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ABSTRACT

The current study is an attempt to analyze discourse from the CDA perspective. The study aims at answering the following questions: How language use in Trump’s and Alisi’s speech affected people? Do their speeches have positive or negative implication for the Egyptians people? And what are the discursive strategies used in their speeches?

To answer these questions, the study hypothesizes that speakers use different strategies, argumentation, and historical background to express their ideologies to listeners to have their supports. Also, it is hypothesized that English and Arabic speakers differ in the ways they make use of these materials.

Wodak’s model (1999); the historical discourse approach (DHA), has been chosen to be the model adopted to analyze the data selected. Accordingly, two speeches of the former presidents; Abdul Fatah Assisi, in Khartoum-Sudan in March 6, 2021 and Donald Trump the former president of the United States of America, on Oct 23, 2020 about Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam are selected to be the data of this study. Concentration is going to be on the components of the historic approach including the strategies, the topos, the context, and the historical background. Each discourse is analyzed according to these components.

At last, the current study finds out that Trump as a speaker uses more topos of danger and that Assisi uses more reference strategy a conclusion which unveils the hidden ideologies of the speakers that Trump is more confident, more powerful and impetuous than Assisi who seems less confident, less powerful and careful in choosing his words.
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1. Introduction:

Discourse Analysis (DA) is a broad field of study that draws theoretical and analytical methods from disciplines such as linguistics, sociology, philosophy and psychology. More importantly, discourse analysis provides models and methods for dealing with issues from education, cultural studies, communication and other disciplines. The vastness of discourse analysis makes it impossible to discuss everything a reader needs to know in such an introductory work. Language, on the other hand, is an invention that shapes reality and affects people’s perception. It is a means of “expressing different types of ideologies, attitudes, hostility, hatred and other functions” (Suleiman, 2003, p. 114). Reyes-Rodríguez (2006) and Lakoff (1995) consider language as a means of promoting nationalism among members of one’s own group. Likewise, Nguyen (2012), Escudero (2011), Nhat (2008), and Heradstveit and Bonham (2007) Claims that language is a tool for promoting good relationships. Language users do not use words or phrases in isolation, but according to the social, cultural and psychological realms in which they live.

Political speech can be both informative and ideological (Kordowe, 2014a). Political discourse may simply be used as a strategy for disseminating information and ideology; however, Fairclough (1995) sees trends in such discourse as a complex distribution. One of the main goals of critical discourse analysis (CDA) is to apply critical methods, positions or attitudes to research papers on written and spoken discourse. Because there are ideologies inherent in language use, CDA’s focus is to unearth those ideologies, beliefs, and perceptions that are reflected in language use. CDA aims to reveal and reveal implicit ideas that cannot be immediately inferred when considering discourse relationships in a text.

According to Van Dijk (1993) CDA is quintessentially “discourse studies, the study of how to legislate, reproduce, and resist abuses of social influence, domination, and inequality through writing and speech in social and governmental settings.” Some scholars argue that CDA seeks to “reveal philosophical and inappropriate behaviors.” Rules. “Systems of Control Belonging to Municipal, State and Traditional Processes”.

Critical discourse analysis is a widely used method of analyzing oral or written material, such as news articles, political speeches, novels, advertisements, films, essays or books. Analysis of political speech can help uncover biased language and raise readers’ awareness of how language is being manipulated. True, political speech is embedded in hidden ideologies and manipulated discursive structures.

The study at hand sets out to analyze the speech delivered by Abdulfatah Assisi, the former president of Egypt in Khartoum-Sudan in March 6, 2021 and Donald Trump the president of the United States of America, on Oct 23, 2020 about Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam following the perspective of CDA. It is an attempt to shed light on the nature of their political discourse as well as the different ways by which language is employed to depict the influence of renaissance dam on Africa and focusing on the use of national and international solidarity expressions, emotive expressions used to sway target recipients to adopt certain attitudes, or beliefs. Accordingly, this study attempts to answer the following questions:
1. How language use in Trump’s speech affected people?
2. How language use in Alsisi’s speech affected people?
3. Do their speeches have positive or negative implication for the Egyptians people?
4. What are the discursive strategies used in their speeches?

2. Literature Review:

The speeches of political leaders have been subjected to different types of analysis and investigation by historians, political scientists, linguists, sociolinguists, and psychologists. This section presents a brief account of some studies which have examined how socio-political relations and ideological power wielding are reflected in political speeches, especially those delivered by.

2.1. Historical Background:

The term “discourse analysis” was first used in 1952 by sentence linguist Zellig Harris in his article titled “Discourse Analysis.” According to him, discourse analysis is a method of analyzing coherent language or writing in order to continue descriptive linguistics beyond the boundaries of simple sentences (Harris 1952). Since then, scholars have admitted that it is difficult to find a comprehensive and acceptable definition for discourse analysis. However, one way of simplifying the attempt to define discourse analysis is to say that discourse analysis is “discourse analysis”. Thus, discourse analysis examines the relationship between language (written, spoken—dialogue, institutionalized forms of dialogue) and the context in which it is used.

Guy Cook (1989:6-7) describes discourse as the language in use, or the language used to communicate what is thought to be coherent, which may correspond to a correct sentence or a series of correct sentences. Thus, in his view, discourse analysis is the search for the factors that give discourse coherence. Discourse analysis developed in the 1960s and early 1970s from work in various disciplines including linguistics, semiotics, anthropology, psychology and sociology. Scholars and works that gave rise to or contributed to the development of discourse analysis include: 1. J. L. Austin How to Do Things with Words (1962) introduced a popular social theory, speech act theory. Many researchers use critical discourse analysis to analyze political speeches by prominent politicians. For example, many studies have analyzed Obama’s speeches, such as Wang (2010) using CDA to analyze Obama’s presidential speeches from the perspective of transitivity and modality to find out how language serves ideology and power. Critical discourse analysis is often associated with the abuse of power by dominant groups that have been censored discourse to control the beliefs and actions of less dominant or powerless groups (van Dijk, 2009). An example of this is media control. When dominant groups control the media, they can brainwash or influence audiences by choosing what information they want to produce, reproduce, or share publicly. CDA is now often synonymous with power manipulation, power relations, social issues and practices, and linguistic studies of ideology and its production, reception, and dissemination (van Dijk 2009, Locke 2004, Fairclough 1992, 1995).
2.2. Definitions of CDA:

Regarding to Fairclough (1993) he define CDA as a discourse analysis, seeks to explore the often incomprehensible causal and determining relationships between discursive practices, events and texts ideologically shaped by the struggle for power and supremacy. More broadly, it is thought to reveal the complex relationship between language, power, society and historical ideology (Tian, 2018). As an interdisciplinary study, CDA should not only analyze text, nor should it only analyze the process of production or interpretation. As Rogers (2011, p. 2) put it, “Language is a social practice, and since not all social practices are created and treated equally, all analyses of language are inherently critical.” Critical Means criticism is inevitable. Gee and Handford (2012) claim that CDA can be defined as the study of language that goes beyond the sentence level, but considers the ways in which sentences are combined to create meaning and, more importantly, achieve purpose. Wodak and Meyer (2009) define this discipline as the common interest to de-mystifying ideologies and power via analyzing semiotic spoken and written data.

2.3. Approaches Leading to The Emergence of CDA:

The term “discourse analysis” has been used by people in various disciplines and departments to describe what they do, how they do it, or both. Barbara Johnstone (2002:1) points out that while many of these individuals are trained in general linguistics, some identify primarily with linguists, while others primarily identify with Fields of study are varied, such as anthropology, communication, cultural studies, psychology or education. other. This suggests that under the label of discourse analysis, many people do their own thing in their own way, relying on methods and approaches that may be specific or relevant to their discipline or field of study.

In her Discourse Methods (1994), Schifflin discusses and compares a number of different approaches to discourse-linguistic analysis: speech act theory, interaction sociolinguistics, communicative ethnography, pragmatics, conversational analysis, and variational analysis. This part of the work, therefore, summarizes the approaches to linguistic analysis of discourse identified by Schiffrin (1994).

2.3.1. Speech Act Theory:

Speech act theory was first proposed by philosopher John Austin (1962) and later developed and more systematically proposed by another philosopher, John Searle (1969, 1975). The theory starts from the premise that language is used to perform actions, and therefore focuses primarily on meaning and the relationship of actions to language. John Austin and John Searle argue that language is used not only to describe the world, but also to perform a range of other actions, which can be seen in the performance of the utterance itself. Schriffin points out that discursive approaches to discursive acts focus on the understanding of the underlying conditions that generate and explain behavior through language. The literal meaning of words and the context in which they appear can interact in our knowledge of the conditions that underlie action realization and action interpretation.

2.3.2. Interactional Sociolinguistic:

The method of discourse known as “interactive sociolinguistics” stems largely from the work of anthropologist John Gumpelz and sociologist Irving Goffman.
According to Schiffrin (1994), the method has the most diverse disciplinary origins ... it is based on anthropology, sociology, and linguistics, and shares a focus with the three fields of culture, society, and language. John Gumperz’s contributions to interactive sociolinguistics provide an understanding of how people share knowledge of a language’s grammar, but can place what is said in a different context - and thus generate and understand very different messages. By contrast, Owen Goffman’s contribution describes how language is located in certain living environments and how it reflects and adds to the meaning and structure of those environments. Schiffrin distinguished the cooperation among self and the other, and setting, as the two focal issues fundamental crafted by Gumperz and Goffman. Schiffrin, further, fights that crafted by the two researchers likewise gives a perspective on language as indexical to a social world: for Gumperz, language is a file to the foundation social understandings that give stowed away - yet by the by basic - information about how to make deductions about what is implied through an expression; for Goffman, language is one of various representative assets that give a record to the social personalities and connections being consistently developed during collaboration.

Interactional sociolinguistics gives a way to deal with talk that concentrations upon arranged importance and researchers adopting this strategy join the thoughts of the anthropologist John Gumperz and the humanist Erving Goffman. As per Schiffrin, what Gumperz adds to this approach is a bunch of devices that give a structure inside which to dissect the utilization of language during relational communication. In all, interactional sociolinguistics sees talk as a social connection in which the developing development and exchange of importance is worked with by the utilization of language.

2.3.3. The Ethnography of Communication:

Ethnography of Communication, otherwise called Ethnography of Speaking, was created by Dell Hymes in a progression of papers written during the 1960s and 1970s (large numbers of which are gathered in his Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach [1974]). Hymes’ Ethnography of Communication is worried about the examination of language use in its socio-social setting. This approach depends on the reason that the significance of an expression can be seen exclusively corresponding to the ‘discourse occasion’ or ‘open occasion,’ in which it isembedded (Hymes 1962). Ethnography of talking is connected with talk examination through the ethnographic methodology where conversational deductions assume a key part: members interface the substance of an expression and other verbal, vocal, and non-vocal signals with foundation information.

2.3.4. Pragmatics:

Pragmatics as a way to deal with talk is essentially worried about three ideas (meaning, setting, correspondence) that are themselves incredibly immense. The extent of pragmatics is wide to the point that it faces definitional predicaments like those looked by talk investigation. Prior examinations on pragmatics characterized it as a part of semiotics, the investigation of signs, however contemporary conversations of pragmatics all take the relationship of sign to their client to be vital to pragmatics. Jacob Mey (2001) characterizes pragmatics as the investigation of the utilization
of language in human not entirely settled by the states of society. Schiffrin (1994) centers around the Gricean pragmatics, especially his thoughts regarding speaker meaning and the helpful rule, as valuable way to deal with talk investigation. A methodology centers around significance in setting.

2.3.5. Conversation Analysis:

Discussion investigation is a way to deal with talk which has been enunciated by a gathering of researchers known as ethnomethodologists. They are known as ethnomethodolgsists since they set off on a mission to find what strategies individuals use to take part in and get a handle on collaboration. The ethnomethodologists inspected how individuals managed their words, when they were not deliberately delivering tests for linguists. Schiffrin (1994:232) fights that discussion investigation gives its own suspicions, its own strategy (counting its own phrasing), and its own particular manner of estimating. The focal point of the conversationanalyst is mostly on the association and organizing of discussion, and not such a lot of its rightness. Schiffrin noticed that despite the fact that discussion examination has its underlying foundations in humanism, it actually contrasts from different parts of social science in light of the fact that as opposed to dissecting social request essentially, it looks to find the strategies by which individuals from a general public produce a feeling of social request. It is a wellspring of a lot of our feeling of social job.

2.3.6. Variation Analysis:

The underlying procedure and hypothesis fundamental the variationist way to deal with talk were those of William Labov. The variationist approach is the main methodology examined in this segment that has its beginnings exclusively inside phonetics. The methodology is worried about the investigation of variety and change in language. The hypothesis continues from the suppositions that phonetic variety is designed both socially and etymologically, and that such examples can be found exclusively through deliberate examination of a discourse local area. Hence, variationists set off on a mission to find designs in the dispersion of elective approaches to saying exactly the same thing, that is to say, the social and etymological variables that are liable for variety (Schiffrin, 1994: 282). She further battles that one of the principal undertakings in variety examination is to find limitations on elective acknowledge of a hidden structure: such compels (that can be phonetic as well as friendly) assist with figuring out which acknowledgment of a solitary fundamental portrayal shows up in the surface type of expression.

The variationists likewise consider the social setting as a component of the investigation of talk units consequently the setting where a story is told permits (or restrains) the presentation of etymological skill - it thinks about friendly setting under specific strategic and insightful conditions. Schiffrin in this manner presumes that the variationist way to deal with talk is based inside a socially reasonable phonetics - somehow or another, semantics obviously overruns the variationist way to deal with talk. In this manner, a variationist way to deal with talk is a phonetically based approach that adds social setting to examinations of the utilization of language.

2.4. Political Speech and Data Collected:

In this review, the CDA is utilized to explore the thoughts of social entertainers and settings to dissect the political philosophies in presidents Alsisi and Trump
discourse. The specialist took on DHA by Wodak (2009). Different explores are being completed on political addresses talk (Alrefaee, et al, 2019; Shamkhy, S. Z., and receptacle January, 2019; Hamdan & Elnadeef, 2020; Hussein and Hussein, 2020). Presidential talks have been exposed to various kinds of examination by language specialists, sociolinguists, political researchers, and students of history. Utilizing the apparatuses of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), language specialists center around various angles in the addresses of political pioneers. They examine the talk includes those specific texts manifest along with the basic philosophies of political perusers. Albeit past examinations (Alrefaee, Abdul-Ghafour, Alazzany & Alrefaee, 2019; Hussein and Hussein, 2020; Khaled, 2020; Edouihri, 2020; Al-Saedi& Jabber, 2020; Hamdan & Elnadeef, 2020) directed on various world pioneers have uncovered fascinating discoveries, little consideration up to this point has been paid to concentrate on Trump’s Strategies in the First Presidential Debate and Alssisi’s discourse. Understanding the significance of Donald Trump’s and Alssisi’s semantic official style and the consideration that it draws, this examination, directed from the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) point of view.

3. The Model Adopted:

The model embraced in this concentrate as alluded to above is Wodak’s (1999). Wodak and her group in Vienna College explained their task of ‘talk noteworthy way to deal with talk examinations in 1990 after a progression of articles concentrating on the discourses of Austrian official mission of Kurt Waldheim in the 1985. Then, this approach is additionally evolved to remember reads up for prejudice and oppression minorities, ladies and etc. (see, for example, Wodak et al, 1998 and 1999 and Cillia et al, 1999). These investigations, likewise, concentrated upon Austria, its personality and country. Here, various procedures are placed in contention to perceive how such peculiarities are haggled in talk (see Wodak, 2001: 71). In a similar heading, Wodak and Van Dijk (2000) concentrate on issues of migration by breaking down “parliamentary talks in six European nations” (Wodak, 2006: 15) to be a unique circumstance and afterward a notable way to deal with represent prejudice. Different assets of noteworthy kind, significant topoi and techniques are expounded in this way to deal with represent bigotry, direction and political character in Europe.

Four parts are acknowledged in this way to deal with handle the talk generally including: the techniques, the topoi, and the memorable foundation and the setting being connected to them.

The term topos (pl. topoi) is an idea taken from the traditional argumentation hypothesis which returns to Aristotle and Cicero (see Aristotle, 1989 and Cicero, 2003). Keinpointer (1992: 194) characterizes topoi as “portions of argumentation which have a place with the mandatory, either express or inferable premises. They are the substance - related warrants or ‘end rules’ which associate the contention or contentions with the end, the case. In that capacity, they legitimize the progress from the contention or contentions to the end” (see likewise Zagar, 2010: 9, and see additionally Wodak et al, 2001:75, Wodak, 2006: 74, Wodak, 2009: 42 and Krzyzanowski, 2009: 102). Likewise, Richardson (2004: 230) characterizes topoi as “repositories of summed up key thought from which explicit explanations or contentions can be created”.
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In the talk noteworthy way to deal with talk examination, Wodak (2001) utilizes this pugnacious apparatus of topoi to represent the separation viewpoints (to contend possibly in support) in the talk within reach. Topoi, likewise, is taken as deficient indistinctive rundown to represent the segregation angles. She records the accompanying topoi depending vigorously on Aristotle's and Tomlin's rundowns. These topoi are then portrayed by unambiguous guidelines or conditions as outlined in the accompanying:

1. **The Topoi of Benefit (Helpfulness)**: in the event that an activity under a particular significant perspective will be valuable, then, at that point, one ought to perform it.

2. **The Topoi of Hindrance (Pointlessness)**: in the event that one can guess that the forecasted outcomes of a choice won’t happen, or on the other hand assuming political activities are bound to prompt the proclaimed point, the choice must be dismissed.

3. **Definition**: on the off chance that an activity, a thing or an individual is named/assigned (as) x, the activity, thing or individual conveys or ought to convey the characteristics/qualities/credits contained in the strict significance of x.

4. **Risk**: in the event that a political activity or a choice bears explicit hazardous compromising results, one shouldn’t perform it.

5. **Compassion**: on the off chance that a political activity or occasion does or doesn’t adjust with basic freedoms shows and values, one ought to or shouldn’t perform it by any stretch of the imagination.

6. **Equity**: if people/activities/circumstances are equivalent in unambiguous regards, they ought to be dealt with/managed similarly.

7. **Obligation**: in light of the fact that a state or a gathering of people is answerable for the development of explicit issues, it or they ought to act to track down answers for these issues.

8. **Troubling**: in the event that an individual is trouble by unambiguous issues, one ought to act to lessen these weights.

9. **Funds / misfortune**: on the off chance that a particular circumstance or activity is too expensive cash or causes loss of income, one ought to perform activities which reduce the expenses or assist with keeping away from the misfortune.

10. **Reality**: on the grounds that the truth is for all intents and purposes, a particular activity / choice ought to be performed.

11. **Regulation (Right)**: on the off chance that a regulation disallows a particular political - regulatory activity, the activity ought to be canceled.

12. **History**: since history instructs that particular activities have explicit results, one ought to perform or overlook a particular activity in a particular circumstance tantamount with the verifiable model alluded to.

13. **Culture**: on the grounds that the way of life of a particular gathering is for what it’s worth, explicit issues emerge in unambiguous circumstances.

14. **Misuse**: in the event that a right or a proposal of help is mishandled, the right ought to be changed or the assistance ought to be pull out, or measures against the maltreatment ought to be taken.
15. **Numbers**: If the numbers (greater part) demonstrate a particular topos, a particular activity ought to be performed or not be done (for these topoi see Cillia et al, 1999, Wodak, 2001: 74-77 and Wodak, 2015: 11).

Thus, topoi are pugnacious plans that the expert ought to depend on to investigate the current digressive movement to show parts of contending with or against separation inside such action. They are a bunch of decides or guidelines that conversationalists use (purposefully or unexpectedly) to deal with their contentions as per the exchange cycle. It is the verbose action dissected which figures out which topoi to pick and which portrayals are given to them.

The term ‘procedure’ initially alludes to “the craft of anticipating and coordinating the bigger military developments and tasks of a mission” (Oxford English Dictionary, 1988: 852, point 2a). Bringing this definition into contemplations, Wodak et al (1990: 31) defines ‘procedure’ as “by and large means a move or less exact arrangement embraced to accomplish a certain political, mental or other sort of goals”. It is, likewise the “efficient approaches to utilizing language… [and] the deliberate arrangement of works on [including the verbose practice] embraced to accomplish a specific… ... point” (Wodak, 2001: 73).

In a record of personality, and in a considerable rundown of systems, Wodak et al, (1990:36-42 and Cilia et al 1999) address a few primary procedures and an extensive rundown of subordinate methodologies which happen at the same time in the talk.

The principal procedures comprise:

1. **Referential or Assignment System**: it endeavors to develop in-bunch and out-bunch enrollment arrangement in the talk. It is semantically appeared by participation arrangement, organic naturalizing and depersonalizing illustrations, metonymies and synecdoche.

2. **The Predication Procedure**: it endeavors to mark social entertainers decidedly or adversely and is showed etymologically by cliché and evaluative qualities of negative or positive characteristics or by verifiable or express predicates.

3. **The Contentious Procedure**: it endeavors to track down avocations of positive or negative credits. It tends to be acknowledged semantically by the factious plans (topoi) which are utilized to legitimize political consideration or avoidance, separation or special treatment.

4. **Perspectivation Technique**: it is the outlining or talk portrayal. It endeavors to communicate inclusion; for example, situating the speaker’s perspective. It tends to be solidified through announcing, depiction, portrayal or citation of racial occasions and expressions.

5. **Heightening and Moderation Methodology**: It endeavors to change the situation with a recommendation. It tends to be acknowledged semantically by escalating or adjusting the power of racial occasions by the utilization of qualifiers for example (for these techniques, see Cillia et al, 1999, Wodak, 2001: 73, Wodak and Meyer, 2008: 18).

The setting plays an extraordinary part to play in the verifiable way to deal with talk examination, as per which each expert ought to make reference to while dissecting a current talk. It is “an intrinsic piece of the authentic way to deal with
talk examination” (Wodak, 2015: 4). Four degrees of setting can be acknowledged in this methodology. These levels are:

1. The prompt language or text-inside setting (the co-text).
2. The intersexual and interdiscursive connections between expressions, texts, kinds and talks.
3. The extra-etymological social factors and institutional casings of a particular setting of circumstance.
4. The more extensive sociopolitical and verifiable setting which desultory practices are implanted in and connected with (see additionally, Wodak, 2001: 67).

In this manner, setting as taken on by the authentic methodology can be summed up in the followings: the co-message, the connections holding among expressions (current and absent), the explicit circumstance and the noteworthy setting of the circumstance.

The verifiable foundation alludes to any authentic data that can be taken from the worldwide setting encompassing the verbose occasion (see Wodak, 2001: 65). Any verifiable assets which have anything to say regarding the current talk ought to be viewed as in the examination addressed and for this reason this approach is known as the authentic way to deal with talk investigation. Likewise, any friendly or political aspects which have a current connection to do with the talk ought to be handled. This ought to be led through an ethnographic hypothesis of the assets of data which might incorporate, for example; gathering information from newspapers, headings, TV interviews, paying attention to individuals in the road (by copying), government reports and so on. This might take such a long time and work to do in view of the huge measure of assets accessible for each talk.

4. Methodology:

The methodology adopted in this study is going to be in the following steps: First, Trum’s speech is going to be analyzed according to the four components mentioned above; topos, strategies, context and historical background. Second, Assisi’s speech is going to be analyzed in the same way. Third, a comparison of the two analyses is going to be conducted depending on the type of topos used, types of the strategies followed and a table is given for each component, when possible, to draw the findings statistically to see which speech is more persuasive accordingly and then justifications are given.

5. Analysis of Data:

Following the components in Wodak’s model, the two speeches of the former Egyptian president Abdulfatah Assisi, in Khartoum-Sudan in March 6, 2021 and Donald Trump the president of the United States of America, on Oct 23, 2020 about Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam are going to be analyzed to unveil the hidden ideologies both the speakers hold and try to express to their audience to have their supports. Such an analysis may reveal discursively a lot about the identity of the speakers.

As we can realize from the data (see the appendix), the president Trump has made use of some topos and strategies as explain in the following:
A. Topos:

1. Disadvantage: This topos is used by Trump in the data chosen once:

   “The largest dam in many years being built unfortunately it stops water from flowing into Egypt a little bit of a problem” since the argument here is that “because the dam stops water “and the conclusion is “so, this is a problem”.

2. Responsibility: In the following extract, Trump has used the topos of responsibility:

   “I’ve been dealing with Sudan on that and I’m just curious how is that going because you’re ruining the third party involved with Ethiopia and Egypt and the dam are they working out their deal because I had a deal done for them and then unfortunately Ethiopia broke the deal which they should not have done”. Since Trump believes that he is responsible for the security of the East, so, he tries to hold the responsibility of being the chef to solve the problem.

3. Danger: In an attempt to threaten the other party, Trump deliberately uses this topos more than once:

   - “Unfortunately, Ethiopia broke the deal which they should not have done”.
   - “But they built a dam which stops water from flowing into the Nile and you can’t blame Egypt for being a little bit upset right how are they doing with that do you know I was actually talking to Sudan to the chairman talking to the prime minister, how are you doing? You may not want to answer”.
   - “Egypt is not going to be able to live that way and they’ll end up blowing up the dam”.
   - “They can’t do that so the deal was done and it’s a very dangerous situation because Egypt is not going to be able to live that way and they’ll end up blowing up the dam”.
   - “So, whatever you can do to get them Ethiopia to do that they’re going to have to okay and we’ve cut off all payment and everything else to Ethiopia it was terrible we’re all set to sign a deal it was negotiated for five years and longer than and they couldn’t make the deal and I got the deal done and then they’re getting ready to sign the deal and they broke the deal which is not good”.
   - “You know because they could have stopped it, they should have stopped it long before it was started I said how do you let it get built and then you say they have a dam you know but they had other things on their mind that was at a time when they were having a minor revolution to put it mildly that was a bad time for Egypt so I guess they had other things on their mind so you’ll work on that”.

In the first example, Trump by the use of the adverb “unfortunately” and the model verb “should not” use the threatening topos since for Trump build the dam (argument) means breaking the deal (conclusion) which is too dangerous for Ethiopia.

In the second example, the speaker is explaining the consequences of building the dam on Egypt, Sudan and Ethiopia since this action is dangerous and may lead to dangerous consequences. Trump is threatening the listener, the Ethiopian prime minister that he would not like to listen to the announcements of Sudan and Egypt as a reaction to the building of the dam using the modal verb “may”.

In the third example, the expressed topos is (because Egypt cannot live like that “argument”) (they will blow the dam” conclusion”).

In the fourth example, the topos represented is: (because they broke the deal)” argument”, (Egypt will blow the dam) “conclusion”.

In the fifth example, Trump again makes use of topos of danger when he threatens Ethiopia of cutting the American financial supports and aids because they have broken the deal which was worked for five years.

In the last example, Trump was threatening the Ethiopian prime minister that because he let them (his people) build the dam, he has to stop it otherwise, and Egypt has other things to do (including of course blowing the dam).

4. **Definition:** In the following extract, Trump made use of a topos of the type definition when he says:

“That was a big mistake”. Defining that breaking the deal between Egypt, Sudan, and Ethiopia from the part of Ethiopia by building the dam is a big mistake because it is going to have consequences on the three countries.

5. **Loss and Finances:** Trump has made use of the topos of loss and finances when he said:

“That was a big mistake and we’ve stopped payment to them of about a lot of aid because they did it, and they will never see that money unless they adhere to the agreement”.

In this example, Trump is declaring that Ethiopia is going to lose any financial aids unless they go back to the agreement.

6. **Law:** Since Ethiopia has built the dam which stops water from flowing into the Nile affecting shapes of life in Egypt and Sudan, Egypt cannot be blamed to be upset to have a reaction. This topos of law or right is represented in Trump’s speech since the decision of building the dam has a dangerous consequence and thus Egypt should abolish that action.

“But they built a dam which stops water from flowing into the Nile and you can’t blame Egypt for being a little bit upset”.

7. **Burdening Topos:** Since the prime minister of Ethiopia is burden with specific problem, Trump tries to act to diminish these burdens locating himself as the policeman of the world. Consider the following examples:

“I had a deal done and then they broke the deal and they can’t do that”. The same is true with the following example: “And I’m telling Egypt the same thing by the way”.

In the same way, Assisi has made use of some topos including:

1. **Definition Topos:**

“مفهومات سد النهضة الإثيوبي، وهو الملف الذي يمس صميم المصالح الحيوية لمصر والسودان بوصفهما دولي المصب في حوض النيل الذين ستأثران بشكل مباشر بهذا المشروع الضخم”.

“Negotiations of the Ethiopian Renaissance Dam, a file that touches the core of the vital interests of Egypt and Sudan as the two downstream countries in the Nile Basin, which will be directly affected by this huge project.”

Here Assisi is trying to explain the file of the Ethiopian dam concentrating on the relation between it and the countries around, so he uses definition topos.

Also, in the following extract, Assisi uses the definition topos:
"Controlling over the Blue Nile through unilateral measures that do not take into account the interests and rights of the two downstream countries. This was embodied by Ethiopia's announcement concerning its intention to implement the second phase of filling the Renaissance Dam"

According to which, Assisi explain what does it mean by Ethiopia announcement of completing the project of the dam. Another use of this topos is in:

"للتوصیف في العملية التفاوضية وهي الآلية التي اقترحها السودان وأيدتها مصر والتي تهدف إلى دعم جيده الرئيس تشيسكيدي Tshiskedi رئيس جمهورية الكونغو الديمقراطية."

“To mediate in the negotiating process, a mechanism proposed by Sudan and supported by Egypt, which aims at supporting the efforts of President Tshiskedi, President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo”

Here Assisi is trying to explain the type of the dealing that the countries are trying to accomplish.

2. Responsibility Topos:

In the following extract, Assisi uses the topos of responsibility:

"لقد اتفقنا على حتمية العودة إلى مفاوضات جادة وفعالة بهدف التوصل في أقرب فرصة ممكنة وقبل موسم الفيضان المقبل إلى اتفاق عادل ومتوازن يلزم قانوناً بشأن مين وتشغيل سد النيل الأزرق ويبقى مصالح الدول الثلاثة (مصر والسودان واثيوبيا) ويعز من اواصر التعاون والتكامل بين بلداننا وشعوبنا."

“We confirmed the inevitability of returning to serious and effective negotiations in order to get, as soon as possible, and before the next flood season, a fair, balanced and legally binding agreement on filling and operating the Renaissance Dam in a manner that achieves the interests of the three countries (Egypt, Sudan and Ethiopia) and enhances the bonds of cooperation and integration between our country and our peoples.”

In this extract, Assisi is asking for making negotiation to stop that attempt (and again with no actual attempt).

B. Strategies:

Trump has used the following strategies to make his identity prevailing and to convince the Ethiopian prime minister to stop the dam and go back to the negotiation:

1. Referential Strategy:

In the following extract, Trump uses the strategy of referential to announce to his hearer that he is leading (implicitly) the group of those who are posing ironic questions to people to solve problems being the representative speaker of this group:
We are going to be sign in numerous countries in the not-too-distant future so that’ll be great while you are on the phone could I ask you how is the dam doing in Ethiopia?

And again, he uses this strategy to represent himself as the policeman who protects the world by using the first-person pronoun ‘I’:

I’m just curious how that going is because you’re ruining the third party involved with Ethiopia and Egypt and the dam.

And again in: I’ve been dealing with Sudan on that.

2. Mitigation and Intensification Strategy:

Ironically, Trump is explain the problem of the dam as being a little bit of a problem to show his hearer that these kind of problems does not and will not cause him much effort if he intends to act aggressively in an attempt to threaten his hearer to mitigate ironically the consequences of building that dam:

The largest dam in many years being built unfortunately it stops water from flowing into Egypt a little bit of a problem right as it should.

Assisi has used the following strategies:

1. Referential Strategy:

As shown in the data, Assisi used this strategy exhaustively in his speech through the use of the plural person pronoun:

“كمان اتفقنا على أهمية الاستمرار في التنسيق الوثيق والتشاور فيما بيننا في هذا الشأن.”

“In this regard, we also agreed on the importance of continuing close coordination and consultation among us”.

“وأكدنا على حتمية العودة إلى مفاوضات جادة وفعالة بهدف التوصل في أقرب فرصة ممكنة وفِي موسم الفيضان المقبل إلى اتفاق عادل ومنزوع وملزم قانوناً بشأن مل وتشغيل سد النهضة وما يحقِّ مصالح الدول الثلاثة (مصر والسودان والأثيوبيا) ويعزز من اواصر التعاون والتكامل بين بلادنا وشعمنا”.

“We confirmed the inevitability of returning to serious and effective negotiations in order to get, as soon as possible, and before the next flood season, a fair, balanced and legally binding agreement on filling and operating the Renaissance Dam in a manner that achieves the interests of the three countries (Egypt, Sudan and Ethiopia) and enhances the bonds of cooperation and integration between our country and our peoples”.

“لقد تطابقت رؤيانا على رفض أي نهج يقوم على السعي لفرض الأمر الواقع وسط السيطرة على النيل الإزريق”.

“Our visions have coincided in rejecting any approach based on seeking to impose the reality and control over the Blue Nile”.

In these extracts, Assisi is trying to express to the audience that his speech does not belong to himself but to the other presidents’ countries in an attempt to get rid of holding alone the responsibility of the speech.

2. Prediction Strategy:

In the following extract, Assisi is referring to the Ethiopian attempt to build the dam as being monocular to explain the Ethiopian action as being one sided without taking the other parties into consideration. However, such a strategy has been used negatively but politely
3. Intensification Strategy:

In the following extract, Assisi is trying to intensify the efforts of the president Tshiskedi to make the negotiation more successful:

"Supporting the efforts of President Tshiskedi, President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and maximizing the chances of the success of the negotiation process. We affirmed our full confidence in His Excellency's ability to manage these negotiations and achieve a breakthrough in order to reach the desired agreement".

C. The Context:

As we can realize from the data, the context is different between the two discourses. Trump speech is between himself and the prime minister of Ethiopia through the phone. While Assisi's speech occurred in a press conference in front of a lot of people a case where the speaker cannot find himself free to speak.

D. Historical Background:

As shown in the appendix, there is a huge amount of historical background since this subject is so old and the former presidents of Egypt talked about it a lot. So, both the speakers seem to be aware of this background and make use of it in their speech.

6. Findings and Discussion:

According to the analysis conducted above, the following table shows the use of Wodak's model components in both of the discourses analyzed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topos</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Advantaging</th>
<th>Disadvantaging</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Danger</th>
<th>Humanitarianism</th>
<th>Justice</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Burden</th>
<th>Intensification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trump</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (6)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisi</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Referential</th>
<th>Prediction</th>
<th>Argumentative</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Intensification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trump</td>
<td>X (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisi</td>
<td>X (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in table (1), Trump has used more topos than Assisi concentrating on the topos of danger, while Assisi never used it. If this proves something, it proves that Trump believes himself to be powerful and capable of threatening the others. So, he used this topos exhaustively in his speech because he believes that building the Ethiopian dam is a political decision which has dangerous consequences for Egypt and Sudan and thus, he made himself the policeman of the world to prevent Ethiopia from completing the project of the dam. Assisi on the other hand never used this topos because (we believe) that he cannot hold the responsibility of that
topos when used, he does not have the ability to indulge in a real action if this topos is used. Assisi used the topos of definition twice because he believes that things need to be explaining briefly to the audience if he wants them to support him in his case; i.e., he is begging support politely. Trump has used this topos once only; he believes that things are clear enough for his hearer to understand and he does not to bother himself explaining things which are already known. Trump has used the topos of disadvantage because he anticipated that the consequences of the Ethiopian decision to build the dam would affect others negatively. So, he used this topos once to show that such a decision is dangerous and is rejected. Both presidents use the topos of responsibility with the difference between the two speakers that Trump should not be involve in this case, but as referred to above he is trying to be the policeman of the world. Assisi used this topos because he believes that he and the other presidents involved in the matter should find the solution for this problem but without any real acts unfortunately. Again, Trump used the topos of finance because he believes that through the card of payments as a kind of help to Ethiopia which is going to be stopped in case Ethiopia rejects the negotiations. Trump has used the topos of burdening because he believes that the prime minister of Ethiopia is burdened with troubles and it is his job to diminish these burdens. Also, Trump used the topos of law because he believes that through the aids, he can abolish the action conducted by Ethiopia to build the dam.

So, as we can see Trump uses more topos than Assisi although mostly in language of threatening because he believes that this is the only language that USA should use; power to impose his own point of view on the others. Assisi, on the other hand uses less topos because be believes that when uttering these topos, he has to act accordingly, something which Assisi cannot hold the responsibility of.

As for the strategies used, Assisi has used more referential strategies than Trump because he wants to announce through the use of the plural pronouns that he is not responsible of the words he is saying only, others are involved with, including the president of Sudan. Trump when using this strategy, expresses something else, he expresses his power to control others by the use of the first-person pronoun in the data. Unlike Trump who never use the strategy of prediction because he need not label people positively or negatively because this does not matter for him, Assisi used prediction strategy negatively (but politely) to express the Ethiopian action. Trump uses mitigation strategy ironically to mitigate the whole problem while Assisi has used intensification strategy to flatter the president of the Democratic Congo because he wants him to solve the problem that he himself cannot manage.

It seems also that the context of situation plays a role in the flow of the speeches. Assisi was not free enough to say what he wants, while Trump was freer on the phone to express his attitudes. These findings show a dangerous status of the personalities of the two speakers. Trump is shown more aggressive, more ironic, more powerful, ambitious, dominant, outgoing, and dauntless, who can use his power to control others through any means and bold. Assisi is shown here to
be more polite, quite, slow in his reaction, he is more depending on the group than himself because he does not want to hold the responsibility alone and less bold.

7. Conclusions:

This paper is an attempt to analyze two different speeches, one by Trump and the other by Assisi on the case of the Ethiopian attempt to build a dam on the Nile. Wodak’s model (1999) and its components: Topos, strategies, context and historical background has been used as the model of analysis.

The findings prove that through such an analysis, traits of the personality can be discovered. Speakers cannot cover their personalities throughout their speeches though they try their best to do so. The findings show that Trump is aggressive, ironic, powerful, ambitious, dominant, outgoing, dauntless, and bold while Assisi is polite, quite, slow in his reaction, cannot act alone and less bold.
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Appendix:
Donald Trump’s Shocking Remarks about Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam.
Oct 23, 2020

TRUMP:

We are going to be signing numerous countries in the not-too-distant future so that’ll be great while you are on the phone could I ask you how is the dam doing in Ethiopia?

The largest dam in many years being built unfortunately it stops water from flowing into Egypt a little bit of a problem right as it should but Ethiopia built a dam you know all about it probably but I’ve been dealing with Sudan on that and I’m just curious how is that going because you’re ruining the third party involved with Ethiopia and Egypt and the dam are they working out their deal because I had a deal done for them and then unfortunately Ethiopia broke the deal which they should not have done.

That was a big mistake and we’ve stopped payment to them of about a lot of aid because they did it, and they will never see that money unless they adhere to the agreement. But they built a dam which stops water from flowing into the Nile and you can’t blame Egypt for being a little bit upset right how are they doing with that do you know I was actually talking to Sudan to the chairman talking to the prime minister, how are you doing? You may not want to answer.

The Ethiopian side:

In very few months brought us together I think we are progressing very well on this we hope to reach our new integration that will bring a lot of benefits from the mentality of the three nations and while we are moving in that direction, we hope to reach an unequal solution.

TRUMP:

Soon yeah, if you would because I had a deal done and then they broke the deal and they can’t do that. They can’t do that so the deal was done and it’s a very dangerous situation because Egypt is not going to be able to live that way and they’ll end up blowing up the dam. And I said it, they say it loud and clear they’ll blow up that dam and they have to do something so whatever you can do to get them Ethiopia to do that they’re going to have to okay and we’ve cut off all payment and everything else to Ethiopia it was terrible we’re all set to sign a deal it was negotiated for five years and longer than and they couldn’t make the deal and I got the deal done and then they’re getting ready to sign the deal and they broke the deal which is not good. So, whatever you could do prime minister if you could that would be great okay you tell them they got to get it done and I’m telling Egypt the same thing by the way. You know because they could have stopped it they should have stopped it long before it was started I said how do you let it get built and then you say they have a dam you know but they had other things on their mind that was at a time when they were having a minor revolution to put it mildly that was a bad time for Egypt so I guess they had other things on their mind so you’ll work on that and thank you very much.
كلمة الرئيس المصري عبد الفتاح السيسي خلال المؤتمر الصحفي المشترك مع رئيس المجلس السيادي السوداني خلال زيارته إلى السودان بتاريخ 6/3/2021 للتباحث حول التعاون المشترك بين البلدين

الرئيس السيسي:

لقد تطابقت رؤيتنا على رفض أي نهج يقوم على السعي لفرض الأمر الواقع وسط السيطرة على النيل الأزرق من خلال اجراءات أحادية لا تراعي مصالح وحقوق دولي القصب. وهو ما تستدعي من خلال أعلام أثيوبيا عن نيتها تنفيذ المرحلة الثانية من مسار النسيحتة حتى إذا لم تتوصل إلى اتفاق ينظم مسار تشغيل هذا السد.

وهو الأجراء الذي يهدد بالحاج اضطراب جسيم في مصالح مصر والسودان.

ومن هنا... فقد بحثنا مسألة إعادة إطلاع مسار المفاوضات من خلال تشكيل رابعة دولية تشمل الاتحاد الأوروبي والولايات المتحدة والاتحاد الأوروبي بجانب الأمم المتحدة للتوسط في العملية التفاوضية وقيادة الرئاسة (Tshiskedi) رئيس جمهورية الكونغو الديمقراطية والعديد من فرص تجار مسار المفاوضات. حيث أكدنا على ضرورة تشكيل الأطراف من خلال فحص ونظام اتفاق ينظم مسار التشغيل هذا السد.

لكننا نعرف أن القوة الحديثة لا تكون من خلال القوة العسكرية، بل من خلال العمل المشترك والتعاون بين البلدين.

السيدات والسادة...