

Reviewer B Comment review:

Camp One: Those Hostile to Psychoabable

1. Claims are too universal, offers no recommendation for psychoanalysis as a tool for getting at the particulars of the case of Long. Lacks specificity. WORSE: it advocates a non-rhetorical theory of charisma and eloquence.
2. Gender trouble: only creates problems, the psychological/cultural assignments of gender are unclear. You say universal structure, but just as much of a case can be made for cultural constructedness.
3. Seems to reduce charisma to oral encounter, which must be a slip since most of the evidence comes from the reading of monuments.
4. Lacks empirical data or looking at Long's actual words; all seems "*post hoc*," and more of an excuse to discuss psychoanalysis than a study of demagoguery.

Camp Two: The Paper on its Own Terms

1. Tells us nothing about charisma. Rather, it says that hysteria produced the monuments. But, once could also argue that the assassination was more of a cause. To produce a theory of charisma, here, you would need to tie to Long's discourse, which is another paper altogether.
2. To say the monuments are phallic is fun, but says nothing (all monuments are phallic, standing in for a missing person, etc.). The hysterical triangle analogy is a "weak" form of psychoanalytic critique, and no attempt is made to describe the monuments features.
3. The reading of Robo-Huey is the most potentially interesting but does absolutely nothing (moreso than Nevadian hysteria over animatronic Greek gods). So what? What is it about animatronics that makes them more monumental? Why is it important? Questions like this go unanswered.
4. "Fascism is underwritten by death" an absurd line (so are all political systems).