tions with China, rather than rely on coercion, in order to realize its national interests while it simultaneously cooperates with China to minimize bilateral and global economic instability.

Chinese ideational power includes the policymaking competence of its policymakers and diplomats, comprehensive national focus on research and innovation, cultural attributes that facilitate economic development, and a development model of authoritarian state-managed capitalism that many national leaderships consider an attractive alternative to U.S. democratic-led unregulated capitalism. Lampton also addresses Chinese efforts to promote worldwide popular interest in China, including its promotion of tourism and its funding of Confucian institutes in many countries.

Having established the sources of Chinese influence, Lampton assesses China’s relations with its neighbors. He observes that China has developed cooperative relations with its many smaller neighbors, but the greater challenge is developing and sustaining cooperation with its larger neighbors—Japan, Russia, and India.

Lampton’s analysis includes a discussion of the most pressing challenge to China’s rise—domestic change. Success requires that China manage the multiple political, social, economic, and environmental problems that accompany rapid economic modernization and thus maintain social and economic stability, the prerequisite to continued modernization. He is appropriately cautious about predicting China’s ability to manage mounting domestic challenges.

The final chapter of *The Three Faces of Chinese Power* considers the implications of the rise of China for the United States. Lampton sees the glass as half full. He recognizes the challenges that China poses to the United States and the bilateral challenges for maintaining U.S.–China cooperation. Nonetheless, he is confident that the rise of China can ultimately benefit Americans, that China and the United States can cooperatively manage emerging conflicts, and that they can work together to sustain a stable and prosperous global order.

**ROBERT ROSS**  
*Boston College*

**Presidents Creating the Presidency: Deeds Done in Words** by Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press, 2008. 384 pp. Cloth, $63.00; paper, $25.00.

The Constitution mandates almost nothing in the way of presidential rhetoric. But as Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson argue in this timely reworking of their 1990 book *Deeds Done in Words*, the responsibilities it does assign require rhetoric in order to be fully activated. As constitutional ambiguities are worked out in practice over time, “rhetoric is a key part of the ways in which presidents exercise power, expand executive power, and establish precedents for its use by their successors” (p. 336). Thus, “these words are deeds; in their speaking, the presidency is constituted and reconstituted” (p. 341).
As in the earlier volume, “these words” are largely those that flow explicitly or traditionally from constitutional processes—veto messages or inaugural addresses, for instance. But the present work updates and restructures its predecessor. New examples from the Bill Clinton and George W. Bush administrations are integrated into extant chapters, and two additional types of discourse are analyzed in new chapters. One is termed the “national eulogy,” (p. 6) reflecting the presidential role of guiding the nation through tragedy, as in Clinton’s 1995 Oklahoma City remarks. The other, the “de facto item veto,” (p. 5) is given a longer history, but its inclusion is inspired largely by Bush’s wave of such claims linked to enacted legislation.

The latter addition suggests the importance of low-salience administrative strategies to presidential power, underplayed here; but it also highlights a useful conceptual shift in the new volume toward interbranch interaction and the role of discourse in shaping the scope of executive authority vis-à-vis other actors. The revised structure moves from functions exercised by the president alone to those carried out in conjunction with Congress, before returning to presidents’ efforts to define their legacy through their farewell addresses.

As communications scholars, Campbell and Jamieson highlight aspects of presidential speech relatively rare in political science’s “public presidency” literature (of which, indeed, they cite little). They focus instead on genres of rhetoric and argue that doing so helps us to classify presidential speech, and also recognize how past speech constrains current practice. A ceremonial occasion that requires epideictic rhetoric, for instance, must, to succeed, strike universal themes of both continuity and change, writing the incumbent president into the flow of American political development. Presidents aim for the timeless, though often achieve only the banal.

A perspective grounded in formal rules of rhetoric allows the book to link and compare their application across the full sweep of U.S. history. This is a real strength, leading to key insights for those more attuned to a hived-off “modern presidency.” Andrew Johnson’s impeachment trial, for instance, is usefully compared to recent iterations. And while Johnson’s trial is often seen simply as a triumph of reason over partisanship, the authors clearly show that reason could not be assumed but had to be induced: converted into rhetoric and argued for.

It is at times less clear that words are equal to deeds, except in a tautological sense. Granting a pardon requires rhetoric, to be sure, but it is not obvious that “better” rhetoric can win public acceptance of a pardon otherwise tainted. Were the political difficulties stemming from Gerald Ford’s pardon of Richard Nixon a result of “pardoning rhetoric” (p. 135)? Or did they stem from the fact of the pardon itself? Attorney General Eric Holder would surely have faced a happier confirmation process if Bill Clinton had not pardoned Marc Rich, no matter how fluently he did so.

As this suggests, a certain ambiguity around questions of causation is a byproduct of the book’s approach. Most broadly, communicative “success,” in
external terms, is hard to establish, and the authors do not seek to provide systematic measures for how well a given rhetorical effort worked or failed. If the point of a given address is to “reconstitute” the public (p. 43), for instance, it is not clear how we know if said public actually feels reconstituted.

This volume, then, will not satisfy those seeking empirical verification of rhetorical impact. But that is not its aim. Taken on its own terms, it remains an enlightening and newly strengthened contribution to our understanding of the role of substantive eloquence in governance.

Andrew Rudalevige
Dickinson College


The subject of campaign negativity has attracted considerable attention in recent years. Political observers have bemoaned the rise of attack ads and the hostile tone of civil discourse. Many claim that our country’s campaigns are getting dirtier, and that this undermines the quality of American democracy. Yet few of these criticisms have been based on systematic evidence. Opinions and anecdotes often outweigh clear data or compelling reasoning.

In this book, Emmett Buell and Lee Sigelman present a forceful counterbalance to conventional wisdom on this subject. Using original analysis, they argue that campaign negativity has not increased, and in looking at races from 1960 through 2004, the most-negative campaigns occurred in 1960, 1972, and 1992.


To reach these conclusions, the authors assess over 17,000 campaign statements taken from 11,000 New York Times news stories. They classify statements based on tone, object of discussion, subject area, attacker, and time of the attack. Using this material, they find that campaign negativity depends in large part on the competitiveness of the race and the political circumstances surrounding particular campaigns.

The authors deserve credit for being clear and systematic in their approach to negativity. More so than most researchers, they are very explicit in describing their database, coding rules, and approach to the assessment. Where their methods and conclusions differ from those of other researchers, they say so. There is no doubt that they have compiled one of the most comprehensive databases of campaign statements in modern elections.