

78th United Nations General Assembly: African Institutional Discourse in Pursuit of Reversing Interactional Frames

Clémentine R. M. Lokonon¹, Michel M. Mehinto²

¹Pan African University Institut

ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6923-18773>

Email: [clementinelokonon\[at\]gmail.com](mailto:clementinelokonon[at]gmail.com)

²Université d'Abomey-Calavi

ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-1488-5485>

Email: [mipapaito01\[at\]yahoo.fr](mailto:mipapaito01[at]yahoo.fr)

Abstract: *"We are tired of..., we are tired, we are tired," echoed in the august hall of the United Nations, expressing the desire for a world of trust and sustainability for individuals and states in 2023. Is this thematic appeal circumstantial or part of a conspiracy framework? This study examines the discourses of demands in a context where, in Africa, some voices are calling for the reversal of the institutional framework. Through an interactional and argumentative lens, it examines contributions from Burkina Faso, Guinea, Mali, and Togo to understand the symbolic significance of discourse in reshaping global and institutional hierarchies. Does the expression given up suggest a reversal of the interactional discourse framework? Therefore, we posit that the argumentative offer guides the discursive construction for interaction. The study employs semi-automated data processing (using Google and Chat GPT-4) software to analyze the ritualization of the UN's argumentative space.*

Keywords: United Nations, 78th General Assembly, African Discourse, Institutional Argumentation, Interactional Framework

1. Introduction

The UN General Assembly traditionally serves as a platform for leaders to address themes of global importance. In 2023, the chosen theme sparked challenging and introspective debates. Specifically, the 78th General Assembly of the United Nations focused on reflections regarding the 'restoration of trust,' the 'revival of global solidarity,' and the 'acceleration of action to achieve the 2030 Agenda and its Sustainable Development Goals for peace, prosperity, progress, and sustainability for all.' These words suggest, firstly, a natural state in question, but also express a dual modality of authority: to say and to do. The setting and the participation (Goffman, 1974) justify the use of these terms; however, they also reveal a staged atmosphere in which organized discursive productions unfold. Will the hearer's locutionary instance truly perceive the informative and communicative intentions of the sender's locutionary instance (Sperber and Wilson, 1986)?

The convener of the space, in a multi-channel context—namely the United Nations (UN), the common residence, and the authority carrying it, that is, the Secretary-General, along with the various structures that necessarily give it life—imposes a construction around the facts and the value of these facts for establishing the premises of agreement (Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, 2008). The verbs 'reestablish' and 'revive,' evolving between illocutionary and propositional forces (Searle, 1972), reveal an evaluation of the situation, a conviction in one's own observations, and an expression of authority to give directives, which is further confirmed by the use of the verb 'accelerate.' Thus, from the theme, the convener positions himself within linguistic acts of exposition and promise, exercising authority through both

verdictive (to judge) and exercitive (to do or make-do) acts. However, expressive authority only exists because the other authorities grant it as such and are aware of their respective statuses. Do they agree to step aside for the expression of the convening authority in the argumentative space, or do they settle for occupying the space in order to establish themselves as institutional power (Lokonon, 2020)?

What arguments support true co-construction? The home is common and constitutes the heritage of all; therefore, no hierarchical relationship that disadvantages others should prosper. Hence, the interest in countries that have long challenged the established order and broken traditions in order to shift the space from a long-standing, unbalanced hierarchy in Africa towards a more equitable hierarchy that benefits each participant in the space: Africa and the rest of the world in all their geopolitical and strategic diversity.

This work aims to first lay down the methodological foundations before providing a brief historiography of the contextual situation in which the world was immersed at the time of the opening of this UN space of discourse which continued the game of simulacra of freedom of expression in order to unveil the constructed argumentative strategies magnanimous for the dominant while the defeated languish under the weight of the power of force in the face of existential issues caused by the evolution of societies, more precisely that of Francophone African countries on the international stage.

2. Materials and Methods

The aim of this research is to analyze the discursive outputs of the speaking entities within the context of the 78th United

Nations General Assembly, with the goal of understanding the ritualization of the UN's institutional argumentative space. Specifically, this study seeks to highlight the constructs of expressions that convey the symbolic significance of the argumentative offers made by the speaker (the convener of the space) and to examine how these symbolic constructs influence the discursive reception behaviors within the space. We posit that the discursive outputs of the 78th United Nations General Assembly reflect the ritualization of the UN's institutional argumentative space. Accordingly, the constructs of expressions reveal the symbolic significance of the argumentative offers made by the speaking entity (the emitter), and from this symbolic significance, a specific type of reception emerges within the institutional argumentative space.

It is therefore clear that the speeches of Burkina Faso, Guinea Conakry, and Mali are analyzed, taking advantage of the space made available to respond to the injunctions of the desired scenic orientation, translated by the theme of the convening authority; and Togo, emerging from silence to follow the trail of those supported until the opening of this space. The text was read by the delegates of each country, namely the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Togo, the Minister of Labor of Burkina Faso, the interim Prime Minister of Mali, and the president of the transitional authority of Guinea. These discourses seem to be confined to the participation framework created and organized for self-construction. Like an answer to the created space, the institutional argument converges towards the citizen argument, developed by a new force, not so new but often stifled: pan-Africanism. The old or the new? other voices ask. The effect is readable and visible throughout the world. If voices, the tone of voices, and body gestures reinforce the construct of the engaged self, this study is only interested in statements on an argumentative level to see how the discursive orientation gave birth to the argumentative space under construction at the direction of the oriented enunciator participant, according to Orecchionian terminology.

Here, the study evolves in two contexts: the meaning of a theme within an informative framework between the sender and the receivers; and the question of the symbolism of the framework created by the theme, revealing the intentions of the sender in posing a simple problem: the perception of reception as another symbolism of the contextual situation for the flow of interaction.

Therefore, **what is the symbolic meaning of the theme, or 'the argumentative offer,' at the level of the speaker?** In this regard, we will not separate the semiotic elements from the cognitive ones; because it is not only a matter of 'signifiers' and 'signified' imposed by coding, but also of tacit knowledge between unconscious rules and principles, always supported by knowledge. This knowledge can be implicit or explicit. Here, we slightly modify Wilson's logic (1974) to assert that, just like language, the sign, in this context, signals 'speak only speak for themselves' (Wilson, 1974: 7); and '(...) every living word is rooted in facts of our mental consciousness and our history, it would be impossible to contradict it (...)' (Ogden & Richards, 1946: 2). It is a different matter to determine what these facts may be.

So, from the symbolism of meaning through the theme, what argumentative space is constructed by the sender? Facts and mental consciousness reflect the state of the human person in a contextual situation. This is the residue that discourse reveals, which can escape situations either by force of circumstances or by avoidance. But an undeniable reality remains: when the victor is established in the participative framework, the other exists with difficulty for him; thus, the construct reveals a world not far from a myth, always repelled by reality. The communicative intention is not really ostensive; at least, if it is, it is for the expression of the self of the victors. This does not serve the informative intention. History and experiences account for this: saliences that do not protect faces, that threaten them and maintain an unbalanced construction in favor of the dominants (Michaud, 2012), are not meant for 2023. However, fiction is indispensable only for cinematography; establishing it as a genre in communication can cause chaos. In reality, the General Assembly, this melting pot of all the members, has always been nothing more than a stage where everyone performs their part, with spectators who are just spectators, waiting for their turns. No naivety, no confusion of roles until the day the curtain rises, sooner or later, to expose the backstage. And this is what happened this September 2023: a secretary-general, whether for himself or not, constructs dramatic moments, with spectators who are used to it paying little attention and thus no longer exposing themselves to it, and distracted ears, suddenly becoming invited participants. This signifies that 'in fictional discourse, we have a series of pretended (as if make-believe) speech acts, usually pretended assertives, and the fact that the speech act is only pretended breaks the word-to-world commitments of the normal assertive. The speaker is not committed to the truth of his fictional assertions in the way that he is committed to the truth of his normal assertions' (Searle, 1983: 18).

From these two aspects, **the third one is: Reception and symbolism of meaning in self-construction.** As it is said, "Symbols direct and organize, record and communicate" (Ogden & Richards, 1946: 9); and here we deal with 'countries,' 'political leaders,' 'receiver vs sender,' and 'argumentative ideological offer.' There is a confrontation of discursive units (Foucault, 1969), originating here from contexts with multiple layers and often unspoken aspects made non-manifest to all. Thus, in this august hall of all nations, discursive productions are intended to manifest a relation to the argumentative offer (i.e. thematic appeal), productions from historical-cultural context, geopolitically rooted productions evolving from the contextual situation, and geostrategic discursive productions, socially anchored to express the new realities. Perhaps unknown to some, deliberately unmanifested to others, or consciously made legible by some. 'Good colonialism,' 'humanitarian colonialism' confronts the 'legacy of time' which, as specified by Borrel et al. (2021), has had the time to transform into 'formal imperialism,' supporting 'informal imperialism' that has shaped everything, including speech, to articulate evil in a single word: 'françafrique' for these 'new African institutional arguments (argumentative ideological offer)'. The focus here is on the construction of being and having as a mutant receiver in this case.

3. Results and Discussion

The thematic appeal constructs speeches

Things are done with words, and this also emphasizes the games of enunciative construction for the sake of interaction. Thus, the argumentative offer presented to convene a space for exchange and interaction is necessarily a source of expressions and a space for impression management (Goffman, 1974). In this way, the co-construction, with the desired mutual management in this 2023 context, reveals an oriented enunciator shaping the space, that is, the authority of speech (Bourdieu, 1982). So, how should we interpret the games of argumentative construction for the stakes of impression delivered by these expressions?

The argumentative offer for the symbolism of meaning and the management of expressions

As is customary, at each UN General Assembly, the members agree on what should bring them together, what they should reflect on. The Secretary-General, elected by them to oversee the daily management of the institution - a common good, a legacy shared by all - outlines a picture of the state of the world at the time of the new annual session. Then, from "expressions given" - what is made manifest to be understood by the receiver - to the "expression given up" - what the receiver interprets after hearing - it seems that the context, the state of each instance, and routine play a crucial role. Thus, words reveal the self in its fullness as an actor and in its representation of the other?

« Il y a tout juste neuf jours, nous avons découvert une vision d'enfer, un paysage terrible, conséquence d'une compilation de nombre des problèmes auxquels le monde est confronté (Guterres, UNGA 2023 septembre). »

Translation

Just nine days ago, we witnessed a vision of hell, a terrible landscape, the result of a compilation of many of the problems the world is facing (Guterres, UNGA September 2023).

By referring to an event that occurred nine days ago, the Secretary-General highlights his priority; he believes in 'making see', 'making heard', 'making believed', much like the media, and above all, indicating in the frame 'what to think' and 'what to say'. But what is it for this authority to use linguistic units that are themselves performative, carrying locutionary force and action through names and axiological evaluations (Kerbrat-Orecchioni, 2002): 'vision of hell', 'terrible landscape', 'compilation of many problems', 'world confronted with...'? The 'intended' message in this speech (introductory words) was, in fact, to refocus attention on the consequences of human actions on nature, which today fuel climate debates and the need to save the planet (an agenda-setting from authority, clearly outlined). Also, the response from the same UN authority calls into question: who authorized and permitted 'the years of conflict' in a country where the economic and development situation is in no way comparable to the situations of several countries in the world, from north to south and from east to west? Let's talk about the 'climate

chaos'! Is the speaker not referring to a country whose desert landscape has been transformed into oases? So, the leaders responsible for the suffering that has befallen these populations in Libya, on top of everything else, with 'there and elsewhere' - even if these spatio-temporal deictics absolve the speaker - do not erase the reality of shared responsibility in terms of action, namely, the UN decisions granted without the grantor's commitment to ensure that things unfold under his command or supervision. Since then, the victorious nations, without assessing the actions carried out in a country and destroying the peace and tranquility of its citizens, continue to believe that they must pursue the policy of granting themselves the right, under the pretext of 'defending minorities', 'defending democracy', to make weapons crackle in a peaceful sky, according to the desires of one party or another. From the enunciative call to this introductory part and installation of the decor for the discursive space, 'the disappearance of genuine, perennial African issues' in favor of 'secondary African problems' as intended reflects 'a forward escape', 'a self-directed reorientation' of what Africans should think about. Thus, it is understood the multiplication of facts and the values of facts, that is to say, the option for the argumentative dimension (Ducrot & Anscombre, 1983; Lokonon, 2019, 2021) of argumentation. Therefore, this authority of speech is asking to be heard and understood that,

« Derna est un triste instantané de l'état de notre monde, emporté par le torrent des inégalités et des injustices, et paralysé devant les défis à relever », « Notre monde est sens dessus dessous », « Nous sommes aux prises avec une multitude de menaces existentielles – de la crise climatique aux technologies de rupture », « L'Europe était composée de nombreuses puissances. Elle était véritablement multipolaire. Mais elle ne disposait pas d'institutions multilatérales solides. Et quel a été le résultat ? La Première Guerre mondiale », « Il suffit de regarder le Conseil de sécurité de l'ONU et le système de Bretton Woods. Ils reflètent les réalités politiques et économiques de 1945, lorsque de nombreux pays présents dans cette salle étaient encore sous domination coloniale. Le monde a changé. Nos institutions, non ! » (Guterres, UNGA 2023 septembre).

Translation

'Derna is a tragic snapshot of the state of our world, swept away by the torrent of inequalities and injustices, and paralyzed in the face of the challenges to be met', 'Our world is upside down', 'We are grappling with a multitude of existential threats-from the climate crisis to disruptive technologies', 'Europe was made up of many powers. It was truly multipolar. But it lacked strong multilateral institutions. And what was the result? World War I', 'Just look at the UN Security Council and the Bretton Woods system. They reflect the political and economic realities of 1945, when many countries present in this room were still under colonial rule. The world has changed. Our institutions have not!' (Guterres, UNGA September 2023).

The ‘expression given up’ here is: recognition of an interaction under threat from the faces of some, an exercise of authority by others in a common home advocating or having advocated equality. The question is: why is the new construction accepted in a situational context that led, as this authority points out, to the First World War? Why this complacency in not returning space dedicated to social justice, egalitarian construction, Nations degrading the human species, degrading nature by prolonging evils against words like ‘slavery’, ‘colonialism’? If it did not cause discomfort yesterday, why should it cause discomfort today? This explains: the independence granted and sewn is for the safeguarding of hierarchical positions favorable to the dominant powers in space. Thus, the ‘intended’ always refers to the disappearance of priorities related to African problems in favor of an orientation towards ‘the agreed-upon’, which everyone easily finds pleasing.

So, the ‘expression given up’ is in this context, stating it in all its action dimensions but not for action in its fullness, namely, denouncing and acting against. Furthermore, how many times has this authority spoken up to say, ‘under me, the institution does things differently’? In any conflict with colonizing powers, it seems like the authority of speech acts in the discursive space as an extension of those powers. Here is the reality called ‘power’. The case of Mali, amidst repeated conflicts with France and other African countries, exemplifies this: the Secretary-General contradicts the words upheld by his institution regarding Mali, concerning Ivorian soldiers and/or within the house that belongs to everyone. Showing the manifestation of this power, despite the changes in the political and regulatory contexts, the right to representation has been revoked.

As we can note, ‘the value of facts’ (Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, 2008) does not carry the facts highlighted and foundational to what the argumentation should be in a multinational interactional space. As a result, the expressions, whether ‘planned’ or ‘perceived,’ distance themselves from the mutual construction required by this multi-State argumentative space. And impression management has something to do with it. Indeed, what is the authority to say on such an occasion, and what should they do? As Persson (2019: 13) aptly reports on Goffman’s apprehension;

I feel even more that it is unrealistic, and abuses words in a manner we must not allow to become characteristic of us, for a president-elect or anyone else to proclaim what the theme of an annual meeting is to be. There are already enough inflated pronouncements in the world; our job is to dissect such activity, not increase the supply.

Is it not the same apprehension today: ‘abuse of words’, ‘exaggerated statements’ representing the identity of some against absence of words, ‘submissive statements’, ‘identity of losing oneself’ in the system of ‘argumentative offering’ of words not meant to dissect the ill(s)? This allows us to deduce the meaning, the symbolic significance of the thematic call of this speaker’s space. This is commonly referred to as the simulacrum of self-justification within a routine system, and to borrow the appropriate term from

Goffman’s logic supported by Persson (2019: 2-3), ‘the etiquette of politics.’ Furthermore, this ‘sociological establishment’ can override it; whether in verbal or non-verbal terms, shocking and offending the habitués, those in collusion with the system, etc.

So, if it is necessary to use grand words, the speaker does so; if it is necessary to construct drama, they do it; if creating fear is required, they will take care of that. All of this for a carefully wrapped and packaged deal: the hegemony of some living at the expense of others and conniving to create entirely fabricated images that lay the groundwork for the pre-discursive (Amossy, 1999), drawn from the residue that reveals the true human being (Allport, 1961; Altman, 2023), who is nonetheless called to interact with the other.

The interaction order is thus characterised as a balancing act. Two ‘forces’ are at work: on the one hand ritualisation; on the other vulnerability, and the equilibrium between these two can be called a temporarily working consensus (Persson, 2019: 26).

These data demonstrate that this hypothesis: “the constructs of expressions reveal the symbolic significance of the argumentative offer from the speaking entity (speaker)” is verified. Nevertheless, at this point, the notion of the ‘principle of cooperation,’ developed by Grice (1975), emerges, prompting us to recall the actual functioning of an interactive axis in terms of constructing the current argumentative space. In fact, if one party, acting to dictate ‘what to think,’ forgets that they are in a condition where two forces interact, the other can remind them; because these two forces are dynamic according to participation, and everything is transformable, modifiable.

Argumentative Offer and Argumentative Ideological Supply: What Manifestation of Self-Construction?

The contrast to downkeying is upkeying: a shift from a given distance from literal reality to a greater distance, an unauthorized increase in the lamination of the frame (Goffman, 1974: 366). Upkeying and distance. Here, this occurs through the construction of relationships via personal deictics, the traces of subjectivization in the discourse, and constructs that indicate the manifestations directed at the other in the discourse. A few examples merit attention here.

Regarding the circularity of information, if self-establishment as a participant dictates a law, namely the one who speaks, in a diversity of statuses, in this context, at the level of the speaker-receiver instance, with its dual role (receiver and sender), a shift from one status to another is noted—acting sender and arch-acting sender (Lokonon and Gbaguidi, 2022) with ‘we’ and ‘I’ versus ‘you.’ However, between delegated representation and de facto representation, it should first be noted that only Guinea’s speech is delivered by the head of state, while Burkina Faso’s is presented by the Minister of Labor, Mali’s by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Togo’s by a representative of the same rank. Thus, while the use of ‘I’ is justified for Guinea’s transitional president, Mamadi Doumbouya (a total of ... versus ... ‘we’), in the other speeches, it can only be justified if participation is clear to all: it is the country speaking through its highest authority, regardless of who

delivers the message. With that clarified, the flow can also be read between emphasis and distance to build mutual acceptance and understanding of what is being discussed among participants through enunciative dynamics involving various treatments, such as flattery, valorization, violence, threats, etc. (Goffman, 1974: 9). This does not block the path to intentions (whether informative or communicative) within a Sperberian and Wilsonian logic. Thus, the argumentative offer should be responded to either by rejection or adherence from the interlocutor.

(...) nous pensons que les fondamentaux qui ont sous-tendu à la création de notre organisation doivent s'adapter aux mutations profondes de notre société (Président de la transition de Guinée-Conakry, M. Doumbouya, UNGA 2023, september 21).

Translation

“(...) we believe that the fundamentals that underpinned the creation of our organization must adapt to the profound changes in our society” (President of the Transition of Guinea-Conakry, Mr. Doumbouya, UNGA 2023, September 21).

(...) le mensonge d'État, l'hypocrisie diplomatique, la boulimie du pouvoir, la recherche effrénée du gain, l'esprit démoniaque de domination et d'exploitation de l'Homme par l'Homme sont les vraies plaies qui gangrènent notre vivre ensemble et font courir toute la société à sa perte, y compris donc notre organisation, l'ONU (Représentant de la transition du Burkina Faso, B. Bazie, ministre du travail, 2023, september 23).

Translation

“(...) the state lie, diplomatic hypocrisy, the insatiable hunger for power, the relentless pursuit of profit, the demonic spirit of domination and exploitation of Man by Man are the real scourges that undermine our living together and lead the entire society to its downfall, including our organization, the UN” (Representative of the Transition of Burkina Faso, B. Bazie, Minister of Labor, 2023, September 23).

(...) nous ne nous laisserons jamais de rappeler cette responsabilité internationale dans la tragédie humaine que vivent la Libye et les pays du Sahel. Aussi, au nom de toutes les victimes de 2011 à nos jours, de dizaines de milliers de morts et de millions de déplacés et réfugiés, nous réclamons justice ; nous demandons réparation. Mais surtout, nous demandons que la communauté internationale assume ses responsabilités et tire toutes les leçons de cette intervention militaire hasardeuse des grandes puissances dans un pays tiers (Représentant de la Transition du Mali, A. Diop, ministre des affaires étrangères, UNGA, 2023, september 23).

Translation

“(...) we will never tire of reminding the world of the international responsibility in the human tragedy that Libya and the Sahel countries are experiencing. Also,

on behalf of all the victims from 2011 to this day, tens of thousands of deaths, and millions of displaced persons and refugees, we demand justice; we request reparations. But above all, we demand that the international community assume its responsibilities and draw all the lessons from this reckless military intervention by major powers in a third country” (Representative of the Transition of Mali, A. Diop, Minister of Foreign Affairs, UNGA, 2023, September 23).

To the idea of the "order" that is "crumbling" from the convener of the space, not only do the summoned adhere, but they also go beyond, performing expositive speech acts (Austin, 1962, pp. 88-89) through accusation and denunciation with the following linguistic expressions or units: “we will tire of...”, “to recall”, “international responsibility”, “human tragedy”, “diplomatic hypocrisy”, “the demonic spirit of domination and exploitation”, “the real sores”, “corrupt”, “drive the entire society to its downfall”, “our organization, the UN”.

Furthermore, the facts and their values contribute to the construction of the argumentative dimension while revealing acts ranging from promissive to exercitive with the following linguistic expressions or units: “the fundamentals...”, “must adapt”, “never”, “all the victims from 2011 to the present day”, “the international community”, “must assume its responsibilities”. This clearly indicates a questioning of the image of the ‘knower’, ‘philanthropist’, and ‘virtuous’ created and maintained against the backdrop of evaluating one’s own actions and status with the following expressions: “reckless military intervention”, “power hunger”, “frantic pursuit of profit”, “great powers”.

Thus, it is easy to observe acts of face-threatening: when the speakers, taking advantage of the argumentative space, position themselves to build their self-image solely from facts and shift positioning within the space in order to reverse the trend—this time, admittedly, for a hierarchical position in their favor rather than in favor of those who have always benefited from the "dominant" status. To achieve this, words are used to question and cast doubt on what one claims to be or to do. As a result, mutual face protection (Goffman, 1974) is compromised in favor of constructing one's own discursive face (Lokonon, 2022) within the space. Thus, the other is explicitly referenced to make the self visible, with all associated statuses (the authority of the speaker, as a knowledgeable figure with a valorized image).

(...) la communauté internationale doit avoir l'honnêteté et la correction de ne pas se contenter de dénoncer les seules conséquences, mais de s'intéresser et de traiter les causes. Le putschiste n'est pas seulement celui qui prend les armes pour renverser un régime. Je souhaite que l'on retienne bien que les vrais putschistes, les plus nombreux, qui ne font l'objet d'aucune condamnation, c'est aussi ceux qui manigancent, qui utilisent la fourberie, qui trichent pour manipuler les textes de la constitution afin de se maintenir éternellement au pouvoir. C'est ceux en col blanc

qui modifient les règles du jeu pendant la partie pour conserver les rênes du pays. Voilà les putschistes les plus nombreux. (Président de la transition, M. Dombouya, UNGA, 2023, septembre 21).

Translation

(...) The international community must have the honesty and integrity not to simply denounce the consequences, but to focus on and address the causes. A coup leader is not only the one who takes up arms to overthrow a regime. I want it to be clearly understood that the real coup leaders, the most numerous ones, who face no condemnation, are also those who scheme, who use deceit, who manipulate constitutional texts to cling to power indefinitely. They are the ones in white collars who change the rules of the game during play to keep hold of the country's reins. These are the most numerous coup leaders

It is the highlighting of facts that cannot be refuted by the interlocutors, reflecting a rupture in "trust", which the convener of the space seeks to "restore" with the verb "restore" - a verb with multiple modalities: promissive, directive, exercitive, and expositive, in short, a performative verb (Lokonon, 2021) that constructs a speaker in both their having and their being. Additionally, the representatives of these countries, breaking away from convention, complacency, and Persson's (2019) "etiquettes of politics", organize what we can call a "representative discursive revolution from below" in this public discursive arena. This can be defined as the argumentative response of an interlocutor continuously held in place in a positioning always favorable to the speaker, in order to shift positions and reject the construction of an agenda that obscures the interlocutor's priorities in favor of those the speaker wants to impose as their own.

Thus, the interlocutor brings their priorities back into the space, since they were only briefly addressed by the speaker, just to do "bonne figure" to preserve the invented and created image (ethos). One may wonder if this General Assembly for the victors has not simply become an annual ritual they fulfill with satisfaction, ensuring control over every step of building, or over the process and the product - if we want to borrow from the construction and marketing sectors.

C'est certes pour donner l'impression que nous vivons en société et que nous défendons des valeurs. L'honnêteté intellectuelle recommande et l'histoire des consciences nous reflètent que nous devons présenter nos sincères excuses au peuple Libyen pour avoir été, collectivement et individuellement, par passivité condamnable ou par complicité active et inacceptable, aux côtés des bourreaux qui ont été la première catastrophe anthropique en Libye. C'est cette catastrophe qui a mis la Libye à genoux (...). », « Et malheureusement, à la tête de cette catastrophe humaine étaient l'ONU sous la résolution 19-70 et le silence coupable voire la complicité de la CEDEAO et de l'Union Africaine. » (Burkina, représentant

pouvoir de transition- B. Bazié, ministre du travail, UNGA, 2023, septembre).

Translation

It is certainly to give the impression that we live in a society and defend values. Intellectual honesty requires - and the history of our collective conscience reflects - that we must present our sincere apologies to the Libyan people for having been, collectively and individually, either through condemnable passivity or unacceptable active complicity, on the side of the oppressors who were the first anthropic catastrophe in Libya. It is this catastrophe that brought Libya to its knees (...). And unfortunately, at the head of this human catastrophe were the UN under Resolution 1970 and the guilty silence or even complicity of ECOWAS and the African Union." (Burkina Faso, representative of the transitional government - B. Bazié, Minister of Labor, UNGA, September 2023)

It is indeed the rejection of the "faceless mass" image of Africa, as the victors and their media know how to portray it (Persson, 2019: 31), with actions that intensify face-threatening dynamics ("giving the impression that we live in a society" - otherwise, what are we living in? In the forest like animals? one might ask this speaker, who further devalues with the statement "and that we defend values" - the second statement, linked to the first by 'and', in terms of value, function, and prepositional content).

Thus, the interlocutors also wish to project a clear expression of themselves, distinctly aimed toward their audience, also within the space.

« qui donc êtes-vous pour bafouer notre humanité ainsi ? qui donc êtes-vous pour nous mépriser ainsi ? qui donc êtes-vous pour nous humilier ainsi ? » ; « La réalité du monde, c'est qu'il n'a plus de centres de gravité monopolistique. Le centre du monde est désormais ici et nulle part ailleurs » (Ministre des affaires étrangères du Togo, R Dussey, UNGA, 2023, septembre 21).

Translation

"Who then are you to trample on our humanity like this? Who then are you to scorn us in this way? Who then are you to humiliate us like this?"

"The reality of the world is that it no longer has monopolistic centers of gravity. The center of the world is now here and nowhere else." (Minister of Foreign Affairs of Togo, R. Dussey, UNGA, September 21, 2023).

Through these questioning acts, the slave emancipates himself; but in reality, between the one who calls himself master and the one he calls his slave, who is truly the slave, following Freudian logic? This shows that both parties are still engaging with the initial statement of the call for space: "restore trust". For there is trust because there is sharing, because the other is taken into account, recognized as the alter of the self.

Au Mali, au Niger et au Burkina Faso, il n'y a ni usine de fabrication d'armes ni de munitions. Qui recrute donc ces terroristes ? Qui les entraînent ? Qui les dotent en permanence ? Qui les nourrit et avec quels moyens ? Croyez-vous à cette philanthropie au nom de laquelle des occidentaux vont envoyer leurs militaires au Sahel mourir pour les beaux yeux des Sahéliens ? Si oui, qu'est ce qui justifie les énervements et autres gesticulations diplomatiques dès qu'on dit à la France de déguerpir militairement ? (Burkina, représentant pouvoir de transition- B. Bazié, ministre du travail, UNGA, 2023, septembre).

Translation

In Mali, Niger, and Burkina Faso, there are no factories for making weapons or ammunition. So who recruits these terrorists? Who trains them? Who constantly supplies them? Who feeds them and with what means? Do you believe in this philanthropy under which Westerners are sending their soldiers to the Sahel to die for the good of the Sahelians? If so, what justifies the irritations and other diplomatic gesticulations whenever France is told to leave militarily?" (Burkina Faso, Representative of the Transition Government – B. Bazié, Minister of Labor, UNGA, September 2023).

Thus, it is further demonstrated to the convener of the space the manifestations of the "global solidarity" he believes once existed and wishes to "revive" in a context where "truth" is no longer a virtue. Does he think he will "restore this"? The mutual construction of the argumentative space rejects the semblance of convenience. These Africans, steeped in and by an ideology, are demanding, like their predecessors, the recognition of an identity.

le moment d'arrêter de nous faire la leçon, d'arrêter de nous traiter comme des enfants. » (Doumbouya, président de la transition de Guinée) ; « l'Afrique n'entend plus dans la nouvelle dynamique restée dans l'ombre d'une quelconque grande puissance. Le temps où

d'autres entités prétendaient parler au nom d'une Afrique qu'elles n'écoutent même pas ici aux Nations Unies et sur la scène internationale est révolu (Dussey, ministre des affaires étrangères du Togo) ; « dans ce sens et afin de prendre leur destin en main, le Mali, le Niger et le Burkina Faso ont signé l'Alliance des Etats du Sahel en abrégé AES ».

Translation

"The time to stop lecturing us, to stop treating us like children" (Doumbouya, President of the Transition of Guinea). "Africa no longer listens in the new dynamic, left in the shadow of any great power. The time when other entities pretended to speak on behalf of an Africa they do not even listen to here at the United Nations and on the international stage is over" (Dussey, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Togo). "In this sense, and in order to take their destiny into their own hands, Mali, Niger, and Burkina Faso signed the Sahel States Alliance, abbreviated AES"

In this regard, it is important to remind that the ritual or routine should never lead the users of an argumentative space to forget that the social construct demands that every man be seen and perceived as "kind of God" in a Goffmanian logic. Based on this data, it can be said that this hypothesis, "the constructs of expressions reveal the symbolic significance of the argumentative offer from the speaking entity (emitter)," is verified in terms of the stakes of construction, without, however, revealing the dynamics of the argumentative construct as a receptive locutory instance.

Expressions given up to the enunciative dynamics of self-construction, shifting from the reception to the production of discourse

The dynamics of construction vary between the self, with the means of its construction as a multimodal entity - shaped by representation, ideology, and priorities - and the representation of the other.

Lokonon, 2024 July

Volume 13 Issue 12, December 2024

Fully Refereed | Open Access | Double Blind Peer Reviewed Journal

www.ijsr.net

As shown in this graph, the symbolism of the right to representation is particularly pronounced among the speakers from Guinea and Burkina Faso. This highlights a balancing act between the represented self and those represented, meaning those who have granted the right to speak and act on their behalf – through the street, not the ballot box. This reveals a diverse perception on both sides. While in Guinea, Doumbouya's ego challenges the nation, in

Traoré's case, a balance seems to be observed, where the ego is present but far from transforming into the nation. This is not the case in Togo, where the ego fades for the represented and aligns more closely, as in the dynamic between Burkina Faso and Mali. What this must reveal are the indicators of the call between the self with its small sovereignty and the self that is open.

Lokonon, 2024 July

With Graph 2, it is clear that Mali is more focused on itself, while the others struggle to attract much attention from it. Only the continent receives timid acknowledgments from Mali, and less than a third of its discourse is directed towards self-reflection (15 references to Africa compared to 62 references to the country). This could become the country's Achilles' heel because the fight for true independence in an African country can never be solely a domestic matter, as the comforts within the borders drawn by colonizers have shown their limits. However, as seen with Burkina Faso, there is a shift from focusing inward to looking outward towards the broader picture. Thus, references to Africa surpass references to the country, followed by the New Alliance (+40 occurrences for Africa compared to +25 for the country). A similar observation can be made for Togo, which leads with over 70 references to Africa (more than double the references to its own country - 28), but with zero references to ECOWAS. This organization seems to only be a concern for denunciations (5 occurrences for Burkina Faso, 3 for Mali, and 1 for Guinea). Yet, all these countries are part of this development framework. These gaps must necessarily be filled by ideological identifications; however, the occurrences still reveal a reluctance to expose intimate ideological convictions. Thus, we observe: 3 occurrences for Togo, 2 for Burkina Faso, and 1 for Mali, while Guinea lags behind with zero occurrences. Therefore, it can be concluded that this hypothesis, "from the symbolic significance of the argumentative offer, a specific type of reception emerges within the institutional argumentative space," is verified. The question is: where do the leaders stand in relation to the populations in the popular

boat of time? Is the real issue with the other, or with the self?

4. Conclusion

Between face protection (Goffman, 1974) and the construction of discursive faces (Lokonon, 2022), the occurrences not only reveal these personalities in motion within the interactional space, but we will refrain from addressing the question here, as there were more representatives than actual bearers of the discourse. This highlights the limits of analyzing the balance between 'I' and 'we.' Who is 'I,' the representative or the represented? Especially since the mutual construction of 'we' (Lokonon, 2015) presents a question of usage.

However, the data have shown that what Goffman (1974: 180) describes as 'recontainment' unfolds before us. While he refers to the context in which the plotting party is discovered by parties other than those concerned, in the case of this 78th General Assembly, not only is there discovery, but also a refusal to conceal the plotter's advantage in their scheming. The consequence is the revisited framework, the 'frame reversal,' or the 'reconversion of the frame.'

If the following hypotheses: "the constructs of expressions reveal the symbolic significance of the argumentative offer from the speaking entity (emitter)," and "from this symbolic significance of the argumentative offer, a specific type of reception emerges within the institutional argumentative space," are verified, then the general hypothesis "the

discursive outputs of this 78th General Assembly reflect the ritualization of the United Nations' institutional argumentative space" holds true.

This demonstrates that the argumentative offer and the introductory discourse of the convener of the international institutional space, who feigns being contextually well-informed and aware of the realities of the world they manage daily, were challenged by the other participants. This justifies what we have called the '*argumentative ideological supply*,' which uses facts and values to continue the traps and enunciative constructions for interactions that shift relational dynamics, redefining the self in space and developing the **discursive faces beyond the traditional frame** of the self through various manifestations, which will certainly be explored further in another study.

References

- [1] Allport, W. Gordon. 1961. *Pattern and Growth in Personality*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston
- [2] Altman, Morris (2023). Mental Models, Decision-Making, Bargaining Power, and Institutional Change. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 57 (4), 1241-1259 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00213624.2023.2273149>
- [3] Amossy, Ruth. 1999. Image de soi et schématisation de l'orateur : Pétain et de Gaulle en juin 1940 [Self-image and schematization of the speaker: Pétain and de Gaulle in June 1940]. In R. Amossy (ed.) *Image de soi dans le discours. La construction de l'ethos*. Delachaux et Niestlé, 101-126
- [4] Amossy, Ruth. 2012. *L'argumentation dans le discours [Argumentation in Discourse]*. Armand Colin
- [5] Amossy, Ruth. 2018. Introduction : la dimension argumentative du discours-enjeux théoriques et pratiques. *Argumentation et analyse du discours [Introduction: The Argumentative Dimension of Discourse - Theoretical and Practical Issues. Argumentation and Discourse Analysis]*, [en ligne], 20I2018 URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/aad/2560>
- [6] Austin, John. 1962. *How To Do Things with Words*. Clarendon Press
- [7] Borrel, Thomas Boukari-Yabara, Amzat Collombat, Benoît Deltombe, Thomas (2021). *L'empire qui ne veut pas mourir. Une histoire de la Françafrique [The Empire That Refuses to Die. A History of Françafrique]*. Seuil
- [8] Bourdieu, Pierre. 1982. *Ce que parler veut dire [What Speaking Means]*. Paris, Seuil
- [9] Charaudeau, Patrick. 1998. L'argumentation n'est peut-être pas ce que l'on croit [Argumentation may not be what we think]. *Revue Le Français aujourd'hui*, n° 123, Association Française des Enseignants de français URL : <https://www.patrick-charaudeau.com/L-argumentation-n-est-peut-etre.html>
- [10] Ducrot, Oswald & Ancombre, Jean-Claude. 1983. *L'argumentation dans la langue [Argumentation in language]*. Mardaga: Bruxelles Foucault, Michel. 1969. *L'archéologie du savoir [The Archaeology of Knowledge]*. Gallimard
- [11] Gazibo, Mamadou. 2010. *Introduction à la politique africaine [Introduction to African Politics]*. Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal
- [12] Gbaguidi, K. Julien & Lokonon, Clémentine. 2023. 1795, cette lettre du roi Agonglo ver Bahia (Brésil) : des mots pour la construction de l'image institutionnelle [1795, this letter from King Agonglo to Bahia (Brazil): Words for the Construction of the Institutional Image]. Actes 8^e Colloque UAC-Valorisation des savoirs endogènes, gage d'un développement durable, du 25 au 29 septembre 2023. 364-376
- [13] Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis. An Essay on the Organisation of Experience*. Boston, Northeastern University Press
- [14] Grice, H. Paul. 1975. Logic and conversation. In Cole, P. & Morgan J. (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 3, New-York Academic Press, 41-58
- [15] Kerbrat-Orecchioni. 2002. *L'énonciation [Enunciation]*. Arman Colin
- [16] Lokonon Clémentine. 2016. Le "nous", un symbole d'ajustement mutuel de face [The 'we', a symbol of mutual face adjustment] » *Cahiers d'études linguistiques* n°11. DSLC-UAC pp. 80-108
- [17] Lokonon Clémentine. 2019. Discours du président Patrice Talon à la rencontre de Genève sur l'accès aux médicaments et aux produits médicaux de qualité en Afrique francophone : les traces socioaffectives dans l'argumentation [Speech by President Patrice Talon at the Geneva meeting on access to medicines and quality medical products in French-speaking Africa: socio-affective traces in the argumentation]. *SANKOFA*, 16, 124-144
- [18] Lokonon Clémentine R. M. 2021. Discours d'investiture de mai 2021 au Bénin : Patrice Talon et la construction des relations à travers l'usage des déictiques personnels [Inaugural speech of May 2021 in Benin: Patrice Talon and the construction of relationships through the use of personal deictics]. *Revue Altralang*. Vol 3, n° 2, 95-115. DOI : <https://www.asjp.cerist.dz/en/articles16792>
- [19] Lokonon, Clémentine. 2022. Discours politiques de vœux en contexte Covid 19 : la question des faces de l'instance locutrice [Political speeches of well-wishes in the context of Covid-19: the issue of the faces of the speaker]. *Cinétismes. Varia*, vol. 1, n° 1, p. 113-125. ISSN-L 2791-2973, E-ISSN 2791-2981; https://www.revue-cinetismes.com/vol-1_n1/
- [20] Micheli, Raphaël. 2012. Les visées, de l'argumentation et leurs corrélats langagiers : une approche discursive [The aims of argumentation and their linguistic correlates: a discursive approach]. *Argumentation et Analyse du Discours [En ligne]*, 9I2012. URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/aad/1406> ; DOI : 10.4000/aad.1406
- [21] Perelman, Chaïm et Olbrechts-Tyteca. 2008. *Traité de l'argumentation. La nouvelle rhétorique [Treatise on Argumentation. The New Rhetoric]*. Bruxelles, éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles
- [22] Michaud, Yves. 2012. *La violence [Violence]*. 7^e éd. PUF- Que sais-je

- [23] Ogden, & Richards. 1946. *Meaning of Meaning*. 4th ed. Harvest Book
- [24] Persson, Anders. 2019. *Framing Social Interaction. Continuities and Cracks on Goffman's frame Analysis*. Routledge Taylor and Francis Group. London and New-York
- [25] Reboul, Olivier. 1991. *Introduction à la rhétorique. Théorie et pratique* [Introduction to Rhetoric. Theory and Practice]. PUF: Paris
- [26] Searle, John. 1983. *Intentionality*. Cambridge University Press
- [27] Sperber, Dan & Wilson, Deirdre. 1995. *Relevance. Communication and Cognition [Pertinence. Communication et Cognition]*, 2nd ed. Oxford UK and Cambridge USA, Blackwell
- [28] Tropol, Sarah A. 2010. Le régime libyen Kadhafi exploite « l'eau fossile » pour irriguer les fermes du désert. *The Christian Science Monitor* | on line] du 23 août 2010
- [29] <https://www.csmonitor.com/World/Africa/2010/0823/Libya-s-Qaddafi-taps-fossil-water-to-irrigate-desert-farms>
- [30] Wilson, Deirdre. 1974. *Rethinking The Symbolism*. University Press, Cambridge