

**JYX**



JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO  
UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

**This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.**

**Author(s):** Palonen, Kari

**Title:** Political science as a topic in post-war German Bundestag debates

**Year:** 2020

**Version:** Accepted version (Final draft)

**Copyright:** © 2020 Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

**Rights:** In Copyright

**Rights url:** <http://rightsstatements.org/page/InC/1.0/?language=en>

**Please cite the original version:**

Palonen, K. (2020). Political science as a topic in post-war German Bundestag debates. *History of European Ideas*, 46(4), 360-373. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01916599.2020.1738775>

## **Political Science as a Topic in Post-war German Bundestag Debates**

Kari Palonen, Professor, emeritus

*Department of Political Science and Philosophy, University of Jyväskylä, Finland*

Opinkivi, Keskussairaalan tie 2

PO Box 35

FIN-40014 University of Jyväskylä

Finland

+358408054178

kari.i.palonen@jyu.fi

# Political Science as a Topic in Post-war German Bundestag Debates

## Abstract

The conceptual history of politics in post-WWII (West-) Germany is connected to the history of academic political science. From the Bundestag plenary debates (beginning in September 1949) both the controversies on the political science itself and the contributors of both contemporary scholars and the ‘classics’ of the understanding of politics can be studied. The digitalisation of parliamentary debates opens up new chances for conceptual research in this regard. The article studies the conceptual commitments in the use of the discipline titles (*Politikwissenschaft, Politische Wissenschaft, Politologie, Politikforschung, Politische Theorie*, also *political science*) and actors (*Politologe, Politikprofessor, Politstudent* etc), and looks at who is mentioned in debates, for example political scientists in early West Germany (Dolf Sternberger, Theodor Eschenburg, Wilhelm Hennis), emigrants (Hannah Arendt, Alfred Grosser), remigrants (Ernst Fraenkel, Ossip K. Flechtheim) or theorists preceding academic political science (Max Weber, Carl Schmitt, Herman Heller). Formulae from Weber’s *Politik als Beruf* seem to be most frequently evoked in the Bundestag.

Keywords: history of political science; German politics; parliamentary debates; German Bundestag; conceptual history; concepts of politics

## Introduction

William Gerard Hamilton in his eighteenth-century maxims, published as *Parliamentary Logick*, already understood conceptual revisions as important moves in parliamentary rhetoric.<sup>1</sup> The uses of concepts can be situated to their procedural and rhetorical contexts, the government vs. opposition divide or parliamentary timetables. My broader aim lies in focusing on parliamentary debates as sources of conceptual

---

<sup>1</sup> William Gerard Hamilton, *Parliamentary Logick*, ed. Eduard Malone (London: Payne, 1808), <https://tinyurl.com/y98n2co9>.

changes in the history of the concept of politics, as compared with other source types.<sup>2</sup>

Against the trend of connecting conceptual history to the disciplinary history<sup>3</sup>, I am interested in conceptual debates on politics in parliament. Quentin Skinner's insight that it is 'political life itself that sets the problems for political theorist' provides for the point of departure for this analysis.<sup>4</sup> For the conceptual history of politics in post-WWII (West-) Germany the references to academic political science in the Bundestag plenary debates are worth looking for. What has been said on the discipline itself, on contemporary scholars and on the 'classics' of the concept of politics?

Thanks to the digitalisation of parliamentary debates, we do now have a broad and systematic corpus of sources to analyse politicians' views on politics. The present paper is a by-product of this research on the uses and the ways of conceptualising the polit-vocabulary in the plenary debates of the (West-)German Bundestag from September 1949 to September 2017.

### **The corpus**

My study of plenary debates of the Bundestag is based on the search options on the website *Drucksachen und Plenarprotokolle des Bundestages – ab 1949*.<sup>5</sup> As background knowledge on the speakers I have also used the 24. *Verzeichnis der*

---

<sup>2</sup> Kari Palonen, *The Struggle with Time: A conceptual history of 'politics' as an activity* (Münster: LIT, 2006/2014).

<sup>3</sup> Ernst Müller and Falko Schmieder, *Begriffsgeschichte und historische Semantik* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2016).

<sup>4</sup> Quentin Skinner, *The Renaissance*, vol. I of *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), xi.

<sup>5</sup> Deutscher Bundestag, *Drucksachen und Plenarprotokolle des Bundestages – ab 1949*, <https://pdok.bundestag.de/>

*Mitglieder des Bundestags und Personenindex.*<sup>6</sup>

Unlike the Historic Hansard for the UK, the Bundestag search engine numbers refer to the debates, not to individual speeches or ‘hits’ in them.<sup>7</sup> Difficulties arise with the compound words written separately, such as *Politische Wissenschaft*. The search mentions 110 hits, but according to my check, less than half of them refer to the title of a discipline or a university chair. This holds particularly for the period since early 1990s, when *Politische Wissenschaft* was increasingly replaced as the standard disciplinary title by *Politikwissenschaft* or *Politologie*.

With these demarcations I have constructed the primary corpus of analysis referring to political science in different linguistic and rhetorical variations, mainly around the following words and the corresponding number of debate sites:

Politikwissenschaft 36

Politikwissenschaftler 38

Politische Wissenschaft 46 (after checking the files)

Politologe 81

Politologie 22

University politics in (West) Germany lies in the responsibility of the *Länder*, with a relatively low degree of coordination and control on the federal level. Accordingly, the Bundestag has not been the arena for battles on founding political science chairs or departments. To the question of the MdB Hugo Collet (SPD) during the first grand coalition, the state secretary Karl Gumbel answered that political science chairs and department already regularly existed in the West German universities and no action of

---

<sup>6</sup> Deutscher Bundestag, 24. *Verzeichnis der Mitglieder des Bundestags und Personenindex*, <https://www.bundestag.de/dokumente/parlamentsarchiv/datenhandbuch/24/kapitel-24/476004> (accessed January 5, 2018).

<sup>7</sup> Historic Hansard, <https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/index.html>.

the federal government was needed: ‘Die Kultusminister der Länder sind seit Jahren bemüht, alle wissenschaftlichen Hochschulen ausreichend mit Lehrstühlen für politische Wissenschaften auszustatten.’ (June 28, 1968)

Studies in political science were, however, not considered as necessary for careers in state administration neither did they offer an alternative to juridical studies. The chair of the committee for the legislation on the officials (*Ausschuß für Beamtenrecht*) Josef Kleindinst (CDU) affirmed that ‘politische Staatswissenschaften’ do not justify the entry to higher administrative careers (May 13, 1953).

In the early Federal Republic political science did not divide the main parties. Hans Reif (FDP) blamed for the low share of political science in research funding, although the discipline is essential for a democracy (June 21, 1956). The CDU Minister of Interior, Gerhard Schröder – not to be confused with the later SPD Chancellor – wrote on the value of political science people to a commission against neo-Nazism (February 18, 1960). All this corresponds to the story of founding as a ‘science of democracy’ (*Demokratiewissenschaft*), which has been questioned recently.<sup>8</sup>

Controversies around political science arose from 1968 onwards. Kurt Schober (CDU) questions the maturity of the discipline by saying that no political science department has been able to give advice regarding the nuclear bomb test treaty (February 7, 1968). In a long debate on the situation of universities and research in May 1968, Hugo Hammans (CDU) evokes the fear for not getting a job as the ground why sociologists and political scientists have been prone to revolt.

Daß die Unruhen besonders von jenen Fakultäten ausgehen, an denen Politologen und Soziologen ausgebildet werden, hat seinen besonderen Grund. ... für die 2000

---

<sup>8</sup> Buchstein, Hubertus, ‘The Eschenburg Controversy in German Political Science’, *Redescriptions* 20 (2017): 115–85.

Studenten der Politologie und Soziologie in der Bundesrepublik nur einige wenige Stellen frei sind, die sie übernehmen können. (May 7, 1968)

This became a common rhetorical *topos* for the CDU opposition members (see the answer of parliamentary state secretary Klaus-Dietert Arndt, SPD, to the oral question of the Wolfgang Pohle, CSU, on the limits to the university entrance, November 12, 1969; the answer of the parliamentary state secretary Eckart Kuhlwein, SPD, regarding the unemployment among pedagogy, sociology and political science candidates, June 16, 1981, also Antje Fuchs, SPD September 9, 1981). Klaus Rose (CSU) wanted to reduce the number of frustrated students and academic unemployment in political science and related fields, ‘meistens der “Logismus”-Richtung, also Soziologie, Psychologie und Politologie’ (January 21, 1982, see also Michaela Geiger, CSU, April 29, 1982 and Irmgard Karwatzki, CDU, May 28, 1982).

Some reforms of the SPD-FDP coalition were criticised as employment programmes for academics, as Georg Gölder (CDU) writes on programmes for the supplementary education (*Weiterbildung*) (June 19, 1975). Horst Schröder, CDU, sees the planning department in ministries as ‘eine ideologische Spielwiese für junge Politologen und Soziologen auf Staatskosten’ (March 19, 1975). Without recognising the intellectual-cum-political value of the *Bildung* in the universities, the overly pessimistic fears on career, employment, public services and ministries had the political target against the rise new types of independent academics present in public debates and institutions.

### ***Politologe* as a buzzword**

The term *Politologe* applies to students, junior scholars as well as professors of the discipline. Karl Moersch (FDP) noted the reaction of the CDU member Will Rasner to this buzzword:

Herr Rasner, Sie schütteln die Hand, wenn Sie das Wort “Politologen” hören. Sie müssen hier einmal begründen, weshalb Sie etwas gegen die Politologen haben. (Abg. Rasner: Gegen die von Ihnen zitierten, Herr Moersch, das sind immer dieselben!) (June 18, 1969)

Part of the campaign against *Politologen* is the polemic against their academic jargon. The Chancellor Willy Brandt (SPD) marked an ironic distance to that when speaking on attempts to misinterpret the programmatic declaration of his government: ‘Man hat nun versucht, gestern noch, das zu mißdeuten – um nicht in der modernen Sprache der Politologen ‘umfunktionieren’ zu sagen –, das umzudeuten, was ich rückschauend zur Regierungserklärung vom Oktober 1969 gesagt habe.’ (February 3, 1971).

The jargon was incomprehensible for outsiders. ‘Das *Politologen-Deutsch* ist nicht zu verstehen!’ shouted Friedrich Schäfer (SPD) to the Baden-Württemberg Prime Minister Hans Filbinger (CDU), who agreed with him (April 14, 1974). The Bavarian Prime Minister Franz-Josef Strauss (CSU) spoke of *Politologen-Kauderwelsch* (December 11, 1979). Even later *Politologe* appears as a buzzword that suffices to disqualify the speech: ‘Zuruf von der CDU/CSU: Das sind Politologen!’ (December 16, 1982); Dr. [Werner] Marx [CDU/CSU]: Das hat ein Politologe geschrieben! (November 22, 1983); Dr. [Werner] Marx [CDU/CSU]: Mit politologischen Sprüchen! (October 10, 1984); ([Hans-Joachim] Fuchtel [CDU/CSU]: Das ist doch schon politologisch! (January 18, 1989).

Indeed, the fashionable systems theoretical or functionalist jargon in political science frequently looks at politicians with contempt and misses the point of parliamentary-style politics. Nonetheless, the campaign-like use against *Politologie* and *Politologen* demonises the discipline to a uniform enterprise, while actually different approaches and traditions militantly opposed to each other in West German political science.



Some examples are directed against the ‘ultra leftists’ in political science. Georg Golter (CDU) had posed a question against the appointment of ‘des Berliner Politologen Wilfried Gottschalch’ to a tenured chair at the University of Bremen. Klaus von Dohnanyi (SPD) responded by referring that the Länder are responsible for the academic appointments, and the federal government is neither allowed nor willing to intervene in them (September 22, 1971). Ernst Müller-Herrmann (CDU), however, returned to the case of Gottschalch by disputing the autonomy of the university in personal matters, by raising the possibility to terminate the funding of the Bremen University in the name of ‘freiheitliche Ordnung’ (September 24, 1971).

Another example of campaigning concerns professor Wolf-Dieter Narr at the Freie Universität Berlin. Friedrich Voss (CSU) asked the oral question on Narr’s speech in a ‘symposium on terrorism’ at the Goethe-Institut in Athen:

Hat das Goethe-Institut in Athen kürzlich ein zweitägiges Symposium zum Thema Terrorismus und Berufsverbote in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland durchgeführt, an dem unter anderem das Beiratsmitglied des Russel-Tribunals, Professor Narr, sowie der Generalsekretär der kommunistischen Partei Griechenlands teilgenommen haben? (April 20, 1978)

The parliamentary state secretary Hildegard Hamm-Brücher (FDP) strongly denies everything implied in the question. The topic was not terrorism, Narr discussed with two journalists, of whom one was close to the Eurocommunist party, and no party leaders were present.

Ein Symposium zum Thema “Terrorismus und Berufsverbot in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland” hat das Goethe-Institut Athen nicht durchgeführt. Vielmehr hatte das Goethe-Institut Athen im Rahmen einer Vortragsveranstaltung ... den Berliner Politologen Professor Dr. Narr zu einem Vortrag über “Staatsgewalt und Gewalttätigkeit” eingeladen. Diese Veranstaltung wurde zu einer Podiumsdiskussion mit zwei griechischen Journalisten erweitert. Von den beiden

griechischen Diskussionsteilnehmern steht der eine der Regierungspartei nahe, der andere der eurokommunistischen Partei Griechenlands. Die Generalsekretäre der beiden kommunistischen Parteien befanden sich nicht unter den Podiumsteilnehmern (ibid).

This example illustrates how rumours were used as a basis for parliamentary question in order to disqualify *Politologen*. In winter 1978 the words ‘terrorism’ and ‘communism’ were *per se* assumed to bring a *Politologie* professor into disrepute.

After the replacement of Helmut Schmidt’s ‘social-liberal’ coalition by Helmut Kohl’s CDU-FDP coalition in autumn 1982, the campaign against *Politologen* faded away. Occasional polemics are still visible later, for example this interjection of (Peter Kittelmann [CDU/CSU] to Inge Wettig-Danielmeier (SPD): ‘Politologie studiert, was?’, June 13, 1991). Guido Westerwelle, a jurist, later the FDP leader and foreign minister, attributes to Christa Nickels (Greens) a conception of politics that has been learnt in the political science seminars: ‘Für Sie ist Politik die Fortsetzung eines politologischen Seminars an der Uni, aber uns geht es um Arbeitsplätze.’ (March 7, 1996). Westerwelle probably knew that Nickels is a trained nurse, but used the occasion for a polemic against *Politologie*.

However, the young CSU parliamentarian Katrin Albsteiger, who had studied it in Augsburg, manifests a very appreciative view on *Politikwissenschaft* as a *Diskussionswissenschaft*, offering debates between different perspectives.

Politikwissenschaft ist eine Diskussionswissenschaft. Bei einer Diskussionswissenschaft – im positiven Sinne – geht es darum, dass man sich mit einer Vielzahl von Beiträgen unterschiedlicher Art auseinandersetzt. Diese kommen in einer schier unendlichen Zahl von Monografien, Handbüchern, Aufsatzsammlungen und Periodika vor. Da ist es ganz wichtig, dass es Semesterapparate gibt, die diese Vielzahl von Themen, diese unterschiedlichen Auffassungen auch tatsächlich abbilden. (September 25, 2014)

This Weberian-style understanding of political science would definitely have been a provocation for the CDU/CSU members from late sixties to early eighties. The ‘rhetoric of reaction’<sup>9</sup> that many members practised in the Bundestag appears to have been quite exceptional: although the critique against leftist professors and students was a commonplace, was the stigmatising of *Politologie* another West German *Sonderweg*?

### **Political scientists as authorities in the debates**

The views of well-known political science professors are nonetheless used as rhetorical supports in debates. The parliamentary state secretary Ernst Benda (CDU) refers to a ‘Leserbrief eines sehr bekannten Politologen, Professor Kielmansegg’ in support of his view in the debate (June 26, 1980) and Theo Weigel (CSU) refers to a journalistic article of ‘Professor Sontheimer am 28. November 1986 in der “Wirtschaftswoche”’ (March 18, 1987). Gerd Bucerius (CDU) mentions his conversation with Theodor Eschenburg (June 20, 1956).

An interesting tactic lies the attempts to persuade the adversaries by quoting professors of political science, who were members of different parties than the speaker. Karl-Hermann Haack (SPD) argues, ‘daß genau dies Ihr Parteifreund, der Politologe Waldemar Besson ... geschrieben hat’ (January 28, 1971). Helmut Kohl, as the CDU opposition leader subscribes to what the SPD member ‘Politikwissenschaftler Professor Sontheimer’ has written (June 21, 1977). During the social-liberal coalition Helga Schuchardt (FDP) quotes, ‘der Union angehörende und, ich glaube, sogar für sie kandidierende Politologe Kaltfleiter’ (February 13, 1980). Minister Gerhard Stoltenberg (CDU), a political scientist himself, refers to ‘dem bedeutenden sozialdemokratischen

---

<sup>9</sup> Albert O. Hirschmann, *The Rhetoric of Reaction: Perversity, Futility, Jeopardy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991).

Politikwissenschaftler Arnulf Baring’ (December 15, 1982), and Jürgen Rüttgers (CDU) to ‘Politikprofessor Karl Kaiser – gleichzeitig auch SPD-Mitglied’ (December 8, 1988).

On the basis of the corpus on references to the disciplines and the previous knowledge of West German political science scholars in the post-war decades I made a search for their presence in the Bundestag debates. My search was based on the full names of the persons. The top ranking list with full names is this one:

Richard Löwenthal 31  
Julian Nida-Rümelin 25  
Alfred Grosser 23  
Theodor Eschenburg 21  
Eugen Kogon 18  
Karl Deutsch 18  
Arnulf Baring 13  
Karl Kaiser 13  
Dolf Sternberger 12  
Klaus Mehnert 9  
Samuel Huntington 8  
Otto Kirchheimer 7  
Otto Suhr 7  
Wilhelm Hennis 6  
Ernst Fraenkel 5  
Roland Roth 5

This is by no means a list of academic quality or reputation. Suhr as a Berlin *Bürgermeister* and Nida-Rümelin as *Kulturstaatsminister* in the Schröder government are as much politicians as scholars. Löwenthal, Kogon and Baring are rather examples of media personalities with professors’ title than strictly academic scholars. Also most others have been quoted in the Bundestag rather due to their contributions to German weeklies and newspapers rather than their proper academic studies.

For the closer analysis, I selected three scholars, whose work I know and who can be linked to conceptual debates, namely Eschenburg, Sternberger, and Hennis.

Theodor Eschenburg (1904–1999) had a PhD in history, was an advisor to Gustav Stresemann in the Weimar republic, a business lobbyist in the Nazi regime and became 1952 professor of political science in Tübingen. He was a well-known debater since the early days of the Federal Republic, but his activities in the NS time have provoked a huge posthumous controversy.<sup>10</sup>

Dolf Sternberger (1907–1989) had his PhD in philosophy and served as a journalist in the *Frankfurter Zeitung* until it was forbidden in 1943. In the post-war era he became famous with the *Sprachkritik*, with essays published in *Die Wandlung* (1945–1948) and as a book *Aus dem Wörterbuch des Unmenschen* (with Gerhard Storz and Wilhelm E. Süßkind) in 1957.<sup>11</sup> Sternberger taught political science in Heidelberg from 1947, since 1962 as *Ordinarius*. In 1978 he published a two-volume book *Drei Wurzeln der Politik*.<sup>12</sup>

Wilhelm Hennis (1923–2012) was a law scholar by training. He was long time a member of SPD, due to his opposition to the student movement he left it for the CDU in 1969, but became later an opponent for nuclear energy and a critic of Helmut Kohl. Since 1967 he was professor of political science in Freiburg. Against his earlier neo-Aristotelian views Hennis turned in the 1980s into a Max Weber scholar, with *Max*

---

<sup>10</sup> Buchstein, ‘Eschenburg Controversy’.

<sup>11</sup> Dolf Sternberger, Gerhard Storz, and Wilhelm E. Süßkind, *Aus dem Wörterbuch des Unmenschen* (Frankfurt am Main: Ullstein, 1980[1957]).

<sup>12</sup> Dolf Sternberger, *Drei Wurzeln der Politik I–II* (Frankfurt am Main: Insel, 1978).

*Webers Fragestellung* (1987) and later writings, which have greatly contributed to the revision of Weber studies.<sup>13</sup>

These three political science professors were in the Bundestag referred to as authorities. All three are mainly referred to in constitutional questions, sometimes mentioned as political scientists. They are used both by government and opposition parties without remarkable differences between the three traditional parties (CDU, SPD, FDP), and they had become acceptable even for the Greens.

Rezzo Schlauch (Grüne) quotes Eschenburg's critique of the Adenauer government attempts to control the public radio and independent journalism: "Fernsehstaatsstreich" nannte damals kein Geringerer als Theodor Eschenburg den Adenauerschen Anschlag auf die Rundfunkfreiheit' (February 8, 1995). Gerhard Pfeffermann (CDU) quotes 'nicht irgend jemanden, sondern Professor Theodor Eschenburg', although he is not 'yet' a member of the CDU (October 3, 1975). The SPD parliamentary leader Peter Struck regards Hennis as 'Der große alte Herr der Politikwissenschaft' (March 29, 2001), and Harald Friese (SPD) twice mentions Hennis as 'Nestor der Politischen Wissenschaft in Deutschland' (May 10, 2001; April 19, 2002).

The emphasis that the professors from different parties again adds to the 'argument on authority'. Richard Jaeger (CSU) quotes Eschenburg's view on referenda as Trojan horse of the Communists: 'Dieser Mann, von dem Sie nicht sagen können, daß er unser Parteigänger sei' (February 24, 1958, see also Rainer Barzel (CDU) in the same debate as well as on June 13, 1958). Joseph (Joschka) Fischer (Grüne), as Minister of Environment in Hessen, uses Hennis's argument against nuclear energy by

---

<sup>13</sup> Wilhelm Hennis, *Max Webers Fragestellung* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987); Wikipedia, 'Wilhelm Hennis', [https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wilhelm\\_Hennis](https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wilhelm_Hennis).

mentioning his reactionary reputation in university politics ('Gründungsmitglied des Bundes "Freiheit der Wissenschaft", also wahrhaftig kein Sympathisant der GRÜNEN', October 3, 1986). Within a parliament based on strong and stable party divisions, the appeal to a professor with opposite sympathies can at least offer some hope to shake the strict divisions.

What is quoted from these three professors, are mainly recent articles or interviews (for example Gerhard Rudolf Baum, FDP, on Eschenburg's view on party finances, March 13, 1986) in newspapers, weeklies, radio and television. Also their public speeches (Heinz Kühn, SPD on Eschenburg's speech in the chamber of industry and commerce, 20.6. 1956) as well as their membership in expert bodies are sometimes referred to (Gerhard Schröder, CDU, on Eschenburg as an 'outstanding member' of the *Parteienrechtskommission*, July 4, 1958). Sternberger was a lobbyist of *Deutsche Wählergemeinschaft*, which, according to the parliamentary state secretary Heinrich Köppler (CDU), is not directly supported by public means (November 28, 1968).

Allusions to the academic writings of three professors are rare, despite the growing number of political science graduates among the Bundestag members. In a debate on the payment of the members, the President of the Bundestag, Annemarie Renger (SPD), quotes Eschenburg's book title *Der Sold des Politikers* from 1959 (December 8, 1976).<sup>14</sup> The Vice-President Erwin Schoettle (SPD) mentions Eschenburg's article 'Das isolierte Berlin' (July 1, 1965) and Uwe Jens (SPD) refers to Eschenburg's *Herrschaft der Verbände* book (May 11, 1979).<sup>15</sup> Each book title itself provides a slogan that suits well to be used in the debates of the Bundestag.

---

<sup>14</sup> Theodor Eschenburg, *Der Sold des Politikers* (Stuttgart: Seewald, 1959).

<sup>15</sup> Theodor Eschenburg, *Herrschaft der Verbände* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1955[1963]).

Dolf Sternberger's two famous catchwords, *Staatsfreundschaft* (friendship to the state) and *Verfassungspatriotismus* (constitutional patriotism) are also reminded. The former goes back to the celebration of the 100 years of the SPD and was originally published in 1963. Willy Brandt alludes Sternberger's formula in order to illustrate how 'state-friendly' the SPD has become: 'darin zeigt sich ..., wie sehr die Sozialdemokraten, die noch lange eine Scheu vor der Macht hatten, in ihrer Staatsfreundschaft – wie Dolf Sternberger es genannt hat – gewachsen sind' (March 13, 1975). *Verfassungspatriotismus* was coined in Sternberger's editorial in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* for celebrating the 30 years of West German *Grundgesetz* in 1979.<sup>16</sup> In the Bundestag Freimut Duve (SPD) subscribes to the slogan: 'In dem Wort vom 'Verfassungspatriotismus' hat Dolf Sternberger die beiden großen Ziele – wir gehören zusammen, als freie Bürger – vereint' (May 27, 1998).

To these uses of political science professors as authorities a few critical remarks might also be remembered. To Max Güde's (CDU) praise of Eschenburg's critical view of parliamentary examination commissions Wolfgang Schwabe (SPD) shouts: 'Auch Eschenburg irrt!' (April 29, 1964). Dolf Sternberger was a well-known supporter of the British-style simple majority electoral system, for which the Kiesinger-Brandt grand coalition was initially favourable.<sup>17</sup> In a polemic with Bert Even (CDU), Thomas Dehler (FDP) downplays the arguments of Sternberger as an old hobby horse: 'dann muß ich mich auseinandersetzen mit Dolf Sternberger und Hermens und all denen ... mit all diesen Scheinargumenten für ein angebliches Mehrheitswahlrecht' (December 16, 1966).

---

<sup>16</sup> Bernhard Vogel, *Dolf Sternberger und die Politische Wissenschaft* (lecture, Marbach, June 23, 2007) [http://www.kas.de/wf/doc/kas\\_12423-544-1-30.pdf?080213161147](http://www.kas.de/wf/doc/kas_12423-544-1-30.pdf?080213161147).

<sup>17</sup> Sebastian Ullrich, *Der Weimar-Komplex* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2009).



Eschenburg, Sternberger and Hennis are thus treated in the debates of the Bundestag rather as occasional politicians in the Weberian sense than as renowned academic scholars. The professional parliamentarians hope to gain added value out of their academic standing but retain a critical distance towards professors as persons, notoriously incapable to practising politics.

### **Theorists of politics in the Bundestag**

As final stage of analysis I looked at the presence of three German-writing authors, who explicitly contributed to the conceptualisation of politics, Max Weber, Carl Schmitt and Hannah Arendt, in the Bundestag. I think they do not need any presentation. The number of debates quoting them with their first name is:

Max Weber 131

Hannah Arendt 33

Carl Schmitt 23

The profile of the quotes differs from those of the contemporary professors in so far as they are treated as 'classics'. The quotes tend to increase with the time. Weber's outnumbering of the others might be understandable because his academic topics remain closer to parliamentary practices than Schmitt's or Arendt's.

As for the contemporary political scientists, the three 'classics' are quoted by CDU/CSU, SPD, FDP and Green members, Arendt once even by a PDS member. The chancellors Helmut Schmidt (March 19, 1975) and Helmut Kohl (January 30, 1981) quote Max Weber, Schmidt also Carl Schmitt (March 14, 1968), while Angela Merkel quotes Hannah Arendt (March 25, 2004), but only Schmidt's Weber quotes are from his chancellor term.

## **Carl Schmitt: a warning example**

Whereas Weber and Arendt are quoted as authorities, Carl Schmitt is mainly referred as a warning example, a closeness to whom discredits the adversaries in the Bundestag.

The stigmatisation of Schmitt persists in the Bundestag, despite all international Schmitt Renaissance in the academia.

There are a couple of exceptions. Hugo Hauser (CDU) borrows a concept from Schmitt, 'eine sogenannte dilatorische Kompromißformel, um einen Begriff zu gebrauchen, den einst Carl Schmitt geprägt hat' (April 14, 1967) and Matthias Zimmer (CDU) refers to Schmitt's view how theological debates migrate to politics (July 7, 2011). But the CDU family minister Heiner Geissler denounces Schmitt's views as a right-wing variant the post-Hegelian philosophy of total state: 'Mensch und Familie werden zum bloßen Teil des Staates' (September 13, 1984, also September 13, 1985). For Helmut Schmidt in turn, Carl Schmitt represents 'alten romantischen deutschen Irrationalismus', which in a new fashion has arisen again on the right and among the communist and sectarian left (March 14, 1968).

Gerd Müller (CSU) mentions in the debate on the EU constitutional treaty Schmitt's dark prognosis of 'Entparliamentarisierung der Demokratie' (February 24, 2005). In contrast Gerd Weisskirchen (SPD) sees that we have luckily got rid of national sovereignty bound to Schmitt's 'nomos of the earth': 'die Zeit der klassischen nationalstaatlichen Souveränität, die an das Territorium und die, wie Carl Schmitt es gesagt hat, an den Nomos der Erde gebunden war, ist glücklicherweise vorbei' (July 3, 2007).

Erich Mende, the FDP Vice-chancellor in the Erhard government, opposes at several occasions to Schmitt's anti-parliamentarism. Against the practice of reading prepared speeches in the plenum of the Bundestag he defends debating as the principle

of parliamentarism: ‘jener diskursive Vorgang von Rede und Gegenrede, von Argument und Gegenargument mit dem Ziel, die relativ beste Lösung zu finden’. When reading speeches have become a common practice in the Bundestag, Mende finds it difficult to defend parliamentary principles against Schmitt (June 26, 1955). Under the Kiesinger-Brandt grand coalition, Mende repeats the argument and refers to Schmitt when opposing to the time restrictions for the FDP amendments (June 14, 1967) and to government plans to reduce the number of the Bundestag members (March 27, 1969). The SPD minister Horst Ehmke also mentions Schmitt as an adversary of parliamentary democracy, but refers to his argument against adjournment and defends the government view on the urgent decision by the Bundestag (February 24, 1972).

In recent debates on terrorism and state security Green and SPD members dispute Schmitt’s famous thesis on the state of exception (for example Thomas Oppermann (SPD, November 18, 2013) and Renate Künast (Grüne, November 24, 2015). Jürgen Trittin (Grüne) claims that a strategy paper of the CSU resembles the first sentence of Schmitt’s *Politische Theologie*, linking sovereignty with the ability to declare the state of exception.<sup>18</sup> For Trittin, if the state of war is normal and the state of exception the rule, then the constitutional order breaks down.

Wissen Sie, woran ich mich sofort erinnert gefühlt habe? An den ersten Satz der Politischen Theologie von Carl Schmitt. Dort heißt es: Souverän ist, wer über den Ausnahmezustand entscheidet ... Dadurch, dass Sie den Kriegszustand als Normalzustand definieren, wollen Sie den Ausnahmezustand in der Sicherheitspolitik zum Regelfall machen... (May 7, 2008; see also Trittin’s speech on September 17, 2008)

Hans-Dietrich Genscher (FDP), Minister of Interior in the Brandt government, is the

---

<sup>18</sup> Carl Schmitt, *Politische Theologie* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1979[1922]).

only member who alludes to Schmitt's famous friend-enemy-distinction. Against the former CDU Chancellor Kurt-Georg Kiesinger, who had linked politics to war, Genscher speaks:

Aber "Krieg"! Ist das nicht eigentlich die Wiederbelebung jenes Begriffes, den ich eigentlich aus der deutschen Politik verbannt zu sehen hoffte, die Wiederbelebung des bösen Wortes vom Freund-Feind-Verhältnis in der Politik? (Beifall bei der SPD) Sein Vater Carl Schmitt – mit C – sagt: Der politische Feind braucht nicht moralisch böse, er braucht nicht ästhetisch häßlich zu sein, – kann man nicht behaupten – (Lachen bei der CDU/CSU) er muß nicht als wirtschaftlicher Konkurrent auftreten, und es kann vielleicht sogar vorteilhaft und rentabel sein, mit ihm Geschäfte zu machen. Der Feind ist in einem besonders intensiven Sinne existentiell ein Anderer und Fremder, mit dem im extremen Fall existentielle Konflikte möglich sind. Diese Form des politischen Konflikts wollen wir eben nicht. (October 30, 1969)

This is no exact quote from *Der Begriff des Politischen*, but Genscher makes here a point with the distinction between adversary and enemy.<sup>19</sup> The relationships between parliamentary parties or between the government and opposition cannot be understood in terms of war and enmity.

### **Hannah Arendt: history politics and politics as freedom**

The Hannah Arendt quotes in the Bundestag use her as an authority, whose ideas and catchwords should be remembered. Many of the quotes refer to the politics of the past (see already Gerhard Schröder, the CDU Minister of Interior, February 18, 1960). With her it is possible to remind contemporary politicians for not forgetting the Nazi past of Germany and to understand that 'organised guilt' should not be mixed with the thesis on 'collective guilt'. In the context of decriminalising the war deserters Helmut Lippelt

---

<sup>19</sup> Carl Schmitt, *Der Begriff des Politischen* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1979[1932/1963]).

(Grüne) refers to this distinction as Arendt's original contribution<sup>20</sup>:

Ende der 40er Jahre, ..., hat Hannah Arendt einen kleinen Aufsatz mit dem Titel "Organisierte Schuld" geschrieben. Sie hat sich damit gegen die damals verbreitete These von der Kollektivschuld des deutschen Volkes gewandt und gesagt: Nein, keine Kollektivschuld, aber dieses Volk hat unter einem Regime gelebt, das Schuld an dieses Volk heranorganisiert hat. (March 16, 1995, on the politics of the past see also Lippelt September 1, 1989, Jürgen Reents, Grüne, February 9, 1984; Gerd Weisskirchen, SPD, January 30, 1997)

Wolfgang Thierse (SPD), as President of the Bundestag, refers to Arendt's view that a coming terms with the past is possible only in the form of posterior stories:

Sofern es überhaupt ein Bewältigen der Vergangenheit gibt, besteht es in dem Nacherzählen dessen, was sich ereignet hat. Aber auch dieses Nacherzählen, das Geschichte formt, löst keine Probleme und beschwichtigt kein Leiden, es bewältigt nichts endgültig. Vielmehr regt es, solange der Sinn des Geschehens lebendig bleibt – dies kann durch sehr lange Zeiträume der Fall sein –, zu immer wiederholendem Erzählen an. (November 14, 1991)

Arendt's discussion of guilt and remembering is also applied to contemporary Ruanda (Andeas Nick, CDU, April 4, 2014) and to the terrorist group 'Nationalsozialistischer Untergrund', responsible for ten murders of predominantly immigrants in Germany (Volker Ullrich CSU, November 5, 2014).

Soon after its publication Thomas Dehler's (FDP) refers to Arendt's thesis in *Eichmann in Jerusalem* that Eichmann was not a monster but a stupid, ordinary man:

---

<sup>20</sup> Hannah Arendt, 'Organisierte Schuld', in *Verborgene Tradition: Acht Essays* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1976[1945]), 35–49.

‘hier und da habe sie ... hell auflachen müssen über die Dummheit, über die Einfalt dieses Menschen; Eichmann sei ein Hanswurst gewesen’ (March 10, 1965).<sup>21</sup>

Freimut Duve (SPD) quotes from Arendt’s totalitarianism book that the destruction of human rights was the core of Hitler’s foreign policy, which had discredited the very concept as hypocritical idealism (May 7, 1984). Gerd Weisskirchen (SPD) takes up Arendt’s formula right to have rights: ‘Jeder Mensch hat ein Recht auf Menschenrechte’ (November 30, 2005). Marieluise Beck (Grüne) in her critique of Russian aggression in Ukraina evokes Arendt’s thesis on the factual truths as a principle that should be respected in international law (April 27, 2017, see also her views on the Balkans, June 11, 2015). Thomas Kossenday, CDU (November 14, 1991) mentions Arendt’s thesis on bureaucracy as the rule of nobody, *Niemandsherrschaft*.

SPD members support Arendt’s consensual view of power as acting in concert. Karin Kortmann demands for a new ‘social contract’ with the countries of the south (January 21, 2002). At his installation as the *Bundespräsident* Johannes Rau refers before the Bundestag to Arendt’s view on the love of the world: ‘Politik ist angewandte Liebe zur Welt’ (July 1, 1999), and Bundestagspräsident Wolfgang Thierse quotes the same formula at the installing Rau’s successor (July 1, 2004).

The most quoted reference to Arendt’s understanding of politics is taken from the fragments published in 1993 under the title *Was ist Politik?*<sup>22</sup> Margarete Wolf (Grüne) is the first to emphasise the freedom included in politics, as opposed to bureaucracy:

---

<sup>21</sup> Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem: Ein Bericht von der Banalität des Bösen* (Leipzig: Reclam, 1990[1963]).

<sup>22</sup> Hannah Arendt, *Was ist Politik?*, ed. Ursula Ludz (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1993).

Unsere verkrusteten bürokratischen Strukturen müssen im Interesse von mehr Arbeitsplätzen und des Strukturwandels auf den Prüfstand. Nur wenn wir das angehen, haben wir eine Chance. Auch hierfür gilt das Motto, das für Hannah Arendt immer prägend war: Die Aufgabe von Politik ist Freiheit. (6.5. 1999, see also her speech 5.4. 2001)

The idea, with a more precise quote “‘Der Sinn von Politik ist Freiheit’”, wie Hannah Arendt sagt’ is taken up by Ulla Jelpke (PDS), with a critical edge against the SPD-Greens coalition (November 15, 2001). Angela Merkel, then the leader of the CDU opposition, repeats the same formula a couple of years later by saying that it is popular to quote Arendt and she also wants to do that:

Da in diesen Tagen manchmal Hannah Arendt zitiert worden ist, möchte auch ich einen Satz von ihr zitieren. Sie hat gesagt: Der Sinn von Politik ist Freiheit. Ich glaube, dass der Sinn von Politik für uns ist, unser freiheitliches Leben in einer gerechten Gesellschaft voranzutreiben. (March 25, 2004)

Freedom thus remains a catchword, which even the PDS wants to claim for one’s own side. The quotes (see also Edathy, SPD, January 21, 2005) insisting on a conceptual link between freedom and politics are all from the period of the red-green coalition. Arendt has been quoted in support of a version of a ‘republican’ view on liberty, which Quentin Skinner sees as a counter-concept to dependence, in contrast to ‘freedom from inference’, for which freedom and politics would be opposed to each other.<sup>23</sup> Perhaps it is indicative that among the MdBs quoted are no FDP members.

### **Max Weber’s ideal type of politician**

In the early days of the Bundestag Richard Hammer (FDP), a medical doctor born in 1897, refers to Weber as ‘my teacher’ (July 27, 1950). Else-Marie Lüders (FDP)

---

<sup>23</sup> Quentin Skinner, *Liberty before Liberalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

assumes that Max Weber is known for all members (October 29, 1958). Thomas Dehler (FDP) refers to the first *Bundespräsident* Theodor Heuß (also FDP), who had known Max Weber and who recommended to Adenauer's cabinet ministers to read *Politik als Beruf* every year: 'Bei einem Neujahrsempfang hat Theodor Heuß einmal dem versammelten Kabinett den Rat oder die Mahnung gegeben, in jedem Jahr einmal 'Politik als Beruf' zu lesen. Ich tue es' (December 16, 1966). Ulrike Bahr (SPD) assumes the familiarity of Weber's metaphor of politics as boring hard boards for all: 'denn wir alle wissen seit Max Weber: Politik ist das starke und langsame Bohren dicker Bretter mit Leidenschaft und Augenmaß' (June 22, 2017).

Weber is also quoted throughout the party spectrum. A majority of Weber mentions (74 debates) refer to *Politik als Beruf* and concern mainly four topics: the opposition between living off and living from politics; the triad of the qualities of the politician; the pair of two ethics of politicians and the final metaphor of slow boring boards. Although the slow boring example provokes the most original interpretations and further developments of Weber's ideas, I have discussed it elsewhere<sup>24</sup>, and will leave it out here.

Weber (already 1905) borrowed the terms of 'living for' and 'living off' politics (*für die* vs. *von der Politik leben*) from James Bryce's *The American Commonwealth*.<sup>25</sup> In the Bundestag the problematic of professionalisation of politics arose mainly in the context of the compensation, later salaries of the members.

---

<sup>24</sup> Kari Palonen, *Max Webers Begriffspolitik* (Baden-Baden: Nomos, forthcoming).

<sup>25</sup> Max Weber, 'Bemerkungen im Anschluß an den vorstehenden Aufsatz von: R. Blank, Die soziale Zusammensetzung der sozialdemokratischen Wählerschaft in Deutschland', [1905], in *Max-Weber-Studienausgabe*, ed. Wolfgang Schluchter, vol. 1 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 69–70; James Bryce, *The American Commonwealth* (Indianapolis: Liberty Press, 1995[1888/1914]).



The first to take up the topic was Carlo Schmid (SPD), a famous lawyer and for some years a political science professor in Tübingen: 'wer für die Politik lebt, in der Politik müsse leben können'. He also uses Weber's concept of *Abkömmlichkeit*, availability for parliamentary career, understanding that parliamentary democracy can only work if there are enough candidates available for parliament. The state must guarantee such availability, that 'sich genügend Menschen der Art, wie wir sie hier brauchen, von einer Berufstätigkeit abkömmlich machen können' (February 12, 1960). After a discussion of the situation parliamentarians in different countries Schmid demands that constitutional law should be adapted to the MdBs' real living conditions.

The theologian Eugen Gerstenmaier (CDU), President of the Bundestag, offers an historical account of the compensation for the members in Germany. He notes that the constitution of the Reich had excluded this, 52 years before 'Max Webers durchdringenden Einsichten über die "Politik als Beruf"' (February 22, 1967).

More recently Volker Beck (Grüne) quotes Weber's view that an alternative to the 'plutocratic recruitment' of parliamentarians is that 'ihre Führung wird Vermögenslosen zugänglich gemacht, und dann muß sie entgolten werden'. Referring to the *Diätenurteil* of the Bundesverfassungsgericht from 1975, Beck claims, in line with Weber, that the compensation must be so efficient that it guarantees the independence of the parliamentarians (December 16, 1995). He later repeats the Weberian view with the addition that also leading political positions can be misused 'für ihre privaten ökonomischen Interessen auszunutzen', what the Greens, of course, did not want (June 30, 2011).

Common to these cases is to use Weber's authority to legitimise a proud defence of parliamentary politics against the popular prejudices and a willingness to strengthen the independence of members by public finances.

In *Politik als Beruf*, originally a lecture in Munich late January 1919, Weber discusses the ethos of the politician with the pair *Verantwortungsethik* vs. *Gesinnungsethik*. Although Weber turns above all against the consequences of a pure ethics of conviction, he clearly recognises that the two ethics are both incompatible and equally indispensable. The ideal typical politician must try to combine them even if knowing that it is impossible.<sup>26</sup>

In the Bundestag debates Weber is mainly seen as a defender of the ethics of responsibility, although Theo Weigel (CSU), later Minister of Finance, recognises: ‘die Verantwortungsethik, die Sie von Max Weber und anderen ableiten, sich nicht ohne Gesinnung vollzieht, und Verantwortungsethik und Gesinnungsethik sich nicht ausschließen’ (September 10, 1986). Also Hermann Otto Solms (FDP) understands that responsibility without conviction is as dangerous as the opposite case, but sees that currently too many people rely in politics merely on conviction: ‘Max Weber nennt solche Leute Windbeutel’ and requires a courage to unpopular politics (March 30, 1995), Weber uses ‘Windbeutel’ (windbag) in his notes to the lecture, at the time of Solms’s speech published in the *Gesamtausgabe* and *Studienausgabe*.<sup>27</sup>

The earliest defenders of ethics of responsibility with a Weber reference are prominent Social Democrats. Karl Schiller (SPD) quotes, a few days before the fall of the Erhard government, both the triadic quality of the politician and the opposition between the two ethics: ‘Allerdings hat Max Weber vor 50 Jahren gesagt: Die bloße Geste der Gesinnungsethik genügt für die Politik nicht; die Verantwortungsethik muß

---

<sup>26</sup> Max Weber, ‘Politik als Beruf’, [1919], in *Max-Weber-Studienausgabe*, ed. Wolfgang Schluchter, vol. 1 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994) esp. 85–8.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 86.

hinzukommen' (November 10, 1966). He thus seems to claim that opposition is more responsible in economic matters than the government.

The Chancellor Helmut Schmidt admits that it is rare to confess something in parliament, but following a speech of Richard v. Weiszäcker (CDU) he commits himself to the ethic of responsibility:

für mich als Politiker, als politischen Menschen kommt nur das in Betracht, was Max Weber "Verantwortungsethik" genannt hat: ... daß der politisch entscheidende Mensch, der politisch handelnde Mensch nach Abwägung – oder, wie Weber ja sagt, nach Abwägung "mit Augenmaß" trotz "Leidenschaft" – (Windelen [CDU/CSU]: Aber auch Geduld!) verantworten muß, was an Folgen aus seinem Handeln entsteht, nicht nur die von ihm erstrebten Ziele, sondern auch das, was an anderen Folgen, an Nebenfolgen, an Gegenwirkungen, also das, was insgesamt an Folgen aus seinem Handeln entsteht. (March 19, 1975)

Schmidt uses the Weberian vocabulary to emphasise that unintended consequences, which are always present in politics<sup>28</sup> and links this to balancing *Augenmaß* and *Leidenschaft*, following the final page of *Politik als Beruf*. Responsibility is for Schmidt an ethical principle, whereas passion and detachment are part of a politician's judgement.

For CDU and FDP members it is common to favour one-sidedly the ethics or responsibility. The Bavarian Minister of Education, Political Science professor Hans Maier (CSU) opposes in a debate on the *Berufsverbot* 'einen unbegrenzten Subjektivismus ab, in das, was Max Weber Gesinnungsethik genannt hat' and looks for 'objective criteria' for judging the applicants (February 15, 1979). Kurt J. Rossmannith (CDU) opposes the Social Democratic educational policy in the *Länder* with the Weberian pair: 'weshalb manchmal in Diskussionen über Politiker von

---

<sup>28</sup> Weber, 'Politik als Beruf', 75–6.

Gesinnungslumperei und nicht von Verantwortungslumperei gesprochen wird' (May 28, 1985). Rolf Olderog (CDU) tries to use Weber for support of his view against immigration: 'Seit Max Weber wissen wir, daß in der Politik Verantwortungsethik und nicht Gesinnungsethik gefordert ist. Wir wollen kein Einwanderungsland sein' (June 24, 1988, see also Norbert Eimer, FPD, in favour of strengthening the asylum criteria of the Grundgesetz (May 26, 1993). For Helmut Rauber (CDU) a conscientious objector can 'gesinnungsethisch den Dienst an der Waffe verweigern' but the state must act 'nach dem Grundsatz der Verantwortungsethik' (February 20, 1996). For Weber the state definitely is no acting collective person.<sup>29</sup>

In matters of punishing violence in marriage Horst Eylmann (CDU) appeals to the ethics of responsibility (May 12, 1989). Two years later he argues with it against the anti-abortion fundamentalists of his own party: 'Mein Standpunkt ist ... verantwortungsethisch im Sinne der Trennung von Max Weber begründet, die ich immer noch für richtig halte. Ich muß nämlich sehen, was nachher aus den Gesetzen in diesem Lande wird.' (September 26, 1991) For Michael Frieser (CSU) *Verantwortungsethik* requires to focus on small steps instead of ideological controversies in the world-wide struggle against the death penalty (October 7, 2010). In a debate on the government report on the foreign policy the ultra-right CDU member Erika Steinbach claims that the *Gesinnungsethik* concerns only the saints, not politicians (November 25, 2015).

The triad *Leidenschaft*, *Verantwortungsgefühl*, *Augenmaß* – passion, sense of responsibility, detached judgement – as criteria for politicians is also repeatedly used. Carlo Schmid (SPD) paraphrases Weber on the political requirements for a minister: 'die sachorientierte Leidenschaft, Verantwortlichkeit gegenüber eben dieser Sache,

---

<sup>29</sup> Kari Palonen, 'The State as a Chance Concept', *Max Weber Studies* 11, no. 1 (2011): 99–117.

Augenmaß und Distanz zu den Dingen und Menschen' (October 25, 1962). He thus presents also Weber's explication of them, which is not always the case (see Hans Engelhart, FDP, March 29, 1979; Friedhelm Bohl, CDU, June 26, 1985). Such pedagogical tones are less moves in an ongoing debate on a motion than attempts to enlighten fellow MPs, maybe with some element of manifesting one's own learning.

For Weber all the aspects of the triad are of equal weight. In a debate on the rules of procedure, Annemarie Renger (SPD) wants less polemics but more passion: 'Ich wünschte mir allerdings – um Max Weber zu bemühen –, daß die Leidenschaft für die Sache neben Verantwortungsgefühl und Augenmaß noch stärker und für die Bürger spürbarer zum Ausdruck käme.' (January 30, 1986, see also Joachim Poß, SPD, November 28, 2008).

Weber's triad serves also a polemical tool, to claim that some of the ideal-typical qualities of the politician are lacking from the adversaries. In the debate on the installation of the Kiesinger-Brandt coalition Alex Möller (SPD) replied to Thomas Dehler (FDP):

Ich habe, als er heute sprach, wieder an Max Weber gedacht und an die drei Qualitäten, die Max Weber als für den Politiker entscheidend ansieht: Leidenschaft im Sinne der Sachlichkeit, Verantwortungsgefühl – selbstverständlich beides bei Herrn Dehler vorhanden – und Augenmaß. ... Hier gestatten Sie mir ganz leise, vorsichtige Zweifel. Herr Dehler hat gesagt, die SPD war 1949 nicht koalitionswürdig. (December 15, 1966)

Hubertus Heil (SPD) takes up Weber's triad in three speeches. He first disputes Rainer Brüderle, the FDP Minister of Economy, both passion and distance: 'Leidenschaft habe ich bei der Rede von Herrn Brüderle eben auch nicht gespürt ... Außerdem kann ich beim Handeln dieser Regierung in der Haushaltspolitik auch kein Augenmaß erkennen.' (January 21, 2010). In discussing the European Union Heil takes up first the willingness

to take responsibility for unpopular politics – ‘die Bereitschaft, Verantwortung zu übernehmen in einer Zeit, in der es nicht populär ist, für Lösungen einzustehen, die aber notwendig sind, um das gemeinsame Europa auch wirtschaftlich zusammenzuhalten’ (November 24, 2011). Again Brüderle is the target: ‘Ihm fehlt die leidenschaftliche Überzeugung, in Europa voranzukommen und es stärker zu integrieren’, whereas from the entire FDP lacks *Augenmaß* (November 24, 2011). Finally, Heil claims that the eurosceptic Frank Schäffler (FDP) has neither responsibility nor detached judgment: ‘Ich spreche Ihnen nicht die Leidenschaft ab; aber den Beweis, dass Sie die Bereitschaft haben, Verantwortung zu übernehmen, sind Sie heute schuldig geblieben. Auch Augenmaß spricht nicht aus Ihrer Argumentation.’ (June 20, 2012)

Weber’s elementary formulations on politics as striving for power – ‘Politik würde also für uns heißen: Streben nach Machtanteil und Beeinflussung der Machtverteilung’ or, ‘Wer Politik treibt, erstrebt Macht’<sup>30</sup> – are not quoted in the references to Weber. Is striving for power too evident for Bundestag members – as opposed to Weber’s student audience in January 1919? Or is the reason rather, that Weber *Chance*-based conception of power is too complicated to be elaborated in a parliamentary debate?

### **Concluding remarks**

Similarities between the parliamentary uses of contemporary political science professors and modern classics on the field concern the use of their slogans, which all of them have provided quite abundantly. References to Arendt and Weber can provide some distance to the actual debates, but their slogans can contribute to the debate or might be used in a partisan way. Anyhow, it seems that the members have done some reading of the

---

<sup>30</sup> Weber, ‘Politik als Beruf’, 36.

modern classics, although the stigmatising uses of Schmitt might indicate a second- or third-hand knowledge. Especially in the case of Weber there are occasional rather long quotes, although not always exact ones.

Even if Latin poetry is hardly used, the way of using the three modern classics suffices to give to the Bundestag a tone of a literate parliament in matters of political theory and political science. The references to Schmitt also illustrate that for parliamentary debates notorious thinkers also have their rhetorical uses. Of Weber's blank-boring example, I found also some innovative interpretations contributing to re-thinking of some aspects of politics in the context of actual parliamentary debates.

In many fields academic concepts are met in parliament with deference, and scholars as experts in parliamentary committees, they are tempted to appeal to academic authorities. Weber's rhetorical devices against the knowledge of the officials (cross-examination, access to the sources, parliamentary examination commissions<sup>31</sup>) can also be used towards the uncritical appeal to academics. In so far it is rather refreshing to know that although political scientists are used as rhetorical authorities in debate, their views are not taken as indisputable but rather as slogans or sources of inspiration that the members use for their own purposes.

The members of the Bundestag – at least from the 1970s onwards – do not have any deference towards political science. When Weber's or Arendt's formulae are occasionally quoted, they are not taken as authoritative definitions. I rather think that a typical attitude among the parliamentarians is 'we if anyone know what politics is' – don't come to teach us. Guido Westerwelle's parody of political science seminars might

---

<sup>31</sup> Max Weber, 'Parlament und Regierung im neugeordneten Deutschland', [1918], *Max-Weber-Studienausgabe*, ed. Wolfgang J. Mommsen, vol. 1 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988), 202–302, here 235–48.

be mistaken, but it still manifests the basic attitude: politics is not learnt from books but in doing politics.

All this makes parliamentarians talk about politics even more interesting. When they do not repeat academic textbook formulae or scholar's terminology, where they do get their views on politics? How far we can find self-explanations of how the MPs have formed their view on politics. Which are their paradigmatic examples and experiences in regarding something as 'politics' or 'political'. Which are the criteria they use in such occasions. In which kinds of parliamentary debate situations we might expect to find such 'confessions' as Helmut Schmidt said? How to combine the search options on the website with typological<sup>32</sup> or conceptual historical<sup>33</sup> schemes of interpreting politics/political in the debates?

---

<sup>32</sup> Kari Palonen, 'Four Times of Politics', *Alternatives* 28, no. 2 (2003): 171–86.

<sup>33</sup> Palonen, *Struggle with Time*.