

IN MEMORIAM PROF. DR P. HENNIPMAN (1911–1994)

Professor Pieter Hennipman died on the 3rd of July 1994 after a fruitful life dedicated to economic science. During a long period he invested a significant part of his time in running *De Economist* in cooperation with editors of different generations.

The main contributions of Professor Hennipman as an economist lie in the field of welfare economics and the theory of economic policy. His profound knowledge of the history of economic thought was exemplary. It made him aware of the fact that many ideas presented as novelties in economics had their roots long before and that the originators of new ideas did not always get the credit they deserved. This insight combined with the modesty, which was part of his character, led him to present his own work after carefully scrutinizing all arguments relevant to the case, thus revealing what were the real issues and what was merely semantic cover up. Or, as Zijlstra (1981, p. 7) puts it: 'Reading his work, one is constantly aware of his firm convictions which permeate all the complexity of his discourse and his painstaking arguments pro and contra.'

Time and again Professor Hennipman argued against unwarranted value judgement in economic science. He did so with great intellectual power and conviction as can be illustrated by quoting from his work: 'The futility of the attempts to construct a genuinely normative welfare economics does not rule out perfectly legitimate recommendations of allocative efficiency linked to economic theory. These are unexceptionable if the vainly pursued full integration of theory and value judgements is replaced by an association in which the two components are kept strictly separate. Proposals resting on such a combination do not belong to economics proper but to political economy as defined by Lord Robbins. In his words, this does not form a part of "scientific economics" since it involves assumptions which "lie outside positive science and are essentially normative in character"' (Hennipman (1984, p. 96)).

Professor Hennipman had a long lasting and intensive relationship with *De Economist*. He joined the Board of Editors in 1946 and acted as Managing Editor for 27 years after which he chaired our meetings until his retirement from the Board in 1988. From then on Professor Hennipman was the elected Honorary

Chairman of *De Economist*. Many economists will remember him in his different capacities. As managing editor he succeeded in maintaining the high scientific standard of the journal at times that publications were mainly in Dutch and the supply of papers was not always abundant to say the least. As Chairman of the Board of Editors Professor Hennipman guided the journal through difficult periods in his admirable, friendly but determined manner. For some of us the change in language in the seventies was felt as a cultural loss. I presume that Professor Hennipman was in sympathy with this view. For him as a great stylist the Dutch language was a cultural heritage not to be given up without careful consideration. However, he also quickly recognized the inevitability of publishing in English and the advantages to be gained by it. Due to his wisdom and persuasiveness the change in language was effectuated in a smooth manner. Other problems in the field of publishing and finance were solved under his chairmanship in a similar vein, thus setting the stage for the present position of the journal as the quarterly review of the Royal Netherlands Economic Association.

Professor Hennipman wrote many articles and reviews which have been published in *De Economist*. His last full article appeared in the 1992 volume of this journal. Besides articles in this journal Professor Hennipman published regularly in other outlets for scientific work. Therefore, he may have reached a large audience, but it seems fair to say that he aimed at a group of insiders who do not merely accept fundamental research at face value, but appreciate its originality and above all its relevance for theoretical and applied economics. Writing these words Samuelson's famous statement comes to mind: 'Not for us is the limelight and the applause. But that doesn't mean the game is not worth the candle or that we do not in the end win the game. In the long run, the economic scholar works for the only coin worth having – our own applause' (Samuelson (1962, p. 18)). Our applause for Pieter Hennipman will never subside.

Th. van de Klundert

REFERENCES

- Hennipman, P., 1984, 'Normative or Positive: Mishan's Half-way House,' *De Economist*, 132, pp. 86–99.
- Samuelson, P.A., 1962, 'Economists and the History of Ideas,' *American Economic Review*, 52, pp. 1–8.
- Zijlstra, J., 1981, 'Hennipman and De Economist,' *De Economist*, 129, p. 107.