



WELCOME FROM THE EDITOR

Reader, welcome to the first American Economics Association's Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer and Friends (AEA LGBTQ-F) Community Newsletter. We, the newsletter committee, thought it would be fitting to start this issue off with a few words about why we are creating the newsletter.

Foremost, our goal for this newsletter is to provide a forum for queer* economists to gain visibility, to connect, and to share their experiences with a wider group. We'd also like to support people who are doing sensitive and thoughtful research involving queer communities and individuals, as we know that those studying queer people face some of the same discrimination as queer people themselves. As an ally, the biggest thing you can do to help us increase visibility is to help distribute the newsletter. Please put this newsletter in your department lounges, distribute it on your mailing lists, direct your students to the newsletter on the AEA website, and help us reach as many people as we can!

This issue starts out looking backward, summarizing the history, as we are aware

- continued on page 2



JOHN MAYNARD KEYNES
AND DUNCAN GRANT
(ABOUT 1913)

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/duncan_grant

**An inclusive term to describe LGBT peoples as a whole that includes a number of other identities that are culturally related to queer-identities (for example, people who choose alternate relationship configurations) but are not listed in the short acronym. We embrace an expansive definition of queer, while recognizing each identity comes with a unique set of challenges as well as acknowledging the importance of intersectionality.*

CONTENTS

<i>Welcome Letter</i>	
From the Editor.....	1
<i>Notes from the Profession</i>	
LGBT Economists 1.0.....	1
<i>Straight Man to Queer</i>	
<i>Woman by Way of</i>	
<i>Economic Liberty</i>	1
<i>Report on LGBT</i>	
<i>Breakfast at 2016</i>	
<i>AEA/ASSA Meetings</i>	5
<i>A Graduate Student's</i>	
<i>Perspective</i>	6
<i>Research Review</i>	
"The Economics of	
Lesbian and Gay	
Families".....	3
<i>News</i>	
Upcoming Events.....	4
New Publications.....	4
<i>Newsletter</i>	
Committee Members.....	12

NOTES FROM THE PROFESSION

LGBT Economists 1.0

- M. V. Lee Badgett

As the LGBT equality movement began to blossom in the early 1990s, some economists who identified as lesbian, gay, or bisexual (before transgender issues were commonly included) started to wonder why sexual orientation and LGB economists were so invisible in our discipline. When we looked around at our sister social sciences, it seemed that they were all light years ahead of us. In 1985, the American Psychological Association created its Division 44, an official unit focused on LGBT people. The American Political Science Association and the American Sociological Association had active LGB caucuses. And all of those disciplines included scholars doing research related to sexual orientation and LGB people.

Why weren't economists doing anything like that? To try to catch up, somebody decided to

- continued on page 9

Straight Man to Queer Woman, By Way of Economic Liberty

- Deirdre Nansen McCloskey

When the conversation turns, as it should more often, to the low percentage of women in economics, especially in academic life (in Sweden and the Netherlands, by the way, it's worse), I'll wait for a pause, and then drop in my usual joke: "Well, I've done my part." It always gets a laugh, amused by the women and uncomfortable by the men. Ha, ha.

It didn't seem so funny when in the fall of 1995 I started transitioning. Terror was more like it. The *Des Moines Register* put the news on the front page, repeatedly if not unsympathetically: "University of Iowa Economics Professor to Become a Woman."

That, of course, is not possible. I'll always have those pesky XY genes, and can never have the life history of a girl and woman, never for example experience the hostility to an assertive female

- continued on page 10

Email
lgbtq.econ.newsletter@gmail.com

with news, comments,
or requests to be
added or removed from
the distribution list.

WELCOME FROM THE EDITOR • *continued from page 1*

of it, of LGBTQ organizing by economists. There is more detail in the articles, but in brief: starting in 1990, when the AIDS crisis was still fresh (and this author was too young to understand the AIDS crisis), a lunch for queer economists was held at the ASSA meetings in Washington, DC. This was not sponsored by the AEA, and preserving participants' privacy was paramount. These annual lunch meetings continued on quietly for a few years. Thereafter no public trace can be found of anyone in the mainstream economics community trying to organize a meeting of queer economists until Lee Badgett and Kitt Carpenter stepped up to bring together a breakfast at the 2016 AEA meeting (a gap of some 20 years). About 60 people turned up at seven in the morning.

With so little institutional history within the economics profession, it is helpful to look to other disciplines that have proactively addressed their queer community. The American Physical Society recently put out a report on LGBTQ status in the profession.* Among the takeaways from their survey: "a common theme [expressed by LGBTQ physicists] is isolation." Queer identities have the property that they often aren't obvious to others; queer people generally must disclose that they are queer.

At that 2016 breakfast the discussion topic was the climate for queer people in economics. The general sentiment was that there was "no climate." That is, while most people didn't feel overt opposition, they also felt the lack of support. As in the APS study, isolation was a common theme. While many people did know other queer economists, people felt a lack of public visibility, that there were few examples of others in the profession for them to draw on. While they didn't necessarily feel the need to be closeted, they still were hyper-aware of doing things that drew attention to their being queer. A fuller summary of this meeting is published in this newsletter.

Personally, before I had any contact with others in this group, I was keenly aware of the lack of recent public organization. I had spent some time in grad school scouring the Internet for anything I could find about queer economists. The Internet had precious little to say about the topic, and I'd like to change that with this newsletter. There are many under-told stories and underrepresented peoples out there and while we don't pretend that a newsletter will be a panacea, we can give others room to share their experiences, and share ours in turn. Creating space for open discussion is the first step towards more systemic change. And, again, we hope that this newsletter provides a forum for queer economists to gain visibility, to connect, and to share their experiences with a wider group.

To these ends, I want to highlight two sections of the newsletter: the announcements of personal accomplishments or "news" section and the research summary. We hope that both will give people and research a low-stakes forum for increased visibility. As visibility within the profession is of particular importance in supporting queer economics students and others who are new to the profession, we hope you will distribute this newsletter widely in your departments and networks, pass on information about our meetings, and submit tips about things of interest to queer economists or those doing research on queer people, and share notices of personal accomplishments. Whether you are queer-identified or not, we thank you for picking up and reading this newsletter and hope you'll find its contents edifying and interesting! ▼

—*Bitsy Perlman*,

on behalf of the AEA LGBTQ-F Newsletter Committee

* <https://www.aps.org/programs/lgbt/upload/LGBTClimateinPhysicsReport.pdf>

Call for News

“READ ALL ABOUT IT!”

We intend to include regular news updates on professional changes (appointments, promotions, retirements, publications), as well as events and professional opportunities that would be of interest to the LGBTQ community. Please email any relevant announcements about upcoming conferences, events, grant or fellowship opportunities, promotions or retirements, publications, or any other news to: lgbtq.econ.newsletter@gmail.com.

RESEARCH REVIEW

The Economics of Lesbian and Gay Families*- Review by Ron Bird and Bitsy Perlman*

Dan A. Black, Seth G. Sanders, and Lowell J. Taylor.

“The Economics Of Lesbian And Gay Families.”*Journal of Economic Perspectives*, vol. 21, no. 2 (Spring 2007), pp. 53-70.<https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/jep.21.2.53>

The Black, Sanders, and Taylor (2007) paper points out the sparsity of data available about lesbian and gay families and individuals. Though there have been momentous changes in the legal and social recognition of lesbian and gay couples in the ten years since its publication, this dearth of data remains. Thus, we revisit their work to consider implications for future data collection and analysis. While not the first empirical analysis of the demographics and economic status of lesbian and gay cohabiting households (see, e.g., Allegretto and Arthur, 2001; Badgett, 2001; Gates, 2001), Black, et al., arguably provided the most comprehensive analysis then available.

The availability of a nationally representative sample of households in which one can identify gay and lesbian cohabiting couples comes from the shift in the categories that members of the household may use to identify their relationship to the stated head of household. While in 1980 “partner, roommate” was offered as an option, in 1990 “housemate, roommate” and “unmarried partner” were offered as distinct options. (Incidentally, the 1980 census also included an “other” category with write-in space.) This shift was driven by an increasing interest (and increasing incidence) in unmarried different-gendered people who were romantically involved choosing to cohabit. In the collection of information on different-gendered cohabiters, same-gendered (and thus in some sense gay and lesbian people) became distinguishable and visible. This allowed new questions to be asked and addressed.

Due to the nature of the data available Black, et al. skirt questions of identity, attraction, and behavior, focusing on the comparison between people who have chosen to cohabit with a single same-gender partner and those who are cohabiting (as married or unmarried partners) with a partner of a different gender. Thus, they speak of comparing families. However, they also use two surveys that ask about identity in their analysis. Though the Black, et al., analysis is primarily a presentation of empirical comparisons, they invoke Gary Becker’s theories of family formation to inform their work. In doing so, they

fail to acknowledge the many complications that come with the classification of people as family, such as the many questions concerning behavior and identity. Any work dealing with families, theoretical or empirical, is limited by the researchers understanding of what might reasonably be called a family, regardless of the beliefs held by their subjects.

Black, et al.’s empirical comparisons are based on data from the 2000 Census, from the 1993 National Survey of College Graduates (matched to the 1990 Census), from the General Social Survey 1989-2004 (which asks about identity), and from the 1992 National Health and Social Life Survey (NHSLs) (which also asks about identity). Black, et al., present eight tables that succinctly compare the key characteristics of cohabiting gay men, lesbian women and heterosexual couples.

Key findings are:

- Formation of a cohabiting household of those of the same-gender is similar to this formation among different-gender partners: 48% of gay male householders and 63% of lesbian householders were identified as “partnered,” compared to 59% of heterosexual households.
- Lesbian and gay households are less likely to include children compared to heterosexual households (90.3% of gay households and 77.9% of lesbian households had no children, compared to 38% of heterosexual households with no children).
- Gay and lesbian households are more likely to be in an urban area (90.2% of gay, and 85.3% of lesbian households, compared to 74.9% of heterosexual households). Twenty-six metropolitan areas (with San Francisco and Washington, DC heading the list) account for disproportionate concentrations of gay and lesbian households.
- In households with at least one partner working, both gay or lesbian partners more likely to work (about 80%) compared to heterosexual couples (both work 68%).

- continued on page 10

NEWS

Upcoming Events

Look out for additional announcements about the lunch meet-up at the 2018 ASSA! Be sure to see the announcement below about the “Pink Papers: LGBT Economics” session at the 2018 ASSA!

SATURDAY, JANUARY 6, 2018

LGBTQ&F LUNCH (AEA LGBTQ Lunch)

Marriott Philadelphia Downtown

Grand Ballroom, Salon B • 12:30 p.m. - 2:15 p.m.

PINK PAPERS: LGBT Economics

(directly following lunch) Room 405 • 2:30 p.m - 4:30 p.m.

*Featuring:***Marina Gorsuch.**

“Gender, Sexual Orientation, and Behavioral Prescriptions in the Labor Market”

— This paper examines the interaction of sex and sexual orientation on labor market discrimination— noting that the “backlash effect” (a negative response when women violate gender norms) affects gay women and heterosexual women differently.

Thomas Buser, Lydia Geijtenbeek, and Erik Plug.

“Sexual Orientation, Competitiveness & Income”

— This paper studies whether sexual orientation-based differences in competitive preferences can explain gay/straight income differences by using data from an online experiment.

Cevat Aksoy, Christopher Carpenter, Ralph DeHaas, and Kevin Tran.

“Same-Sex Marriage and Attitudes toward LGBT People: Evidence from Europe”

— This paper uses variation in the timing of relationship recognition policies for same-sex couples across European countries to study effects on societal attitudes towards sexual minorities.

Past Events

MARCH 23, 2017

The Economist magazine hosted a Pride & Prejudice Summit in NYC

Promotions

Congratulations to Martha Olney for her recent promotion to Teaching Professor at UC Berkeley! ▼

New Publications

Brandon Dupont (with Drew Keeling and Thomas Weiss). Forthcoming. **“First Cabin Fares from New York to the British Isles, 1826-1914.”** *Research in Economic History*.

— This paper presents a continuous time series on first cabin passenger fares for ocean travel from New York to the British Isles covering nearly a century of time. The authors discuss the conceptual and empirical difficulties of constructing such a time series, and examine the reasons for differences between the behavior of advertised fares and those based on passenger revenues.

Brandon Dupont. 2017. *The History of Economic Ideas: Economic Thought in Contemporary Context*. New York: Routledge.

— This textbook traces the evolution of economic ideas from the ancient to the modern world by examining the contributions of the most important scholars to some of the most important ideas in economics. *The History of Economic Ideas* surveys topics that are important for the understanding of contemporary economic issues.

Deborah M. Figart. 2017. **“Three Short Stories of Progressive Institutional Change.”** *Journal of Economic Issues* 51(2): 263-284.

— This paper analyzes three examples of progressive institutional change. While there are many to choose from, the three short stories focus on: (i) accounting for measures of housework and care work in GDP; (ii) transforming legal values through adoption of marriage equality in the United States; and (iii) interrogating the fresh-tomatoes food supply chain in order to achieve a penny-a-pound more in earnings for migrant field workers.

Michael Martell. 2017. **“Identity Management: Worker Independence and Discrimination Against Gay Men”** *Contemporary Economic Policy* (Early View).

— Martell builds on a growing literature documenting wage differentials for gay men by showing that the wage differential gay men experience varies significantly across occupations with different levels of worker independence. The penalty is smallest in management and professional occupations, which involve a high level of worker independence. It is largest in service occupations, which include a lower level of independence and discrimination.

- continued on page 8

NOTES FROM THE PROFESSION

Report on LGBT Breakfast at 2016 AEA/ASSA Meetings

Reprint of Memo to: Peter Rousseau, Executive Secretary, American Economic Association

From: Lee Badgett and Kitt Carpenter, Co-Organizers, 2016 AEA/ASSA LGBT Breakfast

Date: February 19, 2016

The American Economic Association sponsored an LGBT-themed breakfast from 7 to 8 am on January 4, 2016, at the Allied Social Science Association meeting in San Francisco.

Approximately 60 economists were in attendance, with a good mix of LGBT individuals and allies; PhD students and professionals; academic, government, and private industry economists; and economists from a wide variety of fields. An informal Happy Hour social event also took place from 6 to 10 p.m. later that evening with attendance by over 40 economists. This brief report summarizes the event and plans for moving forward.

The agenda for the breakfast meeting included three items: climate for LGBT economists, experiences doing LGBT economics research, and how the AEA might help support LGBT economists. We had time to cover two agenda items (climate for LGBT economists and how the AEA might help support LGBT economists). To address climate, we had participants discuss climate in small “breakout” sessions at their breakfast tables, and then someone reported back to the larger group from each table. To address how the AEA might help, we had a larger group discussion.

1. CLIMATE FOR LGBT ECONOMISTS

Several common themes emerged from the small group discussions about climate:

- a. Overall the professional climate includes an assumption that all economists are heterosexual and cis-gender (i.e., not transgender). Many groups reported that there is no climate for LGBT economists, though others suggested that “no climate is a bad climate.” Many stated that the default assumption in the profession is that everyone is heterosexual, especially in the job market.
- b. Individuals have concerns about openness and disclosure. There was agreement among several people that there is no culture encouraging LGBT people to come out. Some people were advised by more senior economists not to come out. Graduate students reported that they are out to some other graduate students but are very cautious about being out to faculty. Many individuals reported that in their departments, personal lives do not matter or are considered

irrelevant regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. They thought that this assumption is problematic for everyone, but particularly for LGBT people who are seen as revealing potentially inappropriately personal information when they come out. Some people thought that it was particularly hard for them to come out when they weren't in a relationship, since there didn't seem to be a need to provide such personal information.

- c. Visibility in the profession matters to LGBT economists. Many people suggested that the perceived presence of LGBT economists matters, and meetings like the LGBT breakfast are critical for visibility. People spoke of googling “LGBT economists” to locate others to make contact with. People also wanted more visible LGBT leaders in the profession to serve as role models. It was noted that other associations have official policies and programs, and many wanted the AEA to explicitly recognize and embrace the LGBT economist community.
- d. Problems are quite visible in the job market. Multiple individuals reported negative or awkward experiences with respect to faculty recruitment and job market issues. Others recounted horror stories such as being asked to sign a contract stating that the individual would not sue the institution on the basis of sexual orientation discrimination if s/he didn't receive an offer. Some people expressed concern about possible placements in small rural schools and their fear of working in an unfriendly climate with few other LGBT people around. These situations are made more difficult by the patchwork of existing state laws in the US with respect to employment protections (or lack thereof) on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity.
- e. Some professional environments appear to be more LGBT friendly. It was agreed that there is a wide variation in degree of acceptance for LGBT economists. Some economists in private industry suggested that LGBT is mostly irrelevant or that no one cares in private industry. Some suggested that certain fields are much more conservative than others (say, conservative macro/

- continued on page 6

NOTES FROM THE PROFESSION

A Graduate Student's Perspective

- Richard Nugent

As a graduate student in economics based in New York, I appreciate that being open about my sexual orientation is probably easier than in other places. That said, choosing to come out in this setting has proven difficult and felt isolating. My professors, peers, and students inevitably ask about my plans for the weekend or a holiday, and I have to decide whether to say I have plans with my boyfriend, or plans with a friend. We have to consider coming out of the closet all the time.

What's more, feeling isolated has been compounded for me by the imposter syndrome (a feeling of fraud despite evidence of high achievement*), something I think is more common than we might perceive. I would have benefitted earlier in my graduate education from being able to reach out to someone with whom I could easily relate, someone who lived through and felt the isolating feelings I felt, and also the stress and anxiety in, for example, completing the comprehensive exams.

While I did not have someone to reach out to early in my graduate study, I did have someone to look up to, and that was powerful for me. Professor Deirdre McCloskey has been a role model for me ever since I met her during my undergraduate study in economics at the University of Illinois at Chicago where she is a celebrity in her own right. While her experience is different than mine, she courageously pursued her genuine identity, has served as a role model for our community, and most importantly has been a wildly influential scholar in the intersection of economics, history, and rhetoric. She has written sixteen books, edited seven more, and published around

“ . . . coming together as LGBTQ-F economists comes down to broadening the discourse and building community. ”

360 scholarly articles. Thus, while I did not have anyone I could immediately relate to, I did have a role model. I knew this one very successful economist from our community I could look up to, and this was really powerful for me.

Role models are just one reason I am excited for this newsletter. As graduate students, I hope that we can share our experiences and shore up our courage. I also look forward to reading the advice and experiences of the professional economists over the course of your careers. I am interested how you have experienced changes in the climate around sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression. I think graduate students are also interested in how you have experienced changes in the field of economics in general. No matter how brief your comments may be, you could serve as role models for the graduate students reading this newsletter.

My very wise advisor noted that coming together as LGBTQ-F economists comes down to broadening the discourse and building community. As graduate students, we are ultimately responsible for broadening the discourse as the next generation of professional economists, and will depend on an active research community to get that done. ▼

* Clance, Pauline Rose and Suzanne Imes (1978). “The Imposter Phenomenon in High Achieving Women: Dynamics and Therapeutic Intervention” in: *Psychotherapy Theory, Research and Practice* 15(3): 241-274.

NOTES FROM THE PROFESSION • **Report on LGBT Breakfast at 2016 AEA / ASSA Meetings** • *continued from page 5*

finance compared to less conservative labor/health). LGBT economists from outside the US reported more difficulty being out than LGBT economists from or working inside the US. Many individuals expressed the belief that there is far less support for LGBT individuals in economics as compared to other social sciences. The climate for LGBT economists was reported to be much better in major cities than in small rural places, which may prevent some LGBT economists from taking positions in those environments.

f. Bisexual and transgender economists face additional challenges. It was suggested that climate is particularly difficult for bisexual and transgender economists (as opposed to lesbian and gay economists). In particular, there are additional visibility challenges to navigate with respect to relationship/partner status (i.e., a different-sex partner makes one appear to be heterosexual), pronoun recognition, etc.

- continued on page 7

NOTES FROM THE PROFESSION • *Report on LGBT Breakfast at 2016 AEA / ASSA Meetings* • *continued from page 6*

- g.** The external climate affects opportunities for LGBT economists. Sexual orientation and gender identity can matter substantively in the lives of LGBT economists in part by affecting the places they can go even for professional reasons. For example, it can be dangerous to travel to conferences or to work in certain countries with explicit anti-LGBT attitudes and policies.

2. HOW THE AEA MIGHT SUPPORT LGBT ECONOMISTS

Attendees had several specific ideas for how the AEA might support LGBT economists. These included:

- a.** The AEA could support a breakfast/lunch meeting and/or a social reception at each AEA annual meeting. It was agreed that this would be particularly valuable in the near-term as whatever organization that might take shape has an opportunity to reach a wide range of economists.
- b.** The AEA could consider creating a formal group that would address some of the issues and challenges unique to LGBT economists. That group could create an LGBT-themed newsletter to increase visibility of LGBT economists and the group's activities. It could also consider an LGBT-themed mentoring program along the lines of what CSWEP does for women economists. Such a group should encourage communication between other groups of economists, such as LGBT economists of color, LGBT women economists, and others. That group could also help draft guidelines for the recruitment process to treat LGBT individuals equally, which was an issue that arose in many discussions about climate for LGBT economists.
- c.** The AEA could highlight and support LGBT economics research, for example by putting LGBT-themed sessions on the AEA/ASSA program and/or in the Papers & Proceedings. The AEA could include or highlight LGBT-related activities in its mobile app and on the program.
- d.** The AEA could issue a statement urging data collection agencies (including the federal government) to improve or to start collecting systematic data on sexual orientation and transgender status. It could also call for more funding for research on LGBT populations.
- e.** The AEA could prioritize nominating candidates for election to the association who are openly LGBT.
- f.** The AEA could consider fielding a survey on climate in the profession related to LGBT issues.

3. MOVING FORWARD / NEXT STEPS

Overall, we think the discussion summarized above reveals some issues that should be of concern or interest to the AEA, and so we make a few preliminary recommendations for your consideration:

- a.** Continue to sponsor LGBT-related breakfast or lunch meetings at the AEA/ASSA meetings, including Chicago in 2017. There was universal support for the value of these meetings. (This happened.)
- b.** Support the formalization of a network or organization of LGBT economists within the AEA. There were a range of opinions about whether the AEA should consider forming an official group dedicated to addressing LGBT concerns in the profession, but our sense was that there was a great deal of support for the idea of a more formal network. In terms of numbers, our best estimate is that an "official" organization could be of direct interest to several hundred LGBT economists (not counting allies). Consider that there are over 18,000 members of the AEA. Most credible population based surveys indicate that at least 2% of adults self-identify as lesbian, gay, or bisexual, while a smaller proportion identifies as transgender. While we have no reason to believe that sexual minorities are underrepresented in the discipline relative to the population, at least one recent study found that gay men and lesbians were overrepresented in college teaching as a whole (Tilcsik, Anteby, and Knight 2015 *Administrative Science Quarterly*). These figures suggest that an LGBT organization would serve approximately 400 members of the AEA.
- c.** Support the development of guidelines to educate academic and industry employers about ways to improve the workplace climate and fair treatment for LGBT economists. Nonacademic employers often have diversity policies with excellent ideas for creating fair and welcoming workplaces for LGBT people, and we should draw on those for ideas. These might include encouraging employers to have statements of nondiscrimination that include sexual orientation and gender identity in job ads, giving all job candidates accurate information about employment benefits for same-sex partners, guidelines about questions that make LGBT people feel uncomfortable and unwelcome, and offering information on campus or local LGBT resources to those coming for campus visits.
- d.** Support research on LGBT issues. Examples might include a statement encouraging more and better collection of data on LGBT people or calling for increased funding to study LGBT populations. ▼

NEWS • *New Publications* • continued from page 4

Michael Martell (with Mary Eschelbach Hansen). 2017. **“Sexual Identity and the Lesbian Earnings Differential in the U.S.”** *Review of Social Economy* 75(2): 159-180.

— The authors show that misclassification of sexual identity may lead to erroneous conclusions about changes in labor market outcomes. The results highlight the need to develop robust methods for collecting data on sexual identity and for more research on the interrelationship between sexual identity and behavior, especially occupational choice.

Martha Olney (with Aaron Pacitti). 2017. **“The Rise of Services, Deindustrialization, And The Length Of Economic Recovery.”** *Economic Inquiry* (Early View).

— Economic recovery is longer in service-providing economies than in goods-producing economies. Services cannot be produced and inventoried ahead of demand; goods can. Olney and Pacitti discuss the macroeconomic repercussions of the sectoral shifts that accompany deindustrialization and the rise of services. They show that the increase in service production and deindustrialization in the United States over the last half-century lengthens the trough-to-peak employment recovery from recessions by about 40%.

Elisabeth Ruth Perlman (with Steven Sprick Schuster). 2016. **“Delivering the Vote: The Political Effect of Free Mail Delivery in Early Twentieth Century America.”** *The Journal of Economic History* 76(3): 769-802.

— The rollout of Rural Free Delivery (RFD) in the early twentieth century dramatically increased the frequency with which rural voters received information. This article examines the effect of RFD on voters' and Congressional Representatives' behavior. The authors find that communities receiving more routes spread their votes to more parties, but that it did not change turnout. RFD shifted positions taken by Congressional Representatives in line with rural constituents, including increased support for pro-temperance and anti-immigration policies.

John Tang (with Kazuki Onji). 2017. **“Taxes and the Choice of Organizational Form in Late Nineteenth Century Japan.”** *The Journal of Economic History* 77(2): 440-472.

— Tang and Onji examine the short-run impact of introducing a personal income tax (PIT) in 1887 on tax-motivated incorporation. Between 1880 and 1892, they find that the introduction of PIT increased the share of incorporated firms by more than 3 percentage points, indicating firms chose their organizational structure to avoid new taxation.

John Tang (with Christopher Meissner). 2017. **“Upstart Industrialization and Exports, Japan 1880-1910.”** *NBER Working Paper* 23481.

— In this new working paper, Tang and Meissner examine the Japanese economic experience of the late 19th century, using a new disaggregated trade data set. They explore the role that trade costs, market-specific forces, and product specific factors played in the entry and exit of Japanese products into a large set of countries.

John Tang (with Dwight Perkins). 2017. **“East Asian Industrial Pioneers: Japan, Korea and Taiwan.”** In *The Spread of Modern Industry to the Periphery since 1871*, edited by Kevin Hjortshøj O'Rourke and Jeffrey Gale Williamson, Chapter 8. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

— Tang and Perkins have a chapter in this new edited volume on the spread of modern industry to East Asia. Their chapter examines the different historical patterns of industrial development in Japan, Korea and Taiwan. ▼

Our newsletter committee is looking forward to hearing from you!

Please consider emailing any relevant announcements about:

Upcoming Conferences • Events

Grant or Fellowship Opportunities

Promotions • Retirements • Publications

or any other news to us!

Thank you!

NOTES FROM THE PROFESSION • *LGBT Economists 1.0* • *continued from page 1*

convene a group. The other people I remember who were out LGB economists early on were Bob Anderson (UC Berkeley), Richard Cornwall (Middlebury College), and Rhonda Williams (University of Maryland-College Park), all of whom were involved in this first era of organizing. Richard offered to pay for a lunch and set up a room at one of the Allied Social Sciences Association (ASSA) meeting hotels in 1990.* We put the word out in the ASSA program and wondered who would show up. After a brief debate, we agreed we needed an explicit sign with the L, G, and B words to point people to our group, thus making the statement that we were going to be out LGB economists. And while the group that showed up wasn't as large as the 2016 breakfast crowd in San Francisco (where we had about 65 people), we were thrilled to find others to talk to about being LGB in economics.

The group, which met for the next few years at ASSA, included newly minted PhDs as well as people who'd been active academic economists for much longer. We had lots of men, not surprisingly for economics, but also a reasonable number of women. We came from fields ranging from theory to applied labor economics. We wanted to meet each other to feel safer and more accepted in our discipline, and we wanted economics to include the study of LGB people and issues.

Out of that first lunch, we decided to organize a panel for the next year's meetings to present research that several of us were doing. To our surprise, the panel was accepted, and in 1992 our visibility soared.** The session included four papers: Bob Anderson on "Economic Issues Related to Sexual Orientation," Richard Cornwall on "Notes on a Research Agenda for Economists Inspired by the Coming Out of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Communities: The Role of Markets in the Social Construction of Identities," Kathryn Larson on "The Economic Status of Lesbians: The State of the Art," and I had a paper on "Labor Market Discrimination: Economic Issues for Gay Men and Lesbians." Heidi Hartmann and Rhonda Williams served as discussants.

Sadly, I don't think we ever had another panel accepted by the AEA after that. In 1993 and 1994 the Union for Radical Political Economics (URPE) sponsored a panel on sexual orientation at ASSA. Over time, connections with URPE

and the International Association for Feminist Economics (IAFFE), in particular, gave (and still give) us opportunities for presentations at the annual ASSA meeting.

The lunches only lasted until Richard Cornwall retired in the late 1990s, but an informal network of economists continued to grow, with additional scholarly panels on economics happening outside of the ASSA. Many in our network were also members of the Association for Public Policy and Management (APPAM), and Kitt Carpenter has been organizing dinners and panels for the APPAM annual conference for many years now. IAFFE has had panels on LGBT issues at almost every recent conference and now has an LGBTQ interest group.

Scholarly curiosity has been the invisible hand urging both LGBT and non-LGBT economists to conduct research on sexual orientation and gender identity. In its 1995 inaugural issue, *Feminist Economics* was the first economics journal to publish an article on sexual orientation, followed quickly by *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* in the same year, and many other journals since then. Labor economics has proven to be a particularly fertile field for studies of sexual orientation discrimination and for studies of LGBT families. Many people have used the tools of economics for policy analysis on LGBT issues. The amount of high quality data available has expanded steadily.

A lot has changed in the world for LGBT people and economists since the annual LGB lunches at the ASSA meeting ended. Deirdre McCloskey was very public in her gender transition and wrote a book about it, opening up an interest in gender identity in economics and putting the "T" in LGBT economists. Scholars outside the USA have become more prominent in research on sexual orientation and gender identity. Changes in public policies and attitudes appear to have created more space for LGBT economists to come out and come together.

Even with those changes, it's clear from our discussions in 2016 and 2017 that we need LGBT Economists 2.0 at the center of our profession in the AEA. That stronger and more inclusive vantage point should help us continue to work toward full acceptance of LGBT economists and LGBT economics in our discipline. ▼

* You can see it here on page 16: https://www.aeaweb.org/Annual_Meeting/assa_programs/ASSA_1990.pdf

** For summaries of the papers, see: "The Economics of Sexual Orientation: Establishing a Research Agenda," M. V. Lee Badgett and Rhonda M. Williams, *Feminist Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 3, 1992, 649-657. Richard's presentation was eventually published in 1997 as "deconstructing silence: the queer theory of political economy of the social articulation of desire," *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 29(1): 1-130, 1997.

RESEARCH REVIEW • *The Economics of Lesbian and Gay Families* • *continued from page 3*

- Among gay or lesbian couples, about 43% reported that the highest educational attainment within the pair was Bachelor's degree or higher, compared to about 27% for heterosexual couples.
- College graduate men in different-gender partnerships had majors with low percentages of women, the mean being 33%, this is followed by gay men (44%), lesbian women (54%), with the highest mean being for heterosexual women (62%).
- Compared to college educated men in heterosexual couples, college educated men in gay couples earned less: \$71,601 for heterosexual men, versus \$56,898 on average for men in gay couples. It is notable, however, that the gay male earnings were still significantly greater than the \$31,258 mean annual earnings for employed women in heterosexual couple households.
- Women in lesbian couples earned less on average than their gay counterparts (\$45,169) but significantly more than the women in heterosexual couples.
- Combined earnings of couples averaged \$91,676 for gay male partner households, \$73,760 for lesbian partner households, and \$73,235 for heterosexual partner households.

Black, et al., discuss the possible reasons for the observed differences in economic characteristics of lesbian and gay partnerships compared to heterosexual couples. As noted above, their approach is firmly rooted in the concept of rational economic choice, extending the foundation laid by Becker (1981, 1991). Rather than speculating about innate differences

in the broad spectrum of preferences or endowments of lesbian women and gay men, Black, et al., start from the premise that same-sex attraction is the sole difference between lesbian or gay individuals in comparison to their heterosexual counterparts.

They argue that different outcomes observed between gay and lesbian people in comparison to their straight peers reflect differences in the costs and other economic constraints faced by gay and lesbian people arising from the realities of their sexual orientation. They thus view sexual orientation as innate and binary, and though they acknowledge potential sexual fluidity in those who may have been partnered to a different-gendered partner at one point and later with a same-gendered partner, this does not play into their theory. In particular, Black, et al., focus on the costs imposed by social discrimination, but they also acknowledge the constraints of biology in determining the cost of having children. They conclude that many of the observed differences are driven by this difference in the cost of having children and, in gays and lesbians, the lack of clear expectations about whether they will specialize in market or household activities. They do not speak of the burden of engaging in these household activities on market work or vice versa. Both of these factors are clearly changing, as people in different-gendered partnerships choose to adopt non-traditional gender roles, and gay and lesbian partnerships have greater access to adoption and other reproductive services. Thus, the documented difference represents a snapshot of partnerships as they existed in 2000, but are by no means destiny for the families formed in the future. ▼

NOTES FROM THE PROFESSION • *Straight Man to Queer Woman, By Way of Economic Liberty* • *continued from page 1*

graduate student. At Harvard in the 1960s Donald McCloskey was praised for such assertion; Barbara Bergmann ten years earlier was thoroughly dispraised for it.

High school football player, tough-guy Chicago economist, I was married from 1965 to 1995, to the love of my life. I was straight. Well . . . since age eleven in strict privacy I occasionally cross-dressed, but that little male peculiarity is pretty common, especially for some reason among engineers. Most are straight in affectional preferences, “heterosexual cross-dressers” being the term. And they don't want to be women. When early in 1995 I discovered cross-dressing clubs, I was struck by the heavily male talk at them; the engineers gathered in drag to talk in a meeting room at the local Holiday Inn about Iowa football. Regularly the few GGs (genetic girls)

at such gatherings, a handful of wives or hairdressers, would be serving the food and cleaning up afterwards. Hmm, that's odd, I thought. Don't these guys realize that we are playing at being women? Then in August of 1995 I twigged.

There was nothing false about my love over a third of a century for my girlfriend and then wife. If she appeared at my front door today, I'd hug her and invite her in. (So too my son and daughter, who, like my ex-wife, have not knocked at my door for 21 years.) Affectional preference does not correlate with gender preference, contrary to the locker-room theory of people like Michael Bailey of Northwestern that queers are queers, and all the same, and that gay men want to be women. (Incidentally, the “experiments” up in Toronto on which his theory is based have no GG controls. And his “sample” for

- *continued on page 11*

NOTES FROM THE PROFESSION • *Straight Man to Queer Woman, By Way of Economic Liberty* • *continued from page 10*

The Man Who Would be Queen (2003) was six Chicana prostitutes from a bar in Chicago. Economics is not the only depressingly unscientific science in which ideology controls the show from behind the curtain.)

And people change, which is something our Max U method needs to allow for, and not, as George Akerlof and Rachel Kranton do it, by putting Max U inside a wider Max V. Identity is not fungible with utility. Ask the mother who runs into a burning house to save her child, or a soldier who went over the top at the Somme.

Economists on the whole viewed my change with equanimity. (Well, I'll never know for sure: maybe that appointment at, say, Yale was, so to speak, queered.) "He . . . I mean she . . . has the right to choose." Free to choose, you might say. In fact, Milton and Rose Friedman were smoothly graceful about it at Milton's 90th birthday party. At the first AEA meeting Deirdre went to, Al Harberger of UCLA, who had been Donald's colleague for years at Chicago, chaired the meeting of the Executive Committee, referring to me carefully each time as "Deirdre" because, I think, he was having trouble remembering to use "she." So does my highly supportive mother of 95 years. She has known me as "Donald" longer than anybody else.

Economic historians, my sub-tribe, were especially fine. Claudia Goldin and Elyce Rotella and other women organized a party in November 1995 when I was released from a night at a locked psychiatric ward. (It was one of two such imprisonments arranged by David Galenson and my sister. My sister and I are just fine.) At the party the balloons declared, "It's a Girl!" Joel Mokyr hired a lawyer to spring me from the loony bin. A few weeks later Richard Sutch and Susan Carter invited me to Thanksgiving at their house in Berkeley, my first day as Deirdre, and ever since. Martha Olney and her wife, an American Baptist pastor, then protected me in the East Bay from my sister and David, and showed me how to live a religious life.

My colleagues in history seemed to have a harder time. I imagine it's because they have in their theories no presumption of liberty, as economists do, even when the economists are willing on even days to give the government massive powers of violence. The Blessed Adam Smith wrote of "the liberal plan, of equality, liberty, and justice." Damned right. Modern historians view identity as a one-time affair, which then is sociological determinative of an entire life. Like Popeye, you are what you are. And my colleagues in literary studies, gay or straight, tend to view my change as something like a fashion choice. Hey, cool. I guess it's better than confused disdain.

A society like ours trying to follow Adam Smith's liberal plan allows gender transition, and out gays and lesbians, and green hair. In Iran, in accord with the queer-killing locker-room theory, gays are *compelled* to change gender. And you know how the queers are treated in Uganda, that bastion of Anglican Christianity. Being religious, other than American Baptist or progressive Episcopalian, doesn't guarantee that you follow the spirit of the tent-maker of Mecca or the carpenter of Nazareth.

I don't need to tell you how much that has changed in Northern Europe and its offshoots. (The 100-year legal reign of terror, under the supervision of psychiatrists, did not happen in southern Europe.) A month ago I gave to an enthusiastic audience a talk on transsexuality and economics at, of all places, the Central Intelligence Agency. If a transgendered spy was threatened by the Russians with revealing her former gender, I suppose she would reply, "Feel free, guys." Unlike Trump's worry.

I lived in Adams House as a Harvard undergrad, class of 1964, but didn't know that the place was notoriously gay. It shows how deeply people were then in the closet. Academic life has become an easy place to come out. When I wrote a piece for the (London) *Times Higher Education Supplement* about the ease, a brilliant journalist headlined it as, "It's Good to be a Don If You're Going to be a Deirdre." Most of the private colleges were slow to adjust. By contrast, my beloved University of Iowa, I discovered in 1995, had detailed and liberal policies in place, a decade before Fair Harvard. By now, though, Harvard has a sensible dorm policy and a GLBTQ magazine—though it comes through the mail in a plain brown wrapper. We're not *quite* there.

At my 50th college reunion the Radcliffe women of my class invited me to join them in the big photo on the steps of Widener Library. Huzzah! Only one woman, with whom I thought I had had an affair in the spring of my freshman year, objected. After my transition I called up a male dean at Harvard—since Radcliffe, idiotically, had been closed—and asked him if Harvard could change my degree to Radcliffe. "Oh, I don't think we can do that." I whined, "But the U. S. State Department had no trouble changing my passport from male to female." Pause. Then with a smile in his voice, "Ah, yes. But Harvard is older than the U. S. State Department."

Sigh. Some things never change. ▼

MAYNARD'S NOTES



2301 Vanderbilt Place
PMB 351819
Nashville, TN 37235-1819

THE NEWSLETTER OF THE AMERICAN
ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION'S LGBTQ and
FRIENDS COMMUNITY



MAYNARD'S NOTES

Co-CHAIRS:

RON BIRD

ELISABETH PERLMAN

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

BRANDON DUPONT

ALEX EISENBARTH

LUCAS GOODMAN

ERIC WILKINSON

AEA LIAISONS:

LEE BADGETT

CHRISTOPHER CARPENTER

THE NEWSLETTER OF THE AMERICAN
ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION'S LGBTQ and
FRIENDS COMMUNITY

