

of South Africa and sympathy for it, and then later on in the last paragraph, you give your views on liberalism in South Africa, and then you say : "Commenting on his impressions of Europe and England since his last visit in 1948, Professor Murray said that he was conscious of the way communistic ideas were creeping unconsciously into all peoples minds whatever their beliefs". It might apply to South Africa as well as to Europe and England? --- Yes.

Professor, I take it you were correctly reported here? --- I am not sure about the "all", but generally the sense is correct. I am not sure about "all" peoples minds.

You might have simply said "into peoples minds, whatever their beliefs"? --- Yes.

Professor, incidentally, you notice that the heading of this article is "Liberal Struggle in South Africa"? --- Yes.

Because the view you express here is that the policy of apartheid in South Africa is a form of European liberalism? --- Yes.

And the opposite view, namely that this should be one multi-racial state, you say is another form of liberalism? --- Yes.

And therefore you say that the political clash in this country is between two liberalisms? --- I have that theory, yes.

And you notice that in the headline, the sub-editor put the words "liberal struggle" into inverted commas, suggesting perhaps that your use of the word "liberalism" isn't perhaps the popular and generally understood one? --- I don't know what he wanted to suggest.

Probably a liberal struggle here would mean - an ordinary liberal struggle would mean something else, a struggle by the liberals, so he wanted to show that the struggle was in liberalism.

When you say with regard to the South African 5 situation that the policy of apartheid is a liberal policy, you would not be using the word liberal in the popular sense? --- I don't suppose the policy of apartheid as it is applied or is legislated on is a liberal - but the policy of a plural state, a federal state, can be a liberal 10 policy.

And you say the political struggle is one between two liberalisms in South Africa? --- One aspect of it, yes.

And I suggest that your use of the word 15 liberalism there, or two liberalisms is a somewhat specialised used, somewhat sophisticated? --- Maybe.

As a political scientist you are perhaps more precise in the use of your words than say a newspaper editor would be? --- Not necessarily, but possibly. 20

X Professor Murray, in your own writings of course, which have been quoted to you in this Court, you have often applied the Marxist-Leninist analysis to the contemporary situation, and you have often quoted Marx? --- Yes. 25

Although of course you did not accept every part of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine? --- Yes.

If one had read your documents, as you have read the documents in this case, one might have said of them, speaking in the broad sense, that they contained 30 communist matter? --- Some of them, yes.

In the same way as you have said it of various

documents in this case? - - Yes. X

I just want to mention to you one of the documents which you referred to as containing communist matter, Exhibit F.A. 41. Would you look at it, please? (WITNESS LOOKS AT DOCUMENT) When that book was handed to you, Exhibit F.A. 41, you said that that contains communist matter. Now I wonder if you could just tell us which is the communist matter. Possibly you are referring to paragraph 4 on page 2 and paragraph 10 on page 4, but if I am wrong, perhaps there is something else in it. The name of the book is What Congress Stands for, Election Manifesto, All-India Committee, New Delhi. I think it is on page 5451 of the record. Was that the communist matter? --- I would have to read this. Page 4, paragraph 10 goes that way, but I would like to read it all.

What does paragraph 10, on page 4 say? ---
"Is it not possible to pursue a policy of laissez faire in industry. This has been rejected in most countries and is peculiarly unsuited to present day conditions in India. It is incompatible with any planning. It has long been a Congress policy that basic industry should be owned or controlled by the State. This policy holds and must be progressively be given effect to. State trading should be undertaken wherever the balance of advantage lies in favour of such a course. A large field for private enterprise is however left over, and this field the aim should be to develop co-operative enterprises on an increasing scale. Thus our economy will have a public sector as well as a private sector. But the private sector must accept the objective of the national plan and fit into it. The progressive extension in the public sector in the field of what is now the private sector must depend on

on various factors, including the result achieved, the resources available and the capacity of the country at the moment. The test should always be what serves the social ends in view. No vested interest or inherited privilege should be allowed to come in the way of the country's economic progress, nor should we allow ourselves to be distracted by slogans and doctrines which sound attractive but which might lead to a worsening of the condition of the people". That could of course fit into the Chinese constitution. 5 10

Is that what you mean by Communist matter?

--- I am not sure now...

Is that communist matter? --- It fits in with the...

Chinese Constitution? --- Yes. 15

Is that the test? --- Well, at least there is a similarity there, and you would consider that this could be interpreted in that way. It is a matter of interpretation of course.

Did you mean that when you said there was communist matter in this document? --- I have not read the thing again, I have looked at it once, you know. 20

This is on page 5578 of the record, at the foot. But Professor Murray, I ask you, is that paragraph you have read communist matter? --- Yes, I would regard it as communist matter, but it can also be socialistically interpreted of course. 25

And paragraph 4 on page 2 that I referred to? Is that communist matter? --- Not particularly. There are one or two little words, but not particularly. 30

Which words? --- The idea of planning occurs here.

Is that a communist idea? --- No, one follows it out to see if it becomes that, but it isn't necessarily.

Any other words? --- No.

If I could just interrupt your reading, the 5
communist matter in that little book, although you have said there is some of it there, it is not all very obvious?
--- No.

Now I wonder if you would look at the front cover of the book. Can you recognise what it is, what it 10
purports to be? --- I should say a popular statement of what the All-India Congress stands for.

Now you know what the All-India Congress is?
--- Yes.

That of course as you recognise from the 15
colours perhaps as well as the name of the body, that is Mr. Nehru's party? --- Yes.

And that as you see is the election manifesto of Mr. Nehru's party for the Indian General Election? ---
Yes. 20

Now I think you have made it clear already in reply to questions put to you by my learned leader that Mr. Nehru is no communist? --- No.

And that his party is not a communist party?
--- No. 25

I take it is - it is a socialist party? ---
The communists hope it will become communist, but it isn't.
No, we can make it a socialist party.

You see, the point that arises out of this, Professor, is that I am not faulting you for saying that 30
there is communist matter in it, in the broad sense as you have said, there is. The point I am making is that, although there is communist matter in that document,

and - of course, that doesn't mean that as a whole it is a communist document? --- No.

And I don't think you meant that when you said there was communist matter in it? --- No.

And nor was there a suggestion that the organisation which has put it out was a communist organisation? --- Yes. 5

What you were doing is so to speak tracing ideas? --- Yes.

And of course, when you said that about the documents, that is what you meant. I don't mean of course when you were referring to Marxist classics, but when you said there was communist matter in a document, you were tracing the ideas in it? --- Yes. 10

In the course, I think, of putting to you certain phrases about fascism or certain ideas about fascism, my learned leader mentioned Professor G.D.H. Cole at Oxford, the late Professor Cole, who you agreed was not a communist? --- Yes. 15

By the way, did you know him when you were at Oxford? --- Yes. 20

You know that he was a labour party man? --- Yes.

Definitely a socialist? --- Very definitely, yes. 25

Some people might think he is a leftwing socialist? --- At times he was, I think.

But certainly not a communist? --- No.

And when you say he was leftwing, you mean that he inclined more towards extreme socialism than towards conservatism? --- He wanted to hurry up socialism. 30

But you don't suggest by that that he was

wanting a violent revolution? --- No.

Professor Murray, an article by Professor Cole in a document numbered A.218 was taken from the offices of the A.N.C. It was not put in by the Crown, and we will put it in in due course. It was a document published by the Asian Socialist Conference. I wonder if you will just have a look at this document and tell me whether you have seen it before. It has blue pencil marks through it, so I don't know whether it was shown to you? --- I don't know - I don't think I have seen it.

Probably not. There were a number of documents taken from the accused or organisations emanating from the Socialist Conference. They were not shown to you I take it? --- No. I can't remember. I mean if I commented on them, I would have seen them.

No, you didn't comment on them. Now this is an article by G. D. H. Cole on a new socialist programme. Now G. D. H. Cole says clearly in this article as you will be able to see for yourself, that he is not a communist, that he detests the suppression of free thinking, which he thinks is an element in communism. He doesn't like their centralisation and their rigid discipline and vindictiveness and so on. He, nonetheless, talks in terms of the socialist revolution. Now when someone like Professor Cole talks about the socialist revolution, how would you interpret that? Is that, you think, what you had in mind when you talked about Die Tweede Demokratiese Omwenteling? --- He probably goes a bit further than that. The Second Democratic Revolution does not mean - can just mean in a very general way more controlled by the people of the financial resources of the country. The socialist revolution definitely means, at least I should say,

nationalisation or the institution of guilds or some very proper organisation.

It means a very radical change in society in the direction of socialisation? --- Something of that sort.

5

But when a person like Professor Cole talks about the socialist revolution in this context, you will see the context, he is not talking of a violent overthrow? --- No, he discussed that somewhere and I think he said it would probably not be necessary to achieve a social revolution...

10

What he means is that he thinks the labour party in England doesn't do enough when it gets into power and it should take more extensive measures of nationalisation? --- Yes.

15

You see, in this document by Professor Cole, he says that he has always been a socialist, he says socialism, as he saw it, was - a part of it was destroying capitalism and imperialism, and putting in their place a world society set free from war and hatred, to devote its energies to banishing poverty and slavery from every country, and then he says that communism and democratic socialism have spent their energies fighting each other, and says that communism as a world revolutionary force has not hesitated to repress all liberty of thought and action, and on the other hand he says that democratic socialism has surrendered its major aspirations in order to meet the requirements of parliamentary success. He says : "I have never been able to accept as final the sharp cleavage in what I still think of fundamentally as a single world wide movement against oppression. I am no communist, for I detest the suppression of all free thinking which

20

25

30

communists not only regard as needful, but seem positively to admire." Then he says that the things that he hates in communism - he says : "I cannot however for that reason consent to regard the peoples of communist countries as enemies with whom I have nothing in common. I have much in common with them. I share their wish to help all the subject peoples of the world to emancipate themselves from foreign imperialist rule. I admire their planned economies and their vast achievements in economic reconstruction. I see them on one condition as advancing, however deviously, towards a classless society, and an expansion of freedom." The one condition is, of course, that they escape from the present peril of utterly destructive world war, fear of which poisons their behaviour and forbids them the luxury of common honesty and decent tolerance. I am assuredly no communist. But he says, no more am I a democratic socialist if this means renouncing the socialist revolution and reducing socialism to a set of national electoral movements designed to gain parliamentary majorities with the support of non-socialist voters." I just wonder whether you would have a glance at this, the parts I have read. He says, incidentally, later on, "The British are still with socialist acquiescence holding down Malaya and Kenya. The Dutch had to be driven out of Indonesia, the French are being driven out of Indo-China and in neither country have the socialists dared to side unequivocally with the colonial nationalists. It has been left to the communists, from whatever motive to appear as the champions of the oppressed peoples of the world." Now would you just have a look at this article? I am afraid that there are blue lines through it that indicates that the Crown did not intend to use it, but I have been reading from blue

parts with blue lines through them. Now what appears clearly from the parts I have read, and I suggest the rest of the article, all of which you can look at in your own time if you like, Professor, is that a person like G. D. H. Cole who is definitely not a communist, who is not in favour of violent revolution, goes a long way - he might say along the same path as communists? --- Yes. 5

It is clear he believes in radical socialism, nationalisation, ending of imperialism, freeing of subject peoples, classless society - he goes along with them a lot of the way, but where they have branched off is firstly the question of violent revolution and secondly, he obviously dislikes the totalitarian features of communist society? --- I should say firstly he dislikes the totalitarian elements - how strong he was on the violent revolution I don't remember. He changed a bit, but he didn't want violent revolution, that is quite right. 15

Now, reading that, one would say that there is certainly the influence of Marxist-Leninist thought in his article? --- Very strongly. 20

A conscious one also in the case of a man like Professor Cole? --- He wrote a book on Marxism.

He certainly knew what the doctrine was. And one would say there that his article again in the broad sense which you have used, contains communist matter? --- Yes. 25

But when you say that, if you said that about this article, you would not want anyone to conclude from that that Cole was a communist or a believer in violent revolution? --- No. 30

In fact, it would be a very unscholarly - it would be very unscholarly to draw that conclusion? ---

Not unless I had more information to go on

I mean on that sort of evidence? --- Yes.

By the way, do you know what the Asian Socialist Conference is? --- Vaguely & no, I don't really know.

5

You might recall, I don't know whether you have come across it in your work in political science - if you haven't please say so, Professor, but I think it began with what was called the Rangoon Conference that Earl Attlee and a number of other Labour leaders attended? 10
It is largely a South East Asian Organisation. You see, there is another one, W. S. 84 taken from - apparently, according to the stamp on it, by Sergeant Venter from W.M. Sisulu, which we will put in in due course, and a number of others. I'll show it to you. I suggest that 15
the ideas of the Asian Socialist Conference are very definitely socialist, but as you see from internal evidence, definitely anti-communist? --- Yes.

That is a phenomenon one finds in the world today, in political thought? --- Yes.

20

- You will find, if you look at W.S. 84, - I wonder if I can show it to you - that this is published by the Anti-Colonial Bureau of the Asian Socialist Conference? --- Yes.

And you will see if you look at that and the other document which I'll leave with you, that this organisation is very anti-colonial, very anti-imperialist, analyses imperialism as exploitation, and oppression and as a danger to peace, prepared to find that there are perhaps social advances made in the Soviet Union, it 30
seems to welcome the emergence of the present Chinese government, but it is definitely, as you will see, not

25

30

communist and indeed anti-communist. Have you come across that type of political thinking in the world? --- You meet that very often - sometimes some communists work with it for the time being, but you get that kind of thing.

And of course sometimes they do it openly, 5
and sometimes not openly? --- Yes.

Is that not a form of thinking that you get particularly in Asia, South East Asia? --- I am not very well up in Asia, but you get in.

Or in Africa? I don't know whether you 10
have seen much of the West African or North African stuff?
--- Yes.

Well, the point I am making is that in analysing a document like that, you would guard against saying this is communist. You would say it contains communist matter, parts of it are in line with communist doctrine. But you would never say it is communist? --- No, I don't think I did either.

As far as - let us consider the Labour Party in England. As far as they are concerned, they are still 20
a socialist party as you understand it in political doctrine? --- Yes.

They are in favour for instance, of nationalisation? --- Yes.

My learned leader in the course of his 25
cross-examination quoted you from Mr. Attlee's book, as he then was, The Labour Party in Perspective, which he says : "It is part of the programme of the British Labour Party to secure for the workers by hand or by brain the full fruits of their industry and the most equitable 30
distribution thereof that may be possible upon the basis of the common ownership of the means of production, distribution

and exchange"? --- Yes.

Now if you are tracing ideas, I suppose you might say that is Marxist in the broad sense? --- It could be Marxist in the narrow sense, but unless there is further support for it, it could also be socialism.

CASE REMANDED TO THE 18TH NOVEMBER, 1959.

COURT ADJOURNS.

ANDREW MURRAY (S.S.):

1

XXD. BY MR. KENTRIDGE (Contd.)

Prof. Murray, when we adjourned yesterday, I was just giving you the Labour Party policy in England as it appears from the book by Mr. Atlee. I quoted the one part of that; on page 179 of the same book, as you may recall, he states: "The financial power must be nationalised". From page 181, "That the Labour Party stands for national ownership of the land." ?-- Yes.

5

You know this book?-- Yes.

Professor, you have had a chance at your leisure to read through these agent socialist conference papers?--Yes.

10

You are sure that you had never seen them before?-- No, I didn't have those documents.

There is nothing that you want to add on them, or is there?-- No.

15

Prof. Murray, I now want to ask you about another English Party which is perhaps more important from the doctrinal point of view, than from the point of view of practical politics; you probably know something about it because I gather that you are acquainted with someone who was the National Chairman of it. I refer the Court to the Independent Labour Party of which Dr.C.A.Smith was the National Chairman in the 1940's?-- Yes.

20

Now, you've told us that you know Dr.C.A.Smith?-- Yes.

25

He, of course, is non-Communist?-- Yes.

In fact anti-Communist?-- Yes.

You've worked with him I gather?-- Yes.

I understand he is no longer in the Independent Labour Party; like yourself I think he's a one man party

30

now?-- I don't know what the position is; I know he is no longer a member of the Party. 1

But you probably know quite a lot about the Independent Labour Party. Now, from the point of view of political doctrine I think that a certain amount has been written about the Independent Labour Party?-- Yes. 5

I think it's recognised in political science that it was a party that was not a Communist Party, but was a very Left Wing Labour Party?-- Yes.

Well, according to the books on political science that I've been able to consult it certainly never affiliated with any Communist organisation, and in fact rejected the idea?-- Yes, I think that is correct. 10

But, it operated as a Parliamentary Party?--Yes.

And it wasn't dedicated to the violent overthrow of the State in Great Britain?-- To the best of my knowledge not; I'm not very well up on the Independent Labour Party, but to the best of my knowledge not. 15

Yes. Well, I mention it because I want to show you some Independent Labour Party literature which also speaks of itself as being a revolutionary party, and I want to ask you what that meant. It apparently means, does it not, that they think that the change to Socialism should be more radical than the official Labour Party believes?-- I think they are a bit more extremist in that way, more radical, yes. 20 25

They have the slogan "Socialism in our Time"?-- That may be, yes.

And I think also they were a Party which departs from the more normal Parliamentary activities, and used to have what they called 'hunger marches', and 30

that sort of thing; you might have come across it when you were in England in the 30's - these hunger marches?-- I don't know about the Independent Labour Party - - there were hunger marches. I'm not very well up on the Independent Labour Party. 1

Well, I wonder then if you would look at some Party pamphlets I have here and tell me whether you can identify them as Independent Labour Party pamphlets. I wonder if you'd look in particular at the passages I've marked in red pencil; just glance at those, Professor?-- I presume these documents are Independent Labour Party documents; I've not seen them before, but I presume they are. 5 10

They tally with what you know about the Independent Labour Party politics?-- Yes.

Now, what appears from them is that the Independent Labour Party insofar as its policy appears in these documents is against Capitalism, it believes that Capitalism leads to war and that only Socialism will end war; it believes in workers' control of industry and industrial democracy; it believes in ending all Imperialism and giving freedom to Colonial territories under British rule; it declares that Capitalism is based on the exploitation of the working class; it asks for economic equality; it believes in the reality of the class struggle; it fears Capitalist dictatorship; it's in favour of disarmament?-- Yes, that clearly appears from these parts. 15 20

And also from another pamphlet which I show you. It is definitely anti-Communist. As you will see here it is extremely critical and hostile so far as the Communist Party is concerned?-- In this paragraph it criticises the Communist Party merely because it is too closely associated with Russia. 25 30

Yes?-- Not very much in principle . . . other 1
parts of its doctrine are quite close. . .

Well, once again the suggestion I make, Professor 5
Murray, which seems to emerge clearly from what you've said
about these and other things is that one can find a Party
programme which talks about class struggle, capitalist
dictatorship - all these things I've mentioned - but it
would be unsafe and unsound to conclude merely from that
that the Party is Communist?-- It would be unsafe to con-
clude that the Party is a Communist Party. The Party may
have Communist tendencies and adopt sections of the Commu- 10
nist doctrine.

As you've said before, you get this almost infi-
nite variety of shading over?-- Yes.

From right to left. Professor, in your general 15
evidence which you gave at the beginning of your examina-
tion you outlined the various parts of Communist, or
Marxist-Leninist doctrine, as you interpreted it?-- Yes.

Now, it appears from your evidence that the per-
son who fully believes in the Marxist-Leninist doctrine
must believe in quite a number of things?-- Yes. 20

For instance, he would have to believe that
everything which is material, that there is a conti-
nuous change in matter and in society which is dialectical
in nature, that the structure of society is determined by
the mode of production, that there are different classes 25
which are in a state of strike, that there is a class
conflict between capitalist and the bourgeoisie and the
proletariat, or workers?-- Yes.

That labour is the main source of value?--Yes.

That the power of the State is exercised in 30

in the ruling class, that socialism must succeed capitalism; 1
that imperialism exists at present in the world, and that
that too must disappear; that there should be a dictator-
ship of the proletariat under the leadership of the Commu-
nist Party, and that this dictatorship of the proletariat 5
must finally do away with capitalism?-- Yes.

And that finally the State will wither away, and
that the changes leading to the establishment of the dic-
tatorship of the proletariat must involve violence in some
way or another. All those things are part of the doctrine?-- 10
Part of the doctrine of Communism, yes.

And as you pointed out to us in a quotation which
you read from Lenin's "What is to be Done" at page 4737
of the record, is that Marxist-Leninist doctrine sharply
condemns what is called eclecticism?-- Yes. 15

Do you recall that quotation?-- Yes, I think the
word I used was probably reformism - - I'm not sure if I
used the word eclecticism. I may have.

It was a quotation, Professor?-- Oh, yes, maybe.

It was a quotation from Lenin's "What is to be 20
Done", and he said, speaking of Marxism, "That he sharply
condemns eclecticism in the formulation of principle"?--
Yes.

Marx wrote: "If you must unite then enter into
agreement to satisfy practical aims of the Movement, but 25
do not make concessions in theory". In other words, the
theory must be kept pure?-- Yes.

You cannot have eclecticism?-- Yes.

That means, I take it - the meaning of that word,
I take it, is the idea of taking one bit from one philo- 30
sophy and another bit from another pilosophy, and building

them up into a synthesis of your own?-- Yes. 1

And consequently a true adherent of the doctrine of Marxism-Leninism wouldn't be entitled to choose what he thinks is good in Marxism-Leninism, and reject the rest?-- Not in theory; in practice he could, of course, do it; but not in theory. 5

Well, again, if I can go back to the personal example because we have it before us, there was a time when you chose out of Marxism-Leninism bits which you thought good?-- Yes. 10

And rejected the rest?-- Yes.

Now, in strict theory you would never have been accepted as a Marxist-Leninist?-- I doubt that.

Yes. A good Marxist-Leninist cannot add in a little bit of Western Liberalism or a little bit of Christianity and mix it with his Marxism-Leninism?-- The perfect Marxist-Leninist cannot; as I said before, the Party allows Christians into the Party and that kind of thing. 15

But, of course, if they are talking doctrine they cannot mix them up; it would be impure doctrine?-- That is the impure doctrine, but they could still be members of the Party of course. 20

Well, provided they didn't spread false doctrine?-- Reactionary doctrine, yes. 25

But to be accepted as a good Marxist-Leninist, you would have to accept all the elements which you mentioned as forming part of the doctrine?-- I don't know how many Marxists-Leninists understand all the elements. But in the perfect State, to be a Professor of Marxism- 30

Leninism in Moscow, I suppose you'd have to accept them
all I presume. 1

Yes. Or even to be a person who is entitled to
make propaganda or lay down policy on behalf of the
Marxist-Leninist Party?-- Possibly.

And then, of course, this also relates to what you
said about the shading off; if a person accepted some of
these things but not all of them, you might describe him
as a socialist, or a left wing socialist, or even a
Marxist socialist, but perhaps not as a Communist?-- That
is more to the right of Communism. 5 10

BEKKER J. Professor, take the Independent Labour
Party. You said it was non-Communist, having read some
of the things, and, of course, with your knowledge of it.
Is there any test one could apply in political science
- taking this as an example - the Independent Labour
Party - enabling you to say "Well, that Party is really
Communist". Is there any test one could?-- Tests
are difficult to mention in an organic situation where
there is a growth from the one to the other. In the
case of the I.L.C there are two points I would raise; 15 20
the one is that to the best of my knowledge the I.C.L.
was anti-revolutionary; anti violent revolution. I'm
not sure about the time when they established it in
1900 but let's forget about that for the moment. At
the moment I believe their policy is anti-revolutionary. 25
I think that is correct. Secondly, in a paragraph I
read there they separated themselves from the Communist
Party because they said the Communist Party followed
the policy of Russia, as real good Communist Parties
ought to do. 30

What I really have in mind is this: Counsel put 1
to you a number of matters which a good Marxist-Leninist
would follow -- a good one -- at what stage would you say
a person, Leftish inclined, has crossed the border and is
now a Communist?-- Quite candidly I don't think I would say
that; I'd have to build up an individual case as a picture. 5
I would hesitate to say at what stage a man is a good Chris-
tian, or a good Churchman.

What test would you apply?-- My test would be
building up various items in his statement or in his beha-
viour . . . 10

In order to answer what question?-- To answer the
question, whether he is a good Christian or a good Marxist.
I don't think there is a hard and fast line you can draw
and say "This side you are a Marxist, this side not."
I think one has to draw up an overall picture. I'm taking 15
the case of shall we say a Christian or a Catholic or a
man who belongs to the type of philosophy of that sort.
You cannot say "This is the crux; this man is a good
Christian because he does this or that". I think one has
to build up a picture -- you have to do with an organic 20
situation, a growing situation. There may, as far as I
know, not be a single person who absolutely swallows
everything that Marxism-Leninism would like people to
swallow, and yet there are Marxists-Leninists. I am al-
ways afraid in political affairs, living affairs, spe- 25
cially with regard to a mind and public opinion, to
draw a hard and fast line.

Can one?-- No; I think you must draw up a
picture and the balance will throw the man that side or
this side. 30

(Witness): I'm sorry, my metaphors are mixed; you must have 1
a picture of all his actions, and decide on that.

What questions would he have to answer, in order
to decide "Well, he is a Communist", or "He falls short of
being a Communist"?-- The question you'd have to answer I
think is how much does he lean towards Marxism-Leninism 5
and to what extent does he dilute his Marxism-Leninism,
and come to the centre or the right of socialism

Counsel put a number of points that a good
Communist would follow, or believe or accept. Would you
say that before a person is entitled to say of another 10
person "He is a Communist", all those points mentioned by
Counsel have to be answered in his favour?-- No, I would not
say that. There are two reasons why I wouldn't say that.
History and experience shows that a person could be a good
Communist and perhaps not even understand some of those 15
points. The other reason is this: that the good Commu-
nist may very easily not express the full doctrine.

But in your mind what are the essentials;
leading to a conclusion that "A" is a Communist, whereas
"B" is not?-- In my mind the essentials will depend on 20
every particular case - let us assume there are fifteen
points. If he has say five or eight - - on five or
eight points he is on the Marxist-Leninist side, I would
be inclined to think, well, he may be a Communist; and
if he had a few more I'd make him a Communist. . . if the 25
facts are in order. But I frankly don't think there is
a hard and fast criteria. I mean you don't get criteria
of this sort in practical life. The analogy I would
use is a question of a good Christian . . .

MR. KENTRIDGE: Perhaps if I may take up what 30

his lordship has been asking you, Professor, one of the 1
difficulties, of course - one of the added difficulties
is, as you have told us, that many of the ideas of Marxism-
Leninism are not even original with Marx or Lenin; for
instance, the idea that everything is in a state of flux
is a very old idea in philosophy?-- Yes. 5

The philosophy of materialism, of course, is not
an invention of Marx?-- No. The dialectical form, the spe-
cial form is Engels, of course, but the materialism gener-
ally is not.

The idea of the dialectic was derived from Hegel 10
?-- Yes, but the dialectic materialism is Marx-Engels, of
course.

Yes. But if one is looking for elements one must
bear in mind that some of the elements might come from
somewhere else?-- Yes, but it is dangerous to atomise, 15
you've got to take these things

The Labour theory of value, for instance, was de-
rived from Ricardo probably?-- Yes, I think Marx gave some
twists to it.

Lenin drew on Hilferding and Hobson for his theory 20
of Imperialism?-- I think Lenin drew on Hobson and Hilferding
for information, which was then squeezed into the princi-
ples contained in Das Kapital, you see.

What about the idea of the importance of economic
classes; that is as old as Aristotle, isn't it?-- Yes. 25

In fact class divisions do exist in society, as
a fact?-- It depends how you interpret it; what you un-
derstand by class.

Well, economic classes?-- Yes. The point is the
Marxists gave a very special definition to that 30

Class antagonisms in fact exist in society?-- Yes. 1
And political parties often represent particular
economic classes?-- Yes.

Such as the Labour Party in England?-- Yes.

Let's take another idea that you've mentioned, the
idea that those who hold economic power in society are the 5
effective rulers of it. That didn't originate with Marx,
did it?-- The idea?

That the people who own the property, or hold the
economic power in the society, are the real rulers of it?--
The idea is they get power in their hands; yes, that is 10
not Marx.

Yes, one can take that back to Harrington's
Oceana?-- Yes.

In the 17th Century.

RUMPF J: May I just follow this up. Assume 15
Professor, you have an island in the Pacific Ocean . . .
do you wish me to let this stand over, Mr. Kentridge?

MR. KENTRIDGE: No, my lord, not at all.

RUMPF J: Assume you have an island in the
Pacific Ocean, a fictitious island, and with a popula- 20
tion, and there is an absolute monarchy, a Monarch
with a Council of Advisers, no parties, no parliament;
assume that there is a movement amongst the population
to do away with the Monarchy - then there is established
a so called class society; the ownership of the Banks, 25
financial institutions, is transferred to the people,
the ground is re-divided amongst the peasants, no parties
are allowed, there is the Movement which governs in a
form of congress or any particular organisation of that
kind, and the Mohammedan religion is declared to be the 30

State Religion?-- Yes.

1

What would you call that form of government, in political science?-- I'd be inclined to call it a dictatorship. I won't call it, from the way it's been described, a dictatorship of the proletariat necessarily, but I would certainly be inclined to call it a dictatorship; it depends how strong the movement is which established this party; how they established it, how they established this form of government.

5

Well, I've put to you the supposition that the Monarch departed?-- Yes.

10

Without more?-- Well, I'd call that a dictatorship. It comes very near to the achievement of the final stages of a dictatorship of the proletariat, but I don't want to use the word proletariat because I'm not quite certain who is governing the situation.

15

Yes....?-- As it stands I would call it a dictatorship.

And if you were asked to classify it on the bare facts which I've given you?-- On the bare facts I would -- I won't yet call it a Communist dictatorship because I'm not quite sure how the property is divided -- that depends on how the production is run, and how people share in the property. But I would classify it as a dictatorship approximating what has been described as a dictatorship of the proletariat, although I'm afraid of the word proletariat

20

25

In the absence of further information?-- In the absence of further information . . .

You are not prepared to stigmatise it?-- No; that would depend on the method of production, the

30

distribution of the commodities, and various other factors. 1

MR. KENTRIDGE: Prof. Murray, let's take another idea that may be part of Communism, but is not exclusive to it; the idea that a capitalist state may be dominated by the money power?-- Yes.

That lies at the root of a lot of socialist and even 5
liberalism and nationalism thought?-- Yes.

For instance in South Africa would any one with any political views dispute that the major gold and diamond mining companies have since the 1880's had a considerable influence on South African affairs?-- No, I wouldn't. 10

Some people might even say they had a major influence...?-- Yes.

Even a decisive influence?-- Possibly, yes.

And many people, without being Communists, might honestly think that this influence has been excessive?--Yes. 15

Again, one need not be a Communist to recognise that in South African politics the interests of farmers are an important factor?-- Yes.

One could easily find examples of legislation passed to safeguard the position of farmers, or to assist them 20
?-- Yes.

Now, arising out of all this, again a non-Communist might very well hold the idea that many of the laws in South Africa which affect non-Europeans have in fact been passed in the interests of the mining industry or the 25
farming community?-- That position has been held. I don't think it is a completely defensible position, but it has been held by people.

It is certainly a possible view?-- Yes.

And one does not need to be a dialectical 30

materialist or a Marxist-Leninist to analyse South African legislation in these terms?-- No. 1

And that particularly applies to pass laws for instance; many people have taken the view that the Pass Laws are a form of economic legislation passed in the interests of the mining industry, or other industries?-- I believe that view has been held, yes. 5

Consider the idea that in capitalist society the profit motive is dominant; although Communists hold that view, it's a view also held by orthodox economists. 10

By orthodox economists?-- By economists, yes.

Well, in your book on "Die Christen en Kommuniste" page 28 you wrote, "Die groot besitter of werkgewer staan vir die status quo en wil die posisie hou soos hy is, want dis onder huidige omstandighede dat hy die meeste profyt maak, en dit is tog sy lewensdoel." That's not a peculiarly Communist view?-- No. 15

Your view was an unthodox one perhaps but not a Communist one?-- Yes. 20

Well, Professor, it appears then, without going into details, that there are all sorts of ideas which are part of Communism and also parts of Socialism, and ideas which are part of Communism and also part of non-Communist and even non-Socialist philosophy, and economics ?-- Yes, there are gradations of ideas. 25

Yes. Now if I may take up the point which was put to you by his lordship Mr. Justice Bekker about the difficulty of drawing a line; as you say you can't draw a hard and fast line, but I take it that there are 30

certain differentia specificae of Communism, certain elements which one finds in Communist theory but not in other theory?-- In Communist theory, yes. 1

In Communist theory. I think one you've mentioned is the idea of the withering away of the State after the dictatorship of the proletariat?-- Yes. 5

And I think earlier, perhaps in your evidence in chief, in answer to his lordship the presiding Judge, you indicated that the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat seems to be a peculiarly Communistic idea?--- Yes.

If you look at Independent Labour Party literature or British Labour Party Literature, however Left Wing, you don't find the idea of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat expressed?-- Not in Labour Party. I think in the Left Wing Labour Party you will find a tendency to say that there must be strong Government action once they are in power. They don't go as far as actually describing the dictatorship of the proletariat in the way Lenin did. 10 15

No. This idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat seems to be essential to the doctrine of Communism according to the quotation which you gave us?-- At one stage of its development, yes. 20

Well, in the sense that according to Lenin at any rate no one who did not believe in that doctrine could be a Communist, as Lenin would have understood it?-- He wouldn't be subscribing to the full theory; he could still belong to the Party. 25

Well, let's test that. Let's assume that Lenin is running the Party?-- Yes.

It may be in different circumstances different 30

things could apply. You referred us to Lenin's two tactics at pages 4761 and 4764 of the record?-- Yes. 1

And also to Stalin on Leninism. It would appear from those passages at least that if someone did not believe in dictatorship of the proletariat Lenin would not have had him in his Party?-- No; I'm not quite sure about that, but I did read another passage in reply to a question - speaking from memory - that so long as the member subscribed to the general policy of the party and paid his subscription, he could become a member of the party. It's all a matter of the practical application of the doctrine, and the creed which is applied finally and fully. 5 10

Yes; well, let's turn to the book that you have quoted for Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kaufsky (?)

RUMPF J: Before you go on, Mr. Kentridge, could I perhaps enquire from the witness what he understands to be the meaning of dictatorship of the proletariat?-- I think I accept the orthodox description of it given by Lenin, that a certain stage of history of development towards final Communism, the proletariat - that would be the working class and the peasantry combined under the leadership of the Communist Party, which would be a minority party, would establish a dictatorship; there would still be a State and the remnants of the bourgeois crowd, the exploiters, would have no say in that party at all, and referring to Lenin the party may use military methods and methods of force to maintain itself in power in this interim period, until gradually the State is weakened and withered away and they've got full control of production and distribution. 15 20 25

When would the term dictatorship apply?-- The term 30

dictatorship would apply the control of the institutions of
Government by the Communist Party. The proletariat - that
is the peasantry and the working class, would have a say in
the Government but the remnants of the bourgeois class would
not be the people; they are not regarded as the people and
they would not have political rights and so forth.

Is it then correct to say that in effect a dictator-
ship of the proletariat - I say in effect - would be a dicta-
torship of the Communist Party?-- I think it is intended to be
that, yes.

MR. KENTRIDGE: Professor Murray, you've referred
us to a book called "Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade
Kaufsky" by Lenin?-- Yes.

Do you remember the book?-- Yes.

Now, Kautsky claimed to be a Marxist and a Social-
ist?-- Yes.

Lenin regarded him as a renegade?-- Yes.

Do you remember why Lenin regarded him as a rene-
gade?-- Yes . . . a reformist.

The reason is clear, that was because Kautsky
either did not accept or tried to water down the idea of
a dictatorship of the proletariat?-- Did not accept or he
tried to water down . . .

He tried to water it down?-- Kautsky went with
the Social Democrats and was virtually a reformist.

Yes, but in the section of that book, the section
of that book called "How Kaufsky transformed Marx into a
common or garden Liberal" the argument is, you will recall,
that Kautsky misunderstood and watered down the idea of
the dictatorship of the proletariat which, as Lenin said,
- I refer to Selected Works, Vol.2 - page 362 - everyone

knows that this, the dictatorship of the proletariat, is the essence of Marxist doctrine?-- Yes. Lenin, of course, wrote that just after the Revolution when they were going to build up a dictatorship and the point was already crucial. 1

Exactly. That is why I'm talking of the party of which Lenin was the Head; things may be different, I don't know?-- Yes. 5

May I refer to the big selected works of Lenin, I think in about 11 or 12 volumes?-- Yes.

Vol. 7, pages 229 and 233; that is a work called "Bourgeois Democracy and Proletarian Dictatorship"; do you have a copy with you?-- Yes. 10

I wonder if you would just take it, Professor. Look at page 229, Professor; you will see there that Lenin is dealing with the difference between the Communists and the Socialists?-- Yes. 15

And he says, the last paragraph on the page - - "The main thing that Socialists fail to understand, and what constitutes their theoretical short sightedness, their captivity to bourgeois prejudices, and their political treachery to the proletariat, is that in capitalist society as soon as there is any theory of intensification of the class struggle on which it is based, there cannot be any middle course between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat"?-- Yes. 20

And on page 233 you will find in the middle of the page again, attacking what he calls "Yellow Socialists and Social Democrats". He speaks there of the "Ridiculous attempt to combine the dictatorship of the proletariat with the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie". He says "That utterly exposes the poverty of mind of the Yellow Socialists 25 30

and Social Democrats, their petty bourgeois political reaction-
riness etc."?-- Yes. 1

Now it may well be, as you may think, Professor,
that the doctrine has changed since Lenin?-- No, no. no. . .

But I suggest that as Lenin saw it, Lenin would not
have recognised anyone as a good Communist if he didn't accept 5
the idea of a dictatorship of the proletariat as being the ker-
nel of the doctrine?--

RUMFFF J: You used the word good Communist; can you
use it without the word good?

MR. KENTRIDGE: Yes, my lord. Or that Lenin would not 10
have accepted anyone as a Communist.....?-- Knowing Lenin's
works on tactics and the suggestion of how the thing should be
built up, I am inclined to think that Lenin would have taken
people into the Communist Party according to the situation,
and he might at a certain time have purged a lot; he was at 15
this time facing the actual situation in Russia when he had
to build up a strong party, and then, of course, he developed
the doctrine, but the doctrine did not change. It's a matter
of application under different circumstances.

Well, then, can we put it this way, that Lenin in 20
circumstances might have been prepared to work with anyone?--
Yes.

Whatever their views?-- Within limits, yes.

Even if they didn't understand Marxist-Leninism?--
He would use such people to further his own ends. 25

He would use them?-- Yes.

But insofar as his party is concerned, his nucleus,
I take it they would have to believe in dictatorship of the
proletariat?-- At a later stage of development; not possibl 30
earlier, because he had to build up a party. He himself co-

operated in two tactics and the other one you quoted a moment ago -- "What must be done". He himself was co-operating with the Social Democrats, and he fought the Social Democrats -- the one wing of the Social Democrats, but he was working with them to get his revolutionary 1

Yes, he was co-operating with them, but on the question of doctrine he would not have recognised anyone as a true communist in doctrine who didn't accept the dictatorship of the proletariat?-- Primarily he would not. 5

Yes; he would not have accepted them as a communist in doctrine?-- He may have accepted him as a party member but not as a communist in doctrine; there I agree. 10

Would he have allowed him as a communist to talk doctrine without dictatorship of the proletariat?-- On the lower levels - the moment he became reactionary he would throw him out of course. 15

Yes. You say incidentally that when Lenin wrote "What is to be done" he was co-operating with Social Democrats. That was at the turn of the century. At that stage what was the name of Lenin's Party? They were called the Russian Socialist Democratic Party?-- Yes, yes. 20

Of course. I mean it's not a case of co-operating with Social Democrats; at that stage he called himself a Social Democrat?-- Yes.

Now this idea of dictatorship of the proletariat in Lenin is, of course, completely bound up with the Leninist idea of proletarian revolution?-- Yes. 25

Now, along with the dictatorship of the proletariat was there not another great issue which divided Lenin and his followers from other Socialists; a great issue which split the Russian Socialist Democratic Party?-- At what stage? 30

Well, let us say from 1902 or 1903 onwards. One 1
of the big issues which since then divided communists as
they came to be called from other varieties of socialists
or social democrats?-- The main issue was method of achieving
the end, whether to have a reformist method or a revolution.

Yes. But what was the point on which the party 5
split; you've quoted the pamphlet "What is to be done". Now
that's generally accepted as a basic work in Leninist doc-
trine?-- Yes.

Now, apart from the individual quotations you've
given us, what was the main theme or argument of what is 10
to be done?-- The argument there is that you don't merely
want to have an economic change. The argument of what is
to be done is that there must be a political change, an
economic change . . . the party must be under revolutionary
guidance, and the other crowd, Bernstein, had soft pedalled 15
the revolutionary nature of Lenin's policy.

What had to be under revolutionary guidance?--
The party which had to achieve social conditions. . . .

Professor Murray, are you not getting it the 20
wrong way round. Isn't it that the revolution had to be
under the party guidance? Surely that is the theme of
what is to be done, the idea that the revolution must be
led by a Marxist-Leninist Communist Party?-- Yes, that
also, but first he argues against the - - almost a de-
viationist, and he makes the point that it's not enough to 25
reduce the party to trade union - what we call - weakness.
He insists on ideological education and that the party
must have a strong revolutionary lead. Then he goes on.....

Was it not previously a revolutionary party in 30
Russia?-- There was I think always an argument between the

two; Plekinoff softened the revolutionary element, you see - that's where he came in - and Plekinoff introduced Marxism into Russia. And Lenin criticised his party because it was not sufficiently revolutionary. 1

In "What is To be Done" he laid down the idea of the small professional Communist Party which had to lead the revolution?-- Yes. 5

Now surely ever since then that has been basic to communism, the recognition of the role of the Communist Party?-- Yes.

Now, that again I suggest is one of the things which might be regarded as essential to Communism?-- Yes. 10

Characteristic to Communism?-- Yes.

You read yourself some quotations in that regard but I think perhaps you didn't read them all. You read for instance from "The Comintern Programme", Burns, page 1032 under the heading of "Fundamental Tasks". You might remember that? But you didn't read the first paragraph. Perhaps you'd look at it; have you got Burns? I've got a copy here if you want one. You know the section "Fundamental Tasks of Communist, Strategy and Tactics"?-- Yes. 15 20

What it says there in the first paragraph, which for some reason you did not read, is "That the successful struggle of the Communist International for the dictatorship of the proletariat pre-supposes the existence in every country of a compact Communist Party hardened in the struggle, disciplined, centralised and closely linked up with the masses"?-- Yes. 25

And then again in the "History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union" from which you quoted, at page 353 - have you got a copy of that?-- Yes. 30

It says, in the chapter headed 'Conclusions'; What 1
the chief conclusions to be drawn from the historical path
traversed by the Bolshevist Party. (1) The history of the
party teaches us first of all that the victory of the pro-
letariat revolution, the victory of the dictatorship of
the proletariat, is impossible without a revolutionary 5
party of the proletariat, a party free from opportunism etc."
And then later on, a few paragraphs down, "The history of the
party teaches us that only a party of the new type, a Marxist
Leninist Party, a party of social revolution" etc. etc. "can
organise the victory of the proletariat revolution"?-- Yes. 10

So it appears I think that one of the elements in
Communist doctrine is the role of the Communist Party?--Yes,
but there again one must distinguish between doctrine and
practice, you see. Both the Comintern Programme -- the
Comintern Programme was written at the time of the revolution 15
when they had to organise, and the History started about
1937 I think - the first edition - when they were busy with
practice, but remember, even in the Comintern Programme
Lenin speaks of the Party, whether it is legal or illegal.
There may be at earlier stages 20

The Comintern Programme you have just quoted from
is 1928, you told us?-- 1922 really; it was accepted in
1928. Finally adopted in 1928. Drawn up in 1922 about.

Yes but legal or illegal there must be a Communist
Party?-- Yes, there must be a Communist Party but it need 25
not always be organised as tightly as you suggest.

Well, I wasn't suggesting it; it is suggested in
these books. You suggest that from your knowledge of
things - whatever that may be - that in practice people do
not necessarily follow the theory, although they pay lip 30

service to it?-- No, no, I'm not suggesting that; I am suggesting that in practice you have to tone down theory according to the instruction to fit a situation. . .

Why do you say 'in practice'; you mean in theory?--
No, in practice, because the instructions in the Comintern Programme is that when the revolutionary tide has been ebbed you must do certain things and be much less aggressive than when the revolutionary conditions are in flow - you can be more aggressive, you see. 5

But you read us the passage on the revolutionary tide being in ebb or in flow; there is nothing at all there to suggest that the Communist Party must adopt another form when the revolutionary tide is in ebb or in flow?-- No, it must not adopt another form, but it mustn't push its doctrine and so forth to extremes. . . 10

But nonetheless this statement which I read - "That the successful struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat pre-supposes the existence of a compact Communist Party hardened in the struggle" etc. There is nothing at all in what you've referred us to, or in what we have found to show that that position is ever deviated from in doctrine?-- Not in doctrine. 15 20

Well, of course, practice is another matter, which we are not dealing with. This Communist Party as it exists in Communist doctrine then - I mean facts are facts - it may be different, we don't know, but let's deal with the doctrine - - in Communist doctrine the Communist Party is a relatively small strongly disciplined party?-- Yes. 25

It's not a mass federal organisation with broad general principles; it's a compact disciplined party 30

with definite Marxist-Leninist ideology?-- Yes.

1

That is the theory. On page 4670 of the record you summed it up, I think, this way. You said "The Party" in doctrine is a relatively small select group which has to lead the masses"?-- Yes.

A small select group?-- Yes.

5

BEKKER J: Do masses not belong to the Party, are they not allowed to belong to the Party?-- No, they do not belong to the Party. The proletariat is not the Party. The Party is a selection of the proletariat. I believe I'm right in saying that in China there are 560,000,000 people and the Party consists of 500,000 I understand.

10

And who selects the Party members?-- It's a matter of Party policy I think. The Party selects them - the leaders of the Party. There are instructions on that; I cannot quite remember what the procedure is.

15

RUMPF J: What in Communist literature is the percentage of the Communist Party to the population in the Soviet Union?-- I could find that out; I could not tell you offhand. I remember the Chinese figure, but not the Soviet's figure.

20

MR. KENTRIDGE: It's generally accepted that it's pretty small?-- Relatively small, yes.

But as I understand the doctrine in "What is to be Done", "The History of the Communist Party" and the "Comintern Programme" it's a small select party; not anyone can join?-- That's so.

25

30

You've got basically in doctrine; I don't know whether it is relaxed in practice, but in doctrine you've got to be a master of Leninism?-- Yes. 1

Now, this idea of the Party, the importance of the Party, the role it plays in Communist theory, is really developed in this way, isn't it, that it links up, if I may use a phrase which appears in the evidence - it links up with the dictatorship of the proletariat and the idea of revolution. The revolution must be prepared and guided by the Communist Party?-- Yes. 5

The dictatorship of the proletariat must be under the control of the Communist Party?-- Yes. 10

In fact that's what makes a dictatorship of the proletariat?-- Yes.

And similarly, just as I said that you couldn't in Lenin be a Communist if you did not accept the role of the dictatorship of the proletariat, presumably you could not be a communist unless you accepted the primacy of the Communist Party?-- Yes. 15

And that, going back to the I.L.P. of course, is one of the reasons why looking at it you say it is not communist, because it does not accept the leadership of the Communist Party?-- Yes. 20

And, of course, . . .?-- On that paragraph, of course, they didn't accept the leadership of the Communist Party because of a specific reason. 25

But I suggest it goes further than a specific reason, Professor. On pure doctrine any one who didn't accept if not membership, at least the discipline and leadership of the Communist Party, wouldn't be accepted as a Communist?-- No, there are certain charges of course - 30

with Tito in Yugoslavia . . . that's the Leninist-Marxist doctrine . . . 1

And then if someone went to Lenin and said "Well, I'm a communist but I don't accept the leadership or the discipline of the Communist Party and I want to make my own revolution without it", whatever else he might have been called by Lenin it would not have been communist?-- No. 5

Yes. Well, now, consequently I understand your answer to his lordship Mr. Justice Bekker, that you cannot have a general rule; you've got to look at a situation, but by and large unless you know what a man's views are in respect of a dictatorship of the proletariat, and the role of the Communist Party, and violent revolution, you cannot be quite sure whether he is a communist or not?-- It again depends on conditions, you know, because there are certain prescriptions on strategy and tactics and commonsense. . . . 10 15

No, I'm talking about what he believes?-- As regards doctrine?

Yes, as regards doctrine?-- No; the thoroughbred communist would have to accept those principles, yes.

Well, let me again get back to the example of your writing, Professor?-- Yes. At one stage you took a Marxist view on capitalism, exploitation, imperialism, class struggle - all of that?-- Yes. 20

But at the same time, as you stated in one of your articles, "Hoe kom ek nie 'n Kummunis is nie", as you stated in that article, you didn't believe in violent revolution or the leadership of the Communist Party?-- Yes. 25

Or the dictatorship of the proletariat?-- Yes.

Now, consequently, if some one had read all your other articles, but not that part in which you said what you 30

DIDN't believe in, he would not have been entitled to con- 1
clude that you were a communist in the full sense?-- He might
have suspected me of it.

Yes, but he would not have been entitled to draw the
conclusion?-- No.

And furthermore, when he read your article saying 5
that you didn't believe in violent revolution, there would
have been no reason for him to disbelieve that?-- Would you
say that again? If he had not

Supposing someone read all your writings in order,
and finally came to the one where you said that you didn't 10
believe in violent revolution, he would have had no reason
to doubt your sincerity and honesty in making that statement
?-- No, it depends on the set-up.

Well, I take it you made that statement honestly and
sincerely?-- Yes. 15

In other words.....?-- There may have been other
statements, of course, which might have made him suspicious
about my sincerity

Yes, but the point I am making is that his suspi- 20
cion would have been ill founded?-- Without further infor-
mation possibly, yes. My point is there may have been
other elements in my total situation, which may have fed
the suspicion and it may have been a partly justifiable
suspicion.

Justifiable in the sense of being a reasonable 25
suspicion?-- Yes.

On the facts known?-- Yes.

But it would have been in false; you didn't
believe in violent revolution?-- Yes.

In other words, you were a person who believed in 30

a very great many things that communists also believed in, but in spite of that you didn't believe in violent revolution?-- Yes.

1

Or in the role of the Party, or in the dictatorship of the proletariat?-- I accepted for the time being the communist analyst of the Capitalist protect.

5

Yes. Which rather suggests, taking your example, that whatever suspicions one might have, it would be extremely dangerous to draw any conclusion about a man's views on violent revolution, from his views on other matters?-- Yes.

I want to ask you something else about this political doctrine of Marxism

10

BEKKER J: Doesit amount to this, that whatever other manifestations of communism may be present, unless there is a reason to accept that he believes in violent revolution, and/or the dictatorship of the proletariat, and/or the communist Party ruling, you cannot call him a Communist?-- No, I'm again afraid of criteria, your lordship. I can imagine a situation, and I think it has occurred in history, where people haven't said a word about violent revolution, haven't said anything about a dictatorship, haven't gone to that extent, but where they have acted in conjunction with other people in a way which made people accuse them of Communism, and when they were ultimately communists.

15

20

Let me put it on this basis. Assuming a person accepts everything that the doctrine of communism prescribes, but he rejects a dictatorship of the proletariat, and/or violent revolution, and/or that the Party must rule, can you call him a Communist?-- If he openly rejects it?

25

He says to himself, "I reject all that, but I accept all the rest"?-- No; then I would not call him a

30

Communist in doctrine - certainly not. 1

Not according to the doctrine?-- No.

MR. KENTRIDGE: Before I ask you anything more about doctrine, Professor, can I ask you about political science; we've been talking about political science; in what sense do you use the word science when you talk about political science?-- I make it a feature between political theory and science of course. By political science I understand it to be the description of political institutions, and how they work. 5

And interpretation?-- Well, that gets on to theory, of course, political theory. 10

Well, you really regard science - political science as a systematic description of political institutions?-- By analogy with physics and chemistry.

Well, now let's just think about that analogy. Once you get away from mere description the analogy does not go very far, does it?-- No, except that even scientists have to have theories to interpret their facts and so on. 15

Yes; but in fact when you are in the realms of political theory, there is likely to be more difference of opinion between political theorists than say between chemists or physicists?-- Possibly; you have the problem of evolution with the scientists and they quarrel a lot about it. 20

But now, for instance, you find that chemists in Cape Town, or Washington or London, or Moscow, or Peking, would all be agreed usually about the chemical formula for any substance?-- Yes, that's science. 25

Whereas amongst political scientists, or political philosophers, you would not expect to find that measure of agreement about the true meaning and implications of the 30

doctrine of Marxism-Leninism?-- But you cannot equate political 1
cal scientists and political philosophers. Political scien-
tists would decry the doctrine. Political philosophers may
differ in their evaluation and son on.

And in fact even in their interpretation of par- 5
ticular passages?-- Yes, that could happen.

Well, I think you've already said, Professor, and
it's quite clear to me, at any rate, from the passages that
you've read, that Marxism seems to be a rather complex and
difficult theory?-- Yes.

There is a lot of material in it and it does seem 10
that different political philosophers give a different inter-
pretation to different parts of it?-- Yes.

And they differently evaluate which are the im-
portant parts and which are the less important parts?-- Not 15
really; there is not much difference there. Various
schools may give different interpretations on points.

Yes. But when you talk about dialectical material-
ism for instance, you gave your view of that, your view of
what it meant, I take it that some other political philoso- 20
phers might interpret it perhaps differently?-- The position
I gave was on the text really - - there are interpretations
of it but - - different emphases by different philosophers.
Mostly in how it works, not in the description of the term,
of the notion.

Well, some of those things you read on dialec- 25
tical materialism seem to me to be very difficult to under-
stand?-- Yes.

I take it that there might be other political
philosophers who would sum it up differently?-- I don't think 30
I summed up; I read from texts.

But there are easier texts.

1

And more difficult ones, I suppose?-- Oh, yes.

RUMPF J: Are you differentiating between the description and the interpretation, because I take it

MR. KENTRIDGE: I assume that there well may be a difference.

5

RUMPF J: Well, the description may be universal.

MR. KENTRIDGE: Yes.

RUMPF J: Amongst scientists.

MR. KENTRIDGE: Yes. Presumably everyone agrees that you are talking about Marxism-Leninism - that the works of Lenin are part of the description?-- Yes.

10

Well, Professor, when we've been speaking of political doctrine, what have we really been speaking about; it means a body of writings primarily, I take it?-- I'm inclined to think a body of argument based on certain premises, coherent argument based on premises and worked up to their conclusion.

15

And this particular doctrine seems to be based on what you call the "Classics"?-- Yes.

You've mentioned Marx, Lenin, Engels and Stalin particularly?-- Yes.

20

Does that include all their works?-- I don't suppose it might include Marx' love letters, but it includes the - - usually, in building up a doctrine of a person you take - - a doctrine of a writer grows and he may change his opinion on various points, and you put those aside, but you would study the main work certainly.

25

But then how do you decide what are the main works - when is a person really talking philosophy and when is he talking about something else. In these classics that you've shown us, I see that letters of Marx or Engels are often

30

published, as part of the classics?-- I think in a case like 1
this scholarship is a co-operative affair, and gradually the
basic doctrines come out, and when one has a reasonable amount
of matter published one can find out the basic doctrine in-
volved.

It may not be the same as the day to day political 5
propaganda put out by one of the classical masters in the
course of his political career?-- You mean that at certain
stages Lenin may have said things which do not fit into the
doctrine?

Yes? Or must they be fitted in?-- Oh, no, you've 10
got to take notice of what was said and possibly there may be
differences.

You see you yourself mentioned a little while ago
that when Lenin wrote about the renegade Kaufsky, he was busy
in the political struggle in Russia, and you've got to read 15
it in that context?-- Yes.

Well, the question arises then, what becomes part
of the doctrine and what do you discard as simply the day to
day polemics of Lenin running a revolution in Russia?-- With- 20
in the day to day polemics of a master you will find that
he maintains his main principles consistently, or pretty
consistently. And he may over emphasise or lay great em-
phasis on certain aspects because of a certain situation.
But the principles run through.

Well, now, isn't that one of the things on which 25
political philosophers may differ; you may say 'Well, this
really does not fit in to the main body of the doctrine;
this is something which he just threw off for some particu-
lar reason'; someone else may say 'No, we must look here
and find doctrine'?-- They may differ, but a fairly consistent 30

body of knowledge is built up in time, and the basic consistent coherent line is established. 1

Well, consider Lenin who now appears in Selected Works of 12 volumes - I don't know how many volumes there are for his complete works - - but is everything in these twelve volumes of equal value? Are they all equally authoritative? Or is there a sort of law of citation as to the differing authority of different parts?-- They are all authoritative but how you use them, of course, depends on the particular document. 5

Different parts might have different weights?-- According to the situation in which they are used. 10

It may also depends on who uses them? I suppose if Marx wrote above letter and Lenin quoted it, it might become part of doctrine?-- If it was a consistent part of the rest of Lenin's theory. . . 15

Well, what about Plesinov whom you've mentioned; is he a classical Marxist-Leninist author?--He is generally regarded as a deviationist. .

You see there were some of his in the books you went through; H.B.53 for instance was one of his works, called "Fundamental Problems of Marxism"; is that a classic, or is this one of the cases where he watered down the idea of revolution?-- I remember that; I think there is a bit of dilution, reformism there - - I would recommend anyone who studies Lenin to study Plekinov but he is not in the direct line of the classics, if I remember the book rightly. 20 25

Who decides whether he is a classic or not? It's a question of political philosophy, is it?-- No; I think it's a question of clear thinking and study and 30

reading up the matter; getting the text of a document as to its coherency, the way it hangs together, you see. 1

But cannot people people that Plekinov is in the true line of Marx whereas Lenin isn't?-- In the true line of Marx whereas Lenin isn't?

Yes?-- I doubt if that can easily be held; I am not very well up in that book at the moment, but I doubt if that could be held easily. Plekinov was more or less denounced; he introduced Marx into Russia but he was denounced later on. 5

Well, could a person believe in the philosophy of Marx and Lenin and yet disagree with Stalin?-- He couldn't disagree with Stalin on principle; he could disagree on certain new economic policy, on socialism in one State - - that kind of thing. 10

Could you not say, "Well, I'm a Marxist-Leninist and Stalin may have written about it but I don't regard him as authoritative"?-- I don't think anybody who knows Marxism-Leninism could say that in principle Stalin wasn't in line - - didn't fall into line. They could criticise him for, if you like, the cult of the individual - - that type of thing. But those are aspects of the case and doesn't involve the main principle. 15 20

But didn't Trotski criticise Stalin on doctrinal as well as practical grounds?-- Some doctrinal interpretation; I don't think they were fundamental -- he criticised him on socialism in one State. 25

I thought he disagreed with him on the question of the doctrine of permanent revolutionism?-- Yes.

Isn't that a very basic difference?-- No, I don't think so. 30

Well, Trotsky thought so, and Stalin apparently
thought so?-- Oh, for the moment it was an important issue,
but the point is, so long as you maintain the revolution
- how you interpret the idea of permanent revolution does
not necessarily affect the principle of Marxism-Leninism-
Stalinism. 1
5

Was Trotsky a Marxist-Leninist?-- He certainly
thought he was.

Yes, he thought he was, but was he? I suppose
Stalin would have said no?-- Yes, he would have said no.

I take it that Isaac Deutcher who has written
about Trotsky might very well say that Trotsky is a Marxist
Leninist whereas Stalin isn't?-- Yes; well, I'm not . . . 10

What would you say as a political philosopher?
Was Trotsky a Marxist-Leninist?-- I'm not for the moment
. . . I'd have to gather some points together. Speaking
generally I would say that Trotsky was a Marxist-Leninist
still in principle, but that in particular circumstances
he gave an interpretation - - he still moves within the
framework of Marxist-Leninist. 15

Yes, in a very general sense. If you wanted to
know what Trotsky's views were on any point of doctrine
it might have been rather unsafe to read Stalin's works
to find out?-- What Trotsky's views were? 20

Yes?-- Yes, read Trotsky himself.

Of course. What all this leads up to, Professor,
is that this doctrine of Marxism-Leninism, although you
have, as asked, tried to give a coherent view of it, has
got very many facets and interpretations and offshoots
?-- On aspect of it; not on the main principles. 25

But these different people may disagree about 30

Collection: 1956 Treason Trial
Collection number: AD1812

PUBLISHER:

Publisher:- Historical Papers, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand

Location:- Johannesburg

©2011

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the Historical Papers website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

People using these records relating to the archives of Historical Papers, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, are reminded that such records sometimes contain material which is uncorroborated, inaccurate, distorted or untrue. While these digital records are true facsimiles of paper documents and the information contained herein is obtained from sources believed to be accurate and reliable, Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand has not independently verified their content. Consequently, the University is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the website or any related information on third party websites accessible from this website.