

THE PRESIDENCY AND THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN JOHN H. ALDRICH, JOHN D. GRIFFIN, AND JILL RICKERSHAUSER pdf

1: Table of contents for The presidency and the political system

Presidency and the election campaign / John H. Aldrich, John D. Griffin, and Jill Rickershauser. Presidency and political trust / Marc J. Hetherington and Suzanne Globetti. Presidential spectacle / Bruce Miroff.

In the context of the Democratic presidential primary, evaluations of candidates by more politically sophisticated partisans were affected by the experimental treatment that mentioned the traditional Democratic issue of social security, whereas less sophisticated respondents were more affected by the issue treatment that mentioned the economy. Strategic voting; Presidential primaries; Electability; Viability; Substance 1. Introduction therefore retrospective evaluations are of lesser value. There are many plausible candidates, most of whom In most presidential primary campaigns, voters are are unknown to the public prior to the campaign. In ad- asked to make a complicated decision with few of the dition, the decision-making context is unusually dy- usual features found in most general elections. The set namic, with many aspects of the campaign changing of alternatives contains candidates from within the dramatically from one week to the next. The voter is same party, so partisan identification or the comparison asked to make a complex decision and asked to do so between competing party records or platforms is irrele- very quickly and often with little information readily vant. Often, candidates within the same party differ lit- at hand. Two general themes are often cited as the basis tle over ideology and policy stances; they distinguish for evaluation and assessment in this dynamic decision themselves instead over policy priorities. In this paper, we report the results of an exper- E-mail addresses: Rickershauser , aldrich iment that tests the effect of different information on duke. Candidates and journalists are also aware of out over several months. Currently, the primaries occur this. Voters respond more pos- sible in order to gain more influence in the outcome. Those so voters make decisions with less opportunity to ac- who lament the quality of decision-making in such quire and assimilate information about candidates. A large number of plausible but mostly un- in primaries. Or is it both? We conducted an experiment that al- claim made by candidates to party leaders in seeking lowed for an early test, in a realistic context, of the their support. Nelson Rockefeller argued in both two categoriesdand of the trade-off voters make be- and that while Republicans might not like him tween substance and the horse race. This is a very sensible, even rational, view. In particular, it may be perfectly logical to con- The differences between candidates on many issues sider both the substantive claims of a candidate and are relatively slight in primary campaigns. Some his or her chances of winning. Keeter and Zukin, Aldrich and Alvarez show that in the ations. There may be this tional Democratic issues economy, poverty, etc. The campaign also demonstrated differing issue emphases. Experimental design Bob Dole and then-Vice President George Bush both took standard Republican stances on budget deficits We administered a survey to undergraduate stu- and taxes, but Dole emphasized the budget deficit and dents in introductory political science classes. Or is it the horse race? One hundred and fifty-nine students com- security was a low salience issue and the economy pleted it prior to the January 19th Iowa caucus. The re- was a high salience issue for young people. The central maining 41 completed the survey the morning after the test was whether the treated issue figured more promi- caucus. Horse race treatment media coverage. The questionnaire also included feel- ing thermometers evaluating the candidates and a vote Subjects receiving this treatment had an electability intention question. The treatment included electability information, issue Bush. This is particularly well suited to the Nine candidates were running for the Democratic race, where electability was a central critique of candi- nomination at that time. We specifically chose three dates and the opposing candidate was already known. Research Some students received just an issue emphasis state- suggests that candidates about whom little is known are ment, some received just an electability statement, and most affected by new information e. This produces a 3 by 3 matrix see While Clark had a significant level of support due to Fig. With [Positive Electability, Negative Electabil- name recognition, he had entered the race later than ity, No statement] by [Social Security, Economy, No the other candidates so not as much was known about statement] there are nine surveys, randomly distributed.

THE PRESIDENCY AND THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN JOHN H. ALDRICH, JOHN D. GRIFFIN, AND JILL RICKERSHAUSER pdf

Very few people knew anything about For people receiving neither issue emphasis nor elect- Edwards at that point. Thus with three candidates, there were a total of most attention to issue y. See Appendix A for complete the treatment, the issue was the economy. For the other treatment wordings. There was also a group receiving neither statement. We designed the 3. Findings survey using poll data, which suggested that social Of the respondents, identified as Democrats, 3 46 identified as Republicans, and the rest identified as ei- Students who completed the survey on the 20th did not have sig- nificantly different responses than those who completed the survey on ther independents or members of a third party. Most the 15th and 16th so it is likely that most did not encounter much me- analyses look specifically at Democrats because those dia coverage of the Iowa caucus before taking the survey. The only are the people who would vote in the Democratic pri- small difference between the two groups is that students who took mary. However, Republicans and independents are the survey on the 20th had a somewhat higher opinion of John Ed- sometimes included when our hypothesis would expect wards, which is likely because the professor had discussed his candi- dacy in the previous class. However, because regressions run with non-Democrats to respond similarly. Regarding elect- and without those 41 students return the same results, we have in- ability, we hypothesize that Democrats will respond cluded them in the analyses presented here. One of the three candidates Clark, Dean, or Edwards was randomly assigned to each survey manipulation. Republicans will respond similarly but in the opposite Bush was widely expected to be a strong contender in direction, so all respondents are included in that analysis. To test the effects of electability in- dent strongly likes the candidate. Each respondent formation, we estimate the following equation: Republicans is counted as receiving the electability treatment. The rate the Democratic candidates 20 points lower than do other two feeling thermometers reported by respondent Democrats. Interestingly, positive electability impacts A are counted as not treated, and thus serve as a control. For Republicans, information that a candi- date is likely to beat George W. This experiment and the people generally, it is particularly important to investi- Democratic primaries allowed us to consider and test gate its effects on partisans. Standard errors are in parentheses. This is, in fact, the case. Among their first or second most important issue. Democrats, a positive statement about electability had In addition to testing whether any mention of an is- a significant effect whereas negative statements did sue affected feeling thermometer scores or if only not. That is, we ask if it is 5. Substance the case that a person who mentions the economy as the most important issue is more affected by the economy To investigate our theory that issue emphasis affects treatment. There are two hypotheses. While so- ces of winning the general election relative to George cial security is a traditional Democratic issue, we 6 assumed that college-aged people would not be as con- The question on the survey is: The data shows that our assumptions of next year. Please indicate the importance of these issues to you, on these two issues were correct. Of the five issues where 1 indicates that it is the most important and 5 indicates that about which pollsters most often asked in this period, it is the least important to you. However, issue emphasis should Table 2 have no consistent effect on Republicans. That pattern Scores on political knowledge questions is found in the data, though the analysis here only shows No. This finding about the economy 5 18 9. It might suggest that partisans are com- 6 32 It is also consistent with the hy- 8 30 Social security was Total a low salience issue to most respondents, and therefore information about a candidate emphasizing it might have made that issue more salient in the positive context groups using this measure of political sophistication: In contrast, the above and below the median see Table 3 for the items economy was already highly salient to most respondents and factor loadings. While there may be an effect, Feeling Thermometer it is not noticeable here. Despite the fact that all re- ings. Electability affects people regardless of the level spondents were enrolled in political science classes, of political sophistication see Model One. Controlling the levels of political knowledge varied significantly for political sophistication, Democrats rate candidates on questions about the American political system and more than 9 points higher on the feeling thermometer about people serving in the government see Table 2. It Based on the extant literature, we hypothesized that appears that voters consistently think strategically in the ten knowledge and two interest questions form one terms of electability. A confirmatory factor analysis using maxi- Political sophistication

THE PRESIDENCY AND THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN JOHN H. ALDRICH, JOHN D. GRIFFIN, AND JILL RICKERSHAUSER pdf

does alter the effects of issue emphasis. Political sophistication estimation showed that this emphasizes see Model Two. As in the previous analysis was, in fact, the case. The differences are Political sophistication considerable. To test Control of US House 0. Veto Override in Senate 0. Among less politically sophisticated respondents, it appears that both Democrats and non-Democrats are affected similarly see Table 4, Model 3. Put another way, respondents with lower levels of political sophistication behaved as we would expect voters to be affected similarly, whereas more sophisticated people react the same way to the same stimuli, whereas less sophisticated people react differently. Information about issue emphasis raised feelings with lesser interest in politics rates a candidate who emphasizes the economy a full 15 points higher than a candidate who does not. Another important finding in this study is that people with lower political sophistication not receive it. Interestingly, mentioning social security, began with an average feeling thermometer score of a low-salience issue, increased feeling thermometer score. Electability information is statistically significant. For both Republicans and Democrats, lower levels of political sophistication tended to moderate feelings before the treatment. Only respondents with Model 1:

THE PRESIDENCY AND THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN JOHN H. ALDRICH, JOHN D. GRIFFIN, AND JILL RICKERSHAUSER pdf

2: Project MUSE - The American Voter Revisited

The Presidency & the Political System, now in an updated sixth edition, incorporates the most recent research and scholarship on the presidency. Each of the 20 thought-provoking original essays, written by some of the field's most prominent scholars, explores an important aspect of the relationship between the presidency and our political system.

Additional Information In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: References Abramowitz, Alan I. Political Science and Politics Racial Attitudes and Partisanship in the U. Aldrich, Philip Paolino, and David W. Evidence from the , , , and Presidential Elections. Aldrich, Jill Rickershauser, and David W. Aldrich, and David W. Change and Continuity in the and Elections. Change and Continuity in the Elections. Evidence of an Issue Evolution. University of Chicago Press. Niemi, George Rabinowitz, and David W. Funk, and John R. Allsop, Dee, and Herbert F. Collective Preferences in Democratic Politics: Opinion Surveys and the Will o f the P eople. C ambridge University Press. Michael, and J ohn Brehm. Michael, and John Brehm. Hard Choices, Easy Answers: Values, Information, and American Public Opinion. Michael, and J onathan Nagler. Voter Choice in the Presidential Election. Michael, and Jonathan Nagler. Cohen, and Theodore M. Political Attitudes over the Life Span: The Bennington Women after Fifty Years. University of Wisconsin Press. The C reation o f a D emocratic M ajority: The Case of Negative Advertising and Turnout. A Test of Three Key Hypotheses. You are not currently authenticated. View freely available titles:

THE PRESIDENCY AND THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN JOHN H. ALDRICH, JOHN D. GRIFFIN, AND JILL RICKERSHAUSER pdf

3: Summary/Reviews: The presidency and the political system /

Aldrich, John H., John D. Griffin, and Jill Rickershauser. "The Presidency and the Election Campaign: Altering Voters' Priorities in the Election." In *The Presidency and the Political System*, edited by Michael Nelson, Congressional Quarterly Press, Washington, DC.

Bibliographic record and links to related information available from the Library of Congress catalog. Contents data are machine generated based on pre-publication provided by the publisher. Contents may have variations from the printed book or be incomplete or contain other coding. Contents Preface 00 Contributors 00 1. The American Presidency in Comparative Perspective: Systems, Situations, and Leaders 00 Bert A. Presidential Competence 00 Paul J. The Presidency and the Nominating Process: Politics and Power 00 Richard Pious 8. The Presidency and the Election Campaign: Hetherington and Suzanne Globetti The Presidential Spectacle 00 Bruce Miroff The Presidency and the Press: The Presidency and Interest Groups: Milkis Part V Presidents and Government The Institutional Presidency 00 John P. Presidents and the Bureaucracy: Management Imperatives in a Separation of Powers System 00 The President and Congress 00 Matthew Dickinson The Presidency and the Judiciary 00 David A. Divided Government and Policymaking: Negotiating the Laws 00 Paul J. Quirk and Bruce Nesmith The President and the Cabinet 00 Andrew Rudalevige The Presidency at War 00 Andrew J. Polsky Index 00 CT: Every syllabus for a college course notes the term and year the course is offered, usually in the upper right-hand corner of the first page. In many departments, this is simply a clerical entry: Timing matters immensely, however, in a course on the American presidency. Indeed, what makes political science so interesting is that its subject succinctly described by political scientist Harold D. Lasswell as "who gets what, when, and how" refuses to stand still. This point applies especially to the presidency, in which the nature of the institution is so closely intertwined with that of the person who, at any given moment, occupies it. Bush and his Democratic challenger, Sen. Kerry, and the consolidation of united party government under the auspices of the Republican Party. All of these political developments and more, along with the new contributions to the flourishing scholarly literature on the presidency and the political system they have inspired, are treated fully in this eighth edition. To note that the authors have taken recent developments into account is not to say that this is a "current events" book--far from it. The presidency is an office with deep roots in history, shaped by decisions that were made at the Constitutional Convention of and by more than two centuries of change in the system since its founding. It also is shaped by the history and current functioning of the myriad parts of the American political system, such as Congress, the courts, the bureaucracy, interest groups, the media, public opinion, the electoral process, and the party system. This broader understanding of the presidency underlies all of the analyses of more recent events that the writers present. The most noteworthy addition to the eighth edition is the roster of new contributors: Topically, this edition devotes greater attention to the presidency at war, the presidency and the cabinet, and presidential-bureaucratic relations in comparative perspective. I do not agree with everything that every author has to say in this book; nor will any reader. But together the contributors constitute an all-star team of presidential scholars, and the intellectual substance of the chapters is fully matched by their readability. Through seven previous editions, this book has been widely assigned in courses and extensively cited and reviewed in scholarly books and articles. Students may be assured of receiving the most comprehensive possible understanding of the presidency, and scholars will continue to find the essays valuable in conducting their research. I am deeply grateful to those who helped in the preparation of the eighth edition, the authors first and foremost. Hargrove of Vanderbilt University helped me to think through the themes and organization of the first edition, and Barbara de Boinville served as a helpful editor. Every edition since then has enjoyed the gently guiding hand of Brenda Carter. The fourth and fifth editions also benefited from the work of Joanne Ainsworth and Talia Greenberg, as did the sixth edition from the contributions of Gwenda Larsen, Belinda Josey, and Debbie K. Nancy Geltman and Colleen Ganey contributed skillfully and well to this eighth edition.

**THE PRESIDENCY AND THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN JOHN H. ALDRICH,
JOHN D. GRIFFIN, AND JILL RICKERSHAUSER pdf**

Presidents -- United States.

THE PRESIDENCY AND THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN JOHN H. ALDRICH, JOHN D. GRIFFIN, AND JILL RICKERSHAUSER pdf

4: How Fear and War Lead to G.W.B's Reelection by Thomas Anastos on Prezi

Rickershauser 3 REFERENCES John H. Aldrich Department of Political Science Duke University Box Durham, NC aldrich@www.enganchecubano.com ()

The Presidential Election Paul R. The election of involves two linked and countervailing puzzles. How did President George W. Bush manage to win at all, avoiding the fates of George H. Bush and Jimmy Carter? This would seem to Electronic supplementary material Supplementary material is available in the online version of this article at <http://www.nature.com/nature>: We think that the juxtaposition of these questions will help to explain the outcome of the election and of the pattern of the results. Of primary import was that George W. Bush was the incumbent. It is well established that campaigns with an incumbent are different from those without one. Voters will evaluate the performance of the incumbent, both overall and in particular spheres. Those evaluations will largely determine whether there will even be a real contest between the incumbent and his challenger, and the outcome if there is a competitive contest. Presidents with strongly positive job evaluations tend to win by substantial margins; those with negative evaluations tend to lose Abramson et al. Bush and his job performance were the focal points of the campaign. Partisans are more likely to evaluate their candidate positively than are persons who identify with the other party. Thus the distribution of party identification in the electorate is an important contextual feature. If one party has substantially more adherents than the other, as was true for Democrats in the s, there would be a significant bias in the competitive balance. In , the partisan balance was about even. The General Social Survey conducted among 2, respondents from September through December found a similar small Democratic advantage. As the previous paragraph implies, the distribution of party identification varies over time. So too do opinions on public policy and governmental performance and the relationship between those things and party identification. One of the most widely discussed changes in American politics in recent decades is political polarization. Poll data compiled by Jacobson illustrates the point. The first group was always highest, the last was always lowest, and Independents fell in between. Moreover, GOP ratings varied relatively little over the 4 years, but the range for the other two groups was substantial. In particular, while for the first 8 months of the Bush presidency the ratings given by Democrats and Independents were significantly lower than those from Republicans, after the terrorist attacks on September 11, the gap in ratings closed considerably. Over the next 3 years, Democratic and Independent ratings declined almost monotonically, opening a huge gap relative to Republicans. This point gap was 18 points greater than the inter-party difference for President Clinton 8 years earlier Abramson et al. Offering a more long-term perspective, Jacobson also shows , p. Specifically he presents approval ratings by party in the first post-election Gallup poll for presidents elected to a second term. Bush was 76 points. Terms of Evaluation Substantive Context The elements just discussed capture long-term considerations relevant to Now we turn to a consideration of the terms of evaluation that voters used for 1 The exit poll data were taken from www. The poll had four formats, but all four measured questions about partisanship. Bush and John F. Kerry because of conditions specific to this election. NES data show that the public had a decidedly negative picture of the state of the economy at the time of the election: Thus this perennially important issue was a decided negative for the president. Moreover, the president decided to respond to the terrorist threat by seeking regime change by force not only in Afghanistan, but also in Iraq. Thus the campaign took place in the context of an ongoing two-front war. While the state of the economy is always a major electoral influence, foreign policy is important only sporadically Abramson et al. But the presence of terrorist threats and war made one of those times. Thus we would expect these three issues to be the most significant ones in explaining the pattern of election results. The NES asked about seven candidate traits in , including intelligence, morality, knowledge, honesty, and whether the candidate could make up his mind. All of these traits could be expected to have some influence on voter evaluations, but two of them—“whether the candidates cared about people like the respondents and whether they were strong leaders”—appear to be particularly relevant to the issues

THE PRESIDENCY AND THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN JOHN H. ALDRICH, JOHN D. GRIFFIN, AND JILL RICKERSHAUSER pdf

of war, terrorism, and the economy. In the face of external threats, voters think that having a strong leader as president is especially important, and it seems that having a president who cares would be important to voters who are concerned about the state of the economy and other domestic matters. Theoretical Rationale This explanation of the substantive context was developed not only in light of our observations of the contest, but also in light of our theoretical understanding of elections. Our description begins with party identification and its implications, moves to the consideration of central issues, and finally considers evaluations of the two candidates, and evaluation of the Republicans as managers of the government. This theory has been revised in the more sophisticated, multi-equation formulation of, e. The view presented here, however, builds on those theories in part by focusing on retrospective voting, particularly the economic and foreign policy issues that Fiorina so elegantly developed. Empirical Overview of the Context This discussion yields the elements we think are central in explaining the results of the contest. First, voters should focus on how well the incumbent has done on the most important issues. Clearly the most advantageous issue for the president was terrorism. Indeed, half the sample strongly disapproved. Finally, on handling the economy, the proportion of positive opinions was nearly identical to those on Iraq: This made terrorism the only one of the three issues on which the balance of opinion was positive. If terrorism were the only important issue to the voters, we could have expected Bush to win by a large margin in an election that was never in doubt. Conversely, the course of the war in Iraq and the perceived state of the economy were heavy burdens for the president in the campaign. Therefore, if the issue of terrorism had been absent, and the voters had focused only on Iraq and the economy, Bush likely would have had a very difficult time. Table 3 presents the distribution of opinion on the two personal traits we consider to be of greatest relevance. We then subtract the rating for Kerry from the rating for Bush to get the relative evaluation. We can see that each of the candidates was advantaged on one and disadvantaged on the other. Here only a third said that the statement better described Bush, and almost half said it better described Kerry. Consider, for example, how polarized were the perceptions of Bush, as measured by the feeling thermometer scale. Consider also that in all evaluations in , the strongly approve and strongly disapprove categories were much more frequently chosen than the approve and the disapprove responses, again unlike earlier years. We have six variables that capture the main considerations we have argued to be most important in Pundits often saw great polarization between the two parties or two ideological groups or, perhaps, both everywhere they looked. Whether the public has polarized policy preferences is not germane to the nature of their evaluations of political choices, however. When the world hands the voter a consistent diet of fairly to very liberal Democrats and fairly to very conservative Republicans, their evaluations of those political figures will reflect the degree of elite polarization. Even slightly liberal voters will evaluate Democrats more highly than Republicans and even slightly conservative voters will choose the Republican alternative. Even a moderately liberal voter will react to this consistency in Bush and Kerry in just the opposite way. It is the consistency of the elites that imposes this consistency in evaluations and choices among the public. At least, something closely approximating this only slightly overdrawn portrait is just what we observe in the election data. We begin by observing the high level of predictability of the vote. What little room there is for deviation from voting for the higher-scored candidate is found among those reporting only slight differences between the two candidates. This variable is, of course, a strong predictor of the vote, even one including party identification, with a coefficient of a whopping 1. So high is the correspondence that we like others before us, e. As noted, it is common for scholars to treat thermometer evaluations as surrogates for the vote. It allows them to use the interval scales, which require simpler and more powerful statistical tools, and also to capitalize on the greater observed variation of two point measures compared to a dichotomous vote choice. Because of the very strong collinearity between thermometer differences and the vote, this is done without explicit justification of the use of thermometer measures on theoretical grounds. However, because we find some noticeable and consistent, but relatively small, differences in the patterns of variables related to the vote in comparison to the difference in thermometer scores it becomes important for us to justify their use as a supplement to an exclusive focus on

THE PRESIDENCY AND THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN JOHN H. ALDRICH, JOHN D. GRIFFIN, AND JILL RICKERSHAUSER pdf

vote choice. We offer two such justifications. First, having found these differences, it is important that we present them to the research public so that scholars considering their use in the future can make an informed decision in light of the evidence of at least some small degree of difference. Second, precisely Polit Behav For example, virtually all models of the national vote for Congress give a central role to evaluations of the president—typically as one of the two or three core variables explaining both off- and on-year votes. Many theories of voting place evaluations of the two candidates center-stage, from The American Voter onward. However, this is perhaps clearest in the systems-equations model of the vote i. Therefore, we will consistently compare the estimations of our models on both dependent measures, drawing attention to the differences as well as similarities in their estimates. What is at least somewhat more novel in this election year is the large number of other general evaluations that yield something very close to the high level of correspondence between feeling thermometer scores and the vote. In earlier years, presidential job approval ratings were, of course, linked to the vote, but imperfectly. Democrats might, and many did, give positive ratings to Eisenhower and to Reagan, for example. Increased polarization, however, has also polarized approval ratings as discussed above. Consider, for another example, that in , the general approval measure had a pseudo R2 with the vote of . Thus, it approximated the strength of the relationship between the feeling thermometers and the vote—without even considering who the opposition candidate was. Even regressed alone on the thermometer differences, this approval rating yielded an R2 of . That is to say, approval ratings corresponded closely to the difference in thermometer evaluations and to the vote. We will return to these measures several times, treating them as distinct. Our general point is that they, like other evaluative measures are very strongly correlated—each with each other, with the vote, and with the other general evaluations we are considering in this section. Still, each is in principle distinct, and the evidence suggests that the electorate as a whole responded to these as autonomous and with nuance.

5: 40 results in SearchWorks catalog

The Presidency and the Election Campaign: Altering Voters' Priorities in the Election 00 John H. Aldrich, John D. Griffin, and Jill Rickershauser Part IV Presidents and Politics 9. *The Presidency and Political Trust* 00 Marc J. Hetherington and Suzanne Globetti

6: CQ Press - Change and Continuity in the Elections

The presidency and the political system. presidency and the election campaign / John H. Aldrich, John D. Griffin, and Jill Rickershauser --The presidency and.

THE PRESIDENCY AND THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN JOHN H. ALDRICH, JOHN D. GRIFFIN, AND JILL RICKERSHAUSER pdf

C and data structures book by balaguruswamy filetype Thoreaus philosophy of life, with special consideration of the influence of Hindoo philosophy Late 19th century furniture by Berkey Gay Barnes Noble Health Basics Menopause Readings in American Indian Law Greek vegetarian cookery A glass of wine with you, sir Beneath this mask meghan march Papers on social science utilisation. The Great Necessity Underwater electrical equipment Devore statistics 8th edition Subtracting Fears for the Future Persephone Is Transpluto V.8. The pioneers; or, The sources of the Susquehanna. Cisco ccna security study guide You say you dont want evolution Jannie is a warm, gentle name C. Ellen Watts The cultural dimension of international business 7th edition V. 1. A phological introduction Intellectual contexts John Stevenson and David Thomas My memoirs of Concord in the great Civil war. Management of hepatitis a Tuberculosis Caroline S. Zeind, Helene Hardy, and Greta K. Gourley The decline and fall of the negro-minstrely The essential Parley P. Pratt Lead As You Live, Live As You Lead Call of duty advanced warfare art of Programming as if people mattered Concise geologic time scale Chicago independent Two Heads Are Often Better Than One Love hina manga espa±ol Great German Recipes Gleanings on the Magdalen Islands The correspondence of Edmund Burke, April 1744 to July 1797. Discourse category (text-type/genre) Boulding, K. E. The limits to progress in evolutionary systems. Student behavior reflection sheet Cell and tissue transplantation into the adult brain