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Introduction

In this issue of The Northern Line, several distinct pieces are published. Following on from the publication in the last issue of ‘John Anderson and Idealism’ which will be published in The Dictionary of British Idealism later this year, the three other articles submitted to that volume for publication are here reproduced. The first is an account of the history of Idealism in Australia and New Zealand and while it does not discuss John Anderson, it does provide a description of the philosophical environment Anderson encountered when he arrived here in 1927. For example, ‘Realism and some of its critics’ is a response to various contributions by A.C. Fox, Morris Miller, T.A. Hunter, W.A. Merrylees, and E.V. Miller. With the exception of the last mentioned, all are discussed in this article. The other two articles discuss the first two professors of philosophy in Australia, Henry Laurie and Francis Anderson, and each were important in their own ways. Laurie, from Edinburgh, imported a distinctive brand of Personal Idealism into Australia which determined the key issues discussed in philosophy over the next fifty years. Anderson, from Glasgow, was firmly in the tradition of Caird’s Hegelian Idealism and was also to play an important role in Australia’s cultural history, discussed in detail in Gregory Melliush’s Cultural Liberalism in Australia. Past readers of ‘JA’ are reminded that in number 25 of that journal, there is an extensive discussion of Francis Anderson and of the visit by Henry Jones to Australia in 1908. This issue also continues the publication of the Anderson/Walker correspondence for March 1952. Several topics are raised in the correspondence including the emergence of the Libertarian Society at Sydney, Ruth’s confrontation with Karl Popper at London, and the discussion of various individuals including Alec Ritchie and David Stove. There is also an interesting extract by Anderson of his view of philosophy as an elaborate defence mechanism. The account of Ruth’s exchange with Popper is also of interest for it clearly demonstrates her ability to challenge one of the leading philosophers of the day in an objective and Realist manner. This is strong evidence in support of the view that John’s attraction to Ruth was primarily intellectual and philosophical and not simply sexual, as some of Anderson’s detractors have suggested.

The last items are a continuation of the collection of the biographical details of the ‘Andersonians’. David Craig, Hedley Bull, David Stove and Rawdon Dalrymple are discussed here and it may interest readers to learn that David Craig is alive and well and recently corresponded with me concerning Space-Time and the Proposition. During this correspondence it emerged that Craig’s notes of Anderson’s 1946 Metaphysics course were borrowed by Anderson to set exam questions for the course. When they were returned to Craig, they had been extensively annotated by Anderson, and Craig had these typed and placed in the archives at Sydney University. I had been aware of the existence of these lectures in the archives but did not know of Anderson’s input into them. These notes would appear to another candidate for publication by Sydney University, although there has still been no statement from the current Anderson Fellow or the Anderson Advisory Committee of which lectures will eventually be published as the Anderson corpus. Regarding the entry on David Stove, there appears to be little available information on his time at Sydney University (roughly 1945 to 1952). Jim Baker has described him as part of the ‘Holy Trinity’ (Baker, Stove and MacCallum) during the forties, although I am not clear on precisely when this was. I understand that Baker was at Oxford from 1948 to 1950 which would suggest the years 1946 and 1947. However Stove graduated in 1950 and if he undertook a normal three-year B.A. degree, this would place him as a student during the very years when Baker was at Oxford. If anyone can clear this up or provide any information on Stove’s activities during the post-war period, it would be much appreciated. I am currently working on biographical entries for the following individuals and any information or references on these would be gratefully appreciated: Ruth Atkins; Brian Beddie; Albert Bussell; Peter Gibbons; Margot Henze; Gaius McIntosh; Bill Morison; Perce Partridge; Oliver Somerville; George Molnar; Cyril Walsh.

Donations gratefully received: PC $40; WD $25; GM; $40. On the question of donations, I am currently working casually doing kitchen-hand and laundry duties at a local nursing home which enables me to pay basic expenses. I do not receive any welfare payments and donations enable me to spend my spare time working on Andersonian philosophy and producing The Northern Line.
Idealism in Australia and New Zealand

From the middle of the nineteenth century, Oxford and Glasgow were the centres of Idealist and Hegelian studies in British philosophy. Led by T. H. Green and Edward Caird, Idealism became the dominant philosophical orthodoxy during the second half of the nineteenth century and was the basis of an effective counter attack to the scientific naturalism and evolutionary theory which was then gaining intellectual respectability throughout Britain. After Green’s early death, Idealism at Oxford became preoccupied with logical and epistemological issues, while at Glasgow a lasting tradition of Hegelianism was taking hold which was to have a significant influence on the cultural life throughout the Empire. Glasgow Hegelians travelled to Canada, South Africa, New Zealand and Australia, spreading the gospel of Hegelianism. The establishment of Glasgow as the centre of Hegelian studies in Scotland led to marked differences with Edinburgh, where under the influence of students of Hamilton such as the Personal Idealist, A. C. Fraser, and Seth Pringle-Pattison, historical studies in philosophy were more dominant. While the philosophy at both centres can be fairly described as Idealist, the differences between them were significant.

Before passing on to the origins of philosophy in Australia, it is important to note that a full decade before the first philosopher was appointed to a chair in Australia, the most important Australian-born philosopher in either the nineteenth or twentieth centuries had left Australia and arrived in Oxford to become one of the leading philosophers of the early twentieth century. Samuel Alexander was born in Sydney in 1859, educated at Wesley College, Melbourne, and arrived at Oxford in 1877. He won the Green Prize in 1883 with his essay ‘Moral Order and Progress’ and was subsequently appointed Professor of Philosophy at Manchester University in 1893. Like many Idealists of the time, Alexander sought to reconcile Hegelian Idealism with Darwinian evolutionary theory and D.G. Ritchie praised Alexander’s essay as one of the best examples of this type. Alexander remained an Idealist until the publication of Moore’s ‘The Refutation of Idealism’ in 1903 at which point he began to doubt his Idealist presuppositions. In a number of articles over the next fifteen years, Alexander began to reformulate his philosophical position, a process which finally came to fruition in his Gifford lectures at Glasgow University during 1917 and 1918 and subsequently published as Space, Time and Deity in 1920. J. Alexander Gunn, later a professor at Melbourne University, regarded Alexander’s book as the most important publication in English philosophy since Bradley’s Appearance and Reality. One participant at these Gifford lectures was John Anderson, later the realist Professor of Philosopher at Sydney University, and these lectures had a lasting and significant impact on Anderson. Alexander had now arrived at a position where he thought that the opposition between Realism and Idealism was largely without meaning and called his own philosophy ‘empiricism’. However this term had almost nothing in common with the traditional usage of empiricism and Alexander outlined a detailed metaphysic of Space, Time and the categories, of a universe in a process of emergence, the final level of which would see the emergence of Deity. Alexander’s influence on British philosophy during the twenties and thirties was significant, although after 1939 it was only in John Anderson’s department at Sydney where Alexander’s metaphysic continued to be seriously studied.

In Australia, religious and economic demands in the young nation led to the creation of the first universities from 1850 onwards, firstly at Sydney, then Melbourne, and then in the other capital cities of Adelaide, Hobart, Perth and Brisbane. The first chairs in philosophy were established in Melbourne (1886), Sydney (1890) and Adelaide (1894) and the inaugural appointments to these chairs were all Scottish philosophers, educated at either Edinburgh or Glasgow. Laurie, professor at Melbourne from 1886 to 1911 was educated at Edinburgh, as was Mitchell, professor at Adelaide from 1894 to 1923, while Francis Anderson, professor at Sydney from 1890 to 1922 was educated at Glasgow. Subsequent appointees to chairs in philosophy in Australia and New Zealand were either students of these pioneers (Morris Miller and McKellar Stewart were students of Laurie, Mayo was a student of Mitchell, while Fox, Scott Miller and Muscio were students of Francis Anderson) or were appointed directly from Scotland itself (William and John Anderson). W. R. Boyce Gibson, the one partial exception to this rule, studied philosophy at Jena and Paris, before going to Glasgow to study under Jones and Adamson. Hence academic philosophy in Australia and New

Zealand during its first fifty years reflected the predominant concerns of Scottish Idealist philosophy at Glasgow and Edinburgh. At Melbourne and Hobart, neo-Kantianism and historical studies in philosophy dominated, while in Sydney, Perth and Brisbane, Hegelianism was dominant with an emphasis on liberal public-spiritedness and a concern with theological issues. At Adelaide, Mitchell’s independent metaphysics was the dominant philosophy.

Henry Laurie, a student of Campbell Fraser, was the first professor appointed in Australia and his 1902 work, Scottish Philosophy in its National Development, is in the tradition of Pringle-Pattison’s Scottish Philosophy. Like Fraser, Laurie was more concerned with teaching a critical exposition of particular philosophers than systematically presenting his own views. Hence while it is difficult to elaborate the detail of Laurie’s philosophical views, his general philosophical purpose is nonetheless clear. Laurie opposed the agnosticism and naturalism of Spencer’s evolutionary theory with a fusion of neo-Kantianism with Scottish common-sense philosophy, with some Hegelian influence also evident. Through the influence of his students, most notably McKellar Stewart and Morris Miller, Laurie’s view that the individual personality is the starting point for all philosophical analysis dominated Australian philosophy for its first fifty years.

Francis Anderson was a student of Edward Caird and firmly in the tradition of Scottish Hegelian Idealism. While Anderson was a prominent public intellectual and wrote on a wide variety of social, political and educational issues, he never published a statement of his philosophy. Even in his lectures, which are widely regarded as having an important influence on several generations of Australian intellectuals, there is little surviving material that outlines his philosophical position. Anderson appears to have adhered to the general doctrines of Glasgow Hegelianism established by Caird of the universe as an organic unity in the process of evolving towards God, although his more enduring influence on Australian cultural life was through his articulation and defence of the principles of cultural liberalism. The influence of Edward Caird’s Hegelianism was strong at Sydney with Norman MacLaurin, a Vice-Chancellor, Mungo MacCallum, the inaugural Professor of English and later also Vice-Chancellor, and many other prominent professors, having been students of Caird. The close ties between Glasgow and Sydney were reinforced when Caird’s successor at Glasgow, Henry Jones, visited Sydney in 1908 and gave a series of public lectures at Sydney which were later published as Idealism as a Practical Creed. Jones also visited Wollongong and Brisbane and his lectures in Brisbane were an important stimulus in the establishment of the University of Queensland in 1909.

William Mitchell, also from Edinburgh, had been a student of Fraser and Calderwood and after brief periods teaching at Edinburgh University and University College, London, was appointed professor of philosophy at Adelaide University in 1894. He resigned from the chair in philosophy in 1923 to concentrate on his duties as Vice-Chancellor, a position he held until 1942, when he was appointed Chancellor. His 1907 book, The Structure and Growth of the Mind, was praised by Norman Kemp Smith and R.F.A. Hoernle and was influential on the later Idealist work of Brand Blandshard. Mitchell gave the Gifford lectures at Glasgow between 1924 and 1926, the first volume of which was published as The Place of Minds in the Modern World (1933). The second manuscript volume was destroyed in the London blitz. Mitchell’s work, written in isolation at Adelaide, is difficult and obscure, and contains little or no reference to other philosophers to assist in the understanding of his main themes.

In the twenty five year period from 1886 to 1911, only two books were published by professional philosophers working in Australia and this lack of publication can be attributed in part to the differing philosophical traditions they were working in, as well as the academic pressures of teaching and administration duties at their developing universities. Another significant factor was the ‘tyranny of distance’ characteristic of Australian cultural life, although this was overcome to some degree by the establishment of the Australasian Journal of Psychology and Philosophy (A.J.P.P.) in 1922 with Francis Anderson as its inaugural editor. Early contributions to the journal reflected a general popular appeal, although by the mid-thirties it had become more professionally oriented.

Laurie was succeeded in the Melbourne chair by W. R. Boyce Gibson from 1912 to 1935. Boyce Gibson initially studied mathematics at Oxford but then studied philosophy under Eucken and Leibmann at Jena, and Boutoux at Paris, during 1893 and 1894. He then studied under Adamson and Jones at Glasgow between 1895 and 1897 and after lecturing at the University of London was appointed to the chair in Melbourne in 1912. During his time at London, Boyce Gibson published a wide range of books including works on ethics, logic, theology and Eucken’s philosophy of life. He also translated several of Eucken’s works, contributed an article to Sturt’s Personal Idealism, and wrote
articles on Bergson and Bosanquet. Although Boyce-Gibson had no previous contact with Australia before his appointment to Melbourne, it was John Passmore’s view that no more natural successor to Laurie could have been found. After his arrival at Melbourne, Boyce-Gibson continued his active research life and wrote important articles in Mind and Philosophy on the problem of the real and the ideal in Husserl’s phenomenology and the philosophy of Melchoir Palagyi. After the formation of the A.J.P.P., Boyce-Gibson became a regular contributor to the journal writing of such varied subjects as relativity theory, the meaning of philosophy, problems of spiritual experience, religion and rationality, the political philosophy of Rousseau and the ethics of Nicolai Hartmann. He died six months after his retirement in 1935. Two of his sons, Alexander and Quentin, became professors of philosophy in Australia. Boyce Gibson was a Personal Idealist and defined his position as one where Man is the starting point of philosophical analysis, a view in equal opposition to both Naturalism and Absolute Idealism. Defining Idealism generally as the doctrine which finds the ultimate reality of the universe in spiritual life, Boyce Gibson’s fundamental thesis was that ultimate reality could only be found through our own personal experience. Boyce Gibson rejected his previous allegiance to Spencer’s scientific philosophy and replaced the perspective of the external spectator with that of the inward-looking experienter. It was this insight which led him to the phenomenology of Husserl and while he welcomed Husserl’s insistence on the central importance of the subject, he could not accept that the subject could be conceived as an impersonal essence. However while he recognised that philosophy begins with the reality of the person, it cannot stop there and must push on to the reality of the Ideal and the supremacy of God. It is the Ideal which is the bridge between God and man’s personality, for it is a supra-personal reality present in each personal life which is ‘the reality of God within us’.

After this initial wave of Scottish Idealists, from the start of the nineteen twenties the next generation of philosophers were primarily Australian born and their interests reflected those of their teachers. Francis Anderson was succeeded by Bernard Muscio in 1922 and at Adelaide Mitchell was replaced by MacKellar Stewart in 1923. Muscio was born in country N.S.W. and educated at the University of Sydney under Francis Anderson. He won the Woolley Travelling Scholarship and travelled to Cambridge where he studied under James Ward, Bertrand Russell and G.E. Moore. Although Muscio’s most widely known work was on industrial psychology, he appears to have retained little of Francis Anderson’s Idealism and embraced the new Realism. Muscio held his post as Challis Professor of Philosophy at Sydney University until his premature death in 1926. McKellar Stewart was born in Victoria and after a period of school-teaching, enrolled at Melbourne University with the intention of entering the Presbyterian ministry. In 1906 he won the Hastie Scholarship in the School of Logic and Philosophy and in 1908 completed his qualifications for the ministry. In 1909, he travelled to Edinburgh University and in 1911 he was awarded a D. Phil. for his work on Bergson, published in that year as A Critical Exposition of Bergson’s Philosophy. In the same year, Boyce Gibson succeeded Laurie in the chair at Melbourne and early in 1912 McKellar Stewart was appointed lecturer in philosophy in the department. Boyce Gibson and McKellar Stewart reconstituted the teaching curriculum in the department, with McKellar Stewart’s interest in neo-Kantianism a strong feature of his own teaching. In 1923, he succeeded Mitchell as professor at Adelaide, thus becoming the first Australian-born professor of philosophy in Australia. He held this position until his retirement in 1949. In his work on Bergson, McKellar Stewart agreed with Bergson that scientific knowledge cannot know reality because of its limited conceptual framework. The process of living is inexplicable because scientific knowledge checks and stills this living process, and intuition is therefore necessary to transcend the limitations of scientific knowledge. However in criticism of Bergson, McKellar Stewart argued that intuition is an anti-rational mode of explanation which tends to merge the self into the changing whole and thus negates the principle of the moral personality as the source of freedom. In all forms of knowledge there must be a reference to the self-consciousness of the thinker which unifies the processes of knowing, willing and feeling. It is impossible to get behind the active self in its processes of willing and striving, for the self cannot analyse itself in this capacity and to attempt to analyse the subject is to transmute it into an object. For McKellar Stewart, this is a mystery of which there can be no further unravelling and which we must simply accept. Indeed this mystery of the self-conscious subject is the same as the mystery of the universe itself for the concepts of our thinking are unable to subjugate the universe entirely to our control.

Another of Laurie’s students, E. Morris Miller, was appointed to the chair in Hobart in 1927 and held the position until 1952. He wrote extensively on Kant with his Moral Action and Natural Law in Kant published in 1911, followed by Kant’s Doctrine of Freedom in 1913, The Basis of Freedom in 1924 and Moral Law and the Highest Good in 1928.
Morris Miller argued that Kant was mistaken because he was insufficiently Idealist, for the Ideal is not something set over us to be achieved, but is the rational end of our being which is not separable from the divine order of the universe of which we form a part. Morris Miller also wrote on the early history of philosophy in Australia and particularly the role of Henry Laurie and McKellar Stewart in that history. Other notable graduates of Melbourne University at this time included Norman Porter who worked in John Anderson’s department for four years in the late twenties and wrote ‘An Interpretation of Croce’s Aesthetic’ and W. A. Merrylees who wrote a book on Descartes and was a regular contributor to the A.J.P.P. for a number of years before losing interest in philosophy. Also of interest is Alexander Gunn, a graduate of Liverpool University who wrote an M.A. and Ph.D. on Bergson before his appointment in 1922 as Director of Tutorial Classes at the University of Melbourne with rank of full professor. Gunn was an active contributor to the A.J.P.P. until he resigned his position in 1938.

A.C. Fox, a student of Francis Anderson, was inaugural professor at the University of Western Australia and continued the public-spiritedness characteristic of Anderson’s Idealism. Fox published a book on Spinoza and religion, but appears to have left little other published work. Elton Mayo, a student of Mitchell, was the inaugural professor of philosophy at the University of Queensland from 1919 to 1923. However Mayo’s interests were in psychology, sociology and anthropology and although he went on to have a notable career in social theory and industrial psychology, after writing Philosophy and Religion in 1922, he contributed no further work in philosophy. Mayo was succeeded at Brisbane by M. Scott Fletcher, a student of Francis Anderson, who, in turn, was succeeded by his own student, W. M. Kyle. Both men were interested in theological and moral questions, but again left behind little published work. W. R. Boyce Gibson was succeeded in the Melbourne chair by his son, Alexander Boyce Gibson, who held the position from 1935 to 1966. A. Boyce Gibson was born in London and educated at Melbourne and Oxford before writing The Philosophy of Descartes in 1932. He followed the general direction of his father’s Idealism and where he departed from this it was in the tradition of Christian orthodoxy. Other publications by Boyce Gibson included Muse and thinker, Should philosophers be kings? and Towards an Australian Philosophy of Education.

The development of Idealism in New Zealand universities is more difficult to trace than in Australia. The most dominant figure in New Zealand philosophy was William Anderson, professor at Auckland University College from 1921 to 1955, although he is perhaps better known as John Anderson’s elder brother. William Anderson studied at Glasgow under Jones during the early decades of the twentieth century and, like Francis Anderson, he appeared to concentrate on his teaching duties and the debate of public issues without publishing a statement of his philosophical position. While it is difficult to discern his general philosophical views, he appears to have retained some vestige of Idealism in his lectures to students, although his main theoretical emphasis was on the intimate relationship between politics and education. Anderson defined philosophy as a theory of practice and in that practice wisdom was exemplified. This definition also enabled him to distinguish philosophy from science and politics. While the sciences are offshoots of philosophy, it was absurd to think that science could ever replace philosophy, for to suppose that, was to suppose that a whole could be replaced by a part. On the other hand, he thought the connection between philosophy and politics was more intimate and went so far as to state that philosophy is co-extensive with political theory. As a result of this view, Anderson believed that education is primarily a political question and he was involved in several educational controversies, most notably with the new progressive educationalists. The key issue for Anderson in this dispute was his view that true individuality can only be attained by assimilation into a common tradition. Although other professors of philosophy in New Zealand in the late nineteen twenties included T.A. Hunter at Wellington, C.F. Salmond at Canterbury and F.W. Dunlop at Otago, there is no evidence of a tradition of Idealism existing in New Zealand.

Idealism, in its general sense, was the dominant philosophy in Australia for the first fifty years of its existence (1880-1930). During this period, philosophy was conducted at an exceptionally high level, with commentaries or translations on Husserl, Bergson and Eucken, as well as more traditional studies on Kant and Descartes. There was also independent speculative work done at Adelaide and historical studies in philosophy were a feature of the work at Melbourne and Hobart. Teaching was a particularly important part of the spread of philosophy during this time with neo-Kantianism and Personal Idealism predominant at Melbourne, Hobart and Adelaide, and Hegelianism at Sydney, Perth and Brisbane. The Idealists was also responsible for the introduction of a wide range of diverse cultural and philosophical influences into the country.
Although Muscio was influenced by the emerging new Realism, he died before he could have much impact on the local tradition of Idealism and it was only with the arrival of John Anderson at Sydney in 1927 that the change from nineteenth century philosophy to the twentieth occurred. Anderson fought an effective solo battle against the Idealists during the thirties and with the development of the ‘Andersonian School’ at Sydney during this decade, the tide gradually turned against the Idealists. However even though Anderson is typically regarded as a Realist philosopher, his defence of a systematic conception of philosophy and his use of a wide range of cultural and philosophical sources meant that there was more similarity between Anderson and the Idealists, than between Anderson and so-called realist philosophers such as Moore and Russell and the whole analytic tradition in twentieth century philosophy. Melbourne remained the centre of Idealist studies after the death of W.R. Boyce Gibson in 1935 with the appointment of A. Boyce Gibson, although with the arrival of Wittgensteinians such as George Paul and Douglas Gasking at the start of the forties, Idealism began to decline in influence. While it has often been remarked that the two intellectual ‘faiths’ of Melbourne and Sydney are due to the dominance of history and philosophy in those centres, it is not so widely recognised that on the philosophical side at least, these differences were due in large measure to the Idealism which was taught at Glasgow and Edinburgh in the second half of the nineteenth century.

Francis Anderson (1858-1941)

Francis Anderson was born in Glasgow on 3rd September 1858, the only son of Francis Anderson and Elizabeth Ann Lockhart. After a normal Scottish education, he began to earn his living as a pupil teacher from the age of 14. In 1874, he entered Glasgow University at a time when Edward Caird’s influence was at its zenith. Anderson’s first love was classics but he also excelled in philosophy, winning prizes in both subjects and was the awarded the prize for the outstanding graduate in his year. He was awarded the Clark Fellowship in Philosophy and was assistant to Caird for two years. However in 1886, he turned his back on an academic career in Scotland and accepted a two year position as assistant minister to the Reverend Dr. Charles Strong at the Australian Church in Melbourne. When this position finished in 1888 he was appointed to a lecturership in philosophy at Sydney University. When the Challis Chair in Philosophy became available two years later, he defeated several notable overseas candidates including G.F. Stout and J.S. MacKenzie, to become the inaugural Professor of Philosophy.

During the first ten years in the position, Anderson appears to have concentrated exclusively on his teaching and published very little. His academic responsibility was to teach logic, ethics, metaphysics, ancient philosophy and modern philosophy, although he also taught the newer disciplines of psychology, sociology, economics, education and politics. His teaching ability was highly praised and his students included the poet Christopher Brennan, the psychologist H. Tasman Lovell, the philosopher Bernard Muscio and V. Gordon Childe. However Anderson was not an ivory tower academic and in June 1901 he addressed the Annual Conference of the Public School Teachers Association. He criticised the student-teacher system of teacher training and the complacent bureaucracy of the Department of Education. As a result of the furore following the lecture, the Knibbs-Turner Royal Commission was established to investigate the teacher training system and when their report was submitted in 1903, the N.S.W. Department of Education was comprehensively reformed and university degrees became the compulsory qualification for teachers.

From 1901 to 1922, Anderson was an active public speaker and pamphleteer. His presidential address to the Australian Association for the Advancement of Science (A.A.A.S.) in 1907 was on Liberalism and Socialism and in 1909 he gave a public address on ‘The Organisation of National Education’. In 1912, he published a pamphlet pleading for the teaching of sociology at the University and in 1914 the government printer published his Educational Policy and Development. In 1922, he published Liberty, Equality and Fraternity as a monograph for the A.A.P.P ... During this time, Anderson was active at the University, campaigning for the establishment of the Sydney Teachers College in 1906 with the chair in Education being established in 1910. He was also active in establishing the chairs of Economics

in 1912 and Psychology in 1920. From 1914 to his retirement in 1922, Anderson was a fellow of the Senate, Dean of Arts on several occasions, and Chairman of the Joint Committee for Tutorial Classes of the University Extension Board. He was also president of the League of Nations Union for a long period and Chairman of the N.S.W. Council of Social Services until his death in 1941. At the time of his retirement, students in philosophy numbered more than 500, the department had a staff of three, and the subject of psychology had, under his supervision, grown from a partial course of thirty lectures to a distinct department in its own right. The University commissioned a pair of frescoes in his honour which can still be found in the philosophy lecture room. Anderson also collaborated with Bernard Muscio in the formation of the A.A.P.P. in 1923 and was the editor of the A.J.P.P. from its inception in 1923 to 1928. He was knighted in 1936 and died at his home on 24th June 1941.

Anderson published no systematic statement of his philosophical position and in his lectures only one set gives some indication of his philosophical views. Anderson accepted the Glasgow Hegelian position developed by Caird and Jones of the general unification of Hegelianism and Darwinism. The general features of this position were the treatment of the dialectic as ‘ideal evolution’ and the universe as an organic unity, the highest development of which is God. God is not something which is known merely as an abstract idea, but is known through intuitive, practical activity directed towards Absolute Spirit. This ethical ideal is never fully realised but only attained momentarily as a flash of inspiration which we must nonetheless attempt to bring into the world and act out to its fullest capacity. In the history of human culture, Buddhism had turned man’s vision inwards towards his soul, but had failed to translate this process into social reform for equality. Christianity demanded a movement towards equality, achieved by the principle of Personality which was both the message of salvation and the means for civilising humanity. However the promises of liberty, equality and fraternity which Christianity made remained mere possibilities and it was only with the French Revolution that these potentialities turned into performances. Nonetheless, this revolutionary fervour remained abstract and formal and needed to return to the Christian principle of Personality for its consummation. This principle of Personality is the source and centre of all liberty.

However Anderson’s importance in Australian cultural life lay not in the statement and defence of his general philosophical views but in the application of those views to the economic, social and political doctrines current in Australia at that time. He has been described as the most important influence in the development of Australian Cultural Liberalism. The central tenet of his social and political philosophy was his view that the personality is the true source of liberty. Free men seek to realise their individuality through the pursuit of social solidarity as an expression of a higher moral order. Anderson appears to have been influenced to some degree by Marxism as evidenced in his argument that a new phase of social consciousness is emerging which is linked to the rise of free labour and the emergence of the workers as a significant social force. Future society then will be founded on an emerging co-operation where the various social classes would develop a sympathetic social understanding of each other. However Anderson’s most significant views were those concerned with political and economic issues. He argued that the State plays a progressive role in a society by being an agent for justice and by the provision of services such as education in which there is a common interest and which maintain the common good. He also sought to unify the competing economic claims of the Free Traders and the Protectionists, by defending the traditional free trade position while allowing that protection may sometimes be desirable for ‘special reasons’. John Passmore, while recognising the stimulus Anderson provided to psychological and social study at the University, argued that his contribution to philosophy was slight, for his instincts “...were those of a reformer and a preacher rather than a systematic philosopher.”

**Henry Laurie (1838-1922)**

Henry Laurie was born at Edinburgh on September 22, 1838. He was an undergraduate at the University of Edinburgh from 1856 to 1858 where he enrolled in classes under Professors A.C. Fraser and P.C. MacDougall, both of whom had a high opinion of his philosophic ability. He gained prizes for essays of ‘Berkeley’s Theory of Matter’ in 1857 and ‘Spinozism’ in 1858, but ill health prevented him from graduating. He migrated first to Canada and then to Australia, arriving at Melbourne in 1864 and entered into a journalistic career, becoming editor and proprietor of the Warrnambool Standard.

---

His first writing in Australia was a pamphlet ‘Conservatism versus Democracy’ published in 1868, after which nothing appeared until his article, ‘A Plea for Philosophy’, appeared in the Victorian Review in 1881. This article was in response to opposition from the churches for an appointment of a lecturer in philosophy at the University of Melbourne and his argument must have been persuasive for in 1882 he was appointed to the newly created position. In 1885, he published ‘The Study of Mental Philosophy’ for the Melbourne Review and in 1886 was appointed Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy at the University. Shortly after this promotion, the University of St. Andrews granted him the honorary degree of LL.D. and he remained in this position until ill health forced him to retire in 1911. Laurie’s most important work was his 1902 Scottish Philosophy in its National Development. Laurie also had a fondness for literature and many of his colleagues thought him worthy to hold a Chair in English. He delivered University extension lectures on Robert Browning’s poetry in 1889 and contributed a paper on an ‘Australian Appreciation of Robert Browning’ for the Browning centenary celebration held in London in 1912. He also delivered an address on ‘Plato in English Literature’ to the Classical Association of Victoria in 1921. In 1870, he had married Frances Spaulding, daughter of William Spaulding, Professor of Philosophy at Edinburgh and St. Andrews, and they had three sons who pursued careers in medicine and law. He died in Melbourne on May 13, 1922.

In his teaching Laurie was responsible for the whole field of philosophy including logic, psychology, ethics, metaphysics and the history of philosophy. Like Fraser, Laurie was more concerned with a critical exposition of particular philosophers or a philosophical tradition than systematically presenting his own views. In his logic, he followed the German definition of logic as the laws of thought but also made a special study of symbolic logic, accepting Venn’s view that symbolic logic was a development and generalisation of the traditional, syllogistic logic. Laurie also taught Mill, although his opposition to empiricism led him to formulate an elaborate criticism of Mill’s position which was published in Mind in 1893 under the title, ‘Methods of Inductive Inquiry’. Laurie’s lectures in ethics were mainly historically oriented and dealt with Plato, Aristotle, Butler, Green and Kant. In his lectures on metaphysics, he dealt with the tradition from Hamilton to Mansel and the subjective idealists to Spencer although he also found a place for the Scottish schools from Hucheson to Hamilton. Laurie’s lectures on Spencer were highly praised by Morris Miller and they greatly affected the many students who entered the university as confirmed Spencerians. Spencer, according to Laurie, was forced to attribute to consciousness a conception of power which he had initially denied. Laurie’s introductory lectures on psychology were based on Sully although advanced students were introduced to the work of Lotze. While Laurie was opposed to empiricism in philosophy, he was appreciative of the experimental approach to psychology and education, and was interested in the theory of the unconscious and the field of psycho-pathology. In his moral theory, Laurie argued that there are necessities of moral experience which are fundamental and inexplicable and such moral experience cannot be derived from non-moral elements. There is a moral imperative which is objectively valid and the highest moral satisfactions includes charity, fortitude and justice. Moral duty cannot be held apart from the desires it regulates and the very essence of this duty is that it is imposed by man upon himself. It must be possible to fulfil the law of duty, if not in this life, then in the hereafter, and hence the soul must be immortal. Religion in its true sense cannot be divorced from morality and Christianity emphasises the need of a love of humanity where all men are accepted as equal before God.

While it is difficult to elaborate the detail of Laurie’s philosophical views, his philosophical general purpose is nonetheless clear. Laurie opposed the secular and agnostic tendencies of the colony of Victoria and particularly the widespread influence of Spencer. In this opposition, Laurie followed Campbell Fraser, S.S. Laurie and Pringle Pattison by ‘grafting a quasi-Kantian idealism onto a Scottish common-sense stem’ to elevate the individual mind over nature, and God over both. There is also some evidence of a Hegelian influence being present in his thinking. Laurie’s adherence to the Scottish common-sense philosophy is most evident in his epistemology. Following Reid, Laurie emphasised the veracity of consciousness in our knowledge of things. Consciousness is present in immediate knowledge and this presupposes a necessity which it is impossible to derive from the mere repetition of experience, unless that experience involved necessity from the very beginning. This necessity in consciousness implied the logical laws of identity and contradiction and although there can be no explanation of how these necessities come to be, they are not on that account unintelligible. Following Reid further, Laurie argued that consciousness knows its own experiences directly and knows existing things in terms of their accurate correspondence of our judgements with reality. To this defence of Scottish common-sense philosophy, Laurie fused a strong Kantian influence. He argued that the synthetic unity of mind is a factor that we must have in our explanations of experience and this unity of consciousness is presupposed in any combination of states of consciousness. The categories are necessities of human
knowledge and cannot be empirically derived or proved. Our experience in its widest sense points to an intelligible system of things and in evolution there is not a history of endless change and variation, but a progress inspired by a purpose, the manifestation of an intelligence similar to ours, although infinitely superior in its scope.

Henry Laurie was the first and probably the most significant philosopher during the first fifty years of philosophy in Australia. He transmitted the Personal Idealism of his Scottish teachers to several generations of Australian students and his view that the individual personality is the starting point for all philosophical analysis dominated philosophy in Australia during its formative years.

**Anderson/Walker correspondence March 1952**

6/3/52 JA

John’s ‘phobia’

I certainly don’t find writing to you a ‘task’…; but I have a ‘thing’ (complex, phobia) about distracting you…

**Parmenides and Zeno**

*Reductio ad absurdum* is the Eleatic method (Parmenides as well as Zeno) and to show that motion has contradictory consequences is, on that method, to show that there is no motion. Of course, all that Zeno does show is that motion and units are incompatible; but the underlying assumption is that ‘one unit’ and ‘many units’ are the only possibilities – and, as I’ve constantly argued, the whole point of the Parmenides is that there must be a third possibility, since the other two break down (and for the same reasons).

Alec Ritchie

A few days ago I wrote to him (Alec Ritchie) what he might take to be a rather ungracious letter: I suppose I was irked by the suggestion that his stuff could be an introduction to mine (that, assuming my stuff needed an introduction, he could supply it). Anyway, ungracious or not, I’d say that both ‘The Knower and the Known’ and ‘Mind as Feeling’ are much more intelligible than his Aristotelian paper. Perhaps in my desire to encourage him, I had bluffed myself away from a rather condemning judgement of that paper, and hence reacted more strongly when the swing the other way came round. (I wouldn’t say there was anything very vicious about my remarks i.e. in my last letter to Alec; but I seem to be a little prickly towards Alec and Peter and any attempt to steer a course between me and the linguists.

**Popper**

I don’t think Popper, with his mania for talking, would be much use for private discussion; but I still think tackling him direct in the seminar might be a good idea. (I had never thought there was any impropriety in your going to his logic lectures; I remembered, of course, that John [Passmore] did and that he found interesting differences and resemblances between Popper and me – in particular, found him arriving at some of the same points, with a different terminology and with different methods.)

**Hypotheticals**

I myself have promised Alan ‘Hypotheticals’ for Monday¹ and haven’t started to write it yet – but I think I’ll manage all right; I don’t intend to break new ground or make references to other views; I just want to state as clearly as possible that position I have held on the subject for a long time.

---

¹ This is being written late on Thursday night. This is another confirmation of John Passmore’s claim that Anderson wrote his article in a ‘white heat’ over a sleepless weekend.
17th century French philosophy

I’m wondering how far you would concentrate on Arnauld himself and how far ‘background’ would come into it. I take it that the correspondence with Leibniz would be of some importance; on the other hand, the character of Jansenism in general (and the work, say of Pascal) might not be. I wish I knew some general account of French thought in the 17th century – perhaps the relevant section of Brehier’s history of philosophy would help (Apparently from Taylor’s review he at least treats Malebranche at some length.)

7/3/52 RW

Wisdom, Moore, Acton, Lazerowitz

I’m wondering what the joint session will be like this year as Wisdom and Margaret McDonald said they weren’t going, since they didn’t care for the place and ‘nowadays the young men were shouting to attract the attention of the professors’. In the ‘old days’ apparently conversation with Moore was one of the pleasures of the meeting and Wisdom still goes along each Friday to some sort of discussion-tea with Moore. By the way, I quite enjoyed myself just chatting with Acton and Lazerowitz. The seminar was off because Lazerowitz had a silly head with a cold and we chatted on for a while over afternoon tea, Acton defending Heraclitus against Lazerowitz’s interpretations of him in the lectures. This was more like home though Lazerowitz’s final remark was that he wouldn’t worry about a matter of history, a silly remark in view of the nature of his thesis.

14/3/52 JA

Libertarians

Anyway she (Elwyn) is tied up at present with (hold your breath!) David Stout - how long it will last goodness knows - Alan seems scared that it will affect David's work in English IV, and in general there seems to have been a bit of agitation in the Stout domicile - Jim is as ever (I wish he wouldn't irritate me every time he opens his mouth). They have actually started a 'Libertarian Society' but I don't think it will come to much. There was a paragraph in the Orientation issue of 'Honi' about a group of 'philosophy students' who intend to acquire a greyhound and call it Immanuel Kant, in the hope of someday hearing a bookie shout '6 to 4 Immanuel Kant'. Jim seems to think this is funny. What annoys me about the 'Libs' (apart from the stupidity of their position) is that they are (quite unconcernedly) blocking the kind of thing I could do for students - and did so in your time.

Orientation address: ‘Philosophy as Criticism’

I gave an Orientation speech to aspiring philosophers today (Thurs), introducing some comments on Dr Woodbury (Rector of the Aquinas Academy) who took it upon himself at the opening of their courses last Friday (reported in the Sunday Sun) to attack the philosophy teaching in Sydney University; we were a disgrace to the University, inculcating a spirit of shallow scepticism among students.1 “He described the teaching of Professor Anderson and A.K. Stout as mind- and soul-destroying.” I had a bit of a comeback (although the Sunday Sun omitted some important points) and Alan was reported as saying that Dr Woodbury’s statement was ‘beneath a reply’ (= beneath contempt and unworthy of reply). Anyway I gave the freshers ‘Philosophy as Criticism’, with suggestions of how it would criticise Religion, Science and Democracy.

Hypotheticals

This is a slightly jaded letter... but I’ve scarcely recovered from a strenuous weekend when I finished ‘Hypotheticals’ – it’s now in the printers hands. Tom has seen it and given general approval. (He also stands

1 See Franklin, J. Corrupting the Youth p 81. Woodbury’s attack is in The Catholic Weekly 13/3/52 p 1, 15 while Anderson’s reply is in the Sun 9/3/52 p 12. In the Anderson archives there is a paper titled ‘Philosophy as Criticism’ which occurs with other material dated 1952. (Series 4 Box 41)
with me on austerity!) Well I was very pleased to get it done and hope (in spite of lectures) to continue on the path of virtue.

18/3/52 RW

This letter is quite long (15 pages) and from it I have only included Ruth’s description of the Popper seminar (pp 1-7). Most of the rest of the letter describes Ruth’s experiences at a conference at Brighton, Ruth Atkins, the proposed 1953 Scientific Method course and her research on Arnauld (pp 8 – 14).[MW]

Popper seminar

At the seminar we were to have had a further piece from Prof. Bernadelli, but Popper started off with various things concerning his ceiling theory which he felt it was necessary to make clear. These were chiefly in the nature of loopholes such as you were mentioning in a letter, but one thing he was stressing was that the rationality assumption was not ad hoc as there was independent evidence for it. Various people came in and the flood of ‘of course we know’ etc went on until it was almost 3.30. I don’t know if your suggestion about aggressiveness stirred me on, but while I was thinking it was really time Bern. had his say, I came out with a request for some discussion of the matter in relation to Popper’s point – like yours – that confirmation is important is relation to the possibility of falsifying views. My point was that if, as Popper had said, we all know the rationality principle to be false, then the emphasis on its being confirmed independently of some particular use of it, was damned queer.

There was a lot then from Popper about the question in social sciences not having as much truth or falsity as in the natural sciences, about the thing being that the principle had such a wide field of application. I don’t remember just how we went on – I know I was objecting to psycho-analytic explanations being taken as some sort of second-order use of the principle, or use of it at a second level or something, also to things being three-quarters true and to various other things, but just how these came up I don’t remember. I never got round to saying what it had been thinking, namely that Popper was having things all ways and seemed at one point to be suggesting that after all we be wrong in thinking that the principle was false. Another chap came in at one point and from him and Popper I got the impression that explaining in the social sciences was being taken as having some sort of special methodological force which would cut it off from testing, whereas Popper, again like you (though not in all the details) makes a point of explaining, testing and prediction having the same logical structure. So I asked him something like this: whether he made a greater distinction between explanation and test than he did in the natural sciences, and when he said that he had never taken them as anything but very different, I referred to the phrase about logical structure.

It was about at this point that the fun began. Popper claims to consider nomenclature not important, but it is obvious that he is a prisoner to his own usages and he uses ‘explanation’ for the premises and test in relation to the conclusion of any argument that would be in question for explaining or testing. And even when I said I had used explanation and test for explaining and testing he went on and on about how very different his ‘explanation’ and his ‘test’ were. I was getting fairly wild and disgusted by this but kept on and asked him to answer the question in terms of the reformulation which was finally done. I never got round to the point that had started me off on this track as I think some of the truth stuff came up here and also I’m afraid that at one point I was busy saying – ‘I did not say so and so’.

What I think is cried out for is a setting out of the stuff in terms of the arguments which Popper allows would arise/have the same as in physics, i.e. much more rigour. From some of the remarks others have made I think that they are ‘in a sea of bewilderment’ (This was a phrase I came out with at one point) as to the force and status of this principle, but Popper goes off onto his examples and I suppose something sounds familiar and they express themselves?? as satisfied.

1 See letter dated 28/2/52 (reprinted in The Northern Line No. 2 p 17) in the section dealing with Popper.
Anyway I felt a bit worked up at the end and don’t like this sort of controversy much though I kept going partly because I’ve been getting fed up with Popper’s autocratic ways. At the seminar he shut up one chap earlier with a long homily about how he had been absent from a number of seminars and could not expect to have things gone over again for his benefit, when he could probably have answered him in half the time. I suppose there is sense in this line but Popper will preach. And he makes what are really appeals to authority – very often to his own – sometimes in a deprecatory way which I fear makes my lips curl.

At the end Popper spoke to me and finally took me into tea. He seemed to think that because I referred to his article I must be using words just as he did there, so again we had a moralistic interlude with me saying that I thought a person might refer to another’s views in his own words. At tea it came out that he thought I was ascribing to him a positivist view that explanation (in his sense) could not go beyond test (in his sense) which would explain some of his excitement. By this [time] I had had enough of post-mortem and thinking I was making a light remark said something to the effect that I would never take him to be a positivist. To this he made some such remark as “I have been making this long explanation in order to apologize for mistaking your question, so there is no reason for you to keep on…” (last word lost).

…I hope you don’t find this description an infliction on you and that you get some of the nightmarish or at least balmy atmosphere. However though very conscious of this as the discussion went on, I kept going with the hope of getting sense into the proceedings again, though I fear I was somewhat non-academic at times, and probably a lot of the rest found it quite a show. However I did resist the temptation to follow Popper’s example and use the blackboard in a rhetorical fever. It is a pity perhaps that my first discussion in the seminar should have taken this form but I was wondering afterwards whether Popper would not personalise any sort of basic disagreement between him and another, and also I think it was quite good for me. I’ve often felt that such encounters were somehow a betrayal of theory by both parties whereas having engaged in one, I can see that no good would come from retiring into a dignified silence.

20/3/52 JA

Modern distinction class

The Modern Distinction [class] should not be too bad – Molesworth, Morris, Stempel, Doniela, Austin, Hilbery and Upah, with our old friend Kamenka as a candidate for distinction in the year but not for final honours… I am scheming to let them have it fine and large (with references to Kant and Hegel and general ‘trends of thought’) and have already Hegelised (somewhat) about it all, with a bit of a fling at the Regent of the Aquinas Academy and his ravings about our scepticism and nominalism and jumping from Plato to Descartes… I talked about the two classical periods in philosophy (with Plato and Hegel as the commanding figures), accompanying social ferment and progress in science, as contrasted with the comparatively dead compartmentalising period that intervened – with some reference… to the prosaic and derivative and unmathematical[?] character of Aristotle’s work – not forgetting, of course, to say that philosophy had to criticise mathematics as well as other sciences.

Creativity, criticism and renewal

I seem to be exhibiting the sort of garrulity (inability to make points clearly) that affected me when I wrote last, and I’m afraid of making a mess of the points I wanted especially to take up in this letter. However here’s at it! I think you are right in pointing to the danger of the ‘problems giving rise to problems’, etc, etc, stuff viz sloppiness in thinking; there may well be material in some of my articles (‘Design’, say, or ‘The Cogito’) that I couldn’t improve on much, if at all, and that readers should take as fairly finished and to be worked into their thinking without further assistance from me. Or perhaps even more important than the effect on readers would be the fact that I had reached something I shouldn’t need to go back on, though there might be various things I could go on to connect it with. But still if I felt satisfied with the whole of any such production, there would be some slipshod thinking that I was letting myself away with. On the other hand (and here comes in the question you were raising of critical and creative phases) it might be - and I think it is -
that it isn't by chipping at any such 'work of art' that one progresses but by lying fallow for a bit (or getting on with something else) until the forces of a new upsurge have gathered and one breaks out again on the same topics without any explicit review of what one did before. It wouldn't be, then, that self-criticism leads to a new creation, but that a fairly steady all-round criticism is one of the factors that promotes the unconscious gathering of forces for the next strongly productive performance. Hence a deliberate taking stock (whatever 'appeal' this may have) is not essential, and may even be a hindrance, to real theoretical progress. (In fact, the Cartesian stock-taking is a hindrance to discovery, because it is treating criticism as a separate thing - and thus as itself 'creation' - and, in so doing, is not critical enough) But if we thus reach agreement (from my preliminary flounderings and your answering criticisms) it goes to show the difference between real communication and such external bickering as I've had, for example, with Peter - to show how, in particular, criticism needs the flavour of (needs to operate within) a joint 'enthusiasm' or positive interest.

It might not be a question, then, of eternally 'greeting a new self' but there would be the recurrent sense of renewal (such as, taking an impersonal (i.e. not you and me) example, I have in a small way every time I lecture on the Phaedo). I can understand your feeling that you had an extensive period of the doldrums, so to speak, after your early lecturing days, but that is partly because of the high notion you have of renewal; I, on the other hand, have been able to see more clearly your various upsurges, while at the same time I haven't, I think, been sufficiently conscious of the frustrating effect of the prosaic element in my character. But if I don’t, even now, enter imaginatively enough into things, I think that hearing from you and writing to you is helping to purge my mind of a lot of intellectual dross – so here’s hoping!

21/3/52 RW

Twentieth century philosophy

Almost as soon as I sent my last letter I realised that Price was giving the next Aristotelian and that the Hertz lecture was coming from a Yale man, Blandshard. This latter was deadly dull and had me nodding at least once; the outline suggested Leonard Russell’s talk to students on the change in philosophy in this century but it wasn’t nearly as bright and suggested what seems to me false, that Ryle as contrasted with Moore took ordinary language to be misleading. Some of Thomson’s remarks at Brighton suggested that logical positivism was now taken to be dead, but that philosophy as analysis remained triumphant, though its exponents might be very divergent in their work.

Leafing through Popper’s off-print1 I noticed a “so-called paradox of ‘Tristram Shandy’” which reminded me vaguely of some of my wanderings2 to you about letter-writing on the one hand and certainty-seeking on the other though the emphasis here is on bringing the auto-biography up to date. I’m wondering vaguely now whether even Godel’s theorem or such like would not be brought under the heading of self-consciousness. I haven’t thought very much about this part of the modern movement, but feel that it is influential in relation to the view of philosophy as analysis.

I suppose you know that Craig is getting the professorship at Sydney.3 He went along to some of Ayer’s first year ‘lectures’ and reported to Alan that they were rather hectic. Ayer trusts more or less to inspiration each time and also engages students in arguments. This Craig thought worked fairly well as the students read a good bit, though he also remarked that no one ever sat in the arm chairs provided out of ??k?. Ayer refuses to use a lecture theatre and chain-smokes through-out. I can imagine your snorts on this point.

The bookie ‘joke’ leaves me dead even if there is supposed to be some play on words. This sort of thing would make me question your earlier suggestion that Jim was closer to under-graduate days than Tom. At

---

1 ‘Indeterminism in Quantum Physics and in Classical Physics’. Popper gave Ruth a copy of this article at their meeting after the seminar reported in the letter of 18/3/52.

2 Ruth appears to mean ‘wonderings’ although she may be playing with the meaning of the word.

3 See entry on David Craig below (p 17).
least he may revert to his own, but it seems to lack the undergraduate ‘smartness’ – no doubt owing to his ‘proletarian’ origins…. I am pleased though partly chagrined to hear of Hypotheticals being finished so soon. It will be interesting to see how you did it, as there is, I imagine, no other article of yours which is so definitely ‘logical’.

27/3/52 JA

David Stove

I got a bit of a jolt yesterday (Wed.) – learning that David is going to Ultimo… Apparently he was put second to someone from Britain, but that person wanted to be guaranteed a house and has now (presumably) withdrawn, since David has got his letter of appointment. He’s prepared to stay on, if I like, till the end of this term, and that would, on the present appearance of things, be a help. However, I’ll have to see what Milo [Roxon] would feel about the prospects – I can’t think of any other possibility if he won’t have it (unless I make a despairing appeal to Gwen). But first of all I’m going to have a talk with Steve¹ on Monday and find out what the general position is. I fear there is little chance of my getting a new permanent lectureship for next year.

Tresco Blues

There's a girl to whom I'm partial
but she's far away
and now I'm simply neutral
to everything that's left in Neutral Bay

Tresco blues, you're with me night and day
O Tresco blues, leaving me far from neutral and from Neutral Bay

Oh, they say that I'm one sided
that I'm partisan
but I hold with good old Ludwig (Feuerbach)
without woman, there's no universal man

Tresco blues, you're with me night and day
O Tresco blues, leaving me far from neutral and from Neutral Bay

They attack my distribution
not excluding my middle
but who else on the premises
can answer Russell's riddle?
(or, Can answer (yes, can answer) Russell’s riddle)

Tresco blues, you're with me night and day
O Tresco blues, leaving me far from neutral and from Neutral Bay

Pineapple (?) Blues²

When I think of Hawaii, I think of pineapples
And when I think of pineapples, I think of you
Pineapple salad in the S.U.U.

¹ Stephen Roberts, Vice Chancellor?
² The question mark appears in the manuscript.
Makes Hammer stammer – and makes me blue

Blue for you, sweeter than pineapple
Blue for you, in the S.U.U.
   While the bells are ringing
   I sit softly singing
Singing those pineapple blues

When I think of Popper, I think of constants
And when I think of constants, I think of you
On the embankment there’s a lovely view
But I am prabsent [?] – and it makes me blue

Blue for you, constanter than constants
Blue for you, prabsent [?] to my view
   While the tugs are hooting
   I sit softly fluting
Fluting those Crosby Hall blues

When I think of Bedford, I think of Arnauld
And when I think of Arnauld, I think of you
Representation, bien entendu
Acton is cracked on – but it makes me blue

Blue for you, annotating Arnauld
Blue for you, in the British Mu.
   ‘Mid the papers’ crackling
   I sit crossly cackling
Cackling those true and false blues

‘Logic and Language’ lecture

Struggling up from Manning after David’s news, I had quite a turnout for my ‘Logic and Language’ lecture (including Hedley and Miss Lowes, and Thornton and Miss Wilson, and Elwyn and some queer-looking cuss who, I think, is a genuine second-year) and let go in fair style on Moira1 – though I made it a fairly short session.

Philosophy as a phantasy-system

Your account of your bout with Popper was certainly not an ‘infliction’; I do wish you had had someone to tell you how you went, but it looks to me as if you kept the ball rolling pretty well (and I’m very glad you had a go, even if it was more ‘aggressive’ than you would have liked). Of course, it will be you yourself who will eventually have to work the thing out in a rigorous way (Popper will stick to his defences), but the encounter will have been a stimulus to you doing so. It seems to me that the way people in the philosophic line cling to their errors and won’t even look at other theories (let alone spend the time and energy that would be needed really to come to terms with them) is due partly to conceit, or considerations of prestige (“I’m not going to admit that I’m not as well-established a thinker as he is and that he might teach me something”) and partly to the fact that their ‘philosophy’ is a system of defences or phantasy-system, standing between them and reality – a mechanism for ego-satisfaction. The two run together to some extent, but I’d say that with Ryle it was more of the first and with Popper more of the second.

---

1 There are various papers in the Anderson Archives dealing with ‘Moira’ although none indicate a ‘Logic and Language’ lecture or are dated 1952. However there is an 8 page paper dated ‘1953?’ which deals with Tyler, Vico and Freud, (Series 4 Box 42)
Libertarian Society

I’m hoping to get further with the objectivism v. subjectivism line this year; I’ve already had a bit of a fling at primitivism. (In that connection, did I tell you that the ‘Libertarians’ actually have formed a society and are starting out with a paper by Rybak. There seems to be an impression, shared by Rybak, that it won’t last long, but I’m in two minds whether to get the Freethought going in opposition to them or to let it fade away. It’s strange that a creature like Waters should be able to get people going even to the extent that he has done – although Jim has also played an essential and nauseating part.)

29/3/52 RW

Alec Ritchie

I think there might be an emphasis in Alec’s article which is useful when (or if) he suggests that knowing is not some activity in an agent but is one of those things because of which you speak of a person as an ‘agent’. It seems to have been possible for some realists to think of knowledge as a relation and nevertheless as something in the knower – rather as tho there were knowing as well as knowing P etc¹ and the former was something internal. Or perhaps you would say that Alec takes this line, which I think is not one you take, that knowledge is a relation ?? is a relation. However I don’t suppose Alec would care for my line of appreciation. Everybody seems to be in some trouble as to what to say to him about the article; he told me that he heard from John P. [Passmore] who didn’t have much to say, tho John wrote to me that he found parts of it bright, while others were obscure with a vengeance. All that I have been thinking about it lately is that the finish is damned pithy [?] with the reference to Martin – pointless really to anyone not knowing him and rather stale fish to anyone who does, as well as being a bit of a low level hit in the circumstances.

The Andersonians

Craig, D.P. (David)

David Craig was born at Sydney on the 23 December 1919, and educated at the universities of Sydney (BSc (Hons) 1940, MSc 1941) and London (PhD 1949). He saw war service as an Army Captain between 1942 and 1944 before being appointed as lecturer in physical chemistry at the University of Sydney from 1944 to 1946. He was the Turner and Newall Research Fellow, and then Lecturer, University College, London, from 1946 to 1952. He was appointed professor of physical chemistry at the University of Sydney from 1952 to 1956 and then professor of theoretical chemistry at University College, London from 1956 to 1967. He was appointed foundation professor of Physical and Theoretical Chemistry at the Research School of Chemistry, Australian National University from 1967 to 1984 and was dean of the Research School of Chemistry from 1970 to 1973. He has been emeritus professor since 1984 and a Fellow of the Royal Society since 1968, a Fellow of the Australian Academy of Science since 1969. Other achievements include: H.G. Smith Memorial Medal, Royal Australian Chemical Institute 1972; Liversidge Research Lecturer, Royal Society of New South Wales 1982; Russell Grimwade Lecturer, Royal Australian Chemical Institute 1985; Leighton Memorial Medal, Royal Australian Chemical Institute 1991. Chairman, Queen Elizabeth II Fellowships Committee 1980-84; part-time member of Executive, CSIRO 1980-85; AO 1985, and president, Australian Academy of Science 1990-94. The David Craig wing, Research School of Chemistry, Australian National University was opened 1995 and the David Craig Medal, Australian Academy of Science, was inaugurated in 1999. He has published widely in the fields of quantum chemistry and the chemistry of liquid and molecular crystals. While Craig was at Sydney University, he took two years of philosophy under John Anderson during 1945 and 1946 and his records of those lectures are currently held in the Anderson Archives. Craig recently wrote to me and relayed that his 1946 notes were borrowed by Anderson to set exam questions and when these came back they were extensively annotated. Craig had these lectures typed and it is this copy that is currently in the Anderson Archives.

¹ The preceding two words are difficult to decipher. This appears to be the meaning.
**Bull, H.N. (Hedley)**

(1932 - 1985) A student in philosophy in the early 1950’s and sided with Anderson during the Freethought controversy of 1951. He is also mentioned regularly during the 1952 correspondence with Ruth Walker, primarily in the context of working on a paper on ‘definition’. He was subsequently Professor of International Relations at the Australian National University, the London School of Economics, and the University of Oxford until his death in 1985. *The Anarchical Society* (1977) is his main work and is widely regarded in the field of International Relations and is a central text in the so-called ‘English school’ of International Relations. In this book he argues that despite the anarchical character of the international arena, it is characterised by the formation of not only a system of states, but a society of states. His requirements for an entity to be called a state are that it must claim sovereignty over (i) a group of people (ii) a defined territory, and that it must have a government. States form a system when they have a sufficient degree of interaction, and impact on each other's decisions, so as they "behave - at least in some measure - as parts of a whole." A system of states can exist without it also being a society of states. A society of states comes into existence "when a group of states, conscious of certain common interests and common values, form a society in the sense that they conceive themselves to be bound by a common set of rules in their relations with one another, and share in the working of common institutions." He concludes that, despite the existence of possible alternative forms of organization, the states system is our best chance of achieving order in world politics.

**Stove, D. C. (David)**


**Dalrymple, R. (Rawdon)**

Rawdon Dalrymple was born in Sydney, Australia in 1930 and went to school and university there. After graduation from the University of Sydney he was elected Rhodes Scholar in 1952 and proceeded to Oxford where he took a first class honours degree in Philosophy, Politics and Economics. He returned to Sydney in 1955 as Lecturer in Moral and Political Philosophy at Sydney University. In 1957 Mr Dalrymple joined the Australian Department of External Affairs and continued in that service (now Foreign Affairs and Trade) until 31 March 1994. For much of that time he worked on trade and economic issues; but in the course of his career he was involved at one time or another in all aspects of Australia foreign interests and policy areas. After participating in the planning and formative work leading to the creation of the Asian Development Bank he joined the Bank in Manila in 1987 as Alternate Director. In 1969 Mr Dalrymple was promoted Assistant Secretary and appointed Minister in the Australian Embassy in Jakarta, Indonesia. From 1972 to 1975 he was Australian Ambassador to Israel. Returning to Canberra in 1975 he was First Assistant Secretary in charge of Western division and then of the Economic division. In 1984 he was promoted Deputy Secretary. In 1981 he was appointed Australian Ambassador to Indonesia, then in 1985 he went to Washington as Australian Ambassador to the United States. In 1989 he was appointed Ambassador to Japan and remained there until the end of November 1993. In 1987 Rawdon Dalrymple was made an Officer in the Order of Australia. Rawdon Dalrymple is now a visiting Professor in the Department of Government at the University of Sydney where he teaches courses in International Relations. He is also Chairman of the ASEAN Focus Group Pty Ltd. He has published articles in journals in Australia and the United States and writes a monthly column in a leading Japanese newspaper. (Institute for Corean-American Studies)