

# QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH

Department of Communication Studies  
4505 Maryland Parkway, Box 454052  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
Las Vegas, NV 89154-4052  
david.henry@unlv.edu

14 November 2005

Professor Joshua Gunn  
Department of Communication Studies  
University of Texas  
Austin, TX 78712-0115

Dear Professor Gunn:

The reviews of your manuscript, “Hystericizing Huey: Psychoanalysis, Charismatic Monumentalism, and Southern Demagoguery?” (05-027), accompany this letter. Reviewer A recommends against resubmission. Reviewer B marked both “reject” and “resubmit after major revision,” then observed that if the other reader opposed resubmission s/he agreed that was probably the wisest course. After reading your paper and studying the critics’ assessments, I am persuaded that the essay should not be resubmitted to *QJS*.

The reviewers’ comments are thorough and self-explanatory, I think, so I’ll not rehearse them in detail here. I would, though, emphasize the lines of evaluation they share in common. First, both wonder—in their comments to the author as well as the recommendations to me—what the project wants to be about. As A writes, it is not really about Long or about charisma or about demagoguery, as—and B concurs here—these terms and names are included in the manuscript but not defined, explained, or linked one to another. Second, the paper “seems to be about,” in B’s words, an effort to develop an alternative route to engaging in rhetorical criticism. Yet here, too, too little is explained and developed, while too much is asserted and glossed over. Finally, Reviewer A apologizes at the end of her/his critique if his/her “judgments sound harsh.” But s/he attributes that possibility to the essay’s tone, which s/he terms “remarkably self-indulgent and at times even arrogant and offensive.” Do I believe that is your aim? No. As I read the paper do I understand how the presentation has that effect? Absolutely. The project aspires—or seems to—to move rhetorical-critical scholarship in new directions. To do that will require gaining support along the way as you “teach” readers the value of what’s argued. Insulting an audience, whether intentionally or not (and I believe it is not), is counter-productive to that objective.

The reviews provide, I think, excellent analyses of the current paper, as well as constructive suggestions on how you might proceed. They arrive at recommendations that are not supportive of the finished work at this stage, but they do offer a good number of suggestions on how you might address their concerns. I hope that you find their readings useful. And despite the outcome this time, I also hope you continue to consider *QJS* when preparing your scholarship for review.

Sincerely,

David Henry, Editor