

**FROM IDEAL TYPE *CHARISMA* TO REAL TYPE  
*CHARISMATIC POLITICIANS*  
(LINGUISTIC DISCURSIVE MODEL FOR IDENTIFYING  
FUTURE CHARISMATIC LEADERS)**

**Petlyuchenko N.**

**INTRODUCTION**

The phenomenon of charisma has been a popular object of humanitarian studies for the past hundred years and has given rise to numerous disputes about its nature and forms among sociologists, political scientists, psychologists, philosophers, theologians, anthropologists, and linguists<sup>1</sup>. The latter rely on the assumption that the charismatic, as *l'homme de paroles*<sup>2</sup>, expresses him- or herself and his/her subjectivity through communicative and social actions, which are impossible without language and gestures<sup>3</sup>. Therefore, the focus of linguistic studies on *l'homme charismatique* who has inexplicable power over a large number of people and achieves it through various means including language contributes to the further development of the theory of *linguistic*, or *discursive*, personality<sup>4</sup> and opens new approaches to the study of various ideal-typical constructs (charismatic, genius, passionarian, authoritarian) in the context of their language, implemented in empirical reality (discourse)<sup>5</sup>.

This section, which analyzes one of today's revolutionary concepts—political charisma—will consider (1) the origins of Weber's theory of charismatic domination, the chronology of the origin and development of the concept of "charisma" over the period from 1910 to the present; (2) the specifics of the historical taboo on charisma in the social and political discourse of Germany and the yearning for a new charismatic (Helmut Schmidt, Franz Josef Strauss, Willy Brandt, Angela Merkel, Joachim Gauck); (3) successful adaptation of the German concept in American political discourse (John F. Kennedy) and the rivalry of two

---

<sup>1</sup> Petljutschenko 2014, p. 336.

<sup>2</sup> Hagège 1985.

<sup>3</sup> Petlyuchenko 2015, p. 192.

<sup>4</sup> Потапенко 2012.

<sup>5</sup> Петлюченко 2009.

charismas (Barack Obama vs. Donald Trump); (4) methodology for discovering a future charismatic in the search for *Grassroots-Charisma*.

### **1. The Concept of Charisma in Political Discourse: in Search of New Personalities and New Ideas**

Contemporary political discourse is currently marked with a revived interest in the concept of charisma developed by renowned German sociologist Max Weber and, consequently, a resumed search for new political figures with an ability to be inspired by great ideas and to inspire others with these ideas. A distinctive feature of the situation with charismatic leaders in present-day Germany, however, is the "charismatic vacuum" that has appeared in the birthplace of the concept with no indication of being filled not only due to Angela Merkel's prolonged rational leadership but also because of the lack of charismatic crisis managers in the imminent complicated situation with refugees, the rise of right/left radicals, as well as the great changes in the landscape of German streets.

At the same time, the media often ask whether German politicians need charismatic qualities that were excluded from the positive arsenal of their rhetorical and argumentative strategies and, first of all, the Chancellor due to their negative associations with the German historical background of national socialism and, above all, with the "dark" charisma of A. Hitler. As much as the Germans would like to receive a fresh charismatic leader like Emmanuel Macron (France) or Barack Obama (USA) and a variety of prominent figures in the German political arena (Sahra Wagenknecht, Gregor Gysi, Robert Habeck, Annalena Baerbock, Alexander Gauland), such charismatic influencer has yet to appear but the readiness for his or her projection in Germany is quite high considering the amazing success of the far-right Alternative for Germany.

In Ukraine, which is currently in a state of war and the aftermath of the presidential elections, there is also great demand for a new charismatic leader. In this context, it should be emphasized that the charismatic type of leadership, which first manifested itself in Ukraine in a distinct form during the First Maidan (2004, Orange Revolution), was associated with the names of such politicians as Viktor Yushchenko and Yulia Tymoshenko and underwent changes after the Second Maidan (2014, Revolution of Dignity). The period between the Maidans was marked by decharismatization of the political establishment: the demand

for charisma was dropped because it is mostly needed during periods of revolutions and crises whereas a country's economic development requires rational approaches. We needed our own Ukrainian Konrad Adenauer whose role was unsuccessfully claimed in 2014 by Petro Poroshenko who received a vote of confidence from the people and wasted it—the visa-free travel arrangement with Europe was a mild anesthetic appreciated with certain reserve only by wealthy europhiliacs. Attempts to boost his charisma by manipulating such concepts as VIRA/FAITH, MOVA/LANGUAGE and ARMIYA/ARMY as a formula for uniting Ukrainians in a critical economic situation yielded poor returns, and Yulia Tymoshenko, the Phoenix of the Ukrainian political discourse, is once again coming to the foreground today. Due to the absence of young charismatic leaders, she is again delighted to take up this vacant position returning to the old tested arsenal of rhetorical tools, "I have a NEW TASK for you!"

In post-Maidan Ukraine, there were quite a lot of precocious charismatics fostered by the Revolution of Dignity but they were parochial and reflected the interests of only a small part of the population – these were either ultra-right nationalists (Andriy Biletskyi), left-wing populists (Ilya Kiva), or revolutionary *Robin Hoods* (Mykhailo Havryliuk, Volodymyr Parasiuk) with no unifying significance for all Ukrainians. A contrasting trend of the current election season is the unexpected appearance of such show business celebrities as Volodymyr Zeleskiy who won the 2019 presidential elections by a landslide having embodied electoral insurrections against Petro Poroshenko's politics and ideology and to a certain degree symbolized the end of the old soviet-era elite.

Thus, for both countries, it is vital to find future German and Ukrainian charismatic figures among candidates from the people, the grassroots movements. *Grassroots charisma* is in embryonic state; it is not manifested in the media but its features can be found by directly observing novice politicians at rallies, pickets, signature collections and other social and political events. An important point here is the first public attribution of charisma in the media and social networks, active "combating" spirit expressed in opposing old party structures and the ability to create their own party and lead it into the future like Kevin Kühnert (SPD/JUSOS, Germany).

## 2. Actual talent or skillful staging?

### The roots of the CHARISMA concept. Origin and timeline

Analysis of the origins of the CHARISMA concept is quite interesting as it explains many things in the most attractive terminological creations of German sociologist Max Weber and helps clarify the later differences and interpretations of the *charismatic attributes* of a political leader, which, in the opinion of some scholars, are congenital or gifted from above, and in the opinion of others, and above all of Weber himself, are the result of projection, i.e. can be attributed to the leader by enthusiastic followers as a reflection of their own ideas about him<sup>6</sup>.

This ambivalent approach is primarily caused by the fact that Weber transferred the concept of charisma from religious to political discourse, which allowed him to trace his religious and sociological studies by types of domination<sup>7</sup> on a common platform—charisma. It is known that Weber borrowed the term "charisma" from Rudolf Zom being impressed by his conclusions regarding the *charismatic basis* of cohesion in the first Christian communities, as well as Zom's personality—Weber listened to Zom's lectures on ecclesiastic law at the University of Strasbourg and perceived him as an "unusual phenomenon" similar to a religious apostle or zealot<sup>8</sup>. According to one of the most famous German sociologists and specialists in Weber's heritage Friedrich Tenbruck, the doctrine of charisma, unlike other concepts, emerged "unexpectedly," "without any visible preliminary phase" in 1913<sup>9</sup>. However, we will attempt to trace the chronological sequence of the formation of the charisma concept over the period from 1910 to the present and follow its development from the basic concept of Protestant ethics and sociology to its reterminologized version in modern use meaning "irresistible attractiveness."

Chronologically, the first indirect impetus for the emergence of the concept of charisma was a conversation between Max Weber and other

---

<sup>6</sup> Weber 2006.

<sup>7</sup> Traditional (monarchical, hereditary transfer of power based on traditions), charismatic (revolutionary, power is given to a person brought around by the waves of history), procedural (legal, bureaucratic). The traditional type of legitimization stems from religious consciousness based on faith in God and the sacred right of kings; the second type is caused by the decay of religious consciousness, denial of faith in God, while recognizing belief in a superhuman leader. The procedural type is dominant because it is the most stable one – even charismatic leaders who came on a wave of rapid changes in power seek to change their type of legitimization to procedural, for example, by tailoring the Constitution, holding elections, etc. The charismatic type of legitimization requires constant confirmation by charismatic acts [1].

<sup>8</sup> Radkau 2006, p. 602.

<sup>9</sup> Tenbruck 1999.

guests who gathered on 15 January 1910 at George Simmel's house and discussed the German homosexual poet Stefan George who was inclined to self-presentation and was always surrounded by a large number of enthusiastic male followers who admired him and formed the famous George's Circle. Five months later, on 9 June 1910, in a letter to his student Dora Jelinek, daughter of the famous German lawyer Georg Jelinek, Max Weber used the term "charisma" for the first time referring to poet George, "George's circle has all the features of the sect and at the same time, of charisma as such"<sup>10</sup>. It stands to mention that neither the word "charisma" itself was in use at the time nor Weber himself had used it in his work *Protestant Ethics*.

According to Tenbruck, since 1913, Weber had loved this concept and in the last decade of his life used the terms *Charisma* and *Charismatisch* quite frequently; they were used in his work *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft* (Economy and Society) more than a thousand times. Note that he worked on the book for about 10 years in two phases: the early phase of 1909-1914 and the late phase of 1918-1920. After the outbreak of World War I, Weber ceased working on this book and in the second phase, he planned to rework all the available material, which he managed only partially before his death on 14 June 1920. From that time onward, the book took on a life of its own due to the efforts of Weber's widow Marianne and was published in 1921-1922.

As fate would have it (or by a strange coincidence), an early admirer of Max Weber's theory and later a Nazi ideologist Christoph Steding did an ill service to the theory of charismatic domination by interpreting it in 1932 in favor of the national-socialist ideology thus permanently linking Weber with Adolf Hitler as the latter's predictor, which is still controversial and unproven among historians.<sup>11</sup>

In one way or another, however, Weber's concept of the three types of domination was forgotten until the mid-1980s. Academic interest in M. Weber began rekindling in 1987-1996. German sociologist Friedrich Tenbruck inaugurated the so-called Weberian and Simmelian Renaissance by returning to the works of Max Weber and Georg Simmel, their project of understanding sociology as a science of

---

<sup>10</sup> Weber 1994, p. 560.

<sup>11</sup> Christoph Steding ist heute kaum mehr bekannt, doch spricht der Max Weber-Biograph Joachim Radkau von ihm als dem „merkwürdigste[n] Phänomen der Weber-Rezeption im Nationalsozialismus“.[Joachim Radkau, Max Weber – Die Leidenschaft des Denkens, München: Hanser, 2005, S. 847].

modernity, in his article<sup>12</sup>, which is a revised version of the English-language report made at the 1987 European Conference on Theory, held in Bremen, the "Social Structure and Culture" section.

Thus, the renaissance of Weber's charisma in the 1990s took place not only in the academic paradigm of sociology but it was successfully transferred at the time from the theory of *domination* to the theory of *leadership*. The attribute *rational* was opposed to *emotional* and such concepts as *emotional intelligence* and *emotional leadership* appeared on the agenda<sup>13</sup>, which were associated with or attached to not Weber's concept of sociological charisma, but rather its ecclesiastic and legal understanding (the original, older sense of charisma) and actively used in management, business, career and human resources management, various types of coaching (finance, psychology, politics, healthy lifestyle, etc.).

Entries in the Online Etymology Dictionary clearly tracing the origin of *charisma* to German meaning "gift of leadership, power of authority" (reference) and its use in this meaning by Max Weber in his work *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft* in 1922, are interesting for the chronological analysis of the occurrence and first use of the *charisma* lexeme in English. The first use of *charisma* in this meaning dates to 1930, which is even more confusing and does not agree with either 1913 (Tenbrook) or 1922 (*Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*)<sup>14</sup>. The year 1930 makes one think about a certain relationship with the national-socialist period; at least in the case of English, this relationship can be clearly traced. The use of the *charisma* lexeme in the everyday meaning of "personal charm" dates to 1959<sup>15</sup>.

### **3. Status of the Charisma concept in modern Germany.**

#### **Helmut Schmidt vs. Franz Josef Strauss**

In the post-war years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, active tabooing of the charismatic concept could be observed in the social and political discourse of Germany<sup>16</sup>. As soon as someone who was different and at least attractive appeared on the political stage, anxious voices were not late in coming, usually driven by purely banal tactical reasons of power

---

<sup>12</sup> Tenbruck 1996.

<sup>13</sup> Goleman 1996.

<sup>14</sup> Weber 2006.

<sup>15</sup> Charisma. URL: [http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed\\_in\\_frame=0&search=charisma](http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed_in_frame=0&search=charisma)

<sup>16</sup> Encke 2014.

struggle rather than a great deal of negative experience with charismatics such as the "Bohemian Gefreiter"<sup>17</sup>.

However, the addiction to charisma, the yearning for leaders, the desire to find such a leader (German *Leitfigur*) who could be trusted, have always been felt strongly in Germany. And nobody, according to the editor-in-chief of the weekly *Zeit*, was able to perform this role like Helmut Schmidt<sup>18</sup>. But is this consistent with the role of a political mentor and enlightener? And why is he the one that satisfies the passion for a political leader? In his book *Unterm Strich* German politician Peer Steinbrück writes that the political class in Germany has lost a lot of respect among the public and there is a need for a new type of leader who would stand out from the refined politicians with a ready political career and trained for active self-staging in the right place at the right time. Thus, Steinbrück writes, the same individuals sit on committees and panels and form an unrepresentative cross-section of the social and professional environment<sup>19</sup>.

A yearn for charismatics in politics is expressed in the search for a figure that would stand out of the herd and be identified as a unique unity of *face* and *voice*. However, the interpretation of such a person in categories of charisma in German public discourse immediately receives negative feedback and raises suspicions that such a person could become a *Verführer der Massen* (Seducer of Masses) and use his or her qualities for anti-democratic purposes. Regarding this point, Helmut Schmidt is doubtful, "I am very skeptical about the so-called charismatics... Adolf Hitler was a great charismatic... I do not like this concept (charisma)... it is getting on my nerves, frankly speaking, because it has been outworn in America. We even have charismatic bedding!... *Charismatic* in English sounds bad, and in German *Charismatiker* sounds even worse – it sounds like *Alkoholiker* (alcoholic). In Germany, this concept is also worn out... What is not charismatic?... Even Helmut Kohl is charismatic!"<sup>20</sup>.

While Willy Brandt was loved, his successor Chancellor Helmut Schmidt was perceived as a *Macher* (practical man), a pragmatist, "a reasonable boss acting on behalf of a company called Germany on a global scale"<sup>21</sup> and was known for such anticharismatic statements as

---

<sup>17</sup> Schmölders 2000.

<sup>18</sup> Schmidt H., Giovanni DiLorenzo 2012.

<sup>19</sup> Steinbrück 2010, p. 40.

<sup>20</sup> Schmidt, Stern 2010, p. 66.

<sup>21</sup> Noack 2008, p. 149.

"Wer Visionen hat, sollte zum Arzt gehen" (Those who have visions should visit a doctor) or "Die Vernunft erlaubt uns ein unvergleichlicher Pathos. Denn keine Begeisterung sollte größer sein als die nüchterne Leidenschaft zum praktischen Vernunft" ("Reason allows us incredible pathos. No enthusiasm should be greater than the sober passion for practical reason). However, it is precisely this approach of H. Schmidt, which was based on realistic rather than visionary positions, that could be necessary for resolving the moral and ethical crisis with refugees and was noted by Bundestag members who honored H. Schmidt's memory in 2015, as productive in the difficult situation of the European migration crisis<sup>22</sup>.

In this respect, it is interesting to consider the process of media post-charmatization of the image of Helmut Schmidt, who was not considered a charismatic during his term in office, but in an older age suddenly began meeting the needs of Germans for charismatics in politics. Schmidt became an iconic figure; people honored and admired him, bought his books, and went to his lectures. Thus, H. Schmidt as a late charismatic *played* the vacant role of a charismatic in political life rather than being in fact a charismatic. He performed it in the form of a Schmidt Show with all the attributes from a menthol cigarette to menthol sniffing tobacco during his live shows. Thus, Helmut Schmidt, a man who, as Chancellor, was never called charismatic and always warned against charismatics in politics himself, began playing the role of a substitute charismatic whom the Germans could afford with a safe conscience and with whom democracy in Germany would not be in danger<sup>23</sup>.

It should be emphasized that when Helmut Schmidt himself was a Chancellor, no one associated him with charisma. This distinguished him from his direct competitor and challenger for the post of Chancellor – Franz Joseph Strauss, "the last king of Bavaria" as he was called by adherents who *recognized* him as a *charismatic leader* and worshipped him as a *demi-god*<sup>24</sup>. An example of such reverence for Strauss as a beloved charismatic is the description of the following situation, "You had to accompany Strauss in a helicopter and feel what was happening in this man when he slowly soared up to 50 meters while thousands of

---

<sup>22</sup> Bundestagspräsident Prof. Dr. Norbert Lammert: Würdigung von Helmut Schmidt vor Eintritt in die Tagesordnung. URL : <http://www.bundestag.de/parlament/praesidium/reden/2015/009/395484>

<sup>23</sup> Encke 2014, p.33.

<sup>24</sup> Finger 2005, p. 12.



people on their feet waved at him with their outstretched arms. The stiff smile on Strauss's sweat-covered face showed that he is the one who literally enjoying the moment and rising to another sphere"<sup>25</sup>.

Note, however, that there was no other top-level politician in Germany like Strauss who was both adored and hated with disgust. Helmut Schmidt did not hide his negative attitude to Strauss and compared his speech to a bull who "pisses one way or another" considering him unpredictable and therefore dangerous<sup>26</sup>. Considering the position of Chancellor Candidate Franz Josef Strauss Helmut Schmidt on *Mitbestimmung* (decision-making), Chancellor Helmut Schmidt used the rude expression "Wie der Bulle pißt, eben mal so und mal so" that is difficult to interpret and is associated with a certain knowledge of how bulls urinate on the move. It should be noted that the relevant bull behavior in Northern Germany has become proverbial, e.g., "er geht wie ein Bulle/er pinkelt wie ein Bulle/ er harnt wie ein Bulle", "er spricht wie ein Bulle harnt", where the peculiarities of bull urination on the move are metaphorized because the trace of the urine stream is not even but rather pendulum-shaped, winding. This is because the bull has a very long foreskin, which swings back and forth when moving forward and leads to a winding movement of the stream. Such an interpretation of the proverb can characterize Strauss as a mercurial person without a stable position. On the other hand, there is a second option for interpreting this idiom from the viewpoint of the bull's ethology, namely, at the beginning of urination, the bull does not release all the urine at once but at certain intervals, i.e. after a two-minute spasm comes the first intermittent urination followed by complete urination without interruption. According to German ethologist Hans Heinrich Zambaus, Helmut Schmidt meant this second type of a bull's behavior when speaking of Strauss<sup>27</sup>.

#### **4. The Charisma concept in the USA: from John Kennedy to Donald Trump**

Unlike Helmut Schmidt who was never mentioned in the context of charismatic leadership, his predecessor as Chancellor of Germany Willy Brandt was recognized by numerous compatriots as an absolute charismatic whose irresistible impact extended to all age and social

---

<sup>25</sup> Kempfski 1999, p. 279.

<sup>26</sup> Finger 2005, p. 443.

<sup>27</sup> URL: <http://www.spiegel.de/spiegel/print/d-14316687.html>

groups without exception. Several factors contributed to this. First, Brandt was perceived as a fighter of the Anti-Nazi Resistance. Second, his self-presentation in public discourse paralleled the image of John F. Kennedy who symbolized youth and awakening. Third, Brandt embodied the decency that the Germans lacked among politicians for understandable reasons, and which Brandt made up for in full by kneeling at the monument to the tortured Jews in the Warsaw Ghetto on 7 December 1970 thus further increasing the impact of his aura (*auratische Wirkung*). This kneeling was done by an anti-fascist and a former emigrant, who was not guilty and was not an accomplice to the evil. He knelt on behalf of the entire German people, on behalf of all those who considered it necessary to do so but did not try, could not or would not try. Brandt was close to deification and somehow replaced Kennedy as the long-awaited and much-needed hero, while being a German<sup>28</sup>. It is safe to say that Willie Brandt was beloved and conquered the "hearts of men."

It is widely recognized that Barack Obama had what John F. Kennedy and Bill Clinton possessed—das "gewisse Etwas," "Je ne sais quoi," something inexplicable, —charisma. His charisma adds on to his speeches, gives them something extra that turns these speeches (whether directly or medially) into vibrant political events. You sit there, watching the *gestures* and *words*, wondering the attractive power you cannot resist. Wherever Barack Obama appeared, everyone was happy to see him. The reactions to Obama's "appearance" can be divided into the following three groups: (1) total denial based on differences in ideology; (2) total acceptance; (3) ambivalent attitude. Note that Helmut Schmidt was also skeptical about Barack Obama's victory in the election and put him on a par with Hitler and Oscar Lafontaine, who possessed charisma and became national figures only thanks to it<sup>29</sup>.

In turn, political scientist Yekaterina Shulman, reflecting on D. Trump and Max Weber's three types of legitimization of a political leader, admits that "in the case of Trump, we see a completely unique case where the leader who came to power through procedural legitimization shifts to revolutionary legitimization because it is more in line with his nature as an anti-systemist. For example, Trump has repeatedly stated that several million people voted illegally in the

---

<sup>28</sup> Merseburger 2006, p. 615.

<sup>29</sup> Diekmann 2008.

elections, there was ballot tampering, etc., i.e. such behavior can be characteristic of a leader who has lost the election rather than legally won them as Trump did. Such behavior, believes Yekaterina Shulman, can be unsafe for Trump himself, because "every failure in the fight against the dragon can turn against him."<sup>30</sup> Note that all Trump's orders are highly personalized so each defeat in court strikes at him. The political scientist believes that this is the first time that such a case of changing the type of leadership from beneficial (procedural) to less beneficial (charismatic) has been observed in history.

Comparing the images of Barack Obama and Donald Trump, it seems appropriate to mention a rather succinct (and at the same time quite caustic for both) quote by BBC observer Mark Mardell, in which we see the contrasting features of the previous and current US Presidents, "If US politics was a Western, Mr. Obama would be the *magical preacher*, mystically advocating collective action, Mr. Trump would be *charismatic snake oil salesman*, shouting from the side of the wagon, captivating, infuriating and embodying a certain sort of frustration."<sup>31</sup> What is striking is that it is not Barack Obama whom the author calls charismatic but Donald Trump, and this definition includes a negative attribute of charisma—manipulation (Trump is a swindler, a seller of magic oil as a cure for all diseases), which was not taken into account in Weber's concept a hundred years ago but has today become a pragmatic reality and part of the arsenal of any political coaching method.

## **5. Who comes next: Linguistic and discursive methodology for identifying potential charismatics**

We would like to emphasize that in recent years, German political discourse has been marked by a clear warming towards Weber's charismatic type of leadership and a renewed search for charismatic attributes of contemporary political figures, who, after the period of national socialism, were banned and for a long time excluded from the positive arsenal of the rhetorical and argumentative strategies of German politicians and, first and foremost, the Presidents<sup>32</sup>. However, the

---

<sup>30</sup> Дональд Трамп и три типа легитимизации по Макс Веберу. URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NVuyFOsyobU>

<sup>31</sup> Trump and Obama: Two characters in search of a legacy. URL: <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-38663825>

<sup>32</sup> Blieseemann de Guevara 2011.

charismatic periods may be followed by periods of rationalization, for example, "auf das chrismatische Duo der rot-grünen Jahre "Fischer-Schröder" folgte die Anti-Charismatikerin Angela Merkel, die kühl und sphinxhaft wirkte, weil sie keine Leidenschaften für irgendeinen bestimmten Politikbereich hatte, nicht einmal für die Umweltpolitik" (the chrismatic duo of the red-green years "Fischer-Schröder" was followed by the anti-charismatic Angela Merkel who appeared cool and sphinx-like because she had no passions for any particular policy area, not even environmental policy)<sup>33</sup>. Merkel is not guided by instinct but by control so she lacks a policy with a vision of the country's perspective, and the charisma to be applied to this vision<sup>34</sup>. According to Irish journalist Judy Dempsey, Merkel has exhausted herself as a chancellor because she is now unable to think strategically and point the way for the country's development<sup>35</sup>.

In this respect, Joachim Gauck as a person with moral authority and a politician with his own individual language revived the special hope for the emergence of a new type of politician. For example, a biographer of the former East German Protestant pastor argues that it was not by chance that Joachim Gauck was elected to the high office of presidency: it was his *charismatic qualities* manifested in the appeal to freedom and the concurrent responsibility of modern Germans that made it possible to restore respect for the presidency and strengthen the importance of its function in society and the state in general<sup>36</sup>.

The nature of his public rhetoric also comes to mind: the inaugural speech of the eleventh Federal President of Germany Joachim Gauck who, thanks to his intransigence, uncompromising rejection of pragmatic partisan and parliamentary politics, was a moral authority for all Germans during his presidency, and was universally recognized and magnificent speaker, was devoid of any pathetics or emotions, active gestures or vivid tonal deviations. In this case, the conviction in the tone of his speech, his semantics, were formed by two central charismatic concepts – TRUST/VERTRAUEN and RESPONSIBILITY/ VERANTWORTUNG, which for Gauck were the inseparable moral foundations of his service to the German people. The persuasive effect of Gauck's inaugural speech was also reinforced by his reference in the final part of

---

<sup>33</sup> Langguth 2009, p. 431.

<sup>34</sup> Encke 2014, p. 100.

<sup>35</sup> Dempsey 2013, p. 187.

<sup>36</sup> Legner 2014.

his speech to Gandhi's historical authority ("Nach einem Wort Gandhis kann nur ein Mensch mit Selbstvertrauen Fortschritte machen und Erfolge haben. Dies gilt für einen Menschen wie für ein Land, so Gandhi" (According to Gandhi, only a person with self-confidence can make progress and be successful. This is as true for a person as for a country, says Gandhi.)). Gauck makes active use of pausing division, co-speech head nods and right-hand gestures as paraverbal means of identifying the most important places in his inaugural speech. The overall speech tempo is calm, closer to slow. Gauck, with his genuine charisma, preferred to structure his inaugural speech in the formal style of a performative monolog before Bundestag members who, after two high-profile resignations of previous Presidents Horst Keller and Christian Wolf, expected him to strengthen the authority of the Federal President's office and return the lost confidence to this post<sup>37</sup>. The newly elected President of Germany, Frank-Walter Steinmeier, also stressed Gauck's significance as President, "der diesem Amt und unserem Land gut getan hat... der für die Freiheit spricht... und der das Glück der Freiheit mit jeder Faser verkörpert" (who has done this office and our country good... who speaks for freedom... and who embodies the happiness of freedom with every fiber.)<sup>38</sup>.

Therefore, while Merkel's rational rule is presently dragging on and no longer efficient (especially considering the complete failure of the multicultural program and migration policy, which has plunged Germany into chaos), the question arises in anticipation of the elections in September 2017: who is the next charismatic leader? Despite the diversity of bright faces (Marina Weisband, Cem Özdemir, Serge Menga) and movements (PEGIDA, DDfE, Freie Wähler NRW), so far there is no such charismatic in the German political firmament, but the public's readiness for his or her projection is high, which can lead to misconception: it may happen that someone will be considered as a charismatic only because he or she will be slightly different from the average politician (rich, young, aristocratic, as was the case, for example, with Carl Theodore zu Gutenberg<sup>39</sup>).

---

<sup>37</sup> Петлюченко 2017.

<sup>38</sup> Rede von Dr. Frank-Walter Steinmeier. URL: <https://www.bundestag.de/dokumente/textarchiv/2017/kw06-rede-steinmeier/493110>

<sup>39</sup> During his time as Minister of Economy and Minister of Defense, Gutenberg became a popular politician. Gutenberg was considered a promising conservative politician. He was expected to have a successful political career; become either the Bavarian Minister-President or even the German Chancellor in the near future but the plagiarism scandal in 2011 led to Gutenberg's resignation and his complete fall out of German political discourse.

It should be noted that the current "Trump-Apocalypse" or "Trampanization of Political Discourse"<sup>40</sup> has a twofold effect on sociological studies. On the one hand, the authority of sociologists has been sharply shaken by misguided forecasts, which failed to consider the huge proportion of D. Trump's supporters who do not usually take part in elections at all and who are opposed to politics in principle. On the other hand, D. Trump's victory made one of the most striking concepts of sociology relevant again: charisma, which is organically attached to Trump's image as a revolutionary leader, anti-systemist, and protest leader. According to the BBC, 39% of those surveyed worldwide consider Donald Trump a charismatic (reference), which in itself is a rather high result given that the survey was not limited to the United States alone, and Donald Trump is not one of the religious leaders who tend to have the widest possible audience of adherents attributing charismatic attributes to him. However, today this concept is in demand and is actively used as an ideal-typical construction for analyzing contemporary political discourse in the United States, which is full of irrational events, and therefore, charisma.

The oxymorony of the situation with charisma in Germany is that a charismatic vacuum has formed today in the homeland of this concept, which is leery of being filled not only because of the prolonged rational rule of Angela Merkel, but also because of the lack of charismatic crisis managers in the current difficult situation with refugees, who have changed the landscape of the German streets. Rare voices can be heard asking whether German politics need charisma and trying to rethink Weber's old concept under new conditions<sup>41</sup> and new discourses<sup>42</sup>.

## CONCLUSIONS

We suggest a novel linguistic discursive model for identifying future charismatic leaders, which has a three-tier structure and considers the following types of charisma: (1) *Charisma of Office* (German – *Amtscharisma*) associated with a national leader (chancellor, resident, etc.) whose charisma is determined by the chronology of crisis (charismatic) and post-crisis (rational) periods in the life of the country and society. For the most part, these periods alternate with each other. Any politician endowed with supreme power and influenced in his or her

---

<sup>40</sup> Hard Day's Night. URL: <https://tvrain.ru/teleshov/harddaysnight/shnur-439554/>

<sup>41</sup> Schwinn 2016.

<sup>42</sup> Haese 2017.

actions by the importance of his or her high office can become a charismatic leader; (2) *Public Charisma*, which is characteristic to some degree of various politicians who rank lower than the leader of the country, but whose appeal is very high during crisis periods. The society recognizes such politicians as charismatic leaders with their charisma repeatedly confirmed by media resources; (3) *Grassroots Charisma*, which is in embryonic state stemming upwards from popular initiatives and movements. Discursive portrayal of potential charismatic leaders in German and Ukrainian grassroots initiatives and the determination of their contrastive features rest on four parameters (biological, social, psychological, discursive), forming their charismatic discourse portraits.

The prosodic specifics of charismatic discourse are characterized by intensification of all its dynamic, tonal, and temporal components. In phonetical studies, this acoustic effect is referred to as *prosodic intensity* understood as abrupt changes in pitch, loudness, tempo variations, and pauses in important utterances containing addresses, appeals and concepts with positive semantics. Charismatic rhetoric is also formed by the kinetic (gesture and mimic) component that is functionally related to the prosodic representation of speech making communication more effective. A gesture is an action or movement of the body through which one individual signals his presence, his intentions regarding certain objects to another individual. Charismatic political communications are characterized primarily by accentuating or co-speech gestures that represent movements of the body, especially the arms/hands, by which the speaker explains, complements his words, highlights the key points, emphasizes or amplifies a verbal utterance. A gesture is perceived by the addressee as a *kinematic* form of verbal charisma-appeal through which he exercises his influence on his followers and/or opponents encouraging them to commit actions aimed at achieving a particular goal.

Charismatic rhetoric originates in political communication in times of crisis and is characteristic of politicians whose stand is not consistent with the majority position. Charismatic enthusiasm and inspiration are ethnically colored and reflected in prosodic and gesture emphasis accompanying both independent and dependent parts of speech indicating the autonomy of charismatic rhetoric as a model. The results of this study can be used in discourse studies, applied phonetics, comparative linguistics, and political communication.

## SUMMARY

The paper presents an analysis of charisma-correlates in the language of political leaders in modern German, American und Ukrainian political discourses and suggests a novel linguistic discursive model for identifying future charismatic leaders. The discursive description of charismatic leaders and the discovery of their contrastive features relies on biological, social, psychological and linguistic parameters forming their charismatic discourse portraits. Of decisive importance in this context, is the rhetoric of public appearance, expressive combative position, hortatority, timbral, prosodic and gesture-mimic characteristics further perceived and attributed to its carriers as charisma. Charismatic politicians have always been characterised by sharp statements, categorical views and mobilising speech. Inspired or pep rhetoric is inherent in politicians whose position is contrary to the majority of the public, the opinion of their political allies, members of Parliament, etc.

## REFERENCES

1. Bliesemann de Guevara B. Charisma und Herrschaft: Führung und Verführung in der Politik. Frankfurt [u.a.]: Campus-Verl., 2011. 250 S.
2. Bundestagspräsident Prof. Dr. Norbert Lammert: Würdigung von Helmut Schmidt vor Eintritt in die Tagesordnung. URL: <http://www.bundestag.de/parlament/praesidium/reden/2015/009/395484>
3. Charisma. URL: [http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed\\_in\\_frame=0&search=charisma](http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed_in_frame=0&search=charisma)
4. Dempsey J. Das Phänomen Merkel: Deutschlands Macht und Möglichkeiten. Hamburg : Edition Körber-Stiftung, 2013. 208 S.
5. Diekmann K. Helmut Schmidt spricht Klartext. Großes Interview mit dem Altkanzler/ Kai Diekmann, Walter Mayer, Hans-Jorg Vehlewald. *Bild am Sonntag*. 2008. 14. S. 1–7.
6. Encke J. Charisma und Politik: Warum unsere Demokratie mehr Leidenschaft braucht. München : Hanser Verlag, 2014. 176 S.
7. Finger S. Franz Josef Strauß : ein politisches Leben/ Stefan Finger. München : Olzog, 2005. 555 S.
8. Goleman D. Emotionale Intelligenz. München : Hanser, 1996. 423 S.
9. Haese I. Stadt und Charisma : Eine akteurszentrierte Studie in Zeiten der Schrumpfung. Wiesbaden : Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 2017. 252 S.



10. Hagege C. *L'homme de paroles : contribution linguistique aux sciences humaines*. Paris : Fayard, 1985. 324 p.
11. Hohlspiegel. URL: <http://www.spiegel.de/spiegel/print/d-14316687.html>
12. Kempfski H.U. *Um die Macht : Sternstunden und sonstige Abenteuer mit den Bonner Bundeskanzlern 1949 bis 1999*. Berlin : Fest, 1999. 408 S.
13. Langguth G. Kohl, Schröder, Merkel: *Machtmenschen*. München : Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 2009. 580 S.
14. Legner J. Joachim Gauck *Träume vom Paradies ; Biografie*. München : Bertelsmann, 2014. 382 S.
15. Merseburger P. Willy Brandt : 1913–1992 ; *Visionär und Realist*. München : Dt. Verl. -Anst., 2006. 927 S.
16. Noack H.-J. *Helmut Schmidt : die Biographie*. Berlin : Rowohlt, 2008. 316 S.
17. Petljutschenko N. *Geburt und Tod des Charismas: Maidan 2004 vs. Euromaidan 2014 (diskursive Besonderheiten der Appelle in der Antrittsrede von Petro Porošenko bei seiner Amtseinführung am 7. Juni 2014)*. *Одеський лінгвістичний вісник : зб. наук. праць*. 2014. Вип. 4. С. 336–341.
18. Petlyuchenko N. *Aggressive Rhetoric: Prosodic and Kinetic Means / Nataliya Petlyuchenko, Anna Artiukhova*. *Proceedings of Gesture and Speech in Interaction (GESPIN) International Conference (Nantes, France, September 2-4, 2015)*. P. 191–194.
19. Radkau J. *Max Weber: Die Leidenschaft des Denkens*. München, Wien: Carl Hansen Verlag, 2005. 1007 S.
20. Rede von Dr. Frank-Walter Steinmeier. URL: <https://www.bundestag.de/dokumente/textarchiv/2017/kw06-rede-steinmeier/493110>
21. Schmidt H. *Unser Jahrhundert. Ein Gespräch / Helmut Schmidt, Fritz Stern*. München : Beck, 2010. 287 S.
22. Schmidt H., Giovanni DiLorenzo *Auf eine Zigarette mit Helmut Schmidt*. Audiobook, 1. November 2012. Der Audio Verlag.
23. Schmölders C. *Hitlers Gesicht: eine physiognomische Biographie*. München : Beck, 2000. 264 S.
24. Schwinn Th. *Alte Begriffe – neue Probleme : Max Webers Soziologie im Lichte aktueller Problemstellungen*. Tübingen : Mohr Siebeck, 2016. 465 S.

25. Steinbrück P. Unterm Strich. Hamburg : Hoffmann und Campe, 2010. 479 S.
26. Tenbruck F. Das Werk Max Webers gesammelte Aufsätze zu Max Weber. Tübingen : Mohr Siebeck, 1999. 267 S.
27. Tenbruck F. Repräsentativ Kultur // Friedrich Tenbruck. Perspektiven der Kulturosoziologie: gesammelte Aufsätze. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag. S. 99–124.
28. Trump and Obama: Two characters in search of a legacy. URL: <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-38663825>
29. Weber M. Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft. Grundriss der verstehenden Soziologie. Paderborn: Voltmedia, 2006. 1311 S.
30. Weber M. Briefe 1909–1910 / Gesamtausgabe/Abt. 2, Briefe Bd. 6. Tübingen : Mohr Siebeck, 1994. 854 S.
31. Петлюченко Н. В. Кинетическая специфика инспиративного дискурса харизматических политиков современной Германии. *Одеський лінгвістичний вісник : зб. наук. праць*. 2017. Вип. 9. Т.1. С. 195–200.
32. Петлюченко Н. В. Харизматика: мовна особистість і дискурс : монографія. Одеса : Астропринт, 2009. 464 с.
33. Потапенко С. І. Когнітивна риторика ефекту: в пошуках методу (на матеріалі інавгураційних звернень американських президентів Дж. Кеннеді і Дж. Буша). *Вісник Київського національного лінгвістичного університету. Серія Філологія*. 2012. Т. 15, № 2. С. 131–140.
34. Шнуров Сергей. Hard Day's Night. URL: <https://tvrain.ru/teleshov/harddaysnight/shnur-439554/>
35. Шульман Екатерина. Дональд Трамп и три типа легитимизации по Макс Веберу. URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NVuyFOsyobU>

**Information about the author:**

**Petlyuchenko N.**

DSc. (Philology), Professor,  
Head of the Chair of Foreign Languages No. 2,  
National University “Odessa Law Academy”  
23, Fontanskaya Doroga str., Odessa, 65009, Ukraine