Introduction

In 1949 the general conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization formally announced its plans to study, collect and disseminate scientific materials about race. The official statement issued on 18 July 1950 defined race as a social construction rather than a biological phenomenon, reflecting the findings of scholars such as Julian Huxley, the first Director-General of UNESCO (1946–1948). He had suggested that the term race should be replaced by ethnic group in 1935, when he sought to reject Nazi and Fascist theories that assumed the permanent superiority of some races and permanent inferiority of others. However, by 1950, Huxley was concerned that UNESCO’s statement treated race entirely as a social problem, relying on ‘Soviet egalitarian readings of science’ and ‘pseudo-scientific racial naïveté’ rather than an expert committee that included biologists. He spoke of African cultural underdevelopment and claimed that he wanted to help Africans ‘grow up’ rather than indulge their ids and massage their egos. Moreover, he accepted the role of President of the Eugenics Society in 1959 when it clearly emphasized the importance of biological and social factors in the mental attributes of racial groups.
This paper draws on the archives of Cyril Bibby, a biographer of Julian Huxley’s
grandfather, T. H. Huxley, and Principal of Kingston upon Hull College of Education (1959–
1977), who was commissioned by UNESCO to produce a handbook to help teachers discuss
race and prejudice in British secondary schools in 1953. It also engages with the work of
Michael Banton, Emeritus Professor of Sociology at the University of Bristol and member of
who attended the UNESCO conference on teaching race questions in elementary and
secondary schools convened to help Bibby revise his handbook on Race, Education and
Prejudice in 1955. I argue that Bibby and Banton shared Julian Huxley’s commitment to the
idea of a liberal burden, i.e., helping ‘dark strangers’ from the colonies gain recognition as
responsible individuals in a British environment dominated by cultural conservatism, class
hierarchy and empirical science. Although their progressive approach to the teaching of race
confronted conservative opinion in the 1950s, it was later defined in opposition to radical
anti-racist positions in the late 1960s that were thought to produce emotional and superficial
work. Consequently, this article builds on the recent work of Chris Waters and documents
some of the continuities between the liberal discourse of race relations in the 1950s and
1960s and Powellite ethnic nationalism after 1968.4 Waters traces the roots of a liberal race
relations school to the pioneering work of Kenneth Little, Banton’s doctoral supervisor, in
Negroes in Britain (1947),5 and records some of the liberal scholars who contributed to
influential journals such as Race in the hopes of minimizing interracial conflict. This paper
adds that the books and articles produced by Bibby and Banton did not seriously engage with
Africana existentialists who critiqued liberalism in the 1950s and 1960s. Rather, they tended
to ignore the work of Black activist-intellectuals, such as Aimé Césaire and Frantz Fanon, or
depict it as a maelstrom of violent soundbites that threatened British tolerance.
Cyril Bibby’s Odyssey from the Eugenics Review to the UNESCO Courier

After graduating from Queens’ College, Cambridge, in 1935, Bibby contributed to the *Eugenics Review* (between 1938 and 1946) and was a member of executive committee of the Eugenics society (from 1947 to 1959). His early writings under the pseudonym ‘Red squirrel’ for *New Pioneer*, a periodical of the Woodcraft Folk, a scouting organization with a pacifist, anti-fascist and cooperative orientation, reflected many British eugenicists who thought that there were ‘six main races . . . Australian, Negro, Mongolian, Nordic, Alpine, Mediterranean’. He would only stop referring to ‘Nordic’ and ‘Alpine’ races in the 1950s, when he engaged with UNESCO-approved scholars such as Michael Leiris, the head of the French centre for scientific research, who thought it was ‘absurd to talk about an English “race” or even to regard the English as being of the “Nordic” race’.

One finds glimpses of Bibby’s commitment to debunking racial myths in the column he wrote for *Better Health* magazine in the 1940s. For example, his Teacher’s Page in July 1945 offered the following lesson notes for 11–13-year-olds about heredity.

> Children will often ask questions such as ‘should cousins marry?’ ‘What happens if a black man marries a white woman?’ and so on. Teachers should, therefore, prepare themselves well in advance for such questions, taking care to separate scientific fact from mere prejudice. It is also a useful opportunity to get rid of a good deal of common misunderstanding about ‘races’.

Nonetheless, it was Bibby’s ability to cast himself as a progressive sex educator—a scientific expert who could dispel the myths of misguided students, conservative clerics and right-wing ‘obscurantists’—that caught the attention of UNESCO representatives when they sought to circulate their 1950 statement on race to a wider public. Although UNESCO had published a variety of pamphlets on race by leading social scientists and social anthropologists in 1951 and 1952, there remained a desire to offer schoolteachers a simple synthesis and specific instructions as to the teaching of race. Thus, on 30 September 1953 Alfred Metraux, an ethnologist who served as an international civil servant with UNESCO’s
Department of Social Science, sent Bibby a letter praising his clarity and skill in broaching sensitive matters of sex education and enclosed a brochure on *Race and Psychology* (1951) by Otto Klineberg, a Professor at Columbia University.\(^\text{11}\) Metraux’s hope was that Bibby could effectively synthesize progressive scientific opinion about race in a similar fashion to the way in which he developed popular scientific pamphlets about sexual health. Given the later attempts of the US State department to censor Bibby’s text, it is worth quoting his response.

> Although I shall try to be really diplomatic, I do not see how an honest treatment can possibly avoid giving offence to some circles in the USA, South Africa, etc. I take the main problems to be negro-white, especially in USA and Africa; coloured-white in places such as the seaports in countries which, like England, do not otherwise have a major race problem.\(^\text{12}\)

Metraux’s reply confirmed Bibby’s suspicions about the importance of black–white race relations and stressed the need for the pamphlet to serve as an effective pedagogical tool in the battle against antisemitism. It also re-emphasized the importance of Klineberg, ‘the outstanding specialist in the field of race.’\(^\text{13}\) Carefully following Metraux’s directives, Bibby consulted the works of Klineberg, Leiris and other social anthropologists employed by UNESCO before completing a draft of *Education in Racial and Intergroup Relations: A Handbook of Suggestions for Teachers*. This draft was subsequently revised in order to take into account the papers presented at a UNESCO conference on teaching race questions in elementary and secondary schools in September 1955, and Bibby was pleased to receive a letter from Metraux in March 1956 confirming that UNESCO would be printing his text as soon as possible. However, the US State Department delayed UNESCO’s publication of the book,\(^\text{14}\) leaving Bibby to reflect on his decision to praise Communists such as Paul Robeson as ‘distinguished negroes’.

Despite the concerns of the US State Department, Bibby had not developed a radical text that railed against powerful white elites. The parts of Bibby’s text that appeared in the *UNESCO Courier* in February 1956 reveal a moderate Anglocentric position that was clearly
distinct from radical discussions of the lived experience of blackness in the 1950s and 1960s developed by activist-intellectuals such as Frantz Fanon.\textsuperscript{15} For example, it did not maintain, as Fanon did in \textit{Black Skin, White Masks}, and Anthony Richmond noted in a paper presented to the UNESCO conference Bibby attended in Paris in 1955, that negative stereotypes and derogatory racial epithets used in children’s textbooks, schoolyard songs or popular films were linked to the dehumanization of Blackness.\textsuperscript{16} Nor did it argue, as Césaire had done in \textit{Discourse on Colonialism}, and Fanon would soon do in \textit{The Wretched of the Earth}, that the United States was a ‘monster, in which the taints, the sickness and the inhumanity of Europe had grown to appalling lengths’.\textsuperscript{17} In fact, Bibby claimed that ‘nigger’ was often used in a ‘warm, friendly way’ by English children and refused to make a sharp distinction between the prejudice of minorities and the racism of powerful structures in the Western world. He even equated the prejudice of black men who referred to ‘white trash’ with white men who used terms such as ‘nigger’. In other words, he did not emphasize any distinction between racial prejudice and racial discrimination.

Bibby would often propagate his liberal opposition to ‘one-sided’ discussions of prejudice when he was enlisted as an expert on racial matters by newspapers, political groups and teachers. \textit{The Jewish Chronicle}, for example, twice repeated Bibby’s assertion that it was ‘just as hurtful for a Christian to be called “Goy” as it is for a Jewish child to be called “Yid”’ in the spring of 1956.\textsuperscript{18} After riots in Nottingham and Notting Hill in 1958, Bibby campaigned to become the Labour Party’s parliamentary candidate for Barnet and continued to tell journalists about the need for majority and minority communities to respect the golden rule. Such forays into the British public sphere were not greatly diminished by his decision to abort his parliamentary campaign and take up the post of Principal of Kingston upon Hull College of Education. After Bibby had given evidence to a working group in the House of Commons on the diminution of prejudice on 10 December 1958, and successfully won a long
battle against the US State Department’s attempts to censor the text, Arthur Blenkinsop, the Member of Parliament for Newcastle-upon-Type East, asked the Minister of Education to bring *Race, Prejudice and Education* to the attention of all schools in the United Kingdom.19 With its publication by Heinemann in the UK (1959), and Praeger in the US (1960), Bibby was confident that he had become a role model to the liberal teachers he caricatured as too shy and retiring to speak out in the café, politics and government in ‘friendly argument’.20 His hopes for ‘honest’ teachers who served their country as rational-critical members of a public sphere, and refused to limit their outbursts to ivory towers or cosy middle-class staff rooms, may be laudable. However, it also suggests possible tensions between Bibby’s investment in ‘scientific facts’ and his role as an expert on British race relations. For, while Bibby argued that race cannot be reduced to skin tone alone, he sought to challenge the power of racism by replacing the term ‘white race’ with ‘pink peoples’.

Bibby wanted teachers to develop an ‘honest recognition of biological variation’ and acknowledge that the native African and native European, the native of China and the aboriginal native of Australia ‘may not too inaccurately be called “races”’.21 But he rejected simplistic models of white, black and yellow races in favour of a holistic view that included ‘hairiness of body’ and blood group distribution. In Bibby’s own words,

> **Caucasoids range from pale pink to deep ruddy hue, from a pale olive colour to a definite brown. The point is worth emphasising, because when a child realizes that a dark-skinned Indian belongs to the same main ethnic group as a pale European, and not to the same group as a dark African, he may begin to see that the colour-bar is as illogical as it is immoral.**22

However, Bibby’s emphasis on multicoloured races would come into conflict with his liberal desire to end overt discrimination when he advised teachers to replace the term ‘white race’ with ‘the rather more accurate epithet “pink” in classroom discussions of ethnic differences’.23 This emphasis on ‘pink peoples’ would become a regular feature of Bibby’s lectures and a popular ‘hook’ for journalists hoping to explain Britain’s decline to readers who had grown up with globes that showed the pink marks of the British empire laying claim
to one quarter of the world’s land mass. After Bibby spoke at a conference for ‘Tomorrow’s Citizens’ (held between 29 December 1959 and 1 January 1960), The Daily Worker reported his warning that ‘the pink-skinned groups are becoming fewer as the decades go by and must find favour with dark-skinned races who are obtaining mastery over their own lands’. At a summer conference for the world veterans’ organization held at Godesburg between 19 and 25 June 1960 to discuss the responsibility of the war generation to protect human rights, Bibby continued to promote a pink label for peace.

I find that the thrill of horror that goes through people at the thought of mixing white and black, with the word ‘white’ having all the ideas of virgin and pure etc, disappears when people think of a possible mixture between ‘pink’ and ‘black’ and ‘pink’ and ‘brown’ and ‘pink’ and ‘yellow’. I have for some years used the more accurate term ‘pink’ as it is more correct and nearer the actual colour than ‘white’.

Aside from returning to the earlier comments he had made as ‘Red Squirrel’ in 1938, Bibby’s speech in Godesburg evokes his earlier descriptions of ‘mixed race’ children in Race, Prejudice and Education.

There is no reason to expect the offspring of mixed marriages to be in any biological way inferior to those of ethnically similar parents. In other places, local conditions may make it desirable for the teacher to point out that, quite apart from the biological results of miscegenation, there may be social and cultural handicaps making it difficult for the children so born to get a fair start in life. In yet other places, where there is not merely prejudice against mixed marriages but actual legal prohibition of them, the task of the teacher who wishes to deal with the facts honestly may be difficult in the extreme.

Thus, whether it was discussed in terms of black and white groups, or brown and pink entities, Bibby’s discourse often reproduced notions of essential cultural difference based on skin colour. Furthermore, Bibby critiqued ‘unfair’ states by echoing liberals in Britain who felt the need to prefix any discussion of racism in the United Kingdom with the proviso that they did not have the same levels of racism as ‘pink-led’ governments in the southern states of America or South Africa.

With that said, conservative columnists in the United Kingdom were concerned about the implications of Bibby’s work. After Bibby delicately questioned the omission of positive
African American role models in depictions of American society that give ‘the impression (perhaps quite unintentionally) that they are less American than the majority group’.\textsuperscript{27} Peregrine Worsthorne reviewed \textit{Race, Prejudice and Education} in the \textit{Daily Telegraph} and argued that British teachers did not need to challenge pseudo-scientific nonsense about the different brain sizes of black and white.\textsuperscript{28} Instead, they needed to confront ‘traditionalists’ who found non-whites disturbing because they did not fit easily into established notions of the British class system. Ultimately, Worsthorne warned his readers that ‘this is not a problem which can be solved by moral exhortation. It is one out of which Britain will have to grow’.\textsuperscript{29}

Whereas conservatives used derogatory terms to imply that do-gooders only wanted to impose guilt on the white inhabitants of the United Kingdom, Bibby and other liberal crusaders believed that change could occur through the spread of facts and an explicit ‘philosophy of tolerance’ that would prevent interracial conflict. Hence Penelope Leach talked about teaching tolerance in the \textit{International Review of Education} and praised Bibby’s handbook as one that ‘covers the whole field of facts about race, the ethics of teaching about it, and the ways in which it can be taught’.\textsuperscript{30} Moreover, Sheila Glass’s \textit{Newcomers: The West Indians in Britain} provided a clarion call for Parliament to give tolerance a push by invoking the Notting Hill riots and repeating Bibby’s rhetorical questions to the \textit{Times Educational Supplement} on 15 January 1960.

Is the question of race relations at present sufficiently pressing to demand some central initiative, or is it one of those many things which can safely be left to the slow process of pedagogic infiltration? Have there got to be blatant acts of racial discrimination in our schools before the Ministry of Education gets around to doing something in the way of issuing advice?\textsuperscript{31}
Post-1960: Michael Banton and the Turning Point in Race Relations

It bears repetition that many social scientists in the 1950s called for government policies that could help a growing Black presence in Britain avoid the racial discrimination faced by Blacks in South Africa and the United States. After completing his PhD at the University of Edinburgh, Michael Banton was an increasingly important voice in this campaign and wrote in periodicals such as *The Listener*, a weekly magazine published by the BBC.\(^{32}\) In these forays into the public sphere he followed other researchers, such as Anthony Richmond and Sheila Patterson, who shared his concerns about Black immigrants that did not meet British cultural standards of ‘respectability’. Thus, after repeatedly reminding the reader that the likes of Richmond and Patterson were ‘sympathetic’ to Black immigrants,\(^{33}\) Gavin Schaffer’s recent monograph on *Racial Science and British Society, 1930–62* claims that ‘if even liberal academic and generally pro-immigrant theorists like Richmond and Patterson did not always challenge the idea of black racial super-sexuality in this period, it is perhaps unsurprising that these beliefs were common currency amongst the general public and policy makers’.\(^{34}\) This section critiques some of Banton’s articles on the teaching of race after 1962 in order to add important caveats to Schaffer’s position. In the first place it notes that ‘sympathetic’ writers often claimed to speak, and provide the solutions, for a subordinate group. Secondly, it shows that this paternalistic assumption did not heed Black activist-intellectuals who refused to separate an intellectual vanguard from the general public, and questioned the premise that liberal academics were likely to be less prejudiced than policy makers.

In 1961 Banton was invited to conduct a survey of teacher’s opinions in the United Kingdom concerning the utility of Bibby’s book on *Race, Prejudice and Education*, and a shorter version of his final report appeared in the *UNESCO International Social Science*
This survey involved copies of Bibby’s book being sent to 33 schools in the UK that reflected the backgrounds of Banton’s students at Edinburgh; grammar schools were overrepresented and there was no engagement with schools in areas with long-established Black populations such as Liverpool and Cardiff. Consequently, its raw data and market research findings (approximately ‘5 in 6 teachers thought *Race, Prejudice and Education* would be helpful and useful’, but ‘few were enthusiastic about the book’35) are less interesting than Banton’s interpretations, which highlighted several areas that would emerge in his later comments on Enoch Powell’s position on non-white immigration to the United Kingdom. To be more specific, Banton maintained that individuals who defined race as a social phenomenon should be classed as ‘conservatives rather than racists’, and that ‘race prejudice is not a serious problem in British schools’.36 He believed that ‘much feeling against coloured people and Jews is not fundamentally different to suspicion of any type of stranger’, and he was primarily concerned about incidents of ‘race prejudice’ when hostility ‘towards negroes, Jews or some other minority’ fall into ‘racist thinking’.37 According to Banton, the goal of UNESCO was not necessarily to eliminate such prejudice but to ‘reduce it to the same level as anti-Americanism in England’.38 This is a telling comment because Powell’s opposition to the imposition of America’s ‘racial tragedy’ on British shores was influenced by his trip to the United States and the race riots that followed the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr, not just the letters he claimed to receive from his constituents in Wolverhampton South-West.

To avoid misunderstanding, I am not arguing that Banton provided intellectual justification for Powell’s opposition to the levels of ‘New Commonwealth immigration’ to Britain. While many British individuals acclaimed the speech Powell delivered on 20 April 1968, Banton resisted the popular clamour of support for Powell.39 However, it is important to remember that both Banton and Powell depended on ‘functionalist models of the social
order and assume the existence of an essential Britishness against which the migrant other can be defined'.\textsuperscript{40} This helps us contextualize Banton’s distaste for the incendiary opposition to the spectre of Powellism on the radical left displayed in placards that proclaimed, ‘Up yours Enoch Powell’\textsuperscript{41} Indeed, Banton’s address to the British Sociological Association conference on 28 March 1969, which was reprinted in magazines such as \textit{New Society} and edited collections on \textit{Race and Racialism},\textsuperscript{42} invoked an argument about liberal ‘double standards’ that was common in right-wing journals and questioned the opposition to Powell’s ethnic nationalism by people who excuse ‘Jewish exclusiveness’ and/or promote the ‘minority [sic] nationalism’ of Africans.\textsuperscript{43}

Banton’s views were replicated by Bibby in an article entitled ‘Pride, Prejudice, and Powellism’ for \textit{Patterns of Prejudice} (1969), which called for dispassionate and rational citizens to inform a British public about the realities of race. Rather than critique Powell’s inflammatory rhetoric and interrogate the colonial frameworks or postcolonial melancholia that influenced his ‘Rivers of Blood’ speech, Bibby returned to question what Jean-Paul Sartre deemed ‘racist anti-racism’ in ‘Black Orpheus’ (his foreword to \textit{Anthologie de la nouvelle poise negre et malgache de langue francaise}, which sought to introduce Négritude to a white audience in 1948). Powell’s opposition to ‘non-white immigration’ had been ostensibly based on liberal premises and the fear that ‘rigid communal divisions’ of ‘coloured immigrants’ would threaten the future of Britain’s democratic system.\textsuperscript{44} Similarly, Bibby questioned why some liberals and radicals encouraged the formation of all-Pakistani clubs in England and the Africanization of curricula for Black British students when they opposed all English clubs for whites and the Europeanization of white British students. Much like Banton, he indulged in rhetorical questions that falsely equated discrimination against non-whites and Eurocentric orientations with a promotion of Pakistani culture or Afrocentric pedagogy in a multiracial environment.
In the 1970s, Bibby expressed his increasing frustration with the tone of self-proclaimed radicals. For example, he was disgusted by Dr Martin Cole, who promoted a film of a masturbating woman in the name of sex education, and disappointed by reviews of his science textbooks that criticized the use of diagrams and illustrations with ‘only the white Anglo-Saxon reader in mind’. In a similar fashion, Banton would critique the excesses of Black Power activists and radical permissiveness in an article published in *Dædalus*, the journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, in 1974. Banton’s essay, entitled ‘1960: A Turning Point in the study of Race Relations’, is a problematic attempt to explain the rise of Black Power without addressing its intellectual influences in the Harlem renaissance and Négritude movements of the early and mid-twentieth century. According to Banton,

> [r]ace could only start being a major kind of grouping, comparable to nation if less significant, only when the bogey of inequality was dispelled. Only then could previously subordinated groups accept racial designations. Such a process, I suspect, may have started around 1960. It was as if black leaders in the United States declared, ‘You define us as a racial group. Right. We will accept that label. We will prove that our subordinate position is not the outcome of our physical nature but of our social and political position. We will put an end to our subordination while retaining our racial characteristics."

This ‘history of ideas’ briefly mentions Marcus Garvey, as an ‘exception’, and Oliver Cromwell Cox, as a ‘Black Marxist’ who had published widely cited books on capitalism in the 1950s and 1960s, but it omits to mention W. E. B. Du Bois, C. L. R. James, Césaire and other Black intellectuals who had an ambivalent relationship with academia. This allows Banton to claim that the ‘winds of change’ in the 1960s was not the result of ‘changes in the thoughts of scholars’, but ‘changes in the behaviour of the people who constituted a major portion of the subject matter’. Even when he deploys Fanon’s name, it is only to tag an extra figure onto his list of Black men who produced ‘gripping descriptions of social institutions as they appear to members of minorities’ after 1960. As a result, Banton did not acknowledge that Fanon used his psychological insights and frameworks to analyse racism in
the 1950s and 1960s. Nor did he encourage scholars to develop the genealogical work necessary to uncover the intellectual foundations of Black Power philosophies and delve beyond the romantic racist stereotype of the oft-repeated remark of Senghor, the President of Senegal from 1960 to 1981, that ‘emotion is completely Negro as reason is Greek’. Instead, he described the work of younger scholars who engaged with Black Power rhetoric as ‘emotional’, ‘superficial analysis’ that involved ‘vehement attacks upon white American institutions and white American sociology’, and called on the readers of *Dædalus* to produce a ‘systematic body of knowledge and scholarly understanding of the social processes at work’.

**Conclusion: Honest Errors and Bad Faith**

In the 1980s, Banton would continue to question radical anti-racist approaches to the teaching of race and ethnicity. After the publication of *The Empire Strikes Back: Race and Racism in 70s Britain* (1982), a collection of essays produced by younger scholars based at the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, he delivered an address to a conference convened by the Royal Anthropology Institute and Minority Rights Group on ‘Teaching about Prejudice and Stereotyping’ in 1983. Banton’s paper reflected on his earlier work assessing the efficacy of Bibby’s text with conservative and liberal teachers in the 1960s, and hoped to facilitate communication between liberal and radical proponents on the teaching of race in the 1980s. Yet some readers could not ignore its ‘underlying bitterness towards the radical camp’, especially when Banton insisted that approaches to the teaching of race and ethnicity which emphasize structural forces ‘often lead to the view that cultures of only European origin are racist and the forms taken by racial prejudice among black or brown peoples are neglected’. Revealingly, Banton called on blame to be more widely assigned to non-white cultural groups so that radical anti-racists might study the prejudice of the past as
the ‘honest errors of honest men’, and explore the deductions of historical actors ‘in the context of their own time and tracing through the consequences of such errors’.  

Bibby was pleased to receive a copy of ‘Race, Prejudice and Education: Changing Approaches’, and scribbled an emphatic YES! in the margins when his liberal comrade displayed his knowledge of Greek etymology and called for progressive polyethnic studies rather than radical multiracial offerings. After Bibby’s death in 1987, essays by Banton and his former students have continued to define liberal truth-seekers against politicized radicals. For example, Banton has recently critiqued Stuart Hall, the ‘leader of the Cultural Studies approach’ for letting his ‘politics interfere with scholarship’, even though Hall has emphasized the importance of recognizing the difference between ‘understanding the politics of intellectual work and substituting intellectual work for politics’. In addition, Rohit Barot claims that ‘scholarship rather than politics’ was the driving force of Banton’s arguments, implicitly praising his mentor’s Kantian approach against the Hegelian approach of neo-Marxists like Hall or Weberians like John Rex.

Much more could be said about the binaries established by Banton and his students, whether they involved Kantians and Hegelians, liberals and conservatives, or progressives and radicals. In this short paper there is only sufficient space to suggest that future research about the teaching of race in post-war Britain may find it useful to place Banton’s faith in the honest errors of honest men alongside Sartre’s notion with diagnosis of bad faith and bourgeois liberals who attribute the ‘existence of classes to the action of agitators, to awkward incidents, to injustices which can be repaired by particular measures’. As Sartre’s work reminds us, being ignorant about Black intellectual history in the 1950s and 1960s is not necessarily the same as being unaware of Black intellectual history in the 1950s and 1960s. One can be aware of what one does not know.
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