

FROM PROFESSOR A. J. AYER

NEW COLLEGE

OXFORD

OXFORD 48451

18th December 1970

Professor Georg Lukacs  
c/o Academy of Science  
BUDAPEST  
Hungary

Dear Professor Lukacs,

I have received your letter of December 4th.

Up to a point I agree with you about the Angela Davis case. I think that the fact that she is a black militant and that she holds left-wing opinions (within the prevailing American climate) make it difficult for her to secure a fair trial. On the other hand, I cannot go so far as to describe this as another Dreyfuss case, until I have some evidence that she is innocent of the charge upon which she is being held. If you have such evidence and can supply me with it and I find it convincing I shall, of course, do everything in my power to see that she does not suffer injustice.

Yours sincerely,

A. J. Ayer

Sir Alfred Ayer  
Wykeham Professor of Logic

MTA FIL. INT.  
Lukács Arch.

7

Sir Alfred Ayer  
Wykeham Professor of Logic  
New College, Oxford

1971. jan. 17.

Dear Sir!

First of all I have to apologize: because of a misunderstanding your name was attached to the list of the signers, but my quick démenti clarified the situation.

It was an interesting and sociologically valuable experience for me to analyse the content of your letter, taken your reputation in the field of logic into consideration. It has, first, escaped your attention that I did not describe the Davis-case as another "reyfuss-case, only forewarned the European intellectuals of the possibility of an identical or similar process in the given social context, and the latter was described by you as unfavourable for a fair trial. The more interesting moment in your letter is, however, the demand to supply you with evidence of the innocence of Angela Davis. Disregarding the fact that it is the duty of the prosecuting authorities to supply the evidence of guiltiness of the defendant and not vice versa, I simply ask: how could you, an acknowledged expert of the field, build up a logical modell that excluded "reasonable doubt" concerning someone's innocence in a charge of conspiracy? I think, I could explain quite easily these elementary inconsistencies on the part of a well-known scholar with my crude Marxist method, but I have lived a life long enough to understand the prosaic background of such an elevated impartiality, so I refrain from any kind of comments.

Sincerely:

MTA FIL. INT.  
Lukács Arch.