNESCO, 3 A 31, Race Question in Modern Science – UNESCO/SS Publications, ‘The Effectiveness of the UNESCO Pamphlet Series on Race,’ 11 January 1954 by Gerhard Saenger, 1–20.
34. Ibid, 20.
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