

National Research University
Higher School of Economics

As a manuscript

Zakharova Olesya Viktorovna

**ANALISYS OF ARGUMENTATIVE SCHEMES (TOPOI) IN THE PRESIDENTIAL
HUMAN RIGHTS AGENDA IN ANNUAL ADDRESSES TO THE FEDERAL
ASSEMBLY OF RUSSIAN FEDERATION
(2000-2017 years)**

SUMMARY OF THE DISSERTATION

for the purpose of obtaining academic degree Doctor of Philosophy in Political
Science HSE

Academic Supervisor:
Doctor of Science
M.Yu. Urnov

Moscow, 2019

Research design

Statement of research problem and literature review

In connection with the growing importance of the institution of presidential power, the study of presidential agenda setting is becoming more and more relevant. Work in this sphere is carried out in several main areas: studying the influence of various factors and subjects on agenda setting, analyzing the role of the president in setting the agenda and the mechanisms he uses to promote it. In the latter case, qualitative research methods are primarily used. J. Cummins, for example, analyzes the Addresses of American presidents focusing on their attention to certain topics in the discourse of the President and the Senate¹. K. Karuson and W.A. Farrar-Majers examine the factors used by the president to promote his foreign policy agenda². J. Rex, using the rhetorical model of the presidency, studies the president's influence on the formation and promotion of the military agenda³.

At the same time, most of the mentioned works are devoted to the analysis of the establishment of a presidential agenda in democratic regimes, while the study of this process under conditions of political transition is paid much less attention, despite how topical it has become. In Russia, this issue is most actively studied by philologists. The majority of such works describe the rhetorical style of the president and the peculiarities of presidential discourse and its genres.⁴ The context and socio-political content of the presidential agenda remain outside the scope of such studies.

In this dissertation we propose to focus on human rights in the presidential agenda and the mechanisms of its formation and transformation. Human rights are a central element of modern debates on the legitimacy of power and therefore the nature of their representation in the presidential agenda is of great importance in understanding the relationship between government and the individual and the nature of the political changes taking place.

The experience of many countries, including Russia, showed that the fall of communism does not necessarily mean a transition to Western democracy. The problem is that borrowed institutions and discourses atypical of a post-communist cultural environment collide with the non-liberal ideas of the domestic political elite. In addition, the elite inevitably take into account

¹ Cummins J. The Partisan Considerations of the President's Agenda // *Polity*. 2010. Vol. 42. №3. P. 398-422.

² Caruson K., Farrar-Myers V.A. Promoting the President's Foreign Policy Agenda: Presidential Use of Executive Agreements as Policy Vehicles // *Policy Research Quarterly*. 2007. Vol. 60. №4. P. 631-644.

³ Rex J. The President's War Agenda: A Rhetorical View // *Presidential Studies Quarterly*. 2011. Vol. 41. №1. P. 93-118.

⁴ Gavrilova M.V. Nekotorye cherty rechevogo portreta pervogo prezidenta Rossii B. N. El'cina // *Politicheskaya lingvistika*. Ekaterinburg: Ural. gos. ped. un-t, 2012. №4 (42). S. 17-22; Gavrilova M.V. Diskursivnyj portret V.V. Putina // *Diskurs-Pi*. Ekaterinburg: IFiP UrO RAN, 2013. №3. S.114-115; Hudyakov A.V. Lingvokognitivnye osobennosti prezidentskogo diskursa konca XX-XXI vekov: na materiale diskursov prezidentov Rossii i Francii: dis. ... kand. filol. nauk. Moskva: Moskovskij gosudarstvennyj oblastnoj universitet, 2019.

the views of the population, which also do not always turn out to be "Western" and democratic. As V. Morozov writes, "the goal-setting of the elite cannot fundamentally differ from the discursive logic of the society in which it functions ... Even if people with power rarely come from the people, their personal experience is necessarily correlated with the collective experience of the nation".⁵

As a result, the discourse that is being shaped in states transitioning to democracy may differ from the original version that served as a model for democratic transformation.

In Russia, the clash of Western ideological concepts with the political culture that developed over decades of Soviet power took place much more dramatically. It led to much more significant change to the borrowed ideas than was seen in Eastern European countries. In this regard, an analysis of the contrasting and profound changes in the political discourse observed in Russia over the last 25 years is extremely important from both a scientific and a practical point of view.

The research problem of the study, therefore, is what happens to liberal ideological concepts when they are embedded in post-communist culture, where they face competing illiberal concepts.

In Russian political science there are only a few studies devoted to those in power using human rights in their discourses. These include a study by S. Chugrov, who notes the role of the human rights discourse as a "politico-forming factor of Russian behavior in the foreign arena",⁶ and one by V. Morozov: Human Rights and Foreign Discourse in Modern Russia: Romantic Realism and the Securitization of Identity.⁷ The last work is closely related to the topic of this dissertation and is focused on the place of human rights within the dominant foreign policy discourse and the interaction of this idea with other fundamental political discourse concepts. However, the study by V. Morozov focuses on the discourse in the short interval between 1999 and 2002, constructed around two political events - the wars in Chechnya and Yugoslavia. This dissertation analyzes the evolution of the presidential human rights agenda in the post-Soviet transition from 2000 to the present. In addition, we use the R. Wodak methodology for a discursive-historical approach, which allows us not only to identify the interpretation of the concept under study, but also to analyze how the argumentation strategy can be used to construct and transform a given agenda.

⁵ Morozov V. Rossiya i drugie. Identichnost' i granicy politicheskogo soobshchestva. M., Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2009.

⁶ Chugrov S. V. K voprosu o pravah cheloveka v Rossijskoj vneshnej politike // Mirovaya ehkonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya. 2001. №6. S. 3-13.

⁷ Morozov V. Human Rights and Foreign Policy Discourse in Today's Russia: Romantic Realism and Securitisation of Identity // East European Human Rights Review. 2002. №8(2), P. 143-198.

For many years the topic of argumentation was developed in the field of logic and philosophy. However, in the 1980s it moved beyond the framework of the those disciplines. Philologists showed an interest in argumentation, focusing on the linguistic means of constructing arguments, the so-called discursive connectors.⁸ Over the past two decades, in line with this shift towards linguistics, argumentation theory has become popular in the analysis of political discourse. In particular, M. Kienpointer (M. Kienpointer) used S. Toulmin's argumentation model⁹ to introduce the notion of "topos"¹⁰ into the discourse analysis terminology that was later used by R. Wodak and M. Reisigl. The latter two, using the discursive-historical approach they developed, proposed a topoi analysis method for revealing and deconstructing argumentation strategies in political discourse.¹¹ This method has been found to one degree or another in the works of many leading experts in political discourse, such as R. Wodak,¹² O. Malinova,¹³ T. van Dijk,¹⁴ A. Reyes,¹⁵ and others.¹⁶ At the same time, most of these works are devoted primarily to the description and analysis of research results. The issue of methodology remains outside the discussion. Moreover, various terminological tools are often used in the aforementioned works, which makes it difficult to identify the methodology.

There are a fairly large number of in-depth works devoted to the theoretical and methodological foundations of political discourse analysis.¹⁷ Among domestic researchers the

⁸ Moeschler J. *Argumentation and Connectives. How Do Discourse Connectives Constrain Argumentation and Utterance Interpretations* // *Interdisciplinary Studies in Pragmatics, Culture and Society*. 2016. P. 653-675.

⁹ Bermejo-Lique, L. *Toulmin's model of argument and the question of relativism* // *Arguing on the Toulmin Model. New Essays in Argument Analysis and Evaluation*, (eds. D. Hitchcock, B. Verheij). Dordrecht: Springer, 2006. P. 71-87.

¹⁰ Zagar I. Z. *Topoi in Critical Discourse Analysis* // *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*. 2010. № 6.1. P. 22.

¹¹ Reisigl M., Wodak R. *The Discourse-Historical Approach* // *Critical Discourse Analysis: Concepts, History, Theory* (ed. Wodak R.). London: SAGE, 2011. P. 63-93.

¹² Wodak R., Cillia de R., Reisigl M., Liebhart K. *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*, 2009.

¹³ Malinova O.YU. *Problema politicheskoi «prigodnogo» proshlogo i ehvolyuciya oficial'noj simvolicheskoi politiki v postsovetsoj Rossii* // *Politicheskaya konceptologiya*. 2013. №1. S. 114-130; Malinova O.YU. *Tema proshlogo v ritorike prezidentov Rossii* // *Pro et Contro*. 2011. Maj-avgust. S. 106-122.

¹⁴ Dijk T. van *Discourse and Ideology* // *Discourse Studies. A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Second Edition. London: Sage, 2011.

¹⁵ Reyes A. *Strategies of Legitimization in Political Discourse: From words to actions* // *Discourse and Society*. 2011. №22. P. 781-807.

¹⁶ For example: Amossy, R. *Argumentation and Discourse Analysis* // *The Discourse Studies Reader: Main currents in theory and analysis* (eds. E. Angermüller, D. Maingueneau, R. Wodak). Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2014. P. 297-305; Boukala S. *Rethinking topos in the discourse historical approach: Endoxon seeking and argumentation in Greek media discourses on "Islamist terrorism"* // *Discourse studies*. 2016. №18 (3). P. 249-268; Eemeren van. F.H., Houtlosser P., Henkemans A. F. S. *Argumentative Indicators in Discourse. A Pragma-Dialectical Study*. Dordrecht: Springer, 2007; Fairclough I., Fairclough N. *Practical reasoning in political discourse: The UK government's response to the economic crisis in the 2008 Pre-Budget Report* // *Discourse & Society*. 2011. Vol. 22, № 3. P. 243-268; Kwon W., Clarke I., Wodak R. *Micro-Level Discursive Strategies for Constructing Shared Views around Strategic Issues in Team Meetings* // *Journal of Management Studies*. 2014. Vol. 51. Issue 2. P. 265-290.

¹⁷ Dijk T. van *Structures of Discourse and Structures of Power* // *Communication Yearbook* / Ed. J.A. Anderson. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1989. P. 18-59; Dijk T. van *What is Political Discourse Analysis?* // *Political linguistics* / Ed. by J. Blommaert & Ch. Bulcaen. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1997. P. 11-52; Fairclough N. *A Dialectical-Relational Approach to Critical Discourse Analysis in Social Research* // *Method of Critical Discourse Analysis* / Ed. by R. Wodak and M. Meyer. London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 2009; Fairclough N. *Language and Power*. New

most significant in this area are the works of M. Ilyin,¹⁸ M.V. Gavrilova,¹⁹ O. F. Rusakova and D.A. Maksimov,²⁰ and I.V. Fomin.²¹ However, there are very few works that describe the methodology for argumentation scheme study (topos) in political discourse, particularly their identification and systematization²². For example, one of the most significant works in this sphere is the research of M.V. Gavrilova on cultural norms of Russian argumentation²³.

As a rule, such studies focus on the analysis of discourse devoted to individual events, or to a short period of time, while longitudinal studies on the use of argumentation strategies have not been conducted. This does not allow for the empirical verification of the relationship between argumentation models and changes in political reality.

Thematic analysis and research into changes in the topoi repertoire in the presidential agenda allow us to identify the main characteristics of the evolving concept of "human rights" in the presidential agenda in conditions of political transition.

In this regard, it seems relevant to systematize the methods used in analyzing the argumentation strategy, clarifying the analytical tools and adapting the methodology of the discursive-historical approach to longitudinal studies of political discourse.

Research question

What is the evolution of the use of argumentation schemes in shaping the human rights agenda within the annual Presidential address to the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation?

York: Longman Group UK Ltd., 1989; Leeuwen T. van Discourse as the Recontextualization of Social Practice: a guide // *Method of Critical Discourse Analysis* / ed. by R. Wodak and M. Meyer. London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 2009; Reisigl M., Wodak R. Opt. cit.; Shapiro M.J. Literary Production as a Politicizing Practice // *Language and Politics (Readings in Social and Political Theory)* / Ed. by M. Shapiro. New York: New York University Press, 1984. P. 387-422; Wodak R., Meyer M. *Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory and Methodology* // *Method of Critical Discourse Analysis* / ed. by R. Wodak and M. Meyer. London, SAGE Publications Ltd, 2009.

¹⁸ Il'in M.V. Politicheskij diskurs kak predmet analiza // *Politicheskaya nauka: Sb. Nauchnyh trudov* / RAN. INION. M., 2002; Il'in M.V. Semiotika kak osnova izucheniya yazyka politiki i razvitiya diskurs-analiza // *Diskurs-Pi*. 2015. №1-2. S. 43-47; Il'in M.V. Semioticheskij, morfologicheskij, komparativnyj metody analiza diskursa v mezhdisciplinarnom prilozhenii // *Biznes. Obschestvo. Vlast'*. 2015. №22. S. 67-82.

¹⁹ Gavrilova M.V. Politicheskij diskurs kak ob"ekt lingvisticheskogo analiza // *Polis. Politicheskie issledovaniya*. 2004. №3. S. 67-82.

²⁰ Rusakova O. F., Maksimov D.A. Politicheskaya diskursologiya: predmetnoe pole, teoreticheskie podhody i strukturnaya model' politicheskogo diskursa // *Polis. Politicheskie issledovaniya*. 2006. №4. S. 26-43.

²¹ Fomin I.V. *Obraz gosudarstva kak predmet politicheskogo diskurs-analiza* // *Dissertaciya ... kand. polit. nauk*. Moskva, 2014.

²² Boukala S. Rethinking topos in the discourse historical approach: Endoxon seeking and argumentation in Greek media discourses on "Islamist terrorism" // *Discourse studies*. 2016. №18 (3). P. 249-268; Zaharova O.V. Identifikaciya i analiz toposov (argumentacionnyh skhem) v politicheskom diskurse // *Politicheskaya nauka*. 2016. №3. S. 217-235.

²³ Gavrilova M.V. *Lingvokognitivnyj analiz russkogo politicheskogo diskursa: dis. ... dokt. filol. nauk*. Sankt-Peterburg: Sankt-Peterburgskij gos. un-t, 2005.

The aim and objectives of the study

The aim of the study is to identify the argumentation schemes (topoi) used to construct and transform the human rights agenda in the annual Presidential Address to the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation.

To achieve this goal this thesis must achieve the following *objectives*:

- To study the approaches and methods developed in discourse analysis theory to the study of the argumentation strategies in political discourse;
- To develop a method to analyze argumentation schemes in political discourse and to analyze the transformation of discursive argumentation models in the context of political changes;
- To form a system of semantic indicators (in Russian) to identify argumentation devices (topos);
- To identify the argumentation devices (topoi) most used in the presidential human rights agenda, and to study the evolution of their use;
- To analyze the transformation of the presidential human rights agenda in the annual Presidential Address to the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation for the periods from 2000 to 2017.

Justification of study boundaries

In this dissertation, we examine the evolution of the argumentation schemes (topoi) used in constructing a human rights agenda within the annual presidential addresses to the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation in the period from 2000 to 2017.

These time periods coincide with V. Putin's and D. Medvedev's presidency. The choice of this chronological period was determined by the following criteria.

First, this period is a period of transition from a semi-democracy to consolidated authoritarianism²⁴. In contemporary political discourse, human rights are a central normative element of the debate into a state's legitimacy. Therefore, the study of human rights on the presidential agenda, as well as their interaction with other important national ideological concepts (great power, identity etc.) during this period of transformation will allow us to theoretically understand the dynamics of the president's ideas the role of the state, and the

²⁴ Mel'vil' A.YU. «Krizis demokratii» i «zavisschie» demokratizacii // Rossijskaya politicheskaya nauka: Idei, koncepcii, metody / Pod obshch. red.: O.V. Gaman-Golutvina. M.: Aspekt Press, 2015. S. 11-30; Medushevskij A.N. Politicheskij rezhim postsovetsoj Rossii: evolyuciya, struktura, tendencii // Social'no-politicheskie nauki. 2015. № 4. S. 7-13; Nisnevich YU.A., Ryabov A.V. Postsovetiskij avtoritarizm // Obshchestvennye nauki i sovremennost'. 2017. №4. S. 84-97.

relationship between the authorities and the individual in the context of the political transition process.

Secondly, the duration of the selected period makes it possible to trace the changes in the argumentation schemes' (topoi) used and compare them with the changes in the Presidential human rights agenda.

Methodology

The theoretical and methodological basis of the study is a critical discourse analysis, or rather, one of its directions is the discursive-historical approach proposed by R. Wodak and M. Reisigl.²⁵

In order to minimize the risk of estimation and bias, the authors of the approach introduce the principle of triangulation, which is based on the concept of "context" centered on four levels²⁶.

The concept of discourse used in this work is based on the definition of "discourse" (language in use), proposed by N. Fairclough in 1989. In the book "Language and Power," he emphasizes the close relationship between discourse and power, noting that the latter is realized through the ideological use of language and that, "no one who is interested in the relationship of power in modern society can ignore language".²⁷

The methodology of argumentation scheme analysis is based on S. Tulmin's argumentation model, according to which each argument has several elements in its structure: a claim, the grounds for this claim (data, basis) and a general conclusion (warrant), which establish a relationship between the grounds and the conclusion. The conclusion is a specific, general, widely shared inference, namely a topos. If the argument is presented as the formula "if D, then C", then the topos in this case acts as the bridge that determines the causal link between D and C. The topos itself is also constructed according to the formula "if A occurs, then B follows" or "if not A, then B." But the feature of the topos is that it is akin to an axiom that does not require proof, since it is generally recognized in this society.

Tulmin's model in essence, is a step-by-step instruction on the identification of topos. First, it is necessary to identify the speaker's main statement and then, by formulating relevant questions, identify all parts of the argument. During this process, the topos and its form are identified.²⁸

²⁵ Reisigl M., Wodak R. Opt. cit.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Fairclough N. Opt. cit. P. 3.

²⁸ Zagar I.Z. Topoi in critical discourse analysis // Lodz papers in pragmatics. Lodz, 2010. N 6.1. P. 3–27.

The advantages of this scheme are that it allows not only for structure of argumentation to be identified, but also to determine the strength of the topos and refutation (counter-argument), and thus, to predict the effectiveness of the arguments built based on this topos. However, this leaves the question of how to methodologically identify the topos and thus reveal the signs of the argumentation scheme being used in the text under study. To solve this problem, in our opinion, the most promising is the pragmatic-dialectical approach of F. H. van Yeemeren, P. Houtlosser, and A.F.S. Henkemans.²⁹ It relies on semantic argumentation indicators when analyzing argumentation discourse.

Argumentation semantic indicators are "certain words or expressions that indicate the unfolding of an argumentative scheme in a text".³⁰ Indicators make it easier to identify argumentation schemes. However, as Eemeren rightly observes, "we cannot refer to indicators if certain words or expressions are not identified as indicators of the corresponding type of topos."³¹ Therefore, there is a need to adapt the provisions of their theory to the peculiarities of the Russian language.

Methods

Our empirical research is based on the R. Wodak and M. Reisigl analysis method for discursive strategies. The research is focused on identifying the dominant interpretations of key categories of human rights and argumentation schemes (topoi) used by speakers to consolidate and promote the proposed meanings.

In general, the research algorithm is constructed as follows:

I. Analysis of the representation of human rights in the annual Address of the President of the Russian Federation.

- Identification and analysis of topics raised within the human rights agenda (including coding,³² developing a book of codes and a method for their identification);

- analysis of the lexical choice made by the speaker (the words used to represent key categories - human rights, freedom, relations between the state and the individual);

Ii. Analysis of the argumentation schemes (topoi) used by the speaker in establishing the human rights agenda.

- Constructing a system of semantic indicators for various types of topoi (adapted for the Russian language);

²⁹ Eemeren van. F.H., Houtlosser P., Henkemans A. F. S. Opt. cit. P. 1.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid.

³² The coding was conducted with MAXQDA 2018.

- Identifying the various types of topoi in the analyzed texts, their coding,³³ systematization and description;
- Designing a repertoire of topoi for each period of the presidency and conducting their comparative analysis;
- Analyzing the evolution of changes in various types of argumentation schemes (topoi) during the periods from 2000 to 2007, from 2012 to 2018 and the relationship of different topoi among themselves;
- Establishing the contextual links between different types of topoi and topics in the analyzed texts;
- Revealing the discursive functions of various types of topoi.

Selection of empirical data

The study was conducted based on the formation and transformation of the head of state's human rights agenda, particularly in the framework of the annual Addresses of Russian Presidents Vladimir Putin and Dmitrii Medvedev. In total, 18 annual Addresses by V. Putin were analyzed for the periods from 2000 to 2017.

This approach is quite popular in political science and has been used many times in research papers³⁴.

Such speeches are programmatic: they highlight key areas of domestic and foreign policy. Thus, the inclusion or non-inclusion of human rights in the annual Addresses is essential for analyzing the latter's place in the political discourse. In addition, as noted by O. Yu. Malinova, each year the Addresses touch approximately the same range of issues, which makes them convenient for conducting a comparative analysis, and makes it possible to follow the transformation of the president's approach to the use of topoi.³⁵

Contributions to the discussion of the problem in existing literature

In the dissertation, based on the discursive-historical approach of R. Wodak and M. Reisigl, we designed a scheme for analyzing the transformation of the collection of in a political discourse in the context of political transition. In addition, we adapted the system of argumentative semantic indicators, developed under F.Kh. van Yeemeren, P. Houtlosser and A.F.S. Henkemans's theory, for Russian-language political texts. The methodological results

³³ The coding was conducted with MAXQDA 2018.

³⁴ See, Burett T. Opt. cit. P. 74; Cohen J. Presidential Rhetoric and the Public Agenda // American Journal of Political Science. 1995. Vol. 39. P. 87-107 etc.

³⁵ Malinova O.YU. Aktual'noe proshloe: simvolicheskaya politika vlastvuyushchej ehliny i dilemmy rossijskoj identichnosti. M., ROSSPEHN, 2015. S. 130-131.

obtained can be used to further develop and systematize the theory and methodology of political discourse analysis.

The proposed methodology can be used by researchers and experts to analyze the features of political discursive strategies (the collection of topoi used by political actors as well as their evolution in a political and historical context. This approach is promising for predicting the effectiveness of the argumentation strategies chosen.

The results of this study are rich in material to identify the strategies and techniques used in consolidating, reproducing and transforming ideological concepts in political discourse in the context of sociopolitical changes. Thus, they can contribute to increased knowledge of the political transition processes taking place in post-Soviet Russia. It should be noted that most studies of Russian transition are devoted to structural changes, while the discursive aspects, which are no less important, are not given enough attention. In this paper, an attempt is made to partially fill this gap.

The analysis model constructed can be used not only to study political discourse in Russia, but also in other political transitions.

Statements to be defended

1. The discourse-historical approach by R. Wodak and M. Reisigl can be used for the analysis of political transitions.

2. A longitudinal study of argumentation schemes (topoi) in the annual addresses of the president of the Russian Federation, V. Putin, in 2000 – 2017, makes it possible to identify two sustainable models of argumentation strategy used in shaping a specific human rights agenda. The first type is present in the addresses of 2000-2014, the second one - in the addresses of 2015-2017.

3. The addresses of 2000-2014 are characterized by the use of ideological concepts "human rights" and "democracy", and the close intersection of the "human rights" with the idea of a "strong state". Although Medvedev's Addresses interpreted the concept of a "strong state" somewhat differently than Putin's Addresses, the basic idea of the link between a strong state and human rights remained. The concept "strong state" to a certain extent entered into competition with the interpretation of human rights, proposed by the liberals of the 1990s and implying a certain degree of accountability of the state to international human rights bodies. Meanwhile, the pathos of the state sovereignty, which is inspired by Putin's speeches, rejects the possibility of external influence on domestic politics.

The concept of a "strong state" as a necessary condition for the human rights allowed the conflict to be overcome.

In this concept:

- the ability to guarantee human rights was treated as one of the main characteristics of a “strong (and possibly, great power) state”,
- and at the same time, it was emphasized that human rights can’t hinder the building of a strong sovereign state that does not allow external control over itself.

4. The deterioration of relations between Russia and the West after the Crimean crisis of 2014 led to the ousting of the “human rights” and “democracy” from the presidential addresses. In the addresses of 2015-2017 the topoi of human rights and democracy have practically ceased to be used. Instead of them, the topoi of responsibility and humanity appear. Topos of humanity performs almost the same functions as the topos of human rights, but without the use of human rights vocabulary.

And the topos of responsibility, combined with the topos of unity, successfully replace the topos of democracy and make it possible to justify political decisions without reference to the will of the people or democratic procedures.

The same model of argumentation strategy is observed in Medvedev's Addresses during the Georgian-Ossetian conflict: the rejection of the concepts of "human rights" and "democracy" and the inclusion of the topoi responsibility, humanity and unity in the repertoire of argumentation schemes.

5. Analysis of the transformation of argumentation models has not only a descriptive, but also a prognostic potential. The change of argumentation strategy allows us to describe the nature of political change.

Papers

Publications in peer-reviewed journals

1. Zakharova O.V. Official Human Rights Discourse in Post-communist Russia: from Liberalism to Paternalism // Social Sciences. 2016. № 2. P. 82-93.
2. Zakharova O.V. Identification and Analysis of Topoi (argumentative schemes) in Political Discourse // Political Science. 2016. № 3. P. 217-235.
3. Zakharova O.V. Strategies for Representing the “Consolidation” Category in the Russian President’s Conjunctive Discourse (2000-2015) // Bulletin of the Institute of Sociology. 2016. № 2(17). P. 29-45.

Publications in other journals

4. Zakharova O.V. Human Rights Discourse and the Russian-European Relations // *Polis. Political Studies*. 2013. № 4. P. 100-110.
5. Zakharova O.V. Conjunctive Discourse of Liberal-Democratic Party of Russia (2000-2014) // *Consolidation of Russian Society: organizational, educational and socio-cultural resources. All-Russian Scientific Conference. Irkutsk: IGU. 2015. P. 161-167.*
6. Karmadonov O.A., Egorova N.V., Zakharova O.V. Power and Consensus: discursive-symbolic analysis of the conjunctive role of Russian elite // *Irkutsk: IGU, 2015. P. 118-183.*
7. Zakharova O.V. Conception of Freedom as a Natural Right in Political Philosophy of I. Kant / *Irkutsk: IGU, 2014. P. 15-17.*
8. Karmadonov O.A., Baev P.A., Zakharova O.V., Polyushkevich O.A. Symbol and Transformation: social meanings of Russian society in the age of changes (1984-2011) // *Irkutsk: IGU, 2012. P. 57-111, 276-319.*
9. Zakharova O.V. Discursive Transformation of the "Democracy" in Russian society // *Socgum-Zhurnal. 2010. № 2. P. 326-333.*

Conferences

The contents and results of the study have been presented at the following conferences:

1. XXV International Symposium "Paths of Russia. Boundaries of Politics." Moscow, Russia. March 30-31, 2018. Topic of the paper: Construction of the borders between "Us" and "Others" in the Russian political discourse.
2. International Forum of Henrich -Boll Foundation "The new discussions between Russia and the EU." Berlin, Germany. May 19, 2017. Topic of the paper: The Transformation of Institutions and the Political Discourse on Human Rights in Post-Soviet Russia, its Impact on EU-Russia Relations.
3. Closing Conference held the Research Center for East-European studies and The Higher School of Economics. Bremen, Germany. May 25-27, 2016. Topic of the paper: Human Rights Discourse in Hybrid Regimes: analyzing strategies of marginalization.
4. Workshop on "Social Developments and New Forms of Mass Opinion Research in Contemporary Russia", Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia. August 29 – September 2, 2015. Topic of the paper: The Rhetoric of Threats in the Human Rights Discourse in Post-Soviet Russia.
5. Colloquium at the Research Centre for East European Studies at the University of Bremen.

Germany. June 19, 2015. Topic of the paper: Transformation of Human Rights Discourse in Post-Soviet Russia: from liberalism to paternalism.

6. Annual Conference held by British Association of Slavonic and East European Studies, Fitzwilliam Colledge, Cambridge, the UK, March 28-30, 2015. Topic of the paper: Shaping Politics Through Language: Analyzing human rights debates between Russia and the EU.

7. The ISA/RCSL Joint International Congress "Sociology of Law and Political Action", Toulouse, France, September 3-6, 2013. Topic of the paper: Russia Requires Different Human Rights Approach.

8. Seminar "Faces of Eastern Europe, IWM, Vienna, Austria, April 17, 2013. Topic of the paper: The Debate over Human Rights between Russia and the European Union. "Legal Language" vs. the "Language of Morality".

9. Methodology of the research was used in the research project «Social Consolidation of the Russian Society: system, resources and perspectives» (2014-2016). (The head of the project prof. Karmadonov O.A.).

Analysis of data and findings

In the introduction, the relevance of the dissertation research topic is justified, the degree of scientific elaboration is considered, the object, subject, purpose and objectives of the research are determined, the theoretical and methodological foundations of the work, its scientific novelty, and the provisions to be defended are described.

The first chapter, "**Theoretical and methodological foundations of the study of argumentation schemes (topoi) in political discourse,**" reviews literature devoted to the methodology of political discourse analysis, including analysis of the argumentation strategy.

The first paragraph, "*Political discourse analysis: theoretical and methodological foundations,*" clarifies the concept of the political discourse, describes the methodological foundations of the empirical research. Discourse in this paper is understood in accordance with the theory of N. Fairclough.³⁶

Paragraphs 1.2 and 1.3 operationalize the main concepts of this study - the presidential agenda and human rights.

In the current global political discourse, human rights are one of the central normative elements of the debate on state legitimacy. The study of the place of human rights on the presidential agenda, as well as their interaction with other important national ideological concepts (great power, identity etc.), allow us to theoretically comprehend the dynamics of the president's ideas about the role of the state, as well as the relationship between the authorities

³⁶ Fairclough N. Opt. cit.

and individuals in the context of the post-Soviet transition. Therefore, in this paper we have focused not on the entire presidential agenda, but on only one area of the agenda: human rights.

In this paper, human rights are considered as part of the political agenda. Considering the constructivist nature of the agenda, it is also important to define human rights in the light of the constructivist paradigm.

On this basis, the definition of human rights in this thesis is guided by the communicative approach of J. Habermas³⁷. We view human rights as entitlements that ensure the political participation of individuals in an organized political community, creating conditions for the relationship between the population and the authorities which together ensure the legitimacy of the political system. This understanding of this concept avoids the problematic division of human rights into political, social and economic rights, and thus eliminates the conflict between "Western" and "non-Western" interpretations of human rights. In addition, it allows for a more adequate disclosure of the nature of the relationship between the state and human rights.

In the second paragraph, *"Analysis of argumentative schemes (topoi): a discursive-historical approach,"* the discursive-historical approach by R. Wodak and M. Reisigl is described, including an analysis of various discursive strategies.³⁸ The main method of dissertation research is constructed based on this approach, that of the analysis of argumentation schemes (topoi). In the paragraph, the concept of topos is established its main characteristics are highlighted and its role as an instrument of political discourse is defined.

Particular attention is paid to the linguistic design of topoi (the term was introduced in political discourse analysis by R. Wodak) used by speakers to argue their position. The various approaches to understanding this phenomenon in political science, as well as the methodological problems in identifying and analyzing topoi in political texts are presented in this paragraph.

Chapter Two, "Human Rights in the Presidential Discourse of Post-Soviet Russia (1990-2017): Historical and Political Context," contains a brief overview of the historical and political prerequisites for the formation of the current presidential human rights agenda.

Paragraph 2.1, *"Human Rights in the Presidential Discourse in the Yeltsin Period (1990-1999),"* analyzes the emergence of a post-Soviet human rights discourse. This process is considered in the context of the political transition of post-Soviet Russia in 1990-1999.

Paragraph 2.2, *"Development Trends of the Presidential Human Rights Agenda in the 2000s,"* provides an overview of institutional changes in the field of human rights and reveals the

³⁷ Habermas J. Remarks on legitimation through human rights // Philosophy and Social Criticism. 1998. Vol. 24. №2/3. P. 157-171.

³⁸ Reisigl M., Wodak R. Opt. cit. P. 67.

general characteristics of the presidential human rights agenda during the period from 2000 to 2018.

The third chapter, **"Analysis of argumentative schemes (topoi) in the presidential human rights agenda in the annual Address to the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation,"** presents the results of empirical research, in which the discourse-historical analysis of argumentation strategies is tested on the human rights agenda in the annual presidential address to the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation .

Paragraph 3.1, *"Justification of study boundaries,"* defines the time frame for the study and formulates the principles for selecting material for analysis.

Paragraph 3.2, *"Thematic analysis of the human rights agenda in the annual Address of the President of the Russian Federation,"* presents the results of the analysis of topics raised as part of the formation of the human rights agenda.

The analysis showed that the topic of human rights appears in the presidential Addresses almost every year (except for 2015 and 2017), but the frequency of references to it varies. Clearly this topic was included most often in the presidential agenda between 2000 and 2005. Since 2006, human rights have appeared much less frequently in the texts of Addresses, as has democracy. References to democracy are either isolated or do not appear at all in 2013, 2014 and 2015. At the same time however, when the frequency of references to human rights and democracy decrease, the topics of freedom and civil society increase.

It is interesting to compare "human rights" and "civil society/citizenship". The frequency of the term "human rights" has decreased since 2005, while references to the topic of civil society, on the contrary, have increased. In the period from 2000 to 2004, the term "civil society" was found in every Address, but this topic received little attention. However, in 2005 and since 2012, "civil society" has appeared in each Address. This indicates that for the President, the idea of civil society is not directly related to human rights.

Another prominent feature of V. Putin's presidential human rights agenda is the perception of "human rights" and "strong state" as intertwined categories, which are indivisible. On the one hand, it is emphasized that human rights should not prevent the building of a strong state, as it implied a lack of external control. On the other hand, human rights were identified as one of its main components. Moreover, in the early 2000s, the ability of the state to ensure and guarantee human rights was included in the creation of an image of greatness.

After 2012 however, a strong state is no longer a prerequisite for the realization of human rights, but rather a central ideological concept according to which human rights should be upheld only if they are not in conflict with state interests.

In paragraph 3.3, "*Analysis of the argumentation schemes (topoi) of the presidential human rights agenda in annual Addresses*," the most frequent topoi used by the president in the annual Address to the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation when forming the human rights agenda are identified, based on the developed criteria and methodology. It also showed how topoi construct and transform the presidential human rights agenda.

If we compare the addresses by presidential term, it is obvious that the collection of topoi in the presidential addresses is broader during the third presidential term, and they are used more actively, that is, with greater frequency within each Address. For example, the topos of unity was used by the president before 2012, but irregularly and extremely rarely. Whereas since 2012, it appears in each presidential address more than once. The third term is also characterized by the appearance in the analyzed fragments of the topos of responsibility, which, until 2012, was not at all represented in the presidential human rights agenda. The same is true of the topos of authority, which, however, was regularly used by the president during the second presidential term, that began in 2005.

The topos of democracy was most often used in the Addresses during Putin's second presidential term (from 2004 to 2007). It is found in each of the documents under study for this period. In his first presidential term the topos of democracy was actively used by President Putin only in 2000, and once in the Address of 2003.

During the third presidential term of V. Putin, the use of the topos of democracy is gradually disappearing. It was actively used only in the address of 2012, and, to a much lesser extent, in the Address of 2013. It was not used in the other addresses.

The reduction in the frequency of use for the topos of democracy in the period from 2012 to 2017 correlates with an increase in the use of the topoi of responsibility and unity, which together have replaced it.

At the same time, there is a partial replacement of the topos of democracy with the topos of legitimacy (popular approval). For V. Putin's first two presidential terms, the topos of legitimacy is practically not evident. It was used only in the addresses of 2004 and 2007. During the third presidential term, this topos has been used more often - in the addresses of 2012, 2013 and 2016.

Along with the topos of democracy in the same period (2012-2017), the topos of human rights disappears from President V. Putin's repertoire. It is used only once in the 2012 Address to justify the need to develop a legislative framework for administrative court proceedings, and it does not speak about human rights, but about the rights of citizens.

However, in the period from 2012 to 2017 the topos of humanitarian mission is introduced into the President's repertoire. Before 2012 it was used only once, in the Address of 2001.

Given that Putin's third term in office is responsible for the intensification of conflict between Russia and the West, it is logical to assume that the disappearance of the topos of democracy and human rights was dictated by the desire to abandon "pro-Western" concepts. They were replaced by the topos of responsibility and the topos of humanism (humanist mission).

The repertoire of Medvedev's topoi is similar to that of Putin, but with some differences. For Putin, the topos of legitimacy/constitutionality is practically unused, whereas Medvedev uses it quite often. The topos of threats, which is one of the most frequent topos in Putin's repertoire, hardly appears in Medvedev's Addresses (only once in 2008). As a general trend in the Addresses of both presidents, we see a noticeable decrease in the frequency of the topos of democratisation. "Human rights" is not included amongst Medvedev's topoi in any way.

The following conclusion can be drawn from the results. When liberal concepts such as "human rights", "democracy", and "individual freedom" are transferred to illiberal political cultures, they compete with those ideological concepts more characteristic of the latter. As a result of such an interaction, the borrowed liberal concepts undergo changes and differ significantly from their original, liberal version. Changing the content of the concept while preserving the liberal terminology allows a certain set of argumentation schemes: topos responsibility in combination with the topoi of unity and of threats.