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Abstract:
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I. Introduction

Why coauthor a book or an article as opposed to writing it entirely on your own?

The benefits are many and serious; so much so that I have devoted a large portion of my writing career to just this type of publication. At present, zx refereed journal articles, zx other publications, for a total of zx, with zx different coauthors, appear on my curriculum vitae. I think I am the only person with whom Murray N. Rothbard ever coauthored any publication. I have thought long and hard about this process; I have engaged in it over the years with many different people. The present essay is devoted to giving the reader a bird’s eye view of co-authoring in the fields of Austrian economics and libertarian political theory. Section II is devoted to an exploration of the benefits of co authorship, and section III to the pitfalls. In section IV I discuss some of the nuts and bolts of how co authorship works, at least in my own case. Several objections to my thesis are considered in section V, and I conclude in section V.

II. Benefits of co authorship

What are the benefits of co authorship? One of them is that specialization and the division of labor operate in intellectual pursuits as they do in all others. This phenomenon can occur in several contexts. Consider first my publication Block and Murphy (2003). I had written this article all on my own, and had submitted it to Homo
Oeconomicus, a journal not noted for its receptivity to Austro-libertarian themes. I was very happy to receive in return a reasonably positive “revise and resubmit” letter. Not wanting to be type cast as a writer who could only publish in the “ghetto” of journals receptive to Austro libertarianism, I was very desirous of complying with the referee’s and editor’s requests for change. The main revision they suggested was adding a new section showing how my thesis impacted Selten’s Chain Store Paradox (http://citeseer.ist.psu.edu/context/688474/0) and various Folk Theorems (http://www.google.ca/search?hl=en&q=Folk+Theorems&meta=), both aspects of game theory. Now, I confess, I had never so much as even heard of this area of “economics” before. When I looked it up and found out what it meant, I very much wanted to continue my previous ignorance. The costs of acquainting myself with this material were too high for me. I could have written another half dozen articles in the time it would have taken me to familiarize myself with this material, and apply it to my paper. But this I was unwilling to do. That would mean I would have to give up a perfectly good revise and resubmit offer, and start anew with a completely different journal. What to do? Co authorship came to the rescue. I sent out a query to the Mises web asking if anyone were familiar with game theory in general and Selten’s Chain Store Paradox and the Folk Theorems in particular. I received four expressions of interest. I chose Bob Murphy since I knew him best of the applicants, and turned my paper over to him, offering him co-authorship in return for contributing to the paper in response to the editor and referees of Homo Oeconomicus. He did so, and the revised paper was eventually published. Bob contributed far less than 50% of the material that eventually saw the light of day, but I could not have published this paper in that journal without his input. From both our points of view, this amalgamation was a clear win-win situation.

Another example of this phenomenon is my long and very satisfying collaboration with Roy Whitehead, a legal scholar. Many of my libertarian writings appear in law reviews coauthored with him. For those of you not familiar with publishing in law reviews, there is a certain style required, with which I was not too familiar, nor adept, nor yet desirous of correcting these shortcomings of mine. Seemingly every single solitary sentence must be footnoted about five times (I exaggerate, but only slightly). Successful publishing in this venue requires intimate familiarity with the extant law, with a myriad of court decisions, and technical terminology. My own interests lay along these lines not at all; instead, my concern was to trace the logic of the non-aggression axiom and private property rights, and apply them to issues such as blackmail, discrimination, criminal law and property

---


4 While I am on the topic of how much each co-author must contribute to the combined paper, let me mention Block and Gordon (1985). I had asked David for help with a particular daunting part of the paper. In a phone call he spoke to me quickly and brilliantly, as per usual in his case; his ideas came to me over the telephone wires so thick and fast that I couldn’t get his thoughts down on paper to my satisfaction. I asked him if he would write them up. He agreed, and sent me about 5 single spaced pages of intensely argued prose. This comprised only some 15% of so of the total words of my paper. I could have summarized his material, publicly thanked him for it in the paper, and included rendition of it. This seemed rather churlish to me. Instead, I offered him co-authorship, which he accepted. In my view, he immeasurably improved the paper, in a manner of which I was incapable. In my view, half credit for something really brilliant, thanks to him, was far better than full credit for the more pedestrian paper that I was only capable of without his help.
rights. Roy had had plenty of success in publishing in law reviews before we joined forces; I had had far less. In a sense, I therefore needed him more than he needed me. On the other hand, my ideas were far more radical, off base, ok, weird, than were his. I, too, contributed to our joint efforts. We each helped each other, indicating once again the benefits of cooperation.

Our typical article would invariably start out with his review of the literature, and setting the stage for my crack-pot ideas, which came in the second half of the paper. Usually, we would each contribute very close to 50% of the total verbiage. While in social science the rule is you can submit an article to only one journal at a time, there is no such limitation in scholarly legal publishing. Often, Roy and I would send a manuscript to 100, 200 and even 300 journals at a time. Our “batting average,” as can be expected, was very poor. Most offers of ours were rejected. Of course, it only takes one acceptance for a “hit.” Two experiences stand out. Every once in a while we would get a letter from an editor saying that one part of the paper was excellent, while the other was pure gibberish and worthless. If we would just drop the offending portion of the paper, the other section would be accepted by them for publication. Typically, Roy’s first part of the paper was deemed acceptable, while my own contributions were deemed suitable only for the round file. But once in a while, this assessment was reversed. Needless to say, whenever a letter of this sort came across our desks, one or the other of us would race around to all our colleagues complaining how we were “carrying” the other. Happily, we never took up any of these editors’ offers to publish half a paper; we persevered, and eventually had everything we ever wrote together accepted for publication.

The other experience was this. On several occasions journal A would accept our paper. Whereupon, a week or so later, journal B would also announce its willingness to publish it. Of course, while it is one thing to make multiple submissions, it is quite another, and totally unkosher, to publish the same paper in two different law reviews. Having given our word to journal A, we had to reject the offer to publish from journal B. However, Roy and I usually had several papers “working” at any given time; that is, making the rounds of journals. On several occasions we were able to parley the acceptance from journal B for our first paper into an acceptance for an entirely different one. We would write journal B along the following lines: “Thanks for accepting our paper I. However, we cannot allow you to publish it, since we have just recently accepted a publication offer from another journal. However, since you liked our paper I and cannot publish it, we take the liberty of sending you paper II, enclosed. If you accept this within two weeks, we promise it to you.”

A less dramatic example of two heads being better than one is that co-authorship gives both partners an opportunity to bat ideas around, bounce them back and forth, each one adding something more every time the paper is on his own side of the net. Did you ever get brain gridlock, or writers’ block? Having a co-author to blast you out of that condition is a great help to writing and publishing.

In this regard, let me tell you the story of my short in years but very powerful and profound collaboration with Bill Barnett. But a bit of background first. I arrived at Loyola University New Orleans in the fall of 2001, and was given an office right next to his. Looking back at that time at my own recent writings, I felt a slight disquiet. Too many of them for my taste were on libertarian theory, and too few on (Austrian)
economics. I was going through my “blackmail” phase, and many of my publications in the last few years at that time reflected that fact. Even my economics publications were less than fully satisfactory. They concerned topics I regarded as too easy: it is like shooting fish in a barrel to make the case against minimum wages or for markets in used body parts. Also, within economics, my interests were almost entirely microeconomic, not macroeconomic. This was only a slight unhappiness with my past record, since I am a strong advocate of the view that I should write about, at any given time, what is the most fun. Hedonism isn’t in it for me. However, I had slight guilt feelings, I confess.

Bill’s experience was almost the opposite of mine. His publication record as of 2001 was sparse. Very sparse. But he was an avid reader of the Austrian literature, and thought deeply and importantly about what he read. He would indeed write about Austrian economics, virtually his only professional interest, but would not publish on this topic. Instead, his habit was to generate a paragraph or two on many, many different praxeological subjects, particularly macroeconomics as it happened, and then toss them into a drawer.

We began to have lunch with each other, regularly. Pretty much every such occasion, especially in the early days, resulted in a topic for us to write about. For many of these cases, the beginning of the paper was the few paragraphs Bill had already written about the subject. I would write an abstract, put together a bibliography, make some snarky comments about his contribution, add a bit of my own material, and send it back to him. Whereupon, he would further expand his thoughts, edit my material and return it to me. We would bat a paper back and forth until we both agreed we could do no more. Then we would send it out for publication. My contribution was to a large part in this way provoking him to expand on his earlier unpublished work. Possibly, we could have each published material, separately, equivalent in quality and quantity to what we did together, but I doubt it. Bill needed someone to light a fire under him and make sure that projects were finished. Say what you will about my personal flaws, none of them involve laziness or lack of pushiness.

---

5. This phrase is a redundancy in my view.

6. I have published about two dozen essays on this topic.

7. I spent my formative macro economic years at Columbia University, where I had two options. First, Albert “marble-mouth” Hart, who did indeed discuss the subject, but not in any way I could understand. Second, Arthur Burns, who spoke clearly and even brilliantly, but all he would talk about was his lunches with Nixon and his other buddies in Washington D.C. I spent a year with the two of them, and grew to hate and fear macroeconomics as a result.

8. Don’t make too much of this. People of my ethnic persuasion always feel guilty about something. Maybe it comes from having had a Jewish mother.

9. We were opposites in other ways too. Bill was almost an intellectual hermit. He had read extensively in the Austro literature, but knew personally virtually none of the people actively engaged in this school of thought, apart from those of his Loyola colleagues he himself had converted to this perspective. My reading in Austrianism was less than his (having spent far more of my time than him in libertarian pursuits), and I knew virtually everyone who was active in the Austrian field, from my long association with the Mises Institute.

10. Murray Rothbard used to say that “hatred is my muse” as an inspiration for his writing. On this and so much else I have modeled myself after him.
subject. People might be forgiven for seeing me as the senior partner in this collaboration. After all, before I arrived on the scene, I had already published a ton of articles and books, Bill practically none at all. After nine semesters of working together, our output is monumental. I list 19 publications between us in the appendix, but this includes only actually published or accepted and thus forthcoming works, and is thus only the tip of the iceberg. In addition, we have at this time no fewer than 17 papers now making the rounds of journals, some of them far in excess of 50 pages long. We have a further dozen papers now in the writing process, in various stages of completion. Not too bad for a collaboration of only four and half years. But nothing could be further from the truth, in terms of our relative contributions, in my opinion. He is my mentor in virtually all of our cooperative ventures.

Yet another benefit of co-authorship is that it demonstrates ability to work with others. I don’t want to make too much of this; people who publish on their own are also perfectly capable of collegiality. Nonetheless, this element on a curriculum vita can indicate to a hiring or promotion committee that an applicant has involved himself in research with peers.

I cannot leave this section without relating what is for me perhaps the most personally satisfying series of co-authorships I have ever enjoyed. At the time this experience first started, I was living with my family in Vancouver, Canada. There was a meeting of the Western Economics Association in town in 1994, and I was given permission by my wife to attend on the weekend, but only if I took my son, then aged 16, along with me. Matthew and I were standing in the hall of the hotel in which the meeting was held when we were accosted by Gordon Tullock. He tapped me on the shoulder, and then in the forceful manner for which he is widely noted said: “Block, I hear that you favor private roads, correct?” When I acquiesced, he threw down the following challenge, which I now relate from memory: “That is the most idiotic idea I ever heard. Why, if someone were to build a road from say Boston to San Diego, he could cut the country in two by not allowing any roads to cross his, nor any entrances or exits between these two cities.” I protested that no rational businessman would pursue any such policy since it would hardly be profitable. Gordon stomped off conceding my point but arguing that it nevertheless could happen the way he proposed. Therefore, only a moron could hold the view I held.

This was Matthew’s first taste of academic give and take, and to say that he was entranced would be an understatement. It is only a slight exaggeration to say that for the next year we discussed practically nothing else apart from this one question. I don’t like to brag, ok, ok, I do, in this case, but all during that time his questions and comments were incisive, inventive, and argued passionately. At the end of that period I wrote up what was later to become Block and Block (1996), and was then confronted with a problem: is this a single authored piece of mine? Do I merely give Matthew credit in a footnote for helping me develop the paper? My thought was that to do any such thing would be really to steal my son’s ideas, and unduly take credit for them. He was so intimately involved in every aspect of this paper that to do any less would be a travesty of justice; plagiarism of a sort on my part.

Matthew initially rejected my offer of co-authorship mainly on the ground that no one would believe that a 16 year old could be responsible for contributing to such a publication. But I asked him if it was true that his involvement merited this sort of
treatment, to which he had to agree. I then stated something to the effect that we should ignore what people might think and just stick to the truth.11

III. Drawbacks of co authorship

There are several arguments in favor of single authorship. First, the Randians will think less of you if you take on a writing partner. They will likely accuse you of collectivism, and this would be a bitter pill indeed to swallow. The very idea that Ayn Rand would coauthor anything with anyone is nothing short of preposterous.

Second, tradition. Here is a necessarily partial list of famous Austrian economists and libertarian theoreticians who never joined any others in any of their publications: Menger, Bohm-Bawerk, Mises, Hayek, Kirzner, Spooner, Tucker, Molinari, Acton, Hume, (I need some help in adding to this list).12

Third, problems can sometimes arise with coauthors. Some are very tardy; I have been made to wait as much as an entire year for other people to keep their commitments to joint projects. Needless to say, my enthusiasm for future collaboration with such people decreases, ceteris paribus.

Sometimes there are disagreements that cannot be compromised or talked out. A case in point occurred in the case of Block and Gordon (1985). I wanted to be very critical of Nozick on a certain point and Gordon could not see his way clear to agreeing with me on it. If we included this material, Gordon would have been forced to take a position against his will.13 If we deleted it, I would have been an unhappy camper, since I very much wanted this critique to appear in the paper. How did we solve this seemingly intractable problem? Footnote 50 of Block and Gordon (1985, 48) reads as follows: “David Gordon wishes to thank Robert Nozick for very helpful suggestions, and wishes to deny any responsibility for the material which appears in section IV after this point.” This may have raised a few eyebrows, but, speaking in behalf of Gordon, this was a simple and elegant solution to the problem. Where there is a will, there is usually a way.

Another problem of this sort took place in Barnett and Block (unpublished A). The paper as a whole is highly critical of the Hayekian triangle, utilized by Austrian luminaries such as Rothbard and Garrison. This notwithstanding, I still have something of a soft spot for the use of this geometrical form, while Barnett does not; at all. We tried to fashion compromise language on this, but did not succeed. In similar manner, we each stated our own positions, as follows. In our concluding section, these words appear:

---

11 Although I had hopes that my son would follow me in my career in Austro libertarianism, he chose a very different path. But I think this advice will serve him, or anyone else for that matter in good stead, no matter what calling is chosen.

12 Rothbard’s claim to be included on this list is “marred” by Rothbard and Block (1987). However, this is only an introductory editorial for a journal, not at all a substantive work of research. As far as the latter are concerned, the joys of co authorship were unknown to this giant of liberty and Austrian economics.

13 In my view, all coauthors are responsible for every single word that appears under their names, whether they wrote the specific passage or not.
“Here is a statement on this matter from the second listed co-author: … The triangle is a very valuable heuristic device even for those of us who have been weaned off this geometrical diagram. Even though the present paper discusses numerous difficulties with this device, and serious ones at that, I do not recommend a complete jettisoning of the triangle. When used with full knowledge of its drawbacks, it can still have some, albeit, limited, advantages.”

Several paragraphs below this appear the following words:

“Here is a statement on this matter from the first listed co-author: … In sum, the Hayekian triangle is not so much simple as it is simplistic, which should not come as a surprise as it is an attempt to illustrate the immeasurable complexity of a real world economy with a simple aggregative structure such as the triangle, or, in slightly more advanced mathematical terms, with a single 2-variable function. Regrettably, the Hayekian triangle is fatally flawed, and is of no use whatsoever. It should be jettisoned on the part of all serious researchers. It should be of interest only to antiquarians.”

Then there are those who bring shirking to an art form. I am not talking about those who do less than 50%, 40% or even 30%. These ventures rarely result in exact equality in my experience. I am talking about cases where a boss of mine in the long distant past insisted, with the not so veiled threat of firing me, of putting his name on a piece written entirely by myself. I don’t much like taking credit for the work of others; nor, giving it away either.

Third, it is never clear, at least to outsiders, as to which of several people mentioned in a publication were responsible for making what contributions. This can be important in academia. I once served on a tenure committee where the candidate offered only coauthored articles. There were a sufficient number of them, and they were of high quality, but I and several other committee members had great misgivings since we could never be sure of who was riding on whose coat tails. The answer here, I think, is that if you engage in this practice, limit it to a minority of your publications. Otherwise it will be reasonably asked of you, are you capable of publishing anything on your own?

IV. Nuts and bolts of coauthorship

Who can and/or should ask whom to coauthor? Who, properly, makes the initial overture? It is easy between peers; anyone should feel comfortable asking anyone else. I and probably most people would feel uncomfortable inviting a person clearly more senior than they to coauthor a paper; I suppose that is reasonable. Chutzpahnick that I am, I never would have had the temerity to ask someone like Murray Rothbard, Israel Kirzner, Friedrich Hayek or Ludwig von Mises, all of whose professional lives overlapped with my own, to coauthor anything with me. On the other hand, I have several times been recently approached by relative newcomers to the Austro-libertarian camp for this purpose, and have felt flattered rather than anything else.
In my own case, although 1981 was the first year I engaged in cooperative writing projects, I didn’t get started in a big way until the mid 1990s. I began with a whole slew of co-authorships with my students at Holy Cross that started hitting the presses in 1996. At that time I didn’t think student essays would be acceptable with refereed journals, so I confined my aim to places like *The Freeman*, *The Chalcedon Report*, *Consent*, and various libertarian publications. The next step, was to try peer reviewed periodicals. The idea for this came to me in a light bulb sort of a way. I was sitting at my desk with a whole pile of student term papers in front of me. They were destined, I think, to be published in the same non-refereed venues. On the phone (this was in the days before I got involved in e mail) was a frantic editor of a law review who I had just had to disappoint; his was the second journal that had accepted a paper of mine, I could not allow him to publish it, and he was desperate for material at the last moment. He pleaded with me: didn’t I have anything else I had written I could send to him. Remember, there, staring me in the face was a large pile of student essays. I told this law review editor, that I would get something to him in a few days. Thus began my practice of publishing articles coauthored with students in professional journals.

I think it a good practice to try always to bend over backwards to give more credit, and/or accept less, than I think I deserve. When in doubt, leave your name out. I remember once going over a paper in galley format that I had co authored with Bill Barnett. I was reading it carefully, one last time before publication, looking for typos, as a good author would. The trouble was, I didn’t see enough of me in the piece to justify co authorship, so I demanded that my name be taken off the paper. Bill has upon several occasions followed the same policy.

Females, as always, present unique problems; in this case for co authorship. I have coauthored articles with only three different females who were not students. Part of the reason for this is that there are very few women Austro libertarian academics. Another reason is that in an academia earmarked with heightened, nay, hysterical sensitivity toward possible sexual harassment abuses, a male has to be courageous indeed to take on a female coauthor on a solo basis. For coauthoring is

---

14 From 1981 until 1995, I was involved in only 24 joint publication projects, an average of only 1.6 per year.

15 Bob McGee, with whom I also co-authored on numerous other occasions, was extraordinarily helpful to me in working on these student papers.

16 Due to my outspoken nature, and radical views, I have had a spotty academic career, being fired from far more than my fair share of institutions, and not attaining tenure until I was 60 years old. However, my ability to coauthor refereed journal articles with students has been an important compensating differential for me. Several jobs were offered to me on this basis, as administrators are highly impressed by this practice.

17 Attempting to coauthor papers with male students only would not have been fair. Minor point: it would have also gotten me fired at Holy Cross where I had no tenure.

18 In all three of these cases, it turned out that I was “chaperoned” by one or more additional coauthors. I imply nothing whatsoever about these three women. I am making a statement not about any specific individuals; rather, about a pernicious mindset that now pervades academia.

19 Autobiographical note: I have never had even the hint of any such difficulties with any of my female coauthors. But that does not stop my paranoia about the subject.
an intimate process. There is give and take; there is sometimes, gulp!, shouting involved. The last thing any professor wants to be involved in is a sexual harassment hearing. This, of course, has negative implications for the mentoring of female colleagues. But the cause is not chauvinist piggery. The fault lies very much elsewhere.

Does the co author’s office have to be located down the hall, a situation I enjoyed with Roy Whitehead for four years, or right next door, my present situation with Bill Barnett? Judging from my own experience, this is a definite help, but it is hardly required. Roy’s example shows it is possible to work at long distance. We worked together on many projects during my years at the University of Central Arkansas (1997-2001), but are still going strong some five years later. But it is better to be up close and personal, at least in my experience, as shown by the fact that many of my co authorships were with colleagues when we were both at the same university. And this is to say nothing of the many, many collaborations I have had with people located thousands of miles away from me.

What is the maximum number of coauthors that is workable? The most coauthors I have involved myself with in any one paper is 6 (Anderson, et. al. 2001). However, here are articles sometimes shorter in length than the list of their hundreds of co authors. This occurs mainly in physics and chemistry. For example, Abbot, et. al. (2005) lists about 450 coauthors from almost 50 different institutions. I don’t suggest anything like that. Indeed, the whole idea of that many coauthors falls out of my realm of experience. My practice is to work with one coauthor at a time; then, when the paper is set to the satisfaction, work with a third or fourth coauthor, ultimately giving everyone a veto power over each word, or trying to mediate disagreements. Even in the case of Anderson, et al. (2001) this process had to be severely truncated.

V. Objections

One possible objection to the thesis put forth above concerns individualism.

Murray (2003, 394, emphasis added in bold) defines autonomy (which in his view, undoubtedly correct in my opinion, helps promote human excellence) as follows: “A major stream of human accomplishment is fostered by a culture that encourages the belief that individuals can act efficaciously as individuals, and enables them to do so.” He continues (2003, 394-395): “Autonomy refers to a person’s beliefs that it is in his power to fulfill that meaning through his own acts. Own acts is a crucial element, for the creative act is both audacious and individual by nature. This is not equivalent to saying that great accomplishment always occurs among people acting alone. Scientific knowledge is advanced by sharing ideas with colleagues, and there is the occasional example of a great collaboration in the arts. But creativity ultimately comes down to small, solitary acts in which an individual conceives of something new and gives it a try, without knowing for sure how it will turn out.” Murray (2003, 399, emphasis added in bold) states: “Even in today’s Japan, a century and a half after that nation began Westernizing, it is commonly observed that Japan’s technological feats far outweigh its slender body of original discoveries.

20 I owe this cite to Allan Walstad.
One ready explanation for this discrepancy is the difference between progress that can be made consensually and hierarchically versus progress that requires individuals who insist that they alone are right.

From this one might readily infer that Murray opposes co authorship. True, he makes an exception for “the occasional example of a great collaboration in the arts.” But this would not appear, for him, to carry over into the sciences. Although Murray (2003) explicitly eschews the social sciences, my main area of interest, it is highly possible that he sees individual acts, not those of groups of scholars, as the last best hope for progress in this domain as well.21

This could readily be taken as a criticism of the burden of this paper, extolling the virtues and benefits of collaborative intellectual activity. In some sense it is, and, also, in some sense it is valid. Co authorship may not be best for everyone. Some people are just better at singles tennis or handball, others are more comfortable with doubles. Methodological individualism I think serves best in this context.

21 Although quite possibly not, as the magisterial Herrnstein and Murray (1994) was of course a collaboration of Murray and his co author, Herrnstein.
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Llewellyn H. Rockwell (1) Mises Institute
Murray Rothbard (1) University of Nevada, Las Vegas (1926-1995)
Elyssa Schultz (1) Colleague at Loyola University New Orleans
Donald Shaw (1) Dean, University of Regina, Canada
Deborah Walker (1) Professor of economics at Denver University
Christopher Westley (1) Assistant Professor of economics, Jacksonville State University
Roy Whitehead (16) Colleague at University of Central Arkansas
Walter E. Williams (1) Professor of economics at George Mason University
Stuart Wood (1) Colleague at Loyola University New Orleans
Guillermo Yeatts (1) Independent Scholar and Businessman, Argentina
Yeoman Yoon (2) Professor of finance and business at Seton Hall University

Students

Holy Cross College (1991-1997)
Theresa Amalfitano
Vicky Baderas
William Bandoch
Brian Boland
Michelle Cadin
Michelle Cushing
Mark Callen
Daniel Coffey
Meaghan Cussen
Patrick English
Kenneth Garschina
Michael Gries
Jason Holloway
Jonathan Kerr
Nicole LaBletta
Elizabeth Larson
William R. Layden
Paul McCormick
Gene McDonough
Tim Mulcahy
Ellen O’Leary
Matthew Ragan
Frederick Regnery
Andrea Santonello
Alizabeth Sordillo
Kevin Sohr
Kristin Spissinger (2)
Patrick Tinsley
Andrew Young (now assistant professor of economics at Ole Miss)

University of Central Arkansas (1997-2001)
Gail Betts
Mana Davidson
Jason Evans
Bobby Midkiff
James T. Miller
Keith Reid
Ethan Shorter
Leon Snyman
Debbie Walker
Alan White

Loyola University New Orleans (2001- pres)
James Anderson
Brian Branch
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Megan Clay
Jeanette Delery
Jenny Dirmeyer
Emile Dreuil
Catherine Gould
Erica Kilchrist
Christie Laporte
Fred Tulley
Katherine Wingfield

Misc.
David Lorch, my nephew, Harvard University