Although John Anderson and Austin Woodbury never came face to face in debate, a war by proxy between them briefly captured the attention of the public at the time of the 'Gough affair' of 1961. Dr Victor Kinsella, a Sydney surgeon, wrote in his *The Mechanism of Abdominal Pain*, 'pain from the alimentary tract is typically central, deep and diffuse' and that describes accurately enough his gut reaction to Andersonian philosophy after a course of study with Woodbury at the Aquinas Academy. Kinsella eventually became a part-time lecturer in philosophy at the Academy. In 1958 he privately printed and distributed widely a pamphlet, *Empiricism and Freedom*, attacking the philosophy being taught at Sydney University. Its language is vigorous; the following extract gives a flavour of its invective (and indeed of Woodbury’s lectures, on which it is based):

It has been rightly said of empiricism that it is the philosophy of the gutter, for it admits only sense-knowing — peering, sniffing, nosing, cocking the ears, etc. And now, Professor Anderson shows that lining the empiricist gutter there are posts, but no propters ... The empiricist rejects ‘agencies and the like’, i.e., causes. For him, ‘there are only facts, i.e., occurrences,’ and no causal link can be admitted between them ... Having denied to man any knowing faculty whereby he can read within the externals of things and know something of their natures, the empiricist must reject the moral law. As Professor Anderson tells the school children coming to the University in Orientation Week — ‘intelligence’ (for him a sorter of sense-images) ‘does not recognise such concepts as lack of obscenity or sedition.’

(Kinsella was quite wrong in saying that Anderson denied causality, but, as we saw, the claims about not recognising such concepts as obscenity were correct.)

The pamphlet provoked little reaction at the time, but an opportunity to publicise it arose a few years later when the NSW Government set up the Youth Policy Advisory Committee. Its chairman Judge (later Sir) Adrian Curlewis was the son of the author of Seven Little Australians, a work on the education of youth with, it is fair to say, a philosophy diametrically opposed to Anderson’s. He had been strongly involved in promoting healthy outdoor activities for the young, like surf lifesaving, Outward Bound, and the Duke of Edinburgh’s Award Scheme. He had earlier chaired the NSW Government’s Shark Menace Advisory Committee, after which there were very few shark attacks in Sydney. Could he repeat the performance? Although he did not state publicly his views on those who threatened the morals of society, it is clear what they were from extracts from a speech by Sir Patrick (later Lord) Devlin that he sent to an inquirer. It is worth quoting these views for their insight into the thinking of some of the more extreme (by later standards, at least) of the defenders of society’s mores:

Societies disintegrate from within more frequently than they are broken up from external pressures. There is disintegration when no common morality is observed and history shows that the loosening of moral bonds is often the first stage of disintegration, so that society is justified in taking the same steps to preserve its moral code as it does to preserve its government and other essential institutions. The suppression of vice is as much the law’s business as the suppression of subversive activities; it is no more possible to define a sphere of private morality than it is to define one of private subversive activity ... there can be no theoretical limits to legislation against immorality ... Christian morals are the basis of the criminal

law and ... without the support of the churches the moral order, which has its origin and takes its strength from Christian beliefs would collapse."

Kinsella included his pamphlet in a submission alleging that the empiricist philosophy and psychology taught at both Sydney’s universities were corrupting the morals of the youth. The inquiry considered the matter at some length, assisted by the expertise of its member Monsignor Leonard, holder of a doctorate in scholastic philosophy from the University of Louvain. It eventually found that there was insufficient evidence to support the charge, and confined its recommendations to such schemes as the expansion of cadet units in schools and drawing the attention of the US ambassador to the TV programs from his country which gave the youth the impression that brutalising or serious crime was normal there.

But in the meantime Curlewis had sent a copy of Kinsella’s pamphlet to Dr Hugh Gough, the Anglican Archbishop of Sydney and Primate of Australia. Gough, the only supporter among the English bishops of the Billy Graham crusade of 1954, had found in Sydney a diocese of even more Evangelical tenor than himself, and had settled into regular condemnations of immorality and Communism, evils some thought he did not distinguish very clearly. He warned the press to expect something sensational from his sermon in St Andrew’s Cathedral on 6 July 1961, and the reporters were not disappointed.

After warming up with some remarks on how the ‘seeds of the corruption of the moral consciousness of the Nazis was sown away back in the 19th century by various German philosophers, who taught first agnosticism and then atheism’, he attacked the ‘worse and greater threat in the world-wide challenge of Communism’, the basis of which is atheism. Then he got to the point. ‘Even in Sydney’, he said, ‘we have those who are shamelessly teaching in our universities the same soul-destroying philosophies. I am not saying that such lecturers are Communists, but they are teaching ideas which are break-
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Corrupting the Youth

ing down the restraints of conscience, decrying the institution of marriage, urging our students to pre-marital sexual experience, advocating free love and the right of self-expression. What made university folk everywhere put the wagons round in a circle was his call for State action: ‘If it is true that empires and nations have fallen because of moral corruption which has sapped the mental vitality and physical strength of the people, is it not the duty of governments to take note of this decline in morals and to take action? This is an unpopular and even dangerous question to ask. Any suggestion which raises the slightest suspicion of interference with freedom immediately arouses wrathful opposition.’

True enough. The press was full of it for weeks. Various university figures professed themselves astonished at the idea that anyone at universities should be in favour of free love; Sydney University’s Vice-Chancellor claimed that ‘the morals of students are higher today than ever before’ and threatened a libel action. Pix, leading human-interest-and-cheesecake pictorial, sent its investigative team to interview students at both Sydney universities on their attitude to free love; most were against it, except possibly for other people. A pensive president of the University of New South Wales Students’ Representative Council, John Niland, was pictured beside his opinion that ‘Maybe it’s all right for the few, but free love wouldn’t fit in with civilised living for the majority.’

Kinsella followed up with a long letter to the Youth Committee denouncing, in addition, the University of New South Wales Philosophy Department, the Sydney Libertarian Society, and the textbook by John Hospers used at Sydney, and demanding that the University should be called on to show cause why it should not lose its Royal Charter. Pix made Dr Kinsella’s attack on Hospers’ textbook
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its cover story (‘Raised eyebrows at the uni text book belong to lovely 16–year-old model Elizabeth Thomas. The book is called “evil” by a well-known doctor. Elizabeth is not called evil by anyone.’) Kinsella explained that the author was too cunning to advocate free love explicitly, but that his denial of the objectivity of morals and caricaturing of traditional arguments for the existence of God inevita-
bly led to it." Channel 7 wheeled out the usual suspects for a stoush: the Liberal parliamentarian W.C. Wentworth claimed students believed that to pass they had to write what their lecturers liked, while Labor’s Dr Jim Cairns said that universities, far from being the centre of too much criticism, did not ask nearly enough embarrassing questions. The Communists demanded a meeting with the Archbishop to deny that immorality had anything to do with them. Prime Minister Menzies, then facing his toughest electoral test, bowed to Gough at a dinner and said, ‘I am pleased to see his Grace here. Nothing brings so much balm to the spirit as to see a man who, like himself, is in trouble.’

Perhaps the only reaction that gave the impression of being anchored in experience was a letter to the press from ‘Concerned mother’ of Neutral Bay. It is interesting for its recognition that more than a clash of opinions is under way:

Sir, — I write as the parent of an honours graduate of Sydney University, who has completed his course comparatively unscathed (if one could assume complete loss of religious faith previously held as ‘unscathed’).

My child (now adult) is surrounded by graduate and other university friends who are either living at times with the mate of the moment or, having married young, are eking out an existence in the accepted matrimonial state, with both partners in a perpetual state of nervousness, bordering on neurosis.

Both of course are employed in some way outside the home, and in few cases is the home more than a substitute for that worthy institution. One young woman university student whom I have befriended sees no wrong in bringing an illegitimate child into the world and a short time ago demonstrated this very fact. Her friends rallied to her assistance, and she wanted for nothing. Other young women I have known have aborted in their first university year …

Where then is this unrest and this disturbing influence on the emotions coming from?

John Anderson wrote in a letter to the press:

It’s no use having to ask the Archbishop’s opinion every time you want to suggest a new theory. In my thirty-two years at Sydney University, I never heard a Philosophy teacher advocate free love or pre-marital ex-
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experience in the lecture-room. What he expresses in private is his own business and not the Archbishop’s or Dr Kinsella’s.

The dispute occasioned Anderson’s last major public appearance, when the retiring president of the students’ union, Peter Wilenski, invited him to speak at his old university. He defended himself in some detail against Kinsella’s charges, while denying both Kinsella and the Curlewis committee any standing or competence in judging his philosophy. On Kinsella’s charge that empiricism had an unhealthy monopoly on university positions in philosophy, Anderson replied that ‘if you give students all sorts of views, you are not encouraging a real grasp of philosophy.’ Anderson also spoke at the University of New South Wales, and made it clear that there was no mistake about the conflict between his views and Gough’s. ‘The academic world has to attack any religion which tries to lay down requirements not in accordance with reality. In any university the fight between secularism and religion is intense ... church-going minds are childish. We are dealing with people who are not really adults.’

This drew a reply from Bishop Muldoon, a Catholic bishop who had written on scholastic philosophy, who suggested that a teacher who felt so vehemently could hardly have failed to communicate his scorn and contempt to his students. Kinsella himself lobbed onto campus, to heated objections, telling the students, ‘You’re not the culprits, you’re the victims.’

The three professors at Sydney University attacked by Kinsella, Alan Stout, John Mackie and William O’Neil, also gave their views publicly. From the point of view of Kinsella’s claims, all had interesting histories. Strangely, Stout owed his appointment in part to agitation by scholastics. In the late 1930s, complaints about Anderson had begun to make an impact on the University Senate. In 1937, Catholic circles believed they had convinced Sir John Peden, Professor of Law and a
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John Anderson speaking to University of New South Wales students at the time of the Kinsella affair, 1961 (Fairfax Photos)
dominant figure on the Senate, that the appropriate solution was a chair of scholastic philosophy. Sources of money for the proposed chair were spoken of, along with methods of ensuring that the appointee was an orthodox scholastic, and could be removed if his scholasticism failed to remain orthodox. A certain misunderstanding of the idea of academic freedom in a secular university seems to be involved here.

In a rare display of Christian unity, the Anglican Archbishop and bishops signed a petition to the University Senate complaining that philosophy at the University was taught exclusively from an anti-theistic viewpoint, which, ‘if it be not exposed to effective criticism from within the University itself, is, in our opinion, deeply prejudicial to the best interests of students, and particularly to those of the students who are contemplating service in the Christian ministry ... we believe that the most valuable kind of religious faith is one which has thought its way through all the arguments which can be adduced against it. But we have the strongest possible objection to the negative view being the only view which is officially represented in the teaching of the University.’ The Senate agreed that these complaints were correct, but decided it could not be seen to be influenced by outside criticism of the University. It eventually agreed on a ‘compromise’. To counterbalance Anderson, there would be a separate chair of Moral and Political Philosophy, but it would be advertised openly in the usual way.

Anderson was too fast for the opposition, and during his sabbatical overseas in 1938, encouraged Stout, then at Edinburgh, to apply. Stout promptly became a crony of Anderson, and is reported as saying, doubtless in jest, ‘Of course, it made no difference to John. He went on corrupting the youth just as much as before, and damn it all, he corrupted me too!’ He supported Anderson publicly in the 1943
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‘religion in education’ controversy, and it was not long before the Catholics were complaining that his corruption of the youth was real enough. Anderson’s ASIO file reported in 1950, crudely but not inaccurately,

Professors Anderson, Elkin and Stout form a sort of triangle ... Stout is completely under Anderson’s influence and always ready to step in and cover his tracks. Anderson has the brains of the trio.

Stout’s views on ethics emphasised a ‘moral commitment’ in the absence of reasons, but did not reach the austere extremity of Anderson’s. A student of 1960 recalls:

Ethics classes were more entertaining. Professor Alan Stout, short, passionate and a little on the stout side, sometimes bounced up and down on the platform in his excitement. He had greying hair, a waistcoat buttoned up higgledy-piggledy and, when he was really bouncing, his half-moon glasses swung around him on a black chain ... ‘I am, in many senses, the last of the objectivists,’ he announced. ‘I believe in good and evil, I am quite prepared to point to the good, whatever the difficulties of defining goodness. The preservation of the foreshores is good. The Nazi persecution of the Jews was evil. It is no mere matter of, “Preservation of the foreshores — hooray!” and “Killing the Jews — boo!”’

He did very little philosophy after arriving in Australia, but put a great deal of energy into being a public intellectual. He was a member of the National Morale Committee during the War, and enjoyed himself immensely as chairman of Sydney University’s Air Raids Precaution Committee. By the late 1940s he was president of the Prison Reform Council, on the National Film Board, active in drama and ballet, and so on. Later he was a leading supporter of Sydney Sparkes
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Orr and involved in the anti-nuclear and anti-Vietnam War causes, and with the Council for Civil Liberties. It is probably Stout who is referred to in Gough’s hint, ‘I am not saying such lecturers are Communists, but …’ ASIO had him down as a ‘possible sympathiser’, on the evidence that he was associated with the Sydney Film Society and the Youth Carnival for Peace, both allegedly full of fellow-travellers, that his name was ‘in a list found in the Marx House raid of 1949’ and that his son was once seen visiting the Soviet Embassy."

Stout achieved a brief public prominence at the time of the Melbourne Peace Conference of 1959. The Conference, with many distinguished international invitees, was regarded by the right as a Communist front. ASIO, not without a certain prescience, suspected that the peace movement might be the conduit whereby far left ideas would again infect wider sections of society. Stout, one of the Conference’s sponsors, was personally visited by Charles Spry, the director of ASIO, to convince him of the dangers of being a Communist dupe. Stout did withdraw his sponsorship, but also revealed publicly the visit from Spry. A minor scandal ensued, with Garfield Barwick and W.C. Wentworth savaged in Parliament over their role in sending Spry to see Stout, and Labor parliamentarian Eddie Ward asking Menzies if he could have a personal visit from Spry too, to learn the ‘truth’ about the Conference. (In the event, the truth about the conference was revealed, when it failed to pass a motion in support of imprisoned Hungarian writers, and the most famous overseas attendees withdrew their support.) In response to Kinsella, Stout claimed he had only been joking in putting forward on television arguments
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in favour of trial marriages. He denied he was a member of Anderson’s school, and claimed he knew of no case of immoral conduct in the University.42 His lectures went further. ’Ripping into Gough’s undistinguished academic record at Cambridge, he told us, “The Archbishop, ladies and gentlemen, has two thirds”’.

At the end of the year of the controversy, Stout was appointed chairman of Sydney University’s Board of Studies in Divinity. A churchman hoped this meant he had ’come on side with Christ at last’. Stout said, ‘I think he’s got a cheek.’

John Mackie was an entirely different proposition. His father, Alexander Mackie, a philosophy graduate from Edinburgh, had been the first Principal of Sydney Teachers’ College and Sydney University’s first Professor of Education; that is, in control of teacher education in New South Wales. His views on education as an intellectually respectable profession dominated education in the state for decades after his death.44 John Mackie fell under the Andersonian spell early, and was to be found in the 1930s voicing strict Andersonian views45 and, according to reliable reports, doorknocking for communist candidates.

His article, ’The refutation of morals’, achieved some notoriety, since it meant what it said; it accepted the negative part of Anderson’s ethics while denying the positive. It ended, ’We have shown that the great mass of what is called moral thought is, not nonsense, but error, the imagining of objective facts and qualities of external things where there exists nothing but our feelings of desire and approval.’46 On the
one hand, it was far enough from Anderson’s views to bar him from admittance to the inner circle of the great man’s disciples;" on the other, it prevented Mackie gaining the chair in philosophy in Tasmania that went instead to Orr. No suggestion of moral impropriety attached to him; on the contrary, all spoke of his helpfulness and honesty. But many remarked a certain lack of emotional warmth. David Stove recalled:

I think I was as close to being a friend of John’s as anyone was, but that is not saying much. When I was with him I always felt I had to supply warmth for two, his as well as my own. I didn’t grudge the effort, because he was such a good chap really; but oh, so cool!

After some time in New Zealand, Mackie succeeded Anderson in the Challis Chair of Philosophy at Sydney University in 1959, and let some fresh air into that enclosed atmosphere. He left permanently for England in 1964. Before his death at a comparatively young age in 1981, he completed six well-regarded books, including *Ethics: Inventing Right and Wrong*, which repeats unattenuated his earlier sceptical views on ethics, and the anti-religious *The Miracle of Theism*. Mackie had tangled briefly with Gough in 1960, when the Archbishop advocated the compulsory wearing of seatbelts. Mackie had protested against this moralistic intrusion on liberty with the words, 'If, however, Christianity can be summed up in the principle, “Everyone else must put up with what I like,” as Dr Gough’s other remarks on morality, censorship, and religion in schools would seem to indicate, then surely Christian driving is exactly what we have too much of already.' At the time of Kinsella’s campaign, he replied to the one aspect of the attack that had gained acceptance, the opinion that philosophy teaching at Sydney University was one-sided. Mackie said that while a diversity of views in philosophy departments might be in
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principle desirable, it was certainly not the business of any outside authority to 'secure such diversity in order to reduce the risk of offending those who are hostile to the critical spirit.'

Bill O’Neil’s early work was distinctly Andersonian, and he later saw his work of that time as a first attempt at the ‘Australian materialism’ that later became popular in the philosophy of mind (to be described in chapter 9). Like several leading Andersonians, he was the product of a Catholic education, his views on which appear in his paper, ‘The advantages of a Catholic education’ in the second number of Anderson’s Freethought. He complained that though Catholic students were told their faith was in accord with reason, they were not equipped with the arguments to refute objections. Further, despite too little attention by the Brothers to things intellectual and too much to swotting, he still didn’t get good exam marks. His appointment to the Sydney University chair of psychology in 1945 was attacked in the Catholic Weekly on the grounds of his materialism.

Like Mackie, he was a thinker of independent mind. But he admired, in particular, Anderson’s generally materialist point of view, and accepted his opinion on the lack of unity of the mind — the insistence on ‘the plurality of feelings which interact within an economy or society of mental processes.’ He admitted ‘his [Anderson’s] influence upon my own basic psychological views has been greater than that of any psychologist I have encountered, either in the flesh or through the printed page.’ It was O’Neil who gave the address at Anderson’s retirement, praising him as the ‘modern version of Socrates, the Athenian philosopher who was condemned for corrupting the

The Andersonian influence meant that the Sydney Psychology Department was one of the few in the world where mention of philosophy was permitted. In most places, academic psychology was still trying to put as much distance as possible between itself and philosophy, in the interests of maintaining its status as a true experimental science, free of waffle. At Sydney, on the other hand, it was permissible to suggest that claiming to be free of philosophical assumptions is merely to adopt some long-refuted simplistic philosophical view, and one could say things like ‘a great proportion of psychological research has been misdirected, to pseudo problems on which no conceivable data could throw any light.’

The actual range of philosophical views, however, was not wide. No doubt there was some exaggeration in Kinsella’s belief that ‘in these matters the two departments are indistinguishable; the Psychology Department acts as an annexe of the Philosophy Department’; nevertheless, the differences between their position and Anderson’s were perhaps more evident to insiders than to outside observers, and on the points that mattered, there was a good measure of agreement.

The Gough ‘affair’ died down, but flared up briefly twice again in 1962. Kinsella was invited to orientation week at the University of New South Wales to debate Dr Peter Kenny, a psychologist with connections to the Sydney University Psychology Department and self-styled sexologist. Kenny duly shocked everyone with his views
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on sexual freedom, and Kinsella denounced him to the Curlewis committee, as evidence of the depths to which immoral philosophy had led. Later in the year, Kinsella’s letter was used as publicity for a talk by Kenny at the University of Queensland, leading to the student editor of The Freethinker, Humphrey McQueen, being suspended and given a sound talking to by the Vice-Chancellor on the need for morality.

Gough and Kinsella lost the battle comprehensively. It was widely agreed that Gough had been misled by Kinsella’s allegations, and even Gough came to suspect he had been sold a dud. All the same, a few on the other side harboured private thoughts that their victory was not altogether deserved. David Stove, then recently appointed to Sydney University, wrote privately to David Armstrong concerning Armstrong’s letter criticising ‘the attempt to link the names of Professors Anderson, O’Neil and Stout with any kind of impropriety’:

I didn’t like your letter on the Archbishop etc a bit. Unless you’re privately redefining ‘impropriety’ it is neither silly nor scandalous to impute an influence for impropriety to Anderson, but just obviously true. But I won’t start on this. Alan [Stout] has nearly driven us mad by his reluctance to shut up. In my opinion he’s playing with fire, as well as being plainly and repeatedly dishonest.

He was known to say, many years later, ‘I hate to agree with an idiot like Kinsella, but he was absolutely right.’

Peter Coleman, then beginning to achieve some success in the literary world with books like Obscenity, Blasphemy, Sedition, which attacks those notions as strongly as Anderson, recalled the Sydney University speech as something of a turning-point in his views, which were rapidly becoming more conservative:

The great philosopher could not see that the crowds now shouting tally-ho shared none of his austere, stoic and classicist values. These were the forward scouts of all the creeds of the sixties against whose coming he had spoken so eloquently — the liberationism, the relativism, the irrationalism. Next week they would be cheering his enemies again. But this scourge of religious moralists, patriotic blowhards, philistine censors and
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leftwing bullyboys was overwhelmed by the flattery of the multitude and could see no tincture of truth in the charges of his critics.

Here then was Australia as the 1960s began. The head of the only Church with which I had any bond had raised important issues far beyond his grasp. The head of an old conservative family and publisher of a leading newspaper had taken sides against the teacher who had done most to expose the humbug of our times. That philosopher was now paying grateful homage to the shock troops of the new dark age against which he had warned.\footnote{Coleman, \textit{Memoirs}, p. 165; similar thoughts in Stove, ‘Force of intellect’, at p. 46.}

Dr Kinsella later gave philosophy lessons in several Marist Sisters schools, which are remembered as stimulating by some of the better students.\footnote{Sr J. McBride SM to author.} These lessons, and his primer for philosophy in schools,\footnote{V. Kinsella, \textit{Philosophy for Schools} (48 pp., printed by Erica Press, Huntingdale, Vic, n.d.).} make him a pioneer of the lately fashionable philosophy for schools movement.

The author of the offending textbook, John Hospers, became a genuine danger to other countries, if not Australia. He was Presidential candidate for the Libertarian Party, advocating the dismantling of government services, in the US Presidential Election of 1972, and was later involved in a secessionist coup in the New Hebrides.\footnote{Age 4/6/1980, p. 11; \textit{Bulletin} 17/6/1980, pp. 97–103.}

Gough was not so lucky, and became a victim of the new age against which he had fought. Allegations that he was sacked for adultery on a cruise liner\footnote{R. Neville, \textit{Hippie Hippie Shake} (Melbourne, 1995), p. 105.} are apparently untrue; he was not sacked, nor were the allegations of adultery established. But it was certainly the case that a romantic attachment of some kind to a member of the church led to rumours taken advantage of by his enemies, by then numerous.\footnote{A. Gill, ‘A “shabbily treated” archbishop’, \textit{SMH} 27/10/1987, p. 3; S. Judd \& K. Cable, \textit{Sydney Anglicans} (Sydney, 1987), p. 274; A. Gill to author, 1/11/1995, K. Cable to author, 8/11/1995, S. Judd to author, 21/11/1995.}

The mainstream press did the right thing and carried the usual ‘ill health’ stories when he suddenly resigned,\footnote{\textit{SMH} 25/5/1966, p. 1.} but \textit{Oz} magazine, representing those condemned by Gough in 1961, made the most of the opportunity: ‘Let OZ state quite categorically that it cannot believe such stories in view of Hugh’s well known and forthright public
statements on the true morality.77 Gough was packed off to be vicar of Freshford, Somerset (population 600).78
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