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PASSAGE TO AUSTRALIA

Heinz’s appointment as assistant lecturer at Manchester was for three years, beginning on 29 September 1943. The custom, in those days, was that when an assistant lecturer had not obtained a lectureship by the end of his or her appointment, he or she should seek employment elsewhere. With the return to the university of a number of economists—John Jewkes and Eli Devons among them—who had spent the war in government service, Heinz thought that his chances of promotion would be limited. This was not only because the number of positions in economics was small. Heinz also believed that when Jewkes, Manchester’s second Professor of Economics, returned to the university, the differences between his political opinions and Heinz’s would create difficulties. Jewkes, in fact, did not favour Heinz’s reappointment. Whether J.R. Hicks would have endorsed Heinz’s reappointment is not entirely clear. The chances are, however, that Hicks would not have supported an application from Heinz had he submitted one, which he did not.

It was for these reasons that Heinz began in 1945 to look for other employment. He saw advertised a position in the Ministry of Labour and National Service that he thought might be suitable. Accordingly, he wrote to his Treasury friend, Teddy Kahn: ‘Much as I enjoy teaching, I always turn green with envy when I hear of this sort of civil service job!...Not that I dislike the academic life; on the contrary. But I am beginning to get rather doubtful whether I shall get very far in it.’

Heinz and Jewkes were teaching in the same Economics I course and Heinz was getting on badly with Jewkes. In fact, Jewkes had publicly admonished him for altering the content of the Public Economics and Finance course without obtaining authority from the Board of the Faculty. For Heinz, this rebuke was a humiliating experience and it sent him a warning that Jewkes would not look kindly on his reappointment.

Several university posts for economists were becoming available in British universities as student numbers rose. In large part, this rise was occurring because ex-servicemen were beginning tertiary studies, or restarting courses that the war had disrupted.
Advertisements appeared for positions at Corpus Christi and Pembroke Colleges, Oxford; at the Universities of Exeter, Newcastle and Durham; and at the LSE, these last involving tutorships in trade union studies. Heinz applied for the positions at Durham and the LSE, but was unsuccessful, though Durham granted him an interview. He then placed an advertisement in the *American Economic Review* for a position at an American university, informing the Secretary of the American Economic Association that it ‘had long been my hope to spend a year or two in the United States. Now that the war is over, this ambition may be realisable, and it has occurred to me that the “appointments” page in the American Economic Review might help me to find a suitable temporary job.’ The advertisement appeared in the December 1945 issue and was seen by the Chairman of the Economics Department at McGill in Montreal. He wrote to Heinz, saying that McGill had a suitable vacancy and asking Heinz whether he was interested in applying for it.

At much the same time, Heinz was confiding to Peggy Joseph (an economist friend at the National Institute of Economic and Social Research, with whom he had worked at Chatham House) about the problems he was having with Jewkes and Hicks. Also, he told her of his pessimism about continuing at Manchester after his three-year appointment expired in mid 1946. He mentioned to her a conversation he had recently had with Hicks, who had told him that he should not expect to be reappointed. Peggy reminded Heinz that Rosenstein–Rodan would shortly be leaving University College, London, and as a consequence there might be opportunities there. In addition, she drew Heinz’s attention to a number of research fellowships that were becoming available at the National Institute. She suggested that he should tackle Jewkes, which he did, but with little effect. The result with Jewkes was much as it had been with Hicks.

When Heinz informed Peggy of this unproductive meeting, she replied that she was...

...sorry to hear there is nothing to be hoped from Jewkes. It is very depressing, but there seems to be a general sort of wave of xenophobia—that is perhaps too strong a word, but there is a definite preference for second-rate second-generation Britishers over much better more recent arrivals. I think the same sort of thing is preventing Nicky [Kaldor] from being given [P.B.] Whale’s
Readership [at the LSE], quite apart from [Dennis] Robertson’s chair [at the LSE]—for which I should have thought he’d be much the best candidate.¹

Joseph was not the only person in whom Heinz confided at this stage. He also explained his career difficulties to Tom Wilson, a friend from his student days at LSE who was now at Oxford. Wilson wrote to Heinz, gratifyingly saying: ‘The Manchester University people are swine. Why on earth are they treating you so badly...Are Hicks and Jewkes mad? They have a very small staff and I doubt if many of their people in the civil service will return to Manchester. Where on earth do they think they will get anyone half as good as you?’

At any rate, Heinz decided not to apply for the position at McGill because in late January 1946 he received, quite out of the blue, a cable from the University of Sydney. It informed him that the university proposed to offer him a senior lectureship in economics. Heinz had applied for the job after noticing an advertisement for it in The Times, even though he had considered the application at the time to be a long shot. He had then promptly forgotten about it. So it came as a great surprise, even a shock, when he received a letter from the Dean of the Faculty of Economics at Sydney, Professor Sid Butlin. This letter advised him that his application had been successful and requested that he notify the university as soon as possible of whether he intended to accept the offer.

When Heinz told Ruth she was at first opposed to the idea of going to Australia. She expected that, with the end of the war, it would soon be possible for her to visit her parents, whom she had seen only briefly on one occasion since she left Germany in 1935. Her mother’s health had recently deteriorated and she was naturally reluctant to be separated from her by such a distance.

Heinz, on the other hand, was enthusiastic about the Sydney offer. He quickly contacted his former colleague at Chatham House A.G.B. Fisher, for advice. A New Zealander, Fisher had worked in Australia during the 1930s as Economic Adviser to the Bank of New South Wales in Sydney, and later was briefly Professor of Economics at the University of Western Australia. He informed Heinz that Ronald Walker (a senior Australian economist, who had taught at the University of Sydney in the 1930s before becoming a professor at the University of Tasmania, and who was then beginning what was to become a distinguished career in the Australian diplomatic service) was visiting London. When
Heinz arranged a meeting with Walker on a Sunday morning at the Savoy, where Walker was staying, Walker was able to convince him that he should accept Sydney’s offer. Heinz promised Ruth that they would stay in Australia for two, or perhaps three, years at the most; they would then return to England. With this firm undertaking, Ruth reluctantly agreed.

Winning Ruth’s approval proved to be simple in comparison with a number of other difficulties that had to be resolved before the Arndt family set sail for Australia. There were concerns about the salary scale and superannuation benefits; about when exactly the university expected Heinz to begin his classes; about arrangements for housing in Sydney; about the availability of suitable shipping to Australia; and about the status of Heinz’s application for British citizenship.

Butlin wanted Heinz to be in Sydney by mid 1946. For Heinz, however, so quick a start was impossible, because examinations at Manchester would not be completed until the end of June. That hurdle was soon surmounted when Butlin wrote to reassure Heinz that he

…should not worry unduly about the lecture problem. The first post-war year is so chaotic in any case that the exact content of the third-term work for this particular generation of students need not be taken too seriously. They have had as prescribed reading Haberler\(^2\) and they should by this time have had several rather general lectures on the trade cycle so that if you feel disposed to talk Keynes out of your head it will meet the case…In other words, don’t feel any need to do a large job of preparation for the few lectures that remain.

Decidedly more difficult than the question of lecture content was the chronic shortage of suitable accommodation in Sydney. Butlin warned Heinz: ‘Housing in Australia is difficult, but not to be compared with England’s problems…I may be able to fix something which would do while you looked around. But no promises!’ What Heinz wanted was a house with two or three bedrooms, at least one living room and a bathroom. Because he and Ruth had no furniture of their own, their home would have to be fully furnished. Having paid only two guineas a week for furnished accommodation in London and Manchester, he told Butlin that he would be ‘horrified’ if he had to pay more than three Australian pounds. As a concession, he assured Butlin that he would be happy to pay a month’s rent in advance to secure a ‘roof over our heads’.
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Shipping to Australia was especially scarce at the time. For a while it seemed that Heinz might have to travel ahead of Ruth, but he quickly dismissed the idea. He then thought that it might be possible to fly to Australia via Istanbul, where he could break the journey and visit his father. After making inquiries, however, he discovered that the travel allowance provided by the University of Sydney made air travel financially impossible. In the end, he was able to secure a berth on the Blue Funnel liner *Sarpedon*, an old and small (11,000 tonnes) coal-burning steamer. She was the third passenger ship to make the journey from Britain to Australia since the end of the war, the first two having brought to Australia mainly war brides whom Australian servicemen had married in Britain or in Continental Europe.

Of all the matters that had to be finalised before the Arndt family set sail for Australia, that of Heinz’s British citizenship proved to be the most vexing. Having satisfied the five-year residency requirement for citizenship in 1938, Heinz had applied for naturalisation just before the outbreak of war. The war, however, delayed the process, which had still not been concluded by the time he accepted the Sydney offer. Heinz wrote to the Home Office explaining that he wanted the matter completed by the time he left Britain for Australia. The Home Office replied that, since he was going to Australia, there was now no need for him to take out British citizenship at all. Heinz was furious with this response, writing to Butlin that

…this is an utterly unexpected blow the importance of which I need not emphasise. In the first place, it is clear that Sydney University may have the most enormous difficulties in getting me and my wife past the Australian immigration authorities if we are still technically ‘enemy aliens’. Moreover, to be quite frank, I should have the most serious qualms…of going to Sydney at all without having received British nationality. Naturalisation in this country is something for which I have now waited impatiently for nearly thirteen years and I could not help feeling that it might be foolish to risk it even for the sake of the advancement and interesting experience which the Sydney post means to me. That there might be that risk is apparent in that I do not know what qualifications I should have to fulfil and what new delays would ensue before I could get naturalised in Australia (the more so as the failure of my application here might have an adverse effect on my application in Australia). Nor do I know whether naturalisation in Australia might
not prejudice my eventual return to this country if, as (to be frank again) I now think, I shall want to return after some years. For all these reasons it is, as you will agree, essential that I should try at all costs to get this disastrous decision reversed as soon as possible.

Butlin agreed that Heinz should indeed try to finalise his British citizenship before he left Britain, to avoid possible antagonism from the Australian immigration authorities towards enemy aliens. He offered to assist Heinz by getting his colleague F.A. Bland, Professor of Public Administration at the University of Sydney (and soon to become a member of the House of Representatives in Canberra), to make inquiries through the Australian High Commission in London. Attempts were also made to enlist the help of members of the British government. Heinz sought assistance from the Vice-Chancellor of Manchester University, from senior colleagues (including Jewkes) and from the local MP, George Benson. To Benson, he wrote

My position now is that I have to withdraw my acceptance of the Sydney job unless I can get this Home Office decision reversed, for I cannot afford to risk the prospect of my naturalisation, for which I have waited for thirteen years, for the sake of however good an academic job. I have no means of knowing how long it would take to get naturalised in Australia. Moreover, I cannot be sure that naturalisation in Australia would not prejudice my chances of returning to this country after a few years. Lastly, I have been told by Sydney University that without making their offer of the post conditional upon my prior naturalisation, they would greatly prefer it if I could obtain my British nationality before leaving this country, partly no doubt because my entry into Australia would be greatly complicated if I were still an ‘enemy alien’.

These representations to the British authorities proved, in the end, successful. Heinz was notified of his British citizenship in July 1946, shortly before he left Britain.

The Sarpedon carried 159 passengers, of whom 41 were children. Among these passengers were servicemen returning to Australia and war brides; others were taking up jobs in Australia. There was also the newly
appointed Irish Minister to Australia and the Australian singer Dorothy Helmrich, who was returning home after many years in Britain. There was a medical doctor who later became the President of the Australian Medical Association, and three Irish Dominican priests, of whom one was later to become the Bishop of the Solomon Islands. There was a businessman who was going to Sydney to establish a plastics factory, several engineers and the newly appointed Professor of Chemistry at the University of Sydney, with whom Heinz was to have many conversations before the Sarpedon finally docked in Sydney.

In 1946, the Suez Canal had not yet reopened for passenger shipping, so the route to Sydney lay around the Cape of Good Hope. The trip was to take nearly nine weeks.

Several decades later, Ruth gave a talk entitled ‘A passage to Australia’ to the Australian National University Women’s Group, which covered her family’s voyage to Australia. Life on board ship, she explained, might appear to some to have been a luxurious experience. To be sure, there were stewards who looked after their cabins, there was duty-free alcohol and cigarettes, all the meals were prepared for passengers and there were new places to visit along the way. But Ruth recounted that travelling at sea with an infant was especially difficult. While there was a nursery, it did not accept toddlers, because there was only one childcare assistant on board and that assistant could not keep watch of quick-moving children. ‘So all the looking after of Christopher,’ Ruth explained

...had to be done by ourselves. My husband loves playing competitive games, bridge, chess, anything, and could have had a wonderful time on that journey. He kept a diary on the voyage out, and I was quite appalled when I looked at it recently to read how much time we both spent looking after such a small boy. No wonder there are so many entries in his diary which read ‘on duty again’ from 6 to 11 am.

Even so, Heinz did find enough time to write up a series of the lectures that he had promised Butlin he would give soon after he reached Sydney.

For Ruth, much of the voyage to Australia was tedious. Once the English coast was left behind, little land could be seen, except for the outline of the Canary Islands, until they arrived at Cape Town more than three weeks later. After the Sarpedon left Durban, there were 16 days of nothing but water until they reached Fremantle. It rained for most of
the trip, and the rain cleared only as they approached the west coast of Australia.

The tedium was, admittedly, broken somewhat at Cape Town, where they were met by the brother of a Cambridge friend, who was very hospitable and who took them sightseeing. Three days later they enjoyed the beaches at Durban. ‘But,’ Ruth added, ‘both Cape Town and Durban were our introductions to apartheid…In both places we saw whites pushing blacks off the footpaths and make [sic] them walk in the gutters, and park benches were marked “for whites only”.’

In Durban, the crew of the Sarpedon learned that seamen on a sister ship were being paid higher wages than they were. As a consequence, they decided to go slow across the Indian Ocean. This inconvenience was followed by strikes in the Australian ports: ‘It didn’t worry us,’ Ruth said, ‘for the voyage across the Indian Ocean was probably the most enjoyable part and we were glad to have extra time in each Australian city on the way.’

On the ship, there was a social committee that planned entertainments, such as brains’ trusts and fancy dress dances. Heinz resumed his hobby of sketching, mainly fellow passengers. A major drama occurred when one of the radio officers had a burst appendix halfway across the Indian Ocean. The ship had to slow down as the ship’s doctor performed the operation; an ambulance was waiting when the ship docked at Fremantle, but Ruth later heard that the man had died.

The passengers, including Ruth and Heinz, eagerly looked forward to the ship’s arrival at Fremantle. As Ruth was later to write, ‘Everyone who approaches Australia from Europe by sea falls for Fremantle and Perth and wishes they could get off there. It always looks lovely, and the weather is almost always delightful.’ That was certainly the case the day the Arndts stepped on Australian soil for the first time.

Soon after the ship docked, they went for a walk in Fremantle and lunched at a café. According to Ruth’s account

We had what must have been the best meal in my life because I remember it so clearly. It consisted of a very large steak, something we had not seen for many years and probably larger than any I had ever seen before. On top sat two fried eggs, and with it fried tomatoes and sprinkled all round the plate chopped-up lettuce. We enjoyed it so much that we went back to the Sarpedon, collected some of our friends and took them to that café where we had the same meal all over again.
At each of the Australian ports—Fremantle, Adelaide and Melbourne—they had introductions to economists from the universities. In Melbourne, Wilfred and Marjorie Prest met them at the boat and took them for a walk through the Botanical Gardens with an old LSE friend, Dick Hayward (who later held a high position in the United Nations Secretariat in New York). Also in Melbourne, Heinz was introduced to Joe Burton, the economic historian who had reviewed *The Economic Lessons of the Nineteen-Thirties* for the *Economic Record*, and who was later to appoint Heinz to the Chair of Economics at Canberra University College. They were invited to the homes of the relatives of friends from the boat; Ruth was later to recall that ‘[w]e admired the stately homes in Toorak and South Yarra’.

When finally they arrived in Sydney on 10 October, they were greeted at the wharf in Woolloomooloo by Joyce Fisher, Butlin’s secretary, and driven to a boarding house in Manly, where they rented a room for the first month. For the first few months in Sydney, they moved into and out of a number of houses and flats. Butlin had placed several advertisements for accommodation in local newspapers before their arrival, but he had not had great success. He managed to secure the Manly flat because it was not the peak holiday season. At four guineas a week, it struck him as exorbitantly expensive, but, as he told Heinz, ‘in the circumstances it seems the best thing to do’.

The flat included a verandah, small kitchenette, a laundry and a bathroom that had to be shared with the occupants of two other flats. But it was on the ground floor and the building was located in a quiet and pleasant neighbourhood. Butlin tried to reassure Heinz that ‘Mrs Arndt will like the location even if the flat leaves much to be desired. The main thing is that it will give you a chance to look elsewhere and will be at least a headquarters while you are getting to know Sydney.’ He hoped that some of his inquiries would eventually bear better fruit, adding, ‘I don’t think you will find living in Manly a very great hardship.’

Particularly amusing to Ruth’s family in Europe, when she wrote to tell them of her safe arrival in Sydney, was the sink. This sink, as she explained in a talk she gave much later about her early Australian experiences, was ‘hung out of the window. It may have had something to do with the plumbing, or merely to save space. When we told our friends and relatives, they wrote and asked: “What happens when it rains?” The
bathroom with its gas heater was another mystery and we used it as little as we could. I spent the first month mainly sitting with Christopher on the little harbour beach at Manly.’

After a few weeks at Manly, they found another holiday cottage, this time at Narrabeen, a beachside suburb on Sydney’s upper North Shore. Living at Narrabeen meant three hours of travelling for Heinz each day, between home and the university. At Narrabeen, Ruth later recalled, they were introduced ‘to the dunny in the backyard and to red-back spiders’. When the summer arrived, they had to vacate the house. They were in fact about to rent or buy a tent when they found a room in a boarding house on Kambala Road in affluent Bellevue Hill, which was closer to the university. While the Bellevue Hill residence saved the long travel times from Narrabeen to work and back each day, the rent absorbed almost 40 per cent of Heinz’s salary. Clearly there were limits to how long the Arndts could endure this sort of thing.

When it came to housing in Sydney—and in other Australian cities—just after the war, people took whatever they could obtain. Restrictions imposed on dwelling construction, to divert resources from private uses to the war effort, had created a backlog of housing demand. Ruth’s later claim that ‘our first Christmas was not a happy one’ was an understatement. This unsatisfactory situation was overcome when Butlin’s younger brother, Noel (a lecturer in economic history at the University of Sydney), and his wife, Joan, offered to share with them a subdivided house that they were occupying in Hurstville in the southern suburbs of Sydney.

The arrangement with the Butlins was not ideal, but it was clearly better than what Sydney had thus far provided for the newcomers. But there was another reason why it had become necessary to secure more adequate and stable housing: Ruth discovered that she was pregnant with Nicholas, who was born at King George V Memorial Hospital on 14 July 1947.

As to Heinz’s first impressions of Sydney, he was at first reminded of cities in England, particularly because of the two or three-storey terrace houses that were to be found in many of Sydney’s inner suburbs. He later conceded that this was a very superficial impression, for the light, vegetation and climate were all strikingly different from what he had experienced in
Europe. There also seemed to him to be important differences between the British and Australians in their attitudes, traditions and customs. As he was later to write in *A Course Through Life*

The first impression of Sydney in 1946, after a voyage of 14,000 miles and nine weeks half way round the world from Liverpool, was—that one was back in Liverpool: English looking, English speaking people with part-Cockney part-North-Country accents, the same Victorian Gothic public buildings, the same inner suburbs of working-class terrace houses badly in need of coats of paint, the same petrol and butter rationing (the latter to conserve supplies for Britain). But not quite the same, and the differences quickly grew on one: abundant meat—steaks bigger than we had seen for six years—abundant sunshine, the beautiful harbour and beaches, the olive-grey gum trees, and subtly different attitudes. Most agreeably, there was an almost complete absence of the outward symbols, so conspicuous in Britain, of social class (Arndt 1985:10).

He was soon telling friends and former colleagues that he harboured no regrets about his decision to accept the Sydney appointment. A Manchester colleague, the political scientist Max (later Lord Max) Beloff, wrote to him on Boxing Day 1946: ‘I am pleased that you are finding so many opportunities in Australia and don’t regret Manchester. If they don’t treat their “office boys” as you rightly call us a bit better, they will colonise them very widely, to their own loss, I venture to think.’

To Beloff, Heinz wrote in January 1952 affirming that he had

…at no time regretted coming out here. The chief advantage to me…is the obvious one that, by leaving England for Australia, you exchange the position of Third Mate on a large liner for that of captain (or, at least something like it) of a tug…Australians are not, by and large, an intensely cultural people, but there is a sufficiently large and keen minority with intellectual interests to satisfy most of one’s needs in this respect and the social prestige of university people is, generally speaking, at least as high as in England.
In 1953, Heinz wrote to Dick Spann, another of his former Manchester colleagues, and one who was about to join the University of Sydney:
‘Sydney is, I still think, a lovely city—for its superb site and surroundings rather than what men have made of it.’ Of academic existence in Australia, he told Spann: ‘Frankly, to me, the chief merit of professional life here has been that you enjoy a status far superior to that which your abilities would secure for you in a much larger country like Britain.’ Nevertheless, even as he wrote this, he readily acknowledged that ‘this may be much less important to a less vain person than myself’.