doi:10.1017/S0003055412000652

Notes from the Editors

The new editorial team at the University of North Texas would like to take this opportunity, in our first editors' note, to express our great thanks to the APSA, Presidents G. Bingham Powell and Jane Mansbridge, President-elect John Aldrich, the APSA staff, the Council, and the Publications Committee, as well as to Cambridge University Press, for their support and guidance during this transition process. We are particularly grateful to APSA Executive Director Michael Brintnall, APSA Director of Communications and Publishing Polly Karpowicz, and Mark Zadrozny and the Cambridge University Press team for their vital help in making the transition from UCLA to UNT a smooth one. We would especially like to thank Ron Rogowski and his team at UCLA (and in particular, the Managing/Senior Editor at UCLA, Joseph Riser) for making the transition from the editorial office of UCLA to the UNT office an easy one. It has been a real pleasure to work with their team. Finally, we would like to thank the members of the APSR editorial board for their support and guidance, and we are grateful to those colleagues in the profession who reviewed manuscripts for using their valuable time to serve the profession. Their efforts are greatly appreciated.

This issue (Volume 107, issue 1) is the first produced by the editorial team at the University of North Texas—however, most of the articles that appear in it were processed by our predecessors at UCLA, and it is to them that the lion's share of the credit should be directed. We will continue their tradition of providing a brief introduction summarizing the basic arguments of every article in each issue. This issue's articles speak to both timely and enduring questions in political science, such as the following: What motivates terrorists? Why did democracy emerge first in Western Europe? Does elite polarization drive mass polarization? And do voters during economic downturns behave differently than in "normal" times?

IN THIS ISSUE

Thomas Hegghammer addresses the first question in his article, "Should I Stay or Should I Go? Explaining Variation in Western Jihadists' Choice between Domestic and Foreign Fighting." It explores the question of what motivates Western jihadists to decide whether to engage in operations at home or to join insurgencies abroad. Using an ingenious method to extrapolate estimates of the numbers of foreign fighters, he creates a unique dataset on variations in theater choice by jihadists between 1990–2010. Hegghammer finds that, although most jihadists prefer to fight abroad, there is a small but significant minority that does engage in attacks at home; these jihadists were radicalized, mostly via foreign fighting or contact with a veteran jihadist. The findings have important policy implications. Indeed, as Hegghammer argues, understanding the motivations of jihadists makes assessments of terrorist threats more accurate and hence allows for the creation of more effective counterterrorism policies.

The second article by Lisa Blaydes and Eric Chaney, "The Feudal Revolution and Europe's Rise: Political Divergence of the Christian West and the Muslim World before 1500 CE," speaks to an enduring question in comparative politics: What explains the divergence in political stability, institutionalization, and, ultimately, democracy between Western Europe and the Islamic world? Indeed, Western Europe was an economic and political backwater in the first millennium CE in comparison to the economic, cultural, and scientific advances of the Middle East. However, over time the forms of executive constraint that emerged under feudal institutions in Western Europe promoted increased political stability and ruler duration. These institutions served as the basis for military recruitment, which in turn led to constraints on executive power and ultimately paved the way for the emergence of parliaments and democracy. In contrast, Muslim sultans relied on the use of military slaves imported from conquered territories. Dependence on such "Mamluk" militaries constrained the ability of local notables to limit the power of the Sultan and hindered the development of the adversarial relationship between the monarch and local notables.

Thad Dunning and Janhavi Nilekani in their article examine a basic policy-oriented question—whether political quotas based on ethnicity actually benefit the disadvantaged groups that they are meant to benefit. In "Ethnic Quotas and Political Mobilization: Caste, Parties, and Distribution in Indian Village Councils," the authors test the proposition that ethnic quotas will induce distribution of material benefits to members of disadvantaged groups by examining the impact of quotas for the presidencies of village councils in India from the states Karnataka, Rajasthan, and Bihar. They find weak distributive effects of quotas for marginalized castes and tribes, but strong evidence of the importance of multiethnic party organizations. In fact, party affiliation lessens the tendency of politicians to target benefits selectively to particular ethnic groups and weakens the distributive impact of ethnic quotas. This research highlights the importance of political parties on the distributive effects of quotas at the local level.

James N. Druckman, Erik Peterson, and Rune Slothuus, in "How Elite Partisan Polarization Affects Public Opinion Formation," examine a highly relevant contemporary question: How does political polarization at the elite level affect the American electorate? More specifically, the authors discuss whether elite polarization alters the way in which citizens arrive at their policy opinions. Using data from two survey experiments they find that polarized environments fundamentally change how citizens make decisions—polarization intensifies the impact of party endorsements over substantive information and stimulates greater confidence in partisan-based opinions, even when it

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000652 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is apparent that these opinions are not grounded in substance.

Yotam Margalit in "Explaining Social Policy Preferences: Evidence from the Great Recession" also examines the question of voter preferences, but focuses on the individual level, asking whether individuals are affected more by their personal circumstances or their ideological dispositions. Using an original dataset that consists of four waves of surveys in which the same national sample of respondents were contacted between July 2007 and March 2011 (which allows for assessing the effects of the Great Recession in the United States), Margalit finds that the personal experience of an economic shock, particularly the loss of a job, brought about a sizable increase in support for welfare spending and led to greater convergence among individuals with divergent ideological leanings. Yet, this effect is relatively short-lived, dissipating with the improvement in individuals' personal standing. This study has important implications for the long-standing debate regarding pocketbook and sociotropic voting in U.S. politics.

Josiah Ober's "Democracy's Wisdom: An Aristotelian Middle Way for Collective Judgment" addresses an age-old question in normative political theory: Can a political regime be democratic, while at the same time allowing a role for expertise in its decision making? As critics of democracy have noted, democracy's commitment to liberty and political equality necessarily leads citizens to pursue arbitrary desires rather than real interests. Thus, democracy is inherently "anti-epistemic," and only a nondemocratic regime can make prudent or wise policy. To have an epistemic democracy, some model of decision making must exist that respects democratic values, while taking account of relevant knowledge about the world. Ober introduces the model of relevant expertise aggregation (REA), which differs from a standard Condorcet jury by combining deliberation with voting based on judgments about the reputations and arguments of domain experts. This model enables minimally competent voters to make superior choices among multiple options on matters of common interest.

In "Rawls and the Forgotten Figure of the Most Advantaged: In Defense of Reasonable Envy toward the Superrich," Jeffrey Edward Green builds off the work of John Rawls and argues—on heuristic, protective, and redressive grounds—that legislators should regulate the economic prospects of a country's wealthiest citizens. Further, he counters the objection that such arguments amount to a defense of envy, by bringing back Rawls's often overlooked distinction between irrational and reasonable forms of envy. Thus he shows that any envy involved in the proposed regulation of the most advantaged is a reasonable form of envy and hence is justifiable.

David Ciepley in "Beyond Public and Private: Toward a Political Theory of the Corporation" challenges the liberal, contractual theory of the corporation and argues for replacing it with a political theory of the corporation. Corporations are in many ways quite government-like (and thus cannot be seen as completely "private"), but they are also privately organized and financed (and thus are not simply public). He argues against the "Liberal insistence" on treating corporations as purely associations of private property owners, endowing them with rights they ought not to have. Rather he argues that corporations need to be placed in a distinct category—neither public nor private, but "corporate"—to be regulated by distinct rules and norms.

Jens Hainmueller and Dominik Hangartner tackle the topic of discrimination against immigrants in "Who Gets a Swiss Passport? A Natural Experiment in Immigrant Discrimination." Using micro-level plebiscite data from Switzerland, the authors demonstrate that naturalization decisions vary dramatically with the attributes of the immigrants. The country of origin determines naturalization success more than any other applicant characteristic. Indeed, the proportion of "no" votes is about 40% higher on average for applicants from (former) Yugoslavia and Turkey compared to observably similar applicants from richer European countries, with origin-based discrimination much stronger in more xenophobic municipalities. The study also suggests, importantly, that direct democracy may not serve to reduce discrimination—indeed it claims that outgroup minorities suffer more under the conditions of direct democracy than in situations where legislation is enacted by representatives or judiciaries.

Finally, Daryl G. Press, Scott D. Sagan, and Benjamin A. Valentino, in "Atomic Aversion: Experimental Evidence on Taboos, Traditions, and the Nonuse of Nuclear Weapons," ask this question: How strong are normative prohibitions on state behavior? The authors use an original survey experiment to evaluate American attitudes regarding nuclear use and find that the public's aversion to the use of nuclear weapons is not based on the perception that their use is unthinkable or "taboo." Rather public attitudes are driven largely by considerations of military utility—support for nuclear weapon use increases dramatically when it is viewed as a more effective means of destroying a military target than conventional weapons. Further, individuals who reject the use of nuclear weapons overwhelmingly referred to the risks of setting a dangerous precedent that could lead to the use of nuclear weapons by other states against the United States or its allies in the future. Thus there is little evidence of a nuclear "taboo" for the American public.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CONTRIBUTORS

The *American Political Science Review* (*APSR*) publishes scholarly research of exceptional merit, focusing on important issues and demonstrating the highest standards of excellence in conceptualization, exposition, methodology, and craftsmanship. A significant advance in understanding of politics—whether empirical, interpretive, or theoretical—is the criterion for publication in the *Review*. Because the *APSR* reaches a diverse audience, authors must demonstrate how their analysis illuminates or answers an important research question of general interest in political science. For the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000652 Published online by Cambridge University Press

same reason, authors must strive to be understandable to as many scholars as possible, consistent with the nature of their material.

The *APSR* publishes original work. Submissions should not include tables, figures, or substantial amounts of text that already have been published or are forthcoming in other places. In many cases, republication of such material would violate the copyright of the other publisher. Neither does the *APSR* consider submissions that are currently under review at other journals or that duplicate or overlap with parts of larger manuscripts submitted to other publishers (whether of books, printed periodicals, or online journals). If you have any questions about whether these policies apply in your case, you should address the issues in a cover letter to the editors or as part of the author comments section during online submission. You should also notify the editors of any related submissions to other publishers, whether for book or periodical publication, during the pendency of your submission's review at the *APSR*—–regardless of whether they have yet been accepted. The editors may request copies of related publications.

The *APSR* uses a double-blind review process. You should follow the guidelines for preparing an anonymous submission in the "Specific Procedures" section that follows.

If your manuscript contains quantitative evidence and analysis, you should describe your procedures in sufficient detail to permit reviewers to understand and evaluate what has been done and—–in the event the article is accepted for publication—–to permit other scholars to replicate your results and to carry out similar analyses on other datasets. With surveys, for example, provide sampling procedures, response rates, and question wordings, and calculate response rates according to one of the standard formulas given by the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys (Lenexa, KS: AAPOR, 2006).[1] For experiments, provide full descriptions of experimental protocols, methods of subject recruitment and selection, payments to subjects, debriefing procedures, and so on. In any case involving human subjects, the editors may require certification of appropriate institutional review and/or conformity with generally accepted norms.[2]

The strength of evidence necessary for publication of quantitative empirical findings cannot be captured by any single criterion, such as the conventional .05 level of statistical significance. Therefore the journal's coeditors—–following the evolving disciplinary standard among reviewers—–will evaluate the strength of findings on a range of criteria beyond statistical significance, including substantive significance, theoretical aptness, the importance of the problem under study, and the feasibility of obtaining additional evidence.

In addition, authors of quantitative or experimental articles are expected to address the issue of data availability. You must normally indicate both where (online) you will deposit the information that is necessary to reproduce the numerical results and when that information will be posted (such as "on publication" or "by [definite date]"). You should be prepared, when posting, to provide not only the data used in the analysis but also the syntax files, specialized software, and any other information necessary to reproduce the numerical results in the manuscript. Where an exception is claimed, you should clearly explain why the data or other critical materials used in the manuscript cannot be shared or why they must be embargoed for a limited period beyond publication.

Similarly, authors of qualitative, observational, or textual articles, or of articles that combine such methods with quantitative analysis, should indicate their sources fully and clearly enough to permit ready verification by other scholars—–including precise page references to any published material cited and clear specification (e.g., file number) of any archival sources. Wherever possible, use of interactive citations is encouraged. Where field or observational research is involved, the anonymity of participants will always be respected; however, the texts of interviews, group discussions, observers' notes, and so on, should be made available on the same basis (and subject to the same exceptions) as with quantitative data.

For articles that include candidate gene or candidate gene-by-environment studies, *APSR* uses the same policy as the journal *Behavior Genetics*.[3] In relevant part, that policy states that an article will normally be considered for publication only if it meets one or more of the following criteria:

- It was an exploratory study or test of a novel hypothesis, but with an adequately powered, direct replication study *reported in the same article*.
- It was an exploratory analysis or test of a novel hypothesis in the context of an adequately powered study, and the finding meets the statistical criteria for genome-wide significance—–taking into account all sources of multiple testing (e.g., phenotypes, genotypes, environments, covariates, subgroups).
- It is a rigorously conducted, adequately powered, direct replication study of a previously reported result.

Articles should be self-contained; you should not simply refer readers to other publications for descriptions of these basic research procedures.

Please indicate variables included in statistical analyses by italicizing the entire name of the variable—–the first time it is mentioned in the text—–and by capitalizing its first letter in all uses. You should also use the

[1] See http://www.aapor.org/standards.asp.

[2] One widely accepted guide to such norms is given by the American Anthropological Association's Code of Ethics, particularly Section III, available at http://www.aaanet.org/issues/policy-advocacy/upload/AAA-Ethics-Code-2009.pdf.

[3] *Behavior Genetics* 42 (2012): 1–2, DOI 10.1007/s10519-011-9504-zvi.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000652 Published online by Cambridge University Press

same names for variables in text, tables, and figures. Do not use acronyms or computational abbreviations when discussing variables in the text. All variables that appear in tables or figures should have been mentioned in the text, with standard summary statistics (n, mean, median, standard deviation, range, etc.) provided and the reason for their inclusion discussed. However, tables and figures should also be comprehensible without reference to the text (e.g., in figures, axes should be clearly labeled). Please bear in mind also that neither the published or online versions of the *Review* normally can provide figures in color; be sure that a grayscale version will be comprehensible to referees and readers.

You may be asked to submit additional documentation if procedures are not sufficiently clear. If you advise readers that additional information is available on request, you should submit equally anonymous copies of that information with your manuscript as "supplemental materials." If this additional information is extensive, please inquire about alternate procedures.

Manuscripts that, in the judgment of the coeditors, are largely or entirely critiques of, or commentaries on, articles previously published in the *Review* will be reviewed for possible inclusion in a forum section, using the same general procedures as for other manuscripts. Well before any publication, however, such manuscripts will also be sent to the scholar(s) whose work is being addressed. The author(s) of the previously published article will be invited to comment to the editors and to submit a rejoinder, which also will be peer reviewed. Although the *Review* does publish forums, it does so very rarely. We do not publish rejoinders to rejoinders.

The *APSR* accepts only electronic submissions (at www.editorialmanager.com/apsr). The website provides detailed information about how to submit, what formatting is required, and what type of digital files may be uploaded. Please direct any questions regarding new submissions to the journal's editorial offices at apsr@unt.edu.

Manuscript Formatting

Manuscripts should be no longer than 12,000 words, including text, all tables and figures, notes, references, and appendices intended for publication. Font size must be at least 12 point for all parts of the submission, including notes and references, and all body text (including references) should be double-spaced. Include an abstract of no more than 150 words. Explanatory footnotes may be included, but should not be used for simple citations. Do not use endnotes. Observe all of the additional formatting instructions given on our website. Doing so lightens the burden on reviewers, copyeditors, and compositors. Submissions that violate our guidelines on formatting or length will be rejected without review.

For submission and review purposes, you may locate tables and figures (on separate pages and only one to a page) approximately where they fall in the text, but with an in-text locator for each, in any case (e.g., [Table 3 about here]). If your submission is accepted for publication, you may also be asked to submit high-resolution digital source files of graphs, charts, or other types of figures. Following acceptance, all elements within any tables submitted (text, numerals, symbols, etc.) should be accessible for editing and reformatting to meet the journal's print specifications (e.g., they should not be included as single images not subject to reformatting). If you have any doubts about how to format the required in-text citations and/or bibliographic reference sections, please consult the latest edition of *The Chicago Manual of Style* (16th ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010) and review recent issues of the *APSR*.

Specific Procedures

Please follow these specific procedures for submission:

1. Before submitting any manuscript to the *APSR*, download a PDF of the Transfer of Copyright Agreement from the Editorial Manager login page at http://www.editorialmanager.com/apsr and be sure its terms and requirements, as well as the permissions granted to authors under its provisions, are acceptable to you. A signed agreement will be required for all work published in this journal.
2. When you submit materials (at www.editorialmanager.com/apsr), you will be invited to provide a short list of appropriate reviewers of your manuscript. Do not include on this list anyone who has already commented on the research included in your submission. Likewise, exclude any of your current or recent collaborators, institutional colleagues, mentors, students, or close friends. You may also "oppose" potential reviewers by name, as potentially biased or otherwise inappropriate, but you will be expected to provide specific reasons for doing so. The editors will refer to these lists in selecting reviewers, though there can be no guarantee that they will influence final reviewer selections.
3. You will also be required to upload a minimum of two separate files.

    a) An "anonymous" digital file of your submission, which should not include any information that identifies the authors. Also excluded should be the names of any other collaborators in the work (including research assistants or creators of tables or figures). Likewise do not provide in-text links to any online databases used that are stored on any personal websites or at institutions with which any of the coauthors are affiliated. Do not otherwise thank colleagues or include institution names, web addresses, or other potentially identifying information.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000652 Published online by Cambridge University Press

b) A separate title page should include the full manuscript title, plus names and contact information (mailing address, telephone, fax, and e-mail address) for all credited authors, in the order that their names should appear, as well as each author's academic rank and institutional affiliation. You may also include any acknowledgments or other author notes about the development of the research (e.g., previous presentations of it) as part of this separate title page. In the case of multiple authors, indicate which should receive all correspondence from the *APSR*. You may also choose to include a cover letter.

4. Please make sure the file contains all tables, figures, appendices, and references cited in the manuscript.
5. If your previous publications are cited, please do so in a way that does not make obvious the authorship of the work being submitted to the *APSR*. This is usually best accomplished by referring to yourself and any coauthors in the third person and including normal references to the work cited within the list of references. Your prior publications should be included in the reference section in their normal alphabetical location. Assuming that in-text references to your previous work are in the third person, you should not redact self-citations and references (possible exceptions being any work that is "forthcoming" in publication and that may not be generally accessible to others). Manuscripts with potentially compromised anonymity may be returned, potentially delaying the review processes.

Further Questions

Do not hesitate, in any cases of doubt, to consult the *APSR* Editorial Offices with more specific questions by telephone (940-891-6803) or by sending an e-mail to apsr@unt.edu.

ELECTRONIC ACCESS TO THE APSR

Back issues of the *APSR* are available in several electronic formats and through several vendors. Except for the last three years (as an annually "moving wall"), back issues of the *APSR* beginning with Volume 1, Number 1 (November 1906) are available online through JSTOR (http://www.jstor.org/). At present, JSTOR's complete journal collection is available only via institutional subscription (e.g., through many college and university libraries). For APSA members who do not have access to an institutional subscription to JSTOR, individual subscriptions to its *APSR* content are available. Please contact Member Services at APSA for further information, including annual subscription fees.

Individual members of the American Political Science Association can access recent issues of the *APSR*, *Perspectives*, and *PS* through the APSA website (www.apsanet.org) with their username and password. Individual nonmember access to the online edition is also available, but only through institutions that hold either a print-plus-electronic subscription or an electronic-only subscription, provided the institution has registered and activated its online subscription.

Full text access to current issues of the *APSR*, *Perspectives*, and *PS* is also available online by library subscription from a number of database vendors. Currently, these include University Microfilms Inc. (UMI) (via its CD-ROMs General Periodicals Online and Social Science Index and the online database ProQuest Direct); Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) (through its online database First Search as well as on CD-ROMs and magnetic tape); and the Information Access Company (IAC) (through its products Expanded Academic Index, InfoTrac, and several online services [see below]). Others may be added from time to time.

The *APSR* is also available on databases through six online services: Datastar (Datastar), Business Library (Dow Jones), Cognito (IAC), Encarta Online Library (IAC), IAC Business (Dialog), and Newsearch (Dialog).

The editorial office of the *APSR* is not involved in the subscription process to either JSTOR for back issues or the other vendors for current issues. Please contact APSA, your reference librarian, or the database vendor for further information about availability.

OTHER CORRESPONDENCE

The American Political Science Association's address, telephone, and fax are 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20036, (202) 483–2512 (voice), and (202) 483–2657 (fax). E-mail: apsa@apsanet.org. Please direct correspondence as follows.

Information, including news and notes, for *PS*:

Dr. Robert J-P. Hauck, Editor, *PS*
E-mail: rhauck@apsanet.org

Circulation and subscription correspondence (domestic claims for nonreceipt of issues must be made within four months of the month of publication; overseas claims, within eight months):

Director of Member Services
E-mail: membership@apsanet.org
Reprint permissions:
E-mail: Rights@cambridge.org

Advertising information and rates:
Advertising Coordinator,
Cambridge University Press
E-mail: journals advertising@cambridge.org

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000652 Published online by Cambridge University Press

EXPEDITING REQUESTS FOR COPYING *APSR, PERSPECTIVES*, AND *PS* ARTICLES FOR CLASS USE AND OTHER PURPOSES

Class Use

The Comprehensive Publisher Photocopy Agreement between APSA and the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) permits bookstores and copy centers to receive expedited clearance to copy articles from the *APSR* and *PS* in compliance with the APSA's policies and applicable fees. The general fee for articles is 75 cents per copy. However, current APSA policy levies no fee for the first 10 copies of a printed article, whether in course packs or on reserve. Smaller classes that rely heavily on articles (i.e., upper-level undergraduate and graduate classes) can take advantage of this provision, and faculty ordering 10 or fewer course packs should bring it to the attention of course pack providers. APSA policy also permits free use of the electronic library reserve, with no limit on the number of students who can access the electronic reserve.

Both large and small classes that rely on these articles can take advantage of this provision. The CCC's address, telephone, and fax are 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, (978) 750–8400 (voice), and (978) 750–4474 (fax). This agreement pertains only to the reproduction and distribution of APSA materials as hard copies (e.g., photocopies, microfilm, and microfiche).

The Association of American Publishers (AAP) has created a standardized form for college faculty to submit to a copy center or bookstore to request copyrighted material for course packs. The form is available through the CCC, which will handle copyright permissions.

APSA also has a separate agreement pertaining to CCC's Academic E-Reserve Service. This agreement allows electronic access for students and instructors of a designated class at a designated institution for a specified article or set of articles in electronic format. Access is by password for the duration of a class.

Please contact your librarian, the CCC, or the APSA Reprints Department for further information.

APSR Authors

If you are the author of an *APSR* article, you may use your article in course packs or other printed materials without payment of royalty fees, and you may post it at personal or institutional websites as long as the APSA copyright notice is included.

Other Uses of APSA-Copyrighted Materials

For any further copyright issues, please contact the APSA Reprints Department.

INDEXING

Articles appearing in the *APSR* before June 1953 were indexed in *The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature*. Current issues are indexed in *ABC Pol Sci*; *America, History and Life 1954–*; Book Review Index; Current Contents: Social and Behavioral Sciences; EconLit; *Energy Information Abstracts*; Environmental Abstracts; Historical Abstracts; Index of Economic Articles; Information Service Bulletin; International Bibliography of Book Reviews of Scholarly Literature in the Humanities and Social Sciences; International Bibliography of Periodical Literature in the Humanities and Social Sciences; International Index; International Political Science Abstracts; the *Journal of Economic Literature*; Periodical Abstracts; Public Affairs; Public Affairs Information Service International Recently Published Articles; Reference Sources; Social Sciences and Humanities Index; Social Sciences Index; Social Work Research and Abstracts; and Writings on American History. Some of these sources may be available in electronic form through local public or educational libraries. Microfilm of the *APSR*, beginning with Volume 1, and the index of the *APSR* through 1969 are available through University Microfilms Inc., 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106 (www.umi.com). The Cumulative Index to the *American Political Science Review*, Volumes 63 to 89: 1969–95, is available through the APSA.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000652 Published online by Cambridge University Press