

# Austro-Libertarian Publishing: A Survey and Critique

Walter E. Block  
Loyola University, New Orleans

## 1. Introduction

Suppose that we take it for granted that we favor a society based on private property rights and voluntary interaction with one another. How can we best attain such a goal? Specifically, how can we best attain an Austro-libertarian understanding of it? We Austro-libertarians all tend in a scholarly, not to say a nerdy, direction. Our comparative advantage thus lies not in picking up a gun and shooting people in order to achieve a free society, but rather in the direction of education.<sup>1</sup>

This immediately sets up a choice: Shall our efforts in this regard be aimed at public speaking or writing?<sup>2</sup> Some might say “both,” but given time limits, that sets up the question: What proportion of time should be devoted to each? At one time I would have come down firmly on the side of publishing rather than giving speeches, on the ground that the former is forever, while the latter is ephemeral. Words go out on the wind, and soon disappear. I reckoned

---

<sup>1</sup> Not that this would do much good in any case. Until the “hearts and minds” of the populace are won, were one dictator to be assassinated, dozens more would contend for his position, and one of them would attain it. Without education, the masses of people, without a proper ideology, would support totalitarianism, not freedom. The pen is truly mightier than the sword since the former determines the *direction* in which the latter is pointed. Jeffrey Hummel states, “Ideas, not brute force, rule the world. If you change people’s minds, you change the direction in which they point their guns”; see Jeffrey Rogers Hummel, “A Practical Case for Denationalizing Defense: Part 2,” *The Pragmatist* 3 (June 3, 1986), p. 3. And Hummel refers to “the motivation of the people themselves. Ideas ultimately determine in which direction they wield their weapons or whether they wield them at all”; see Jeffrey Rogers Hummel, “The Will to Be Free: The Role of Ideology in National Defense,” *Independent Review* 5 (Spring 2001), pp. 527–28.

<sup>2</sup> Many of us have jobs that require a certain amount of public speaking (e.g., teaching) and/or writing (if employed, say, by a think tank). I am abstracting from these responsibilities and asking about additional time when we are free to do as we please in this regard.

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

without modern technology, though, which can now preserve the spoken word as well as the written.<sup>3</sup>

At the margin I still favor writing over speaking.<sup>4</sup> If a public address is to be effective, it has to be spontaneous,<sup>5</sup> but, if so, then it cannot be the result of your considered opinion. Rather, you make it up as you go along.<sup>6</sup> In terms of getting to the depths of an issue, it is unusual for an extemporaneous speech to approach the written product, which can be composed at leisure, and then reworked repeatedly, until what is down on paper (or on the screen) is the very best of which you are capable. I feel so strongly about this that I have been raising my speaking fees in an attempt to make more time for writing.

Whether it is the written word or the spoken word, what is important is that the Austro-libertarian word gets created and then publicized. As is written on the men's rooms of the nation, "The job's not over until the paperwork is done." It seems entirely selfish to write an essay and then keep it to oneself, yet there are some people I know who make *brilliant* contributions and follow this practice. Publicizing is like tossing grenades and firing howitzers at the bad guys. It brings recruits to our banner, and discomfort to our intellectual and moral enemies. None of these effects can occur when such material is kept hidden.

I will offer a word about repetitiveness. You don't want to write the same book five times over and call it a career. Nor do you want endlessly to repeat yourself in articles. On the other hand, and there *is* another hand, if you write a lot, there is bound to be some overlap. I was once at a seminar sitting next to my old mentor from Columbia University, Gary Becker, and someone else made exactly the comment I wanted to make. I said something on the order of "Darn, I was going to say that." Gary encouraged me to pipe up, saying, "You can't have too much of the truth." What I got out of this very kind remark is that even though I would make much the same point, it would be subtly different from the one made by the person before me, if only in terms of inflection, emphasis, examples used to illustrate, etc. Sometimes, in

---

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., <http://www.mises.org/media.aspx>.

<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, writing is a lonely business, and good speeches bring the adulation of the crowds, which can be a heady thing, especially if the crowds are made up of knowledgeable, committed free-enterprisers. I admit that I do enjoy this, but regard it as a "guilty pleasure."

<sup>5</sup> If it is written out and merely read, then the time spent on reading it could have been spent writing something else.

<sup>6</sup> Well, if you speak from brief notes, as I do, you know the general direction in which you are headed. Still, extemporaneity and profound thoughts are at best uneasy companions.

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

my classes, when I see on the faces of my students that my point has not really been understood, I first try to say it again, in as many different ways as I am capable of. But there are of course limits, as I am only one person, and thus limited in my mode of expression. On these occasions it is my practice to call upon one or two bright students who did understand me, and ask them to spit back the lesson. They do so, of course, in their own words, with their own “body English” attached. Even though they are just repeating what I had said, often the students who did not, and could not, learn the material from me, can take it in from these peers of theirs. Murray Rothbard has “stolen” many of my ideas. It cannot be denied that he published these decades before I even thought of them, but at least in some cases, I came up with the thoughts independently. Honestly. So, should I hang back and not write about them, merely because he had done so long before me, and in a manner far superior to that I could ever dream of?<sup>7</sup> Not a bit. As Friedrich Hayek says, “If old truths are to retain their hold on men’s minds, they must be restated in the language and concepts of successive generations.”<sup>8</sup> And in the view of Llewellyn Rockwell, “The hatred of markets must be countered by defenses of freedom in every generation. Our lives depend on it.”<sup>9</sup> I have written over

---

<sup>7</sup> In my misspent youth, I used to keep track of how many pages (double spaced, typewritten, about 300 words per page) of writing I could write per day. On a decent day, I could do five. Every once in a while I could attain the giddy heights of ten or even, very rarely, fifteen. Once, I started early in the morning, and continued until the wee hours of the next night. At the end of this orgy of writing, I had twenty-three pages. Full of myself, I telephoned Murray and asked him how many pages he could do per day. He replied (and this is a direct quotation), “Mrech, mrech, who keeps track of such things?” I pressed him beyond all endurance, asking only for an estimate (he always showed great patience with me). Finally, he said, “Eight pages an hour.” Eight pages an hour! A professional typist could do better than that, but Murray was talking about creating *de novo*. I had long since despaired of comparing myself with him in terms of quality. I saw then that even in terms of quantity alone he and I were in different leagues. On the other hand, Murray was a party hound, and I’m a bit of a workaholic recluse. Once, on a beautiful Sunday afternoon when I was working in Auburn, Alabama, at the Mises Institute, I took a look outside and asked myself whether or not I wanted to head for the great outdoors and enjoy myself. I realized then that there was nothing I wanted to do more than keep tickling that keyboard, and went back to work. Maybe in this way I will one day beat Murray in terms of words published. Forget about quality. My motto is, “Do what you can with what limited ability you have been given.” See Walter Block, “Austrians in Academia: A Battle Plan,” August 17, 2005, accessed online at: <http://www.mises.org/story/1888>.

<sup>8</sup> Friedrich A. Hayek, *The Constitution of Liberty* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1960), p. 1.

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

and over on such topics as the minimum wage, rent control, free trade, and blackmail, just to name a few. I tell you what: as soon as they rescind anti-libertarian legislation on any of these, I will cease and desist. Until and unless that occurs, I plan to continue with my writing.<sup>10</sup>

### 2. Where to Publish

For those wishing to have a successful academic career, there is only one real outlet to consider: refereed journals. They are the venues that really count for tenure, promotion, and raises. Non-refereed periodicals, magazines, letters to editors, and books don't count in this regard. If anything, they almost constitute a negative.

Which journals should one publish in? *Ceteris paribus*, the optimal choice is the most prestigious periodical that will accept your article.<sup>11</sup> Like it or not, and I for one do not like it at all, the better jobs, promotions, etc., go to those with publications in the more prestigious journals, as determined by the neoclassical mainstream. However, *ceteris* is not at all *paribus*.

In the Introductory Editorial of the first issue of the *Review of Austrian Economics*, Rothbard and I wrote about

some dilemmas now faced by Austrian-oriented researchers who attempt to publish in the mainline journals. Articles that simply assume a familiarity on the part of the profession with methodological norms and theoretical developments within the Austrian tradition are unlikely to be published; the profession, by and large, has no such familiarity. Articles that devote substantial space to stating and defending the methodological norms and retracing theoretical developments are also unlikely to be published; they are seen, and correctly so, as unoriginal. Articles whose backgrounds are extensive in absolute terms but brief in relation to the remainder of the article do not constitute a workable compromise; they are rejected on the basis of length. These constraints do not totally

---

<sup>9</sup> Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr., "Why They Attack Capitalism," *The Free Market* 20, no. 10 (October 2002), accessed online at: [http://mises.org/freemarket\\_detail.aspx?control=418](http://mises.org/freemarket_detail.aspx?control=418).

<sup>10</sup> For more on the importance of publishing, see Walter Block, "Austrians in Academia: A Battle Plan."

<sup>11</sup> For rankings of journals, in terms of prestige for neoclassical economists, see <http://www.google.com/search?hl=en&q=economics+journal+rankings&btnG=Google+Search>.

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

preclude the publication of Austrian-oriented articles in mainline journals, but they make such events much more difficult.<sup>12</sup>

If this is the case with the Austrian part of Austro-libertarianism, what of the libertarian element? How will libertarian articles fare in journals devoted to ethics, politics, or (property or human) rights, but from a mainstream (e.g., non-libertarian) perspective? In a word, not too well. Here, complete, full, and total familiarity with the likes of Robert Nozick, Ayn Rand, Gustave de Molinari, Rothbard, and Hans-Hermann Hoppe, can readily be assumed. And this achieves much, which is the problem, for it is almost always in the wrong direction; editors of such journals, in a word, are *biased* against libertarian perspectives.<sup>13</sup>

Although Milton Friedman was never the editor of a mainstream economics journal, his attitude toward Austro-libertarians is pretty representative of that breed. He characterized Ludwig Von Mises as an “extremist” and as “intolerant.” He held Rothbard in even lower esteem, seeing him as a “cult builder, and a dogmatist.”<sup>14</sup> Were Friedman an editor of a typical neoclassical refereed periodical, and were an Austro-libertarian to have submitted a typical manuscript to him for publication, I suspect he would have been biased against it, given this attitude. In like manner, standard journals are less receptive to publishing the research of Austro-libertarians than they would be to that of their neoclassical colleagues.

---

<sup>12</sup> Murray N. Rothbard and Walter Block, “Introductory Editorial,” *Review of Austrian Economics* 1 (1987), pp. ix-xiii.

<sup>13</sup> For the argument that bias exists in economics publishing, see Daniel B. Klein and Eric Chiang, “The Social Science Citation Index: A Black Box—with an Ideological Bias?” *Econ Journal Watch* 1, no. 1 (April 2005), pp. 134-65, accessed online at: <http://econjwatch.org/articles/the-social-science-citation-index-a-black-box-with-an-ideological-bias>. Also see Gary North, “The Self-Serving System of Peer Review,” July 7, 2008, accessed online at: <http://www.lewrockwell.com/north/north636.html>.

<sup>14</sup> Friedman states, “[I]n the middle of a debate on the subject of distribution of income, in which you had people who you would hardly call socialist or egalitarian—people like Lionel Robbins, like George Stigler, like Frank Knight, like myself—Mises got up and said, ‘You’re all a bunch of socialists,’ and walked right out of the room. But Mises was a person of very strong views and rather intolerant about any differences of opinion”; see: [http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/commandingheights/shared/miniextlo/int\\_miltonfriedman.html](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/commandingheights/shared/miniextlo/int_miltonfriedman.html). See also: <http://reason.com/9506/FRIEDMAN.jun.shtml>; <http://www.fff.org/comment/com0512b.asp>; [http://www.thbookservice.com/products/BookPage.asp?prod\\_cd=c6823](http://www.thbookservice.com/products/BookPage.asp?prod_cd=c6823); and <http://www.mskousen.com/Books/Articles/guess.html>. I owe these citations to Stephan Kinsella.

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

What is one to do, then? Early on I adopted a combination strategy. For any article that could conceivably fit in either category, I would first try the standard journals. Then, after five or ten rejections from journals in this category, depending upon my impatience, I would try the movement, or free-enterprise-oriented periodicals. After I achieved tenure, and was not as concerned with placement, I more or less pleased myself in this regard. In my case, this consists of sending what I regard as my best work to Austro-libertarian journals, and my lesser efforts anywhere else.

I discuss below in Section 4 the movement or free-enterprise-oriented journals in some detail, giving my own personal experiences with them, but these have to be taken with a grain of salt. My experiences in this regard may not be typical, and for two reasons. One, I write more than most people, and two, my writing is not “nuanced,” as one referee from this sector of periodicals put it. What he meant by this is that I often take on the role of a pit bull, and am hypercritical, not to say hysterical. In his view, I am needlessly antagonistic.<sup>15</sup> I plead guilty of all such charges. My explanation for this is twofold. First, I pattern my writing, as best I can, after that of Rothbard, whose motto in this regard was, “Hatred is my muse.” Second, also from this source, Rothbard sees a “deep flaw in the . . . world-view . . . (of Mr. X since) . . . he doesn’t *hate* the state, he doesn’t resent it from the very depths of his being. . . . [H]e is able to apply to the State the same standards as to any private individual and organization; he lacks the state-hatred vital to any libertarian and which certainly should be in the bones of any self-proclaimed anarchist.”<sup>16</sup> Say what you will about me—and my intellectual enemies have said quite a bit—but none of them has ever perceived in me a lack of this characteristic; indeed, the very opposite is the case.

### 3. Publishing Hints

The closer I get to my dotage, the more and more important I think it is for Austro-libertarians of my generation to help promote the careers of graduate students and young assistant professors who will follow us. That is one of my primary motivations for writing the present article: to help pass on the baton. In this vein I should like to share my publishing experiences and how best to address pitfalls.

---

<sup>15</sup> This referee, and all others, sees only my essay in final draft format, after I have toned it down as best as I am able. One of these days I am going to send out an earlier draft; then real antagonism would be on display.

<sup>16</sup> Murray N. Rothbard, “Eric Mack and the Anarchist Case for War,” *The Libertarian Forum* 18, nos. 5-6 (1984), pp. 3-7.

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

### **a. Rejections**

Do not be put off by rejections. Do *not*.<sup>17</sup> It takes very little time to send an essay to yet another journal.<sup>18</sup> Have a form letter handy for this purpose. My motto in this regard is “Pearls before swine.” True, on several occasions something I wrote was clearly wrong; in these cases, I benefited from critical referee’s remarks, and dropped the project. However, as long as I still think I am right, rejection letters are like water off a duck’s back; I ignore them. Do keep a list, though, of journals that have refused to publish a given essay. It is a waste of time to send an essay more than once to a given journal (and you will earn the enmity of the editor), unless, of course, it has changed editorship.

There are all sorts of articles, written by future and present Nobel Prize winners, that have been rejected on numerous occasions, only to make the reputation of the writer in yet another journal. *Never give up!*

### **b. How to deal with editors**

Try to pick journals where there is a congruence between what you are writing and what they are publishing. It is just a waste of time to make a clearly inappropriate submission; it makes you look like an idiot, to boot. Insist on an acknowledgement of a submission within a month; if you do not get it, withdraw the essay and send it elsewhere. In my early years I would wait six months before making a follow-up inquiry, only to learn that the journal never received the essay (or, had no record of having done so, which amounts to much the same thing). Follow up six months after submission, but be prepared to wait a bit longer than that for an answer. After a year, you can get a bit snarky, well, at least whiny, with an editor. Based on hindsight, I would cut matters off after eighteen months, if, after several subsequent follow-up inquiries, a journal did not let you know whether an essay was accepted or not after that duration.

When you get a revise-and-resubmit letter from an editor, be obsequious. Be intent on doing exactly what is called for in the referees’ reports, that is, when it concerns anything but substance. I will never forget Rothbard’s advice on the format of the *Review of Austrian Economics*: compromise completely on form, nothing on content. That is, if the mainstream neoclassical journals had a table of contents in the front, include one as well. If they had a certain sized margin on their pages, or followed a

---

<sup>17</sup> Many, many of my now published articles have been declined by editors between a half-dozen and a dozen instances. Several have been rejected many more times: one of them fourteen times, three of them fifteen times, and one each on sixteen, eighteen, twenty-two, twenty-six, and twenty-seven occasions, respectively. This latter manuscript took almost fifteen years between writing and publishing.

<sup>18</sup> I am lucky in this matter in one regard; I do very little empirical work, so virtually none of my writings becomes dated.

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

particular editorial pattern regarding footnotes, editorials, etc., shamelessly emulate them. If they featured advertisements, do so also.

In like manner, if a referee wants you to include an extra footnote or to delete one, do so. If he requires as a condition of publication that you buttress a point or remove one, obey. Heck, if he wants an entire section taken out, do not protest. You can always write another article utilizing that excised material. The only thing you should not compromise on is the integrity of the essay itself. Do not clip its wings, substantively, for a publication. In that way lies the dilution of our message.<sup>19</sup>

I urge that you do three entirely separate things in response to a revise-and-resubmit request: write a letter to the editor indicating precisely what was done in response to the referee, send a rough copy indicating, in color with cross outs if need be, what changes were made, and then, finally, a clean copy.

It is important that we publish.<sup>20</sup> Publications are like mortar shells tossed at the enemy. The more there are of them, and the higher their quality, the more likely are we to promote the free society. And, it is *fun*. I only regret

---

<sup>19</sup> See Jacob G. Hornberger, “A Methodology for Hope,” 2005, accessed online at: <http://www.lewrockwell.com/hornberger/hornberger70.html>.

<sup>20</sup> An anonymous referee of *Reason Papers* writes about an earlier version of the present article with these words: “(The author should) make an explicit case as to why it is important to publish in these journals both for the movement and for individual career advancement. The basic idea is that Austro-libertarianism will NOT advance within the intellectual world unless (a) the best minds in the tradition work constantly on improving the argument for economic and political liberty, and (b) that working full time on this sort of ‘science of liberty’ research is consistent with the advancement of their careers. If we rely on the work to come from now full time work, but part time or after work research and writing, then we (Austro-libertarians) will always fall short. So I would like to see a more explicit argument made on why working on the science of liberty is more important than other walks of life for the Austro-libertarian. Also, given the system of tenure and promotion in academia, I would like the author to explain to the reader that what is usually expected are 6 articles in refereed journals in 6 years. With the rise of the number of Austro-libertarian periodicals that are refereed and published by recognized academic publishers, young scholars can actually begin to establish their careers working on science of liberty consistent projects. In economics, for example, a young scholar could publish an article in the RAE, QJAE, CATO, Independent Review, etc. and be well on the way. If they could publish a paper in general journals such as Economic Inquiry or Southern Economic Journal, and better yet the AER and JPE, along with articles in the Journal of Private Enterprise, then their academic life would be pretty much secured at most colleges and universities.” I think these are very wise words, and have helped improve the quality of this article. I quote him, verbatim, rather than summarizing, because I want him to have the full credit for them.

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

that so much of my dissolute youth was spent on things other than writing and publishing.

If I can publish widely, anyone can. I am far from being the brightest light bulb in the Austro-libertarian firmament. I have a second strike against me before I even start: I have a deep abiding hatred for the state and all of its supporters, which burns at a white-fever-intensity pitch. This is off-putting to many people, even those with whom I mostly agree. If I can publish a ton, then anyone can.

### 4. Journals and Their Mission Statements

I turn now to a discussion, first, of the movement journals, and then a briefer note on the fellow-traveling ones. Here is an alphabetical list of all of the journals I discuss:

- (1) *Advances in Austrian Economics*
- (2) *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*
- (3) *Cato Journal*
- (4) *Econ Journal Watch*
- (5) *Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy*
- (6) *Human Rights Review*
- (7) *The Independent Review*
- (8) *Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons*
- (9) *Journal of Ayn Rand Studies*
- (10) *Journal of Markets and Morality*
- (11) *Journal of Private Enterprise*
- (12) *Journal of Public Finance and Public Choice*
- (13) *Libertarian Papers*
- (14) *New Perspectives on Political Economy*
- (15) *NYU Journal of Law & Liberty*
- (16) *Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics*
- (17) *Reason Papers*
- (18) *Review of Austrian Economics*
- (19) *Revista Procesos de Mercado*
- (20) *Social Philosophy and Policy*

#### a. *Advances in Austrian Economics*

This is an annual journal, so it does not have as much space for articles as those that are published more frequently. Most of the volumes are organized around topics (the two most recent were “The Dynamics of Intervention: Regulation and Redistribution in the Mixed Economy,” and “Evolutionary Psychology and Economic Theory”).

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

Here is a statement of the editors:

The editors of *Advances in Austrian Economics* wish to connect the Austrian tradition of economics with other research traditions in economics and related areas. To that end, we are publishing a series of special issues, each devoted to a separate theme. Recent volumes have been devoted to ‘Austrian Economics and Entrepreneurial Studies,’ ‘Evolutionary Psychology and Economic Theory,’ and ‘The Dynamics of Regulation.’ We invite both Austrian and non-Austrian contributions that establish fruitful links between the Austrian tradition and other perspectives on important theoretical and practical problems. We seek scholars who are interested in constructive exchange between Austrian economists and specialists in the theme area. All submissions are subject to double-blind refereeing.

Our editorial policy is based on the conviction that Austrian economics is not a doctrine or a method, but a rich tradition of research in the social sciences whose potential has by no means been exhausted. We reject that view that Austrian economics is ‘libertarian’ in any sense except the accidental one that many of the original adherents of the Austrian revival in America were (and remain) libertarians. It is our view that Austrian economics is a living tradition and an open inquiry.

If Austrian economics is an open tradition, then it should have the potential to engage other traditions in dialogue. It is our intention that *Advances in Austrian Economics* be a vehicle for such dialogue. It is probably true that only a minority of contributors to the recent volumes are Austrian economists. Some might be labeled ‘ambiguous Austrians.’ But all are seriously engaging Austrian issues and Austrian literature. We believe the volumes represent a serious dialogue between Austrian and non-Austrian scholars. It is our hope that *Advances in Austrian Economics* will encourage both the export of Austrian ideas to other traditions and the import of non-Austrian ideas into the Austrian tradition.<sup>21</sup>

As an addendum to the foregoing message, editor Roger Koppl wrote this to me:

I forgot to warn you about one minor issue. While *Advances* strictly adheres to a policy of double-blind reviewing, Elsevier lists it as a

---

<sup>21</sup> Personal email correspondence to the author.

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

book series. Thus, in my internal FDU communications I never call it a journal. I don't really care whether one considers it a journal or not, but I feel I must point out how it is listed at Elsevier.<sup>22</sup>

In my own view of this matter, *Advances in Austrian Economics* certainly qualifies for tenure, promotion, and brownie points, along with all other refereed journals. Certainly, I have listed my own publications in that periodical on my annual reports, and it never raised any red flags with anyone. Of course, I only speak here for the universities that have employed me. For all I know, matters might be different at the "top" universities regarding this journal.

### ***b. American Journal of Economics and Sociology***

The late Larry Moss was an old school mate of mine; we were both students at Columbia University together. He first introduced me to Murray Rothbard. Moss is a staunch Austro-libertarian. Of all of the movement or Austro-libertarian entries, *AJES* is by far the highest ranked in terms of prestige within the economics profession. It is ranked 142<sup>nd</sup> on the list posted on the website of the Department of Economics at the University of Leicester.<sup>23</sup> Now, I admit this might not sound like much; it seems that I am damning *AJES* with faint praise, indeed. However, one must realize that none of the other journals on this list is even ranked.

Here is a statement of the editor:

The *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* (*AJES*) is a quarterly with an annual supplement. It dates back to 1941, when a talented journalist named Will Lissner told his *New York Times* employer that he wanted to start a journal that would be multidisciplinary and keep the world informed of the latest developments in the social sciences. The war in Europe was underway (Hitler said it was about 'lebensraum') and Lissner and others on the editorial staff wanted to end wars by transmitting knowledge and perhaps land reform ideas as well.

It is now nearly 65 years later. I am only the third editor. Frank Genovese served as the second editor and had the foresight to bring the *AJES* to Babson College which is also committed to a multidisciplinary approach in teaching.

Each of the editors set no ideological standards for articles included in the *AJES*. And we state clearly on the back cover

---

<sup>22</sup> Personal email correspondence to the author.

<sup>23</sup> List accessed online at: <http://www.le.ac.uk/economics/research/rankings/jrank.xls>.

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

version of the *AJES* that our journal ‘affords contributors the widest freedom consistent with scientific integrity as defined by the American professional learned societies in the fields that it covers.’ The editor’s job is to raise the quality of the journal but not at the expense of its eclectic nature.

Last year, the *AJES* was invited to join the JSTOR archiving service and this year (2006) the scanning of all of our back issues and special invited issues is underway by the JSTOR professionals. This is exciting for us because our reach is now global and we can almost promise our contributors perpetual life. The electronic distribution of the *AJES* is our fastest growing method for distributing the research that we publish. . . .

The Studies in Economic Reform and Social Justice series is expanding and it may be of interest to Austrian scholars. The *AJES* gets the monograph the same international circulation and perpetual life (that is, JSTOR)! Other publishers will get your monograph published; and at a mere \$120 a copy it may get read, but not by too many people. For some scholars that might indeed be a lucky break. For others who wish to be heard, the *AJES* gets the book out first as part of the *AJES* itself and then in a separate free standing hard copy version at a reasonable price. Those with excellent monographs who care about getting their books out of the warehouses of the world and onto the streets should take a careful look at the *AJES* monograph series.

I should say a word about Austrian economics. Austrian scholars have published in the *AJES* on a fairly regular basis. There is quite a long list of such and the journal’s success in this area speaks for itself. The articles that stand the best chance of getting accepted for publication are those that deal with economic ideas in such a way that they offer an explanation of something ‘out there’ in the real world. And so, a large sized paper on the time preference theory of interest that never gets to explain how the market rate of interest is actually formed, would have a hard time getting the positive attention of the editorial board.

Alternatively, articles about ‘explaining’ the variance of a dependent variable with one or more independent variables and calling the resulting statistical discussion ‘economics’ also have a difficult time getting accepted for publication in the *AJES*. High R-squares by themselves do not explain how the world works. A significant explanation is one that refers to a broader theory or body of theory and relate the ‘dancing data delights’ to something tangible, perhaps a mechanism that can be modeled, understood and

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

represented by a great variety of methods from ‘thought experiments’ to processes that can be modeled by mathematical methods.

Between the world of naked empirics and methodological ballets of the imagination sits the *AJES*. It is after all just another social science journal, but an important one at that.<sup>24</sup>

### *c. Cato Journal*

Its editor, James Dorn, characterizes this journal as being in the “market-liberal” camp. Perhaps this is why my batting average is so low there; I am so far zero acceptances for twelve submissions. I consider myself more of a radical anarcho-capitalist of the Rothbard stripe, and this perspective is not exactly congruent with that of the *Cato Journal*. Nevertheless, I highly recommend publishing in this journal. Doing so will put an author in close proximity to some of the most powerful movers and shakers in the U.S., more so than perhaps any other journal on this list.

Here is a statement from Dorn:

Friedrich A. Hayek has called the *Cato Journal* ‘an indispensable source of information.’ Milton Friedman refers to the *CJ* as ‘exceptional in consistently publishing articles that combine scholarly excellence with policy relevance.’ Those have been the goals of this interdisciplinary journal of public policy analysis since its founding in 1981.

Published three times a year, the *Cato Journal* covers a wide range of topics, with a focus on economic policy, economic freedom and development. At least one issue each year is devoted to a specific topic. Recent issues featured: “Institutions and Development” (vol. 24, no. 3), “International Monetary Reform and Capital Freedom” (vol. 25, no. 1), “Creating a Competitive Education Industry” (vol. 25, no. 2), and “Remembering Peter Bauer” (vol. 25, no. 3).<sup>25</sup>

### *d. Econ Journal Watch*

Daniel Klein is now a professor of economics at George Mason University, having recently moved there from Santa Clara. *EJW* is a magnificent journal, keeping its beady eye closely focused on its target,

---

<sup>24</sup> Personal email correspondence to the author. My friend Larry Moss passed away at an all-too-early age in March 2009; see <http://blog.mises.org/archives/009574.asp>.

<sup>25</sup> Personal email correspondence to the author.

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

namely, all economics journals.<sup>26</sup> This is at once both its strength and its “weakness” as far as publications for young professors are concerned. This journal is *very* narrowly focused on commentary and analysis of economics journals. This allows it to do an excellent job in this restricted field, but will not provide much of a venue for most research.

Here is a statement by Klein:

For my part, I see *EJW* as a project in developing and expressing the character of the spontaneous-order economist, and in criticizing rival characters of economists.<sup>27</sup>

### *e. Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy and NYU Journal of Law & Liberty*

I am considering both of these journals together, since what I have to say about the one I have to say about the other. Both, like virtually all law reviews, are student-run.<sup>28</sup> My experience with each has been that they exhibit great competence. Law review students are meticulous about citations, more so than in other social sciences, demanding that pretty much every sentence be footnoted. These two are no exceptions in this regard. Where they stand out from other law reviews, however, is that they are continuously open to free-market types of analyses. Other law reviews vary in this regard from year to year.

Here is a statement from Robert McNamara, the present Editor-in-Chief of the *NYU Journal of Law & Liberty*:

I’m happy to provide any commentary you’d like, but I wanted to first point out that (as is traditional for law journals), ours is a student-edited journal rather than a refereed journal. We are, of

---

<sup>26</sup> For me, one of the best articles ever written on movement strategy appeared in its very first issue. See Klein and Chiang, “The Social Science Citation Index: A Black Box—with an Ideological Bias?” An alternative title for that publication could have been, in my opinion, “The Social Science Citation Index Has No Clothes.”

<sup>27</sup> Personal email correspondence to the author.

<sup>28</sup> Strictly speaking, law reviews as a rule are not double-blind refereed. Instead, articles are typically selected for publication by the student editors. I include coverage of law reviews in this article, however, since it is my experience that most universities will count publication in these venues toward promotion and tenure, particularly if the professor specializes in an area that touches upon law, such as law and economics, industrial organization, or even microeconomics.

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

course, more than happy to be included with the other scholarly publications on your list if you see fit. . . .

To answer your actual request: The *NYU Journal of Law & Liberty* is dedicated to the critical examination of classical liberal ideas from a wide variety of viewpoints and disciplines, both within the legal academy and outside it. The *Journal* accomplishes this mission by publishing cutting-edge scholarship as well as historical materials of interest and an ongoing series of ‘Essays on Liberty,’ meditations on freedom from outside the academy. In addition to its quarterly publications, the *Journal* sponsors a variety of events in Manhattan, most notably New York University’s Friedrich A. Hayek Lecture in Law.<sup>29</sup>

### *f. Human Rights Review*

The editorship of this journal has recently passed to my friend and Loyola University, New Orleans, colleague Gary Herbert. Although himself a conservative-oriented philosopher, he is very open to libertarian perspectives. This journal is only peripherally interested in economics, and then, mainly as this field impinges on its main area of specialty, human rights.

Here is Herbert’s statement:

*Human Rights Review* is an interdisciplinary journal that publishes scholarly articles and essays on all aspects of the theoretical, practical and political debate over human rights. The journal does not intend to serve as an advocate of any one ideological point of view but simply to promote free and active debate of all areas and issues concerning human rights. *Human Rights Review* publishes essays on the issues of universality and globalization, issues related to cultural and theological diversity, minority rights, gender issues, economic development, and any of the other many human rights-related issues that concern, or ought to concern, the world today. The journal also publishes articles that examine moral, political, philosophical, and social interpretations of human rights, the application and interpretation of human rights legislation in the international community, human rights issues in health care, human rights and the threats of terrorism and genocide, and controversies concerning the compatibility of respect for national sovereignty with foreign intervention in domestic affairs of nations for the protection of human rights.

---

<sup>29</sup> Personal email correspondence to the author.

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

It is becoming increasingly clear that the interminable urgency that surrounds critical human rights issues today cannot be separated from the need for a more careful theoretical clarification of fundamental concepts that ground those issues. The mission and focus of *Human Rights Review* in this context remains what it has been, with a strengthened commitment to promoting critical reflection on the theoretical and/or philosophical issues underlying the worldwide human rights debate.<sup>30</sup>

### ***g. The Independent Review***

Editor Robert Higgs is one of the leading economic historians of the day. This journal is geared more to empirical studies of statist depredation than to my own interest of theoretical libertarian research. Perhaps that is why my batting average with *TIR* is so low: I have submitted no fewer than twenty-nine different essays to this journal, and have just recently received my first acceptance. One reason I have sent Higgs so many essays is that his turn-around time is exceedingly quick. Often, I get a rejection within a day or two of submitting an essay to him. This is a letter I sometimes send to editors who are that considerate: “Thanks for your quick rejection. No, I really mean that. Second to an acceptance, a quick rejection is most welcome. I’ve had editors hold on to my papers for as much as two years before rejecting them. So, again, thank you. Hopefully, the next paper I send you will be more congruent with your needs.”

Here is a statement by the editor:

Dear Walter, After ten years, the purpose and mission of *The Independent Review* remain as I announced them in the first issue, in 1996. I attach a copy. I believe that anyone who reviews the issues that we have published—forty of them in total, when the spring issue comes out in March, 2006—will agree that our practice has conformed to our promise. Best, Bob.

[The mission itself states:] Anyone launching a new quarterly journal in 1996 owes the world an explanation. Obviously, readers face no shortage of periodicals, and some of the existing ones are very good. Nonetheless, not every valuable niche has been filled; hence *The Independent Review* (*TIR*).

*TIR* will present articles, special features, and reviews that deal with political economy, broadly construed. Writing that would interest only economists or only philosophers or only

---

<sup>30</sup> Personal email correspondence to the author.

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

historians—indeed work that would interest only the practitioners of any academically defined scientific or humanistic specialty—will not appear in this journal. Rather, I intend to feature writing that crosses the boundaries of a variety of disciplines, including all the social sciences, philosophy, history, law, and related fields. Although it will serve scholars and comply with strict scholarly standards, *The Independent Review* will differ from such journals as *The American Economic Review* and *The American Political Science Review*. The main purpose here is not to develop a particular discipline but to advance the reader's understanding of the multifaceted reality to which the term "political economy" refers.

Highly formal and technically challenging work will not appear in *TIR*. Heavily mathematical forms of exposition have become *de rigueur* in economics and increasingly in political science. Other fields, such as philosophy, have their own ways of excluding strangers from the conversation. Good arguments can be made for these expositional conventions. But whatever the merits of esoteric forms of communication in the various disciplines, my aims as editor dictate that the common language of this journal, as a rule, must be English. I intend to reject the work of writers who cannot express their ideas clearly. Those who write with vigor, wit, and flair will be received with open arms.

Because *The Independent Review* will eschew arcane or ponderous writing, it should appeal to students as well as teachers, generalists as well as specialists, lay persons as well as professionals. Political economy embraces a great diversity of topics; *TIR*'s intended audience is equally diverse. Although political economy comprises fundamentally important issues, the analysis, interpretation, and evaluation of these issues need not be hard to swallow. When Paul Samuelson published his *Foundations of Economic Analysis* in 1947, he made his epigraph Willard Gibbs's declaration that "mathematics is a language." Fifty years later, we have good reason to insist that English is a language, too.

Fortunately, for many purposes verbal expression is sufficient, and sometimes it is superior, as it accommodates a degree of nuance unachievable by alternative modes of expression. But certain types of analysis require more than words. Authors who make appropriate use of mathematical or statistical analysis—as opposed to just showing off—will find these pages accessible to them. For empirical articles, I shall give preference to expositions that display data or relations in an arresting visual manner. Sometimes a numerical table is essential, and a well-constructed graph goes a long way.

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

Finally, something must be said about ideology. Political economy deals with issues that are infused with ideological presuppositions and implications—liberty, tyranny, democracy, collectivism, taxation, regulation, public policies of all sorts. For many journals, a paper’s ideological correctness is a *sine qua non* for acceptance. Even professional journals espousing “positive” or “value-free” analysis commonly fall short of their aspirations, as ideological assumptions creep unannounced into their pages.<sup>31</sup>

### ***h. Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons***

The content of this journal, edited by Lawrence Huntoon, is narrowly focused as its name implies, on health issues. However, this is not as restrictive as might first appear, for the newly burgeoning field of health economics encompasses issues as disparate as socialized medicine, markets in body parts, drugs, tobacco legislation, etc. Rare in this field, too, is the fact that this journal will not only countenance a free-enterprise orientation, but positively welcomes such a perspective.

Here is the editor’s statement:

AAPS is a national association of physicians dedicated to preserving freedom in the one-on-one patient-physician relationship. AAPS members believe this patient-physician relationship must be protected from all forms of third-party intervention. Since its founding in 1943, AAPS has been the only national organization consistently supporting the principles of the free market in medical practice.<sup>[32]</sup>

*Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons* Mission Statement: *Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons*, the official peer-reviewed journal of the American Association of Physicians and Surgeons (AAPS), is committed to publishing scholarly articles related to the practice of medicine and to promoting open debate and scientific integrity.<sup>33</sup>

### ***i. Journal of Ayn Rand Studies***

Chris Matthew Sciabarra is one of the most helpful scholars I have ever met. Often, I have asked him arcane questions about Rand and Objectivism, to which he usually replies within hours, if not minutes. On the

---

<sup>31</sup> Personal email correspondence to the author.

<sup>32</sup> See <http://www.aapsonline.org/membership.php>.

<sup>33</sup> Personal email correspondence to the author.

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

rare occasions on which he does not have an immediate answer, he will pull out all of stops to get the information. *JARS* is narrowly focused on Ayn Rand and Objectivism, as its name implies. He does not require that an entire essay be focused on this subject, but it must play a large part. For example, in one of my publications, I compared Rand to Robert Nozick and Michael Levin.<sup>34</sup> In another, I compared Objectivism to Austrianism.<sup>35</sup> A mere mention of Rand in a footnote or two will not suffice for publication in this journal. On the other hand, it is a given that Rand was without exception the greatest popularizer of the free-enterprise philosophy in the modern era, despite the fact that she did not consider herself a libertarian. It must be a rare libertarian essay that does not overlap with her interests.

Here is a statement by the editor:

When the *Journal of Ayn Rand Studies* was founded in the Fall of 1999, we enunciated a credo to which we've adhered strictly:

The *Journal of Ayn Rand Studies* is a nonpartisan journal devoted to the study of Ayn Rand and her times. The journal is not aligned with any advocacy group, institute, or person. It welcomes papers from every discipline and from a variety of interpretive and critical perspectives. It aims to foster scholarly dialogue through a respectful exchange of ideas. The journal is published semi-annually, in the fall and the spring.

Readers can learn more about the founding of the journal in an article I wrote on the occasion of its fourth anniversary: <http://www.nyu.edu/projects/sciabarra/essays/fr57jars4years.pdf>.

Tables of contents and contributor biographies are available on the journal's

website: <http://www.aynrandstudies.com/jars/index.asp>.<sup>36</sup>

### **j. *Journal of Markets and Morality***

This journal is unique in that it places a particular emphasis on the connection between ethics and economics, on the one hand, and religion, on the other.

---

<sup>34</sup> See Walter Block, "The Libertarian Minimal State? A Critique of the Views of Nozick, Levin, and Rand," *Journal of Ayn Rand Studies* 4, no. 1 (2002), pp. 141-60.

<sup>35</sup> See Walter Block, "Ayn Rand and Austrian Economics: Two Peas in a Pod," *The Journal of Ayn Rand Studies* 6, no. 2 (Spring 2005), pp. 259-69.

<sup>36</sup> Personal email correspondence to the author.

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

Here is a statement by the editor, Stephan Grabill:

I think that the distinction you draw between ‘movement’ and ‘mainstream’ journals is helpful and largely accurate but that it is also important to recognize the existence of hybrids, which is where I would place the *Journal of Markets & Morality*.

In recent years competition among authors for publishing space in our pages has dramatically increased. Last year, 95 unsolicited submissions were received for 14 possible openings in that calendar year. The Acton Institute as publisher of the *Journal of Markets & Morality* is committed to free enterprise but the *Journal of Markets & Morality* is especially concerned with the moral, religious, sociological, and historical dimensions to economics and economic issues. Our goal is to bring practitioners representing morality (theologians, ethicists, and so forth) into continuing conversation on a broad range of topics with the practitioners of the market (economists, business ethicists, and others in that line of intellectual endeavor).

The free-market world is mostly coherent as a movement but deeply fractured with respect to intellectual sources, prudential judgments about policy, and the integration of religious belief. Many of the submissions we receive are from people who would not consider themselves Austrians or strict libertarians, and so, in that sense, the *Journal of Markets & Morality* is like a mainstream journal because its authors may or may not be persons ‘in the movement’ or have much to do with the intellectual sources of Austrian economics or libertarianism per se.

For further information concerning the philosophy of the *Journal of Markets & Morality*, see the attached, written by Jordan Ballor: <http://www.utpjournals.com/jour.ihtml?lp=jsp/Ballor.html>.<sup>37</sup>

### ***k. Journal of Private Enterprise***

This is the flagship journal of the Association of Private Enterprise Educators. Originally, this was an association composed of, and created by, economists who held endowed chairs in free enterprise. More recently, membership was opened to all of those of a free-market orientation. Under the previous editorship of Gerald Gunderson, and now Ed Stringham, the *Journal of Private Enterprise* has become one of the foremost vehicles for promoting this economic philosophy.

---

<sup>37</sup> Personal email correspondence to the author.

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

Here is a statement from the editor:

The *Journal of Private Enterprise* publishes scholarly papers from any field that are primarily concerned with the operation and organization of private enterprise and markets. Because most of our contributors and readers are college professors we have discovered—as is appropriate for a market—that a bulletin board on educational innovations is also helpful. We call the latter section of the *Journal*, educational notes.<sup>38</sup>

### ***l. Journal of Public Finance and Public Choice***

This journal is the most free-enterprise oriented in Italy, and will give any of the other European journals a run for their money in this regard. Its interests, as its title indicates, focus on public finance and public choice, but in actuality they have a somewhat wider focus than that. My own reading of the material appearing directly below is that this journal will be particularly welcoming of submissions.

Here is a statement from the editor of this journal:

The official mission of the *Journal of Public Finance and Public Choice* is the following: The *Journal of Public Finance and Public Choice* (*PFPC*)/*Economia delle Scelte Pubbliche* deals with the economics and politics of public intervention, following the approach initiated a century ago by European (Italian as well as Austrian and Swedish) public finance scientists and further developed by the American theory of public choice. The journal encourages the submission of manuscripts in the field of public finance and public choice, both theoretical and applied, including papers on the history of economic thought and on economic methodology. The mission, as well as the annual index of the journal since its start (in 1983) can be found in the site: [www.jpfdc.org](http://www.jpfdc.org).<sup>39</sup>

### ***m. Libertarian Papers***

This is the newest of all of the journals listed here, begun only in early 2009. However, already it has made quite a splash in the libertarian community, as would be expected, since its editor is world-class libertarian theoretician Stephan Kinsella.

---

<sup>38</sup> Personal email correspondence to the author.

<sup>39</sup> Personal email correspondence to the author.

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

Here is his statement:

A new libertarian journal—a new *type* of libertarian journal—is born today. *Libertarian Papers* is an exclusively online peer-reviewed journal. Its home is this elegant, fast, easy-to-use website. Please feel free to browse around.

Publishing online has allowed us to break free of many of the constraints faced by paper-based journals. Scholars working in the libertarian tradition will find dealing with us to be a refreshing change. For instance, we publish articles consecutively, online, as soon as they are peer-reviewed and a final copy is submitted. No waiting for the next issue or printing delays. We have also done away with arbitrary space limits. And we don't care what citation style you use, as long as it is consistent, professional, and enables the reader to find the work referenced. Neither our time nor the author's need be wasted converting from one citation style to another, or wondering whether "2nd. ed." goes here or there, or whether it should be "2d. ed." instead. In a digital age, old forms must give way to new forms.

And as our publications are online and open, you won't find our authors furtively posting a scanned copy of their paper articles on their own sites, while their article is trapped in musty paper on a dark shelf—but if they want to, they are free to do so, since to the extent possible everything here is published under a Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 License. Want to republish your piece in a book? No need to ask us for permission. We want to spread the ideas of liberty, not impose DRM on them.

And of course readers will love the ease of access. Subscription is by RSS feed, and free. Follow us on Twitter or Facebook, or other social media to come. And unlike other academic journals, we allow comments on our articles, via the blog posts announcing them. *Libertarian Papers* is completely free and open, because readers' being willing to devote time to studying the ideas of liberty is payment enough for us. It is the profit we seek. And we think having readers who love to use our site and read our articles is what authors want, too.

A few words of thanks are in order. The assistance and support of Jeff Tucker of the Mises Institute, web designer Aristotle Esguerra, and Lew Rockwell and the Ludwig von Mises Institute have been invaluable in getting the website set up and the first non-issue out. *Libertarian Papers* is also proud to have an outstanding Editorial Board, with world-class scholars working in the libertarian tradition. Their help and commitment was also indispensable in helping this project come to fruition. And various loyal and devoted

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

friends in the libertarian cadre, such as Gil Guillory, Manuel Lora, and Anthony Gregory, helped in various ways behind the scenes. A hearty thanks to them all.<sup>40</sup>

### ***n. New Perspectives on Political Economy***

This journal comes to us from Eastern Europe, and it is very welcome, especially from that part of the world. Its editor, Josef Sima, is a leading Austro-libertarian.

Here is his statement:

*New Perspectives on Political Economy* is a peer-reviewed bilingual (English/Czech) interdisciplinary on-line journal, published in Prague, Czech Republic. It aims to resurrect the tradition of Austrian economics and liberty-oriented thinking that thrived in central Europe at the beginning of the 20th century, but sadly disappeared thereafter. By establishing this forum for scholars to engage in the critical debate over both theoretical and applied social issues from a wide spectrum of disciplines, it hopes to build a solid institutional basis for the advancement of the Austrian research program. *New Perspectives on Political Economy* will especially encourage discussions and publish articles on economic and legal theory, classical liberal and libertarian political philosophy, evolution of rules and order, self-governance, economic development, economic policy and regulations.

The journal is published in cooperation with Liberalni Institut and The Faculty of Economics and Public Administration, University of Economics, Prague. For more information, see <http://pcpe.libinst.cz/nppe/>.<sup>41</sup>

### ***o. Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics***

This is another favorite journal of mine; I have published there on numerous occasions, and am wildly biased in its favor. Here is a statement of its editor, Joe Salerno, who is in my opinion one of the foremost Austrian economists now actively writing:

Starting with this issue, I have assumed the position of sole editor of the *Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics*. Jeffrey M. Herbener

---

<sup>40</sup> Accessed online at: <http://blog.mises.org/archives/009276.asp>.

<sup>41</sup> Personal email correspondence to the author.

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

and Mark Thornton continue as Associate Editor and Book Review Editor, respectively.

As before the journal will publish articles dealing with a wide range of issues in the broad Austrian tradition that is exemplified in the works of Ludwig von Mises, F.A. Hayek, Murray Rothbard and Israel Kirzner. The primary purpose of the journal continues to be to advance the frontiers of Austrian economic theory. In pursuit of this aim we are especially interested in publishing articles elaborating, applying or criticizing Mengerian price theory, which constitutes the distinctive core of Austrian economics and whose development has been relatively neglected since Mises's restatement in *Human Action* and Rothbard's comprehensive elaboration in *Man, Economy, and State*. The journal also welcomes articles on monetary theory, the theory of monetary calculation, capital theory, and the theory of entrepreneurship, all of which also offer scope for further extension or refinement. Submissions on the method, doctrinal development and policy implications of Austrian economics are also welcome. Since the journal aspires to serve as a forum for vigorously and constructively debating unsettled issues in Austrian economics, we encourage submission of comments on and replies to published articles. All submissions will be refereed in a rigorously fair and timely manner.<sup>42</sup>

### *p. Reason Papers*

This journal, dedicated to libertarianism, has changed editorship from Tibor Machan to Aeon Skoble. My thinking must be closer to that of the latter editor, since I had no publications in *Reason Papers* under the former editor and five under the latter, all since 2005 (including this present one).

Here is its mission statement:

*Reason Papers* is a peer-reviewed, blind-reviewed journal appearing annually. It features book reviews and review essays along with full-length articles. Not strictly limited to philosophy, we publish work by economists, legal scholars, political scientists, and others, provided the content is normative in the philosophical sense. In addition to articles on moral, political, legal, and social/cultural philosophy, we also run essays on aesthetics.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> Joseph Salerno, "Editorial," *Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics* 3, no. 1 (Spring 2000), p. 2.

<sup>43</sup> Accessed online at: <http://www.reasonpapers.com/>.

**q. *Review of Austrian Economics***

I first became acquainted with Peter Boettke, the editor of *RAE*, when he was a young graduate student. He was then, and is now even more so, a brilliant Austro-libertarian, a voracious reader, a prolific writer, and a movement builder par excellence. A leader of the Society for the Development of Austrian Economics, he is also very active in training new Austrian economists in the Ph.D. program at George Mason University, which I highly recommend.<sup>44</sup>

Here is a brief statement by the editor of *RAE*:

The *Review of Austrian Economics* has two broadly conceived objectives: (1) to promote the development and extension of Austrian economics and (2) to promote the analysis of contemporary issues in the mainstream of economics from an Austrian perspective.<sup>45</sup>

**r. *Revista Procesos de Mercado***

The editor of this journal, Jesus Huerta de Soto, is one of the leading European Austro-libertarians. He is the author of the monumental and magisterial *Money, Bank Credit, and Economic Cycles*.<sup>46</sup> Much of this journal is in Spanish, but some is in English, and other English pieces are translated into Spanish and then published in that language.

**s. *Social Philosophy and Policy***

Each issue is dedicated to a particular theme. Over-the-transom manuscripts are given short shrift if they are not compatible with the theme of any given issue. The key to publishing in this journal is matching your research to the topic under discussion. This can be done by looking, very carefully, at the upcoming themes.

Their mission statement is:

---

<sup>44</sup> See Walter Block, "Advice to Students for Graduate School," March 5 2005, accessed online at: <http://www.mises.org/classroom/gradschool.pdf>.

<sup>45</sup> For an introductory editorial written by Boettke, when he assumed the editorship of this journal, see Peter J. Boettke, "Is There a Market Niche for Austrian Economics?" *Review of Austrian Economics* 11 (1998), pp. 1-4, accessed online at: [http://www.gmu.edu/rae/archives/VOL11\\_1-2\\_1999/boettke.pdf](http://www.gmu.edu/rae/archives/VOL11_1-2_1999/boettke.pdf).

<sup>46</sup> Jesus Huerta de Soto, *Money, Bank Credit, and Economic Cycles*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Auburn, AL: The Ludwig Von Mises Institute, 2009).

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

*Social Philosophy & Policy* is an interdisciplinary journal with an emphasis on the philosophical underpinnings of enduring social policy debates. Each issue is dedicated to a particular theme chosen by the editors, with the advice of the editorial board, designed to appeal to both academic specialists and a broader scholarly audience.

While *Social Philosophy & Policy* is not primarily a journal of policy prescriptions, several contributions in each issue will typically connect theory with practice. The editors encourage and actively pursue diversity of viewpoints of contributors. Diversity is also encouraged by selecting authors from among different disciplines, especially philosophy, economics, political science, and the law.<sup>47</sup>

With this overview of each of these periodicals,<sup>48</sup> let me make several comments about these journals as a group. First, I rank them in terms of being focused purely on Austrianism, mostly on Austrianism, purely on libertarianism, mostly on libertarianism, or on both about equally; I also include an “unknown” category, since several of these are new journals. In this context, “Austrianism” can be read almost as a synonym for “economics,” in contrast to politics, ethics, etc. In some cases, “libertarian” can be read as a synonym for politics and ethics, as opposed to economics, since conservatism is also included in the mix.

**Pure Austrianism:** *Advances in Austrian Economics, Review of Austrian Economics, Econ Journal Watch.*

---

<sup>47</sup> Accessed online at: <http://www.bgsu.edu/offices/sppc/journal.htm#forthcoming%20issues>. This site provides information on past and forthcoming issues of *Social Philosophy & Policy*, including descriptions and tables of contents.

<sup>48</sup> Given space limitations, I have listed and discussed twenty Austro-libertarian, refereed journals. Which additional ones would have been included, had I written a longer article? *American Review of Political Economy; Constitutional Political Economy; Dialogue; Ethics, Place & Environment; Global Virtue Ethics Review; Humanomics; International Journal of Social Economics; Journal des Economistes Et Des Etudes Humaines; Journal Etica e Politica/Ethics & Politics; Laissez-Faire; Journal of Business Ethics; Public Choice; Telos; The Journal of Social, Political, and Economic Studies; The Law & Economics Journal; Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology; Unisinos: Perspectiva Economica.*

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

**Mostly Austrian:** *Journal of Public Finance and Public Choice, Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics, Revista Procesos de Mercado, New Perspectives on Political Economy.*

**About equal:** *American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons, Journal of Private Enterprise, The Independent Review, Cato Journal.*

**Mostly libertarian:** *Journal of Ayn Rand Studies, Journal of Markets and Morality, Reason Papers.*

**Pure libertarian:** *Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy, Human Rights Review, NYU Journal of Law & Liberty, Social Philosophy & Policy.*

Second, I regard these journals, taken all together, as the last best hope for the survival of civilization. I know this sounds somewhat (very much) overblown, but I regard private property rights and free markets as the *sine qua non* of a civil order. There are no other scholarly academic publications that embody these virtues as do those on this list.

Third, I want to make some very critical remarks about some of them, on an anonymous basis. Although these are my favorite journals in all of the world, they are far from perfect. Hopefully, these critical remarks will be accepted in the intended spirit: to improve an already magnificent product.

Several of these journals have adopted an affirmative action policy—not specifically against or in favor of blacks, females, the handicapped, males, Jews, or Asians, as in the usual case, but rather, against prolific writers. The specific format this policy takes is that no author may have more than two articles in the pipeline at any given time. From the time an essay is first submitted, until the time it appears in actual print, it can sometimes take two years. That implies that no single writer can submit more than one essay to this journal every twelve months, on average. The policy applies, too, to co-authors, who are thus in effect “guilty” by association: if author A has two essays pending, a third essay coauthored with B cannot be submitted until one of the prior two has either been rejected or published. B is in effect “punished” if his work is linked to A’s. The work of A is also excluded, not on the basis of quality, but due to there being too much of it.

Now, of course, as a libertarian, I support the right of all owners of private property to discriminate against whoever they desire, employing whatever criteria they wish. However, the editorship of a journal is not exactly a private property rights situation—at least, it is not clear that the editor is the full and entire owner of it. If anything, it is clear that he is not. Rather, he takes on sort of a caretaker role. His implicit (sometimes explicit) job

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

description is to attract the best possible writers, and offer the best possible articles in each issue, whether of an Austrian or libertarian orientation, as the case may be.

Murray Rothbard was a prolific writer. How would matters work if such a policy were imposed upon him? Posit that Murray wrote one essay per month, that is, twelve per year. Under our assumptions, he would be allowed to submit only one of these per year. It seems difficult to reconcile such a policy with the mandate to produce the highest quality journal possible. I am implicitly but not unreasonably assuming that anything written by Rothbard, even the worst of his articles, would be “better” than even the best of anyone else’s. Of course, if the journal only had room for forty-eight articles per year, and published all twelve of Rothbard’s annually, then his work would comprise fully one-fourth of all of the offerings. Perhaps there is an aesthetic argument against such an eventuality, but if so, it goes counter to the far more important mandate to maximize quality. To take an extreme and very unlikely scenario, as far as I am concerned as a consumer, if a journal were filled half with Rothbard’s work and the other half with Mises’s, I would feel privileged to read such a publication. Given the number of scholarly periodicals that now welcome an Austro-libertarian perspective, it is unlikely in the extreme that any one or two individuals would dominate all of them in such a manner.

Here is a different criticism. These periodicals also differ along a spectrum of whether they favor challenging, and to be fully honest, trashing the mainstream opponents of Austro-libertarians, or, on the other side of things, emphasizing similarities between our views and theirs.<sup>49</sup> There was an occasion on which I wrote a strongly worded critique of Prof. X’s work. Prof. X is a mainstream economist, who, in my view, had unfairly lambasted some aspect of Austro-libertarianism, and I was determined to set the record straight.

The referee’s report required as a condition for acceptance that I go over the essay with a fine-tooth comb and either eliminate or reduce the severity of all criticisms in such a way so that “the mother of Prof. X” would find no fault with it. The referee took great pains to make it clear that he meant this quite literally, and the editor backed him up on this. I admit that sometimes I get a bit heated when responding to what I think is an unfair attack on Austro-libertarian economic philosophy. However, are we to stand by *nicely* when mainstreamers savage Austro-libertarians, and be limited to comments the *mothers* of the critics would not find offensive? Evidently, we are to do precisely this, at least in the perspective of this particular journal. I realize that the editor (and at least one referee) of this journal differ sharply from me as to whether the best strategy is to lambaste opponents of free-

---

<sup>49</sup> My own strategy, or, if you will, taste, inclines wildly in the former direction. My motto is, “Blast away at the bad guys.”

## Reason Papers Vol. 32

enterprise philosophy, or to try to reconcile with them by showing similarities between us and them. For sure, this editor is remaining true to the prime directive of maximizing quality by emphasizing commonalities rather than differences. I only object to the *degree* to which this is taken. Prof. X's mother, indeed.

I have one last criticism. One of the journals on this list accepted for publication an essay of mine in 2002. Publication was at that time promised for "2004 or 2005." At the time of this writing, early 2009, it still has not been published. This, undoubtedly, is a measure of success. In the early days of Austro-libertarian publishing,<sup>50</sup> the challenge was to attract enough material to fill an issue; nowadays, quite happily, the opposite hurdle operates: how to ration scarce space amongst numerous high-quality manuscripts.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> I was a co-editor of the *Review of Austrian Economics* (with Murray Rothbard), from volume 1, 1987, to volume 8, no. 1, 1994. In those days, our constant fear was that we would not have enough material to fill the volumes. We had endless debates over whether it was better to come out on time and have a thin issue, or later when we had attracted sufficient essays. There were some prominent Austrians, such as Israel Kirzner, who opposed the inauguration of *RAE* on grounds that there was not a sufficient number of scholars writing in this tradition to support it. Murray's argument in favor of starting the *RAE* was that it would increase interest in this field. Happily, events proved Rothbard correct, and this problem seems a very quaint one from my present perspective.

<sup>51</sup> I wish to thank the following people for help with earlier drafts of this article: William Barnett II, Philipp Bagus, Pete Canning, Pierre Desrochers, Richard Ebeling, Lanny Ebenstein, Nicolai Foss, Ludwig van den Hauwe, Stephan Kinsella, Doug Mackenzie, Thomas Rudolf, and Martin Stef. The usual caveats apply.

Reason Papers Vol. 32