

9

NEW HORIZONS

While Ruth was in Europe, Heinz considered his career and where it might take him. In particular, he wondered whether he should remain in Sydney, seek positions at other Australian universities or return to England. Even before Ruth had left for Europe, he had written to Tom Wilson, who, after graduating from Queen's University, Belfast, had become a Fellow of University College, Oxford. He asked Wilson whether he should apply for one of the vacant positions at Belfast, where the Australian Keith Isles was head of the economics department. Wilson replied that he appreciated Heinz's 'difficulties in Australia—the more so because of the uncertainty I have experienced myself...no roots, family, etc'. He told Heinz that there were posts available, but he was unsure about Heinz's chances of securing one of them. He recommended that Heinz should ask Isles himself: 'Put it to him that Sydney looks very doubtful and ask him whether he could advise you to apply for Belfast.'

It appears that this advice went unheeded, for, at the end of 1948, Heinz was corresponding with officials at the United Nations Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE) about the possibility of an appointment there. These inquiries did not proceed very far because ECAFE had recently moved from Shanghai to Singapore ahead of the communist takeover and was now in the process of arranging more permanent headquarters in Bangkok. Thus, it was not immediately seeking new appointments to its staff.

One of the problems at Sydney University, to which Wilson had alluded in his letter to Heinz, was Sid Butlin's reluctance to fill the vacant second chair in economics. Heinz was ambitious to get ahead, telling his father soon after Ruth had left that 'I have no intention to end my life as Senior Lecturer at Sydney. Unless, therefore, a chance of promotion should come along here fairly soon, I may well begin to look around for a new job elsewhere—quite probably in other Australian universities, but conceivably also in England.' Had Butlin offered him the vacant chair, Heinz would have been quite content to stay in Sydney. Butlin, however, was not disposed to make decisions precipitately, and Heinz was not prepared to wait while Butlin prevaricated.

Two positions—one in England, the other in Australia—tempted him to submit applications while Ruth was away. He learnt from friends that Manchester was soon to advertise two readerships, one in economic theory and the other in international trade. He wrote to Arthur Lewis,⁷ who had recently been appointed to the chair that Jewkes had vacated and who had been at the LSE when Heinz was there. Lewis encouraged him to apply for the post in international trade, yet he did warn Heinz about the problems the latter had experienced before at Manchester, with Jewkes and Hicks. ‘The difficulty that we are afraid of here,’ Lewis wrote

...is that we do not know what may have been said by Jewkes or Hicks when you were last here. At these selection committees there is always a majority of ancient professors from other faculties, some of whom have long memories. Jewkes was not popular at the end, and the fact that you and he did not get on may be counted by some in your favour. Anything you can let me know about the episode would be helpful, in case any of the committee wishes to make things up.

Lewis added that it would be useful if Heinz could get Hicks to write a letter supporting his application since, after all, Hicks had been one of his referees when Heinz had applied for the senior lectureship at Sydney.

At the same time that he was considering the Manchester job, Heinz heard from Brian Tew, Professor of Economics at the University of Adelaide, that Tew had accepted the chair at Nottingham and would be leaving Adelaide at the end of 1949. Tew, who had become a close friend, urged Heinz to apply for the Adelaide chair. Heinz wrote to Ruth saying that he was now confronted with three choices: to apply to Manchester; to apply to Adelaide; or to have it out with Butlin about the Sydney chair. He asked Ruth for advice, recognising that the thought of the long voyage back to Australia might well influence her views. For Heinz, such a voyage would be an important consideration when deciding whether to apply for the readership at Manchester. Ruth, however, wrote back saying that she would not be disappointed if Heinz were to reject an offer from Manchester. All the same, she did not dissuade him from submitting an application.

In the event, Heinz applied to Manchester and to Adelaide. He also decided to tackle Butlin about the Sydney chair and to ask him about the readership that was soon to be vacated by La Nauze. Butlin made it

plain that Heinz's chances of securing either of the Sydney posts would be enhanced if he could show the selection committees that he had an offer from Manchester or Adelaide. Heinz, however, was not convinced that he should apply for these reasons. He made it clear to Ruth that he was 'not very fond of this sort of poker game', because it could lead to offers from the three institutions, leaving him with an embarrassing choice.

Of the Sydney chair, he told Ruth that Butlin would be happy if he were appointed to it, but that he was unsure whether the university was now in a position to fund it. Butlin reckoned that Heinz should not be optimistic about Sydney and should seriously consider applying for the posts at Adelaide and Manchester. For Heinz, it was the insecurity about Sydney that finally made him decide to apply for the positions at the other two universities.

In his application for the readership in international trade at Manchester, Heinz set out his case for appointment

My interest in international economics developed naturally in the course of my work at Chatham House. The history of international economic problems during the interwar period formed the central theme of my book, and much of my other work at Chatham House involved international economic issues. International economics, and particularly international monetary theory, have since then become my chief interest. During my three years in Australia I have had the opportunity of becoming acquainted with the problems of a primary producer country and the many international economic problems which are of special importance to a country in Australia's position. I have made a point of developing international economic theory in the course for which I am responsible and have largely concentrated on this field in the special course for honours students.

When describing his current research, Heinz referred to the project on foreign investment in Australia between 1865 and 1914. He emphasised, for the benefit of the Manchester selection committee, that 'the primary motive for [this research] is a desire to throw further light on the causes of economic fluctuations in the British economy during the nineteenth century'. Although there had not been much progress on the project, because of all the work that he and Noel Butlin were undertaking on national income estimates for New South Wales, he said: 'if I should return

to England, I should hope to have the opportunity of continuing work on some aspects of this problem.' He gave as his three referees J.R. Hicks, Tom Wilson and Sid Butlin.

Tew was far more encouraging about Heinz's chances of selection for the chair at Adelaide than either Lewis or Butlin had been about his chances at Manchester and Sydney. In a letter to Heinz, Tew commented, 'while selection committees are queer things...[my] inquiries have so far not revealed anyone available who in my opinion is in the same street as you, and I think Adelaide would be mad not to select you, but in these matters you cannot be sure, can you?'

Nor did Tew think that anyone in England, who could be regarded as appointable, would apply for the Adelaide chair. Of possible Australian candidates, he considered that Heinz's only serious rival might be Dick Downing, but he was confident that the selection committee would support Heinz ahead of Downing. Later Tew was to inform Heinz that he had contacted Downing, who had told him that he was not interested in the position at Adelaide anyway.

Tew had also raised with Heinz the possibility of the Ritchie Chair at Melbourne University, which Ben Higgins was holding at the time on a two-year appointment, but which was about to expire. He suggested that Heinz should consider applying for that as well as for Adelaide. Though Heinz told Ruth that he thought the Ritchie Chair was well beyond his reach, he confessed nevertheless that 'it's all very exciting—and strictly secret'.

There then followed several months of agonising letters from Heinz asking Ruth for advice as to what he should do if he were offered all or any of these positions. On 29 April 1949, he wrote to Ruth: 'I still don't know at all what I shall do if the Manchester job is offered to me, nor is there any prospect that any further information about the possibilities here will come to hand in time to help me solve the problem. It would be rather absurd if I had to toss coins on an issue like that.'

Nevertheless, his optimism about the Manchester post was soon shaken when Ruth wrote to him in the middle of June. She told Heinz of having heard that, according to what Arthur Lewis had assured one of their London friends, Hicks had written an unfavourable referee's report. Ruth naturally was upset when she was informed about this, telling Heinz that

It would be too silly if you gave Hicks's name again for future applications...It seems to me that all you have to do is to write to Arthur Lewis and ask him what has happened...It all seems

rather silly, can you explain it? Didn't he give you such a favourable testimonial for the Sydney job? However, that can probably be explained. I shouldn't get worked up over this, and for goodness sake don't go and tell everyone about it, it might spoil your chances for future promotion, etc. Just say that you haven't heard anything, write that letter to Arthur and then wait for what he has to say...I shouldn't tell Sid [Butlin] for one. It is rather a nuisance as Hicks would also be the obvious choice for you if you for instance have to apply for the Adelaide chair, so where do you get other references from?

Heinz wrote back to Ruth saying that the news about Hicks 'puzzles me'

The most likely explanation seems to me to be that Hicks, in his unimaginative way, wrote to the effect that I was rather young and inexperienced while he knew me at Manchester and that he does not really know anything about my work since I left. It is just possible that he was annoyed that I did not write to tell him that I had given his name to Arthur, but since it was a private letter to Arthur, I do not think he would have expected that. However, the whole business does not worry me; in fact, I confess I am rather relieved not to have to reject the offer.

What appears to have worried Heinz much more was the fact that he had given Hicks's name as a referee for the Adelaide job as well as for the Manchester one. But he was relieved when Tew, after Heinz had informed him about Ruth's information, replied thus: 'As to Hicks, I may say that I heard confidentially that he might rat on you, and therefore [I] didn't write to him.' Instead, Tew had asked Leslie Melville to support Heinz's application. Melville, who had been the inaugural Professor of Economics at Adelaide, had 'agreed very willingly', having been greatly impressed with the research that he had commissioned Heinz to undertake for the United Nations. Heinz's other referees for the Adelaide chair were Tom Wilson, Paul Rosenstein-Rodan and Sid Butlin.

Now out of the reckoning for the readership at Manchester, and with little optimism justified about the chair at Sydney, Heinz rested his hopes on Adelaide. Brian and Marjorie Tew kept him regularly informed about the progress of the selection process. Marjorie wrote to him on 25 August

saying that 'I am to tell you that your most serious competitor so far is J.S.G. Wilson [an Australian, then at the University of London] and he is a doubtful starter'.

Noel Butlin, on his way to Harvard via England, wrote to Heinz informing him that 'I looked up Brian [Tew] in Adelaide. He tells me that the selection committee reacted very favourably to your application.' With his friends reporting that events were progressing strongly in his favour, Heinz again asked Ruth for her views—'i.e. your personal preferences, on the understanding that I shall not necessarily treat them as decisive, so that you can give them freely without worrying that I shall disregard other considerations'.

Before he had a reply from Ruth, however, he received a depressing letter from Tew. This contained a warning: 'things are not going too well as concerns the chair, and in my opinion you should not rule out other jobs solely because you would prefer Adelaide. Your claims *qua* economist are not disputed, but I am constantly told that our Council is solidly and homogeneously right wing and that prudence demands that we render under Caesar, etc.'

Tew had, in fact, learnt that the Vice-Chancellor was unhappy with all of the candidates and was hoping that others would turn up. 'So far,' Tew told Heinz, 'I've nothing definite to report, only my feeling about the atmosphere—and I may be quite wrong.'

A month later, Tew wrote to Heinz again, saying that the short-list was down to three

Baster (the 'international banking chap'), [Donald] Cochrane [of Melbourne] and you...I am afraid, however, that at present you are the least favoured of the three probably because of the conservative majority in the selection committee, possibly because of a highly adverse report from an eminent economist whom I think to be an irresponsible, prejudiced ass, but who is listened to by other members of the committee, despite the uniformly favourable nature of the other testimonials. (The wicked one was not one of your own referees, so don't blame Sid. In fact, he doesn't live in Australia.)

It is not clear whether Tew was alluding here to Hicks or Melville (now Australia's executive director at the IMF and World Bank in Washington),

but probably the committee had contacted Hicks in Oxford. At any rate, shortly after this letter, Tew wrote to Heinz again. 'The selection committee has not yet definitely pronounced but I judge (with regret) that you are now out of the running.' In the event, Peter Karmel, recently returned to Melbourne from Cambridge, where he had completed a PhD, was appointed to Adelaide.

While Sydney, Manchester and Adelaide were Heinz's preferred options, they were not the only possibilities that came his way at this time. In June 1949, and without any warning, he received a telephone call from John Burton of the Department of External Affairs in Canberra, who had previously helped with the permit enabling Ruth to visit Germany. Burton asked Heinz if he was interested in taking a job in Yogyakarta.⁸ The Indonesian government had recently established the position of Economic Adviser and had asked the Australian government whether there was anyone in Australia with suitable qualifications who might be interested in taking on the job for a number of years, or at least for six months.

Heinz doubted that six months would be long enough for a person to become fully acquainted with Indonesia and its economic problems. Besides, he could not leave the University of Sydney in the lurch, and he doubted whether it would grant him the necessary leave. As to the longer term, Heinz told Burton: 'extraordinarily attractive as it is in some ways, I doubt whether I am the person for that sort of job and whether, from my own point of view, I could hardly make so far reaching a decision without consulting my wife who...will be in Europe for another three months.'

He mentioned that Gerald Firth or Dick Downing might be interested, though he doubted whether the job would hold for them the 'political appeal that it has for me'.

To Ruth, Heinz wrote that 'the idea has its attractions. But you will be glad to hear that I gratefully declined.' Ruth replied that she was 'glad I don't have to go and live with you in [Yogyakarta], however romantic it might have been. But I shall be glad to get back to Sydney and have already proclaimed that for the next six months after we get back home we shall just stay put and go nowhere!'. For good measure, she added

The other night I had such a wild dream about you and a French girl that I woke up in the early hours of the morning and made frantic plans to come back straight away by plane and tried to work out whether the next three months we have to spend here would

be quite as expensive as the air trip home! However it is probably quite healthy for me to wonder after all this time what you are doing.

There was also the possibility of a job in the public service in Canberra; Trevor Swan had raised this notion in conversation with Heinz. Though it appeared to be an attractive offer (so much so that Heinz discussed it at some length with Swan and others), it was not a permanent position. Heinz considered that, were he to take it, and in the event it did not work out satisfactorily, it might be difficult for him to return to academic life. Even so, he didn't discount it completely, as he explained to Ruth

Yet another excitement yesterday: a telephone call from Canberra as I was in the middle of my seminar, from Trevor Swan (the very good young economist who has recently come back from England and is due to head the new Economic Secretariat which is to be set up—on the lines of the Robbins-Meade⁹ set-up): could I be persuaded, on any terms, to enter the Public Service? The point clearly is that Trevor as prospective head of that new department is looking for staff; the job he would offer me is presumably second-in-command to him; very interesting and probably as well paid as a chair; but it would mean giving up the academic career, and on the whole I don't think I want to do that. Anyhow, Trevor wanted no definite answer; nothing concrete is likely to emerge until after the federal election...I merely told him that the answer would probably be NO, but that I would be quite ready to listen to more detailed suggestions. Think about it and let me have your reactions some time.

In the meantime, a new possibility had emerged, and this too appeared to be very appealing. On 24 June 1949, Heinz wrote to Ruth saying: 'Canberra University College are [*sic*] about to advertise a Chair in Economics; I think I shall apply.'