AFRICA HAS TO FOLLOW THE EXAMPLE OF ASIAN COUNTRIES BY PROMOTING INDIGENOUS AND NOT FOREIGN LANGUAGES TO LANGUAGES OF EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT – A POSSIBILITY OR A FORM OF SELF-DELUSION?

Paper presented at the Department of English 6th International Conference June 2011

By

Tyanai Charamba: Department of African Languages and Culture – Midlands State University – ZIMBABWE

Selected theme: **English and African languages.**

ABSTRACT

Some scholars of African descent, who include Mazrui (1978, 2000), Chimhundu (2001), Mutasa (2006) and Magwa and Mutasa (2007), admire, Japan, China and the Asian tigers in general for using indigenous Asian and not foreign languages in Asian education and programmes of development. The same scholars blame African countries for resorting to the use of foreign and not indigenous African languages in African education and programmes of development. This paper argues that, scholars need to ask and answer certain specific questions before they blame African countries for not taking the Asian countries' way in the area of language choice and practice. The questions include: 1) what really helped and still help Asian countries to enforce the use of indigenous Asian languages in their programmes of education and development? 2) Which politico-economic and socio-cultural factors hinder African countries from promoting indigenous African languages to languages of African education and programmes of development as what is the case in Asian countries? 3) Is it fair to blame African countries for not following the example of Asian countries in the area of language choice and practice given that the economic histories of African and of Asian countries are totally different? This paper interrogates scholars' positions and opinions when they blame Africa for not following the example of Asian countries, who have promoted indigenous Asian languages to language of education and development without first of all going deep into the politico-economic histories of the Asian and African countries.

INTRODUCTION

Much as we might admire what our former colonial masters from Europe have done for themselves in Africa and in their own countries , we must not fail to recognize the fact that no

European country has been developed in a foreign language. By way of comparison , we must also observe that Asian countries that have developed and are developing much faster do not function in foreign languages, [Chimhundu (2001: 24).

African countries have struggled in vain to upgrade indigenous African languages to languages of instruction in mass education of the Africans. It is only Tanzania, Ethiopia and Somalia (under President Siad Barre) that have managed to promote indigenous languages to languages of instruction at all levels of primary education. However, no African country has managed to promote indigenous languages to the same position at post-primary school education. Broek-Utne (2005) records a situation when Tanzania failed both in 1985 and 1991 to upgrade Kiswahili to a language of instruction at post-primary Tanzanian education. Broek-Utne reports that, Tanzania failed to achieve that goal as a result of many factors among which was the involvement of the British Council in Tanzania's language policy making and implementation. Broek-Utne also blames the elitist leaders of Africa for having failed Tanzania in that direction. He records that President Nyerere, who championed the need to promote Kiswahili (an indigenous African language) in almost all domains of Tanzanian society, behaved like a linguistic renegade when he stated that "English is the language of instruction in secondary schools and colleges because if it is kept as merely a subject, it might die. We cannot allow English to die because English is the Kiswahili of the world" (Cited in Brock-Utne Ibid: 60).

Mazrui (1978: 289) notes that, "...schools in the British colonies used African languages in at least the first three years of Primary education". The same scenario was and still is the order of the day in now the former British colonies. Most former British colonies have retained English as the official language (Crystal, 2003, Magwa, 2008). As such, it is English, which is the medium of academic discourse from the fourth year of primary education upwards. This is the case in countries such as Zimbabwe, Malawi, Zambia, Botswana, Kenya and others.

The post-independence South African government, embarked on the use of a multilingual approach in order to try and promote indigenous South African languages to languages of instruction at all levels of South African education. The government of South Africa, recommends choice of two languages by schools administrative bodies for use as languages of instruction during the teaching and learning processes. One of those languages has to be the local language of the learners whilst the otherlanguage of the two has to be any one of the eleven official languages. Makalela (2005) views this sort of an education language policy as a futile endeavour since the idea of "choice", which the policy lobbies for, gives an unfair advantage to English and Afrikaans. That is the case because on one hand, there is very

little literature in indigenous South African languages for use during the teaching and learning exercise on the other hand, there is vast learning and teaching material in English and Afrikaans. As a result of such a dichotomy between indigenous languages and the two non-indigenous, the language of education has mainly remained English in most South African institutions of learning. In fact, Makalela (2005) mentions that English is preferred to Afrikaans by the majority of the black South African population since it is Afrikaans and not English that is associated with colonialism and apartheid. That being the case, it is English and not Afrikaans which is the medium of instruction in most black South African schools. The idea of choice of the languages of instruction in schools, which the government of South Africa initiated, is determined by the availability of educational resources in each and every South African official language. At times that choice is determined by political affiliations when it is to be made between choosing either English or Africans as the medium of instruction in Black South African schools.

Mutasa (2006) has discussed efforts put, agreements reached and declarations made in different conferences held in Africa on trying to promote indigenous African languages to languages of education of the Africans. Mutasa (2006: 69) concludes that,

> It is now fifty years since the UNESCO Meeting of Experts deliberated the mother tongue instruction. Forty years have passed since the 1963 OAU Charter. Seventeen years ago the OAU Language Plan of Action was adopted. It is now ten years after the Harare Declaration and almost six years after The Asmara Declaration [and it is almost eight years since the Academy of African Languages was formed] but nothing tangible appears to take place in the field of [the language of] education in spite of the fact that Africa has great scholars world-wide.

With those words, Mutasa makes it clear that, mother tongue instruction is not realised in post-independence Africa. That means, foreign languages are still the media of instruction in the greater part of the mass education of Africans. Therefore,, African countries are failing to follow the example of Asian countries by promoting indigenous African languages at all levels of mass education of Africans.

In almost all former British colonies, it is the official language (English) which is the language of economic development. It is after he had discovered that indigenous African languages are rarely connected to programmes of economic development that Chimhundu (2001: 19) says that, "...we should now shift emphasis from the politics of indigenous languages to the economics of language as communities within the general process of national development while, at the same time accelerating regional integration".

Magwa and Mutasa (2007) are critical of African countries for their having failed to follow the example of Asian countries by promoting indigenous African languages to languages of development. The scholars seem to emphasise the idea that indigenous languages are the centripetal forces in development endeavours whilst foreign languages are the centrifugal ones.

In the Herald Newspaper of 6 January 2000, Mazrui spoke of the need to "scientificate" indigenous African languages in order for them to be able to enforce techno-economic development in Africa. Mazrui (2000) says that,

> No country has ascended to a first rank technological and economic power by excessive dependency on foreign languages. Japan rose to dazzling industrial heights by 'scientificating' the Japanese language and making it the medium of its own industrialization. Korea has approximately scientificated the Korean language and made it the medium of its own industrialization.

Basing on these sentiments, Mazrui seems to be making some three pertinent points pertaining to language and techno-economic development. The first point he is making is that, a country cannot achieve techno-economic development when it excessively uses foreign languages. His second point is that, unlike Japan and South Korea, African countries have not managed to link their languages to techno-economic developmental activities. The third point that Mazrui makes is that, for indigenous languages to help enforce techno-economic development they need "scientification".

What Mazrui asserts helps the present researcher to make some two points pertaining to African languages and techno-economic development. In the first place, he establishes that, Mazrui lobbies for the idea that, it is not the mere use of foreign languages which hinder techno-economic development to be realized in Africa. Rather, it is their "excessive" use which functions as a blockade to the nature of development in question. The researcher also establishes that, Mazrui is saying that, in their current state, African languages cannot enforce development. That sort of perceiving linguistic reality in Africa has pushed Mazrui to give a condition which can aid the languages to enhance techno-economic development in Africa. The condition he gives, is that of "scientificating" the languages in question before applying them in programmes of techno-economic development. The three points Mazrui makes on language and techno-economic development and the two conclusions that can be drawn from the points will be used in this discussion.

REASONS WHY INDIGENOUS LANGUAGES ARE RARELY Promoted IN African EDUCATION AND PROGRAMMES OF DEVELOPMENT

Scholars make multifarious points on why Africa is failing to follow the example of Asian countries by promoting indigenous languages in education and development. It is those points, which scholars give that help the researcher to establish who the scholars blame for causing and perpetuating that lop-sided situation. Mutasa (2006) and Chimhundu (2001) seem to have summed up almost all the points which scholars from all walks of life raise in their endeavour to account for what causes Africa to fail to upgrade its languages to languages of education and development (especially economic development) as what Asian countries have done. Mazrui and Mazrui (1998) give novel ideas on the issue in question.

Mutasa (2006) gives thirteen factors, which he thinks are hindering African countries from promoting their languages in education and development. The thirteen factors are captured and briefly discussed in this paper. They are as follows:.

- The multiplicity of languages – Mutasa views the idea of scouting which language should be promoted to occupy the position of foreign languages in multilingual African societies to be one such hindrance to the promotion of African languages in education and development. Achebe (1988) also refers to the same factor when he asserts that, there are a total of 200 indigenous languages which are spoken in Nigeria. As such, Achebe believes that, it is English and not any of those indigenous languages which will help him to address Nigerian people who speak different indigenous languages.

- Failure to revitalize lost vigour. Mutasa believes that, "African countries exuded the spirit of enterprise and energy as they freed themselves from colonial domination through the barrel of a gun. They were prepared to die for the restoration of their dignity". On the linguistic arena, that sort of vigour, as Mutasa has it, was demonstrated by the Soweto students who championed the imposition of Afrikaans as the language of education in their schools. Such vigour as Mutasa views it, has since vanished. As such, African people have no zeal to champion the dominance of English in their societies with the view of promoting indigenous African languages.

- The mindset of the elites. Mutasa views the elites of Africa as having an insatiable liking for foreign languages. As such, the elites see no point of trying to upgrade indigenous languages in education and programmes of development. Mazrui (1978: 271) asserts the same point when he says that, "Among the most radically de-traditionalized of all Africans must presumably be included African academics..." That in itself means, the elites of Africa do not incline themselves to "things African" such as Indigenous African languages. As such, they have not zeal to promote those languages in African education and programmes of development

- Policies in schools. Mutasa asserts that "Africa adopted colonialist educational policies. Those policies were crafted to promote English culture and language in schools. The policies made sure African languages were offered as subjects and were not to be used as media of instruction in schools from the fourth year of primary education. It is the adoption of colonial education policies which Mutasa views to be a hindrance to the promotion of African languages education from the fourth year of primary education up to university level. That sort of understanding is echoed by Mazrui (1978: 207) when he says that, "The Eurocentrism we have inherited in our educational institutions is still with us. For the time being we seem unable to achieve a paradigmatic revolution in favour of greater intellectual autonomy". In the same vein, the linguistic Eurocentrism that was inherited in educational institutions is still a force to reckon with.

- Shortage of learning material in indigenous African languages as a factor. Mutasa believes, it is the shortage of learning and teaching material in indigenous languages which forces students to prefer learning in foreign languages to learning in indigenous languages. This is all because most of the material, which is used in institutions of learning, is in foreign languages. Makalela (2005) spells out that the South African multilingual approach to education is failing to take shape due to the fact that students and school administrative bodies prefer English to indigenous South African languages since most teaching and learning material is in English.

- Language attitude and the fear of the unknown as a factor– African people have negative attitude towards use of the indigenous languages in education and development fearing what they do not really know will happen if they resort to using them in education, economics and other domains of their life. Chiwome and Thondhlana (1992) discovered that, it is only a question of a negative attitude of both the learners and the educationists towards the teaching of Shona language and literature in Shona that the Department of African Languages and Literature of the University of Zimbabwe continue to teach Shona language and literature in the medium of English.

- Parents' perception as a constraint in the use of African languages in education – Mutasaa noticed that, South African parents prefer sending their children to English-medium schools to sending them to indigenous languages-medium schools. That then becomes a hindrance to the promotion of indigenous languages in South African schools. In fact, school administrative bodies will work towards promoting English and not indigenous South African languages in their bid to make sure their schools become the parents' first choice when they plan to sent their children to school.

- Lack of political will by elitist leaders of Africa as a factor. Mutasa blames the elitist leaders of Africa for having no will and zeal to promote indigenous African languages in African education and progrmmes of development. Chimhundu (2001) and Magwa (2008) take sides with Mutasa for they also blame the political leaders of Africa for paying lip-service to commitment to the

development of African languages at political rallies. In fact, Chimhindu (2001: 22) says of the Zimbabwean elitist leaders who took leadership posts in 1980, "They are shaped in the system they took part in overturning, and there is little will to deal with the language issue, other than in ritual, festive speeches...[and] In connection with elections, when they need votes".

- The poorly developed state of most African languages as a factor –Mutasa believes that, African languages need to be developed in order for them to suit and operate in the modern environment . Probably Mutasa has in mind what Mazrui (2000) has called the "scientification" of African languages for the purpose of enabling them to be used In techno-economic development. What it means Is that, Mutasa sees that In their present state, African languages cannot enforce techno-economic development In the continent.

- English itself as a force to reckon with – Mutasa quotes Crystal (1997: 10) who says that, "English is fast becoming, a global language because of its competence" and people accept it for use in education and development. One can also quotes Crystal (2003: 191) who says that, "If there Is a critical mass, does this mean that the emergence of a global language is a unique event, in revolutionary terms? It may be that English, in some shape or form will find itself In the service of the world community for ever". It is the upholding of the idea that English has already become a global language, which forces Africans to have a strong liking for English and a negative attitude towards indigenous languages in all spheres of their life.

- The environment In which educated children find themselves is one other factor which Mutasa considers to be hindering the promotion of indigenous languages in African mass education. Mutasa asserts that, the environment of the educated children Is English. That is the case because the DVD, VCD, the computer, television, radio etc. which the children operate on daily basis, use English. With this assertion, Mutasa seems to connote to what McPhail (2006) has called Electronic Colonialism. McPhail (2006) proposes that the world has undergone four periods that are marked by four different types of colonialism. The four types of colonialism that have been proposed by McPhaill are: Military Colonialism - which stretched between Before Christ (BC) up to 1000 AD, Christian Colonialism - which stretched from 1000 AD to 1600 AD; Mercantile Colonialism - which stretched from 1600 AD to 1950 and Electronic Colonialism - which stretched from 1950 up to the present day. McPhail (2006: 19) says of Electronic Colonialism,

> Electronic Colonialism represents The dependent relationship of poor regions on the post-industrial notions established by the Importation of communication software, and foreign-produced software along with engineers, technicians and related information protocols, that establish a set of foreign norms, values and expectations that to varying degrees, after domestic cultures, habits, values and the socialization process itself. From

comic books to satellites, computers to fax machines CDs, DVDs, to the internet, a wide range of information technologies makes it easy to send and thus receive information.

-globalization — Mutasa believes globalization as being "instrumental in extirpating many languages. For Mutasa globalization puts weaker languages at risk of being stultified and marginalized" by languages of wider communication (2006: 84). In their marginalized form, indigenous African languages are rarely promoted to languages of education and development in the African continent.

-Lack of empowerment of the African people on economic and technological levels as a factor. Mutasa views economic disempowerment of the African peoples as a factor that hinders promotion of indigenous languages in education and other life domains. Mutasa (2006: 67) asserts that,

> Thus empowering Africans economically and technologically is an essential ingredient in the promotion of their languages. Undoubtedly, if a group of people is empowered enough to own something in terms of big companies and Industries that produce market products that sell, the group can find the development of its languages and can also buy airtime for the cultivation of the languages on television

Again Mutasa (2006: 87) says, "Empowering African communities economically and technologically therefore, helps them take control of their destiny". That destiny Includes their linguistic destiny.

Chimhundu asserts that, there are two false myths which hinder the promotion of African languages in the different domains of African people's life including those of education and economics. The two are: 1) "...an exaggerated picture of multilingualism within individual nation state, a failure to recognize the relatedness between these languages, failure to distinguish between languages and dialects and failure to recognize what we refer to as cross-border languages". 2) The notion that "an African language equals "tribe" and "tribe" equals "tribalism" (Chimhundu, 1993 Cited in Chimhundu 2001:).

Chimhundu establishes subsidiary myths which emanate from the two. The subsidiary myths Include:

- all African languages are vernaculars that are only useful in limited domains, such as the home etc.
- being educated implies acquiring levels of proficiency and literacy in English, French or Portuguese and acquiring the habits, tastes, mannerisms, preferences and practices of Europeans.
- Information and computer technology is incompatible with indigenous African languages

- globalization comes along with fair play and it will ultimately benefit everyone and make them equal enjoying the same status and or access to wealth, if people everywhere adopt and communicate in one dominant language (English). Therefore, promoting multilingualism is a hindrance to progress.
- African politicians are all cultured, patriotic and informed individuals. Therefore, they know best and they will formulate and implement enlightened policies on all these issues.
- someone else will come from overseas or from heaven and do the work that is required to research, develop and promote our own indigenous languages simply because this would be politically correct and fair and because we think we do not have or can not master the resources or and ability to do this ourselves.

All these factors Chimhundu gives to account for why African countries are not promoting indigenous languages in education, economics and other domains are crafted around the same factors that Mutasa supplies such as lack of vigour, negative attitudes of parents and elites towards indigenous languages, the myth of a globalizing world, the multiplicity of African languages in a single given country, the undeveloped nature of African languages and the need for scientificating indigenous African languages. However, unlike Mutasa, Chimhundu does not treat factors to do with the environment in which African educated children find themselves and the issue of economic disempowerment of the African populations as factors that hinder the development and promotion of indigenous African languages in education, economics and other domains of life. At the end of it all, Chimhundu seems to blame it all on African people. For him African people are both the sources and solutions to their linguistic problems.

About nine of Mutasa's thirteen points blame Africans for behaving like the stumbling blocs to the promotion of indigenous African languages in education and development. It is only four of the thirteen points which do not put the blame on the Africans themselves. Those four blame some other aspects in the word environment. Those aspects include, the environment in which the educated child finds him/herself; English itself as a force to reckon with in global affairs; globalization as a phenomenon that suppress other languages and the economic status of the African people which is not favourable enough to aid them have control over their linguistic and other destinies. Therefore, Mutasa seems to be of the view that most of Africa's linguistic problems are of African making and few of those are a result of some forces and constructs which emerge in world affairs. One thing that needs to be noted on Mutasa is that, he believes that, for Africa to overcome all its problems of a linguistic nature, that emerge from within and from outside Africa, she needs, "...some kind of consciousness with a global perspective that will help to integrate African languages and content that relates to the modern world or the new world

order" (2006: 60). In that sense, Mutasa seems to assume that solutions to Africa's problems are not solely indigenous since they need to be informed by global realities. It seems his hypothesis builds on the idea that globalization is a "realized" and not a mere "futuristic" phenomenon.

Mazrui and Mazrui (1998) assert that, there are two factors that have hindered African people from resorting to the use of indigenous African languages in the different domains of their life. The two are, the non-expansionist policy of African societies as it is opposed to the expansionist policies of the USA and some European countries. The other factor has to do with Africans themselves who lack the zeal for linguistic nationalism save the Afrikaners of South Africa and the Somali of Somalia. The two scholars say that,

> The linguistic balance sheet on the interplay between the indigenous and Western legacies in Africa so far has been decidedly in favour of European languages that came to the continent as part of the colonial cultural package. This linguistic state of affairs, we contend, has evolved as a result of two interrelated factors: originally the failure of African societies to be expansionist enough in territorial terms, and later, the failure of African people to be nationalist enough in linguistic terms. (1998:)

What that means is, Mazrui and Mazrui blame Africa and the Africans for perpetuating the hegemonic status of English over indigenous languages. In the first place, Africa failed to embark on an expansionist policy as what was the case with the USA and some European countries. In the second place, especially after they attained political independence, Africans failed to be nationalist enough on linguistic levels. It seems the two scholars blame Africa and the Africans for failing to follow the example of Asian countries by promoting indigenous African languages in Africa's different spheres of life. Having reached this far, it is vital to reiterate the main goal of this paper

The goal of this paper is twofold. In the first place, the paper seeks to establish whether or not it is by choice and by design that African countries are failing to promote indigenous African languages in education and development as what Asian countries have managed to do. In the second place, the paper seeks to account for what aids Asian countries to promote indigenous Asian languages in education and development. Establishing that sort of reality will help the present researcher to try and prove whether or not it is by choice and by design that African countries, unlike Asian countries have failed to promote indigenous languages in education and development. That being the case, the seemingly two tasks, which this paper seeks to perform will appear like a single task.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This paper is informed by various concepts that are proposed by different scholars. In some cases what the paper argues for will collide with what some scholars lobby for in their scholarly discourses. Yet, in other cases what the paper advocates may diverge from what predecessor scholars have propounded. Basically, the paper argues that, what each scholars says on why African countries are failing to follow the example of Asian countries by promoting indigenous languages in education and development depends on what h/she perceives to be both the source and solution to African problems of linguistic nature. Some three schools of thought have emerged in that direction and the present researcher adds another dimension to the debate in question.

The first school of thought is what this paper calls the school of linguistic skeptics. These scholars, "...believe that most of [African people's] ills are imported, that the real source of [their] problems come from outside. [They] blame colonialists and imperialists and neo-colonialists; [they] blame communists both from Moscow and Peking and send their representatives packing. [They] blame the Americans and the CIA..." (p'Bitek Cited in Mazrui, 1978: 304).

The idea of blaming foreigners for have caused all the problems, which African people are suffering, is what Mazrui (2004) has termed "scapegoat complex). Scholars such as wa Thiongo (1987) and Rodin in his famous book *How Europe Under-developed Africa* fit in this category. However, these linguistic skeptics are in two sub-categories. There is a category of those skeptics who hold that all African people's ills come from outside, and the solutions to those "social ills can be imported" (p'Bitek Cited in Mazrui, 1978: 304). The other sub-category of the linguistic skeptics believes that all social ills, which African people are suffering, come from outside but the solutions to those problems are indigenous. The solution to social ills which African people are suffering, as how this second category of skeptics views it, is in total detachment from the West and from the Western philosophies of life. Wa Thiongo (1987) and wa Ngugi (2003) qualify in this second sub-category of skeptic scholars.

The other school of thought is what this paper calls the essentialist and/or the p'Bitekan school of thought. It is a school of the "indigenizers". The school holds that, "Both the social ills of Africa and the ultimate solutions for those ills from now own are to be traced to domestic realities" (Mazrui 1978: 304). In fact, p'Bitek himself (Cited in Mazrui, 1978: 304)) says that, "I believe that most of our social ills and that the primary sources of our problems are native. They are rooted in the social set up and most

effective solutions cannot be imported but must be the result of deliberate re-organization of the resources available for tackling specific issues" Probably, Chimhundu (2001), who holds that the linguistic problems in Africa result from the African people's negative attitude towards indigenous languages and that the African people are the solutions to those problems, qualifies in the p'Bitekan school of thought.

The other school of thought is the school of thought which this paper calls the school of semi-essentialists and/or semi-modernists. The school can also be termed the Mazruian school of thought. What the school holds is best summarised in Mazrui's (1978: 304) words. Mazrui says that,

> My own position lies somewhere between Okot p'Bitek and the trends he is criticizing . Many African problems are indeed indigenous but they are others which have been created in part by external forces. Some solutions to those African problems need external cooperation or changes in the total world environment. But many solutions could be found from within as a result of what Okot p"Bitek calls "deliberate re-organization of the resources available for tackling specific issues".

Mutasa who has given nine of his thirteen factors that bloc the promotion of indigenous African education as having an African origin and four of the thirteen as having a non-African origin, and who lobbies for "...some kind of consciousness with a global perspective that will help to integrate African languages and content that relates to the modern world or the new world order" as the solution to Africa's linguistic problems, seems to qualify in the Mazruian school of thought. The Mazruian school of thought views the bulk of Africa's social ills to be having an indigenous origin and some few of those problems are emerging from outside Africa. Further, the school holds that the bulk of the solutions to those problems are indigenous but some of them emerge from Africa's cooperation with the outside world.

This paper proposes another approach to the whole debate on the causes and solutions to Africa's socio-linguistic ills. The approach is both semi-skeptical, semi-essentialist and semi-essentialist. The position of the present researcher is that most of the socio-linguistic ills of Africa have a direct and indirect foreign influence and few of those arise from within Africa. However some solutions to those problems come from within Africa "as a result of what Okot p"Bitek calls "deliberate re-organization of the resources available for tackling specific issues" and some of the solutions come from outside Africa as a result of what Mazrui has called the need for "external cooperation or changes in the total world environment". The approach is semi-skeptical In that, it considers the bulk of the socio-linguistic ills.

which African people are currently braving, to have a foreign origin. The approach is semi-essentialist in that, it considers the bulk of the solutions to those ills to be indigenous. It is semi-modernist in that it holds that some solutions to those problems call upon Africa to cooperate with the outside world to enforce a total change in the world environment. This paper will call that approach, The Semi-skeptical-semi-essentialist-and-semi-modernist approach.

THE SEMI-SKEPTIAL-AND-SEMI-MODERNIST APPROACH TO AFRICA'S SOCIO-LINGUISTIC ILLS

Different scholarly views lead the present researcher to resort to the using of the approach that is semi-skeptical semi-essentialist and semi-modernist in the language debate. Mutasa's (2006) view that techno-economic empowerment of a particular people, helps them to have control over language choice and practice is quite informative to the researcher. It is worthy to capture what Mutasa says at one moment. Mutasa says that,

> One major factor that keeps African languages in the periphery is the economic circumstances of the speakers of the languages. The speakers of African languages are not empowered economically and technologically enough to determine their [linguistic] destiny. Nations that use their own languages practically in all aspects of public domain are of countries that are economically and technologically advanced. Examples of such nations are Japan, China and Malaysia.

With these sentiments, Mutasa makes certain important points in the language debate in African scholarship. In the first place, he establishes that economic and technological advancement is the pre-requisite for a people to have power over their destiny, of course including their linguistic destiny. In the second place, he asserts that African people are not empowered economically and technologically enough to have control over language policy making and implementation. That being the case, African people do not have a genuine contribution to the issue of seeking to promote indigenous African languages in education, development and other domains of life. In the third place, Mutasa asserts that Asian countries use their languages practically in almost all domains of Asian people's life since Asian people and Asian nations are technologically and economically advanced. In that sense, Mutasa seems to approach the debate on why African countries are failing t follow the example of Asian countries by promoting indigenous languages in education and development from what can be termed "a techno-economic viewpoint". His techno-economic viewpoint holds that, techno-economic empowerment of the African people to be the primary requirement for Africa to have the capacity to follow the example of Asian countries in the area of language choice and practice.

Due to the fact that African countries are not advanced in economic, technological and socio-political arenas, Sorensen (2004) has categorized them under what he has termed "Weak and failing postcolonial states". Sorensen (2004: 172) has this to say, "In this book, the term (weak) is used to designate states which are weak in terms of all the three core aspects of statehood; government, nationhood and economy." It is like, Mutasa asserts that those states which Sorensen has called "weak and failing postcolonial states" have no control over their destiny of which their linguistic destiny is part.

Using this approach, Mutasa seems to have tackled an all-season problem in African scholarship on language and development. Scholars such as Chimhundu (2001), Mazrui (2000) and others, seem to suggest that it is linguistic nationalism which leads to the techno-economic development of African societies. This is the case since they believe that, it is through the use of indigenous African languages that will enable Africans to achieve technological and economic success. With his novel approach to the language debate, Mutasa (2006) seems to be opposing them since he suggests that it is techno-economic advancement of African people and societies that has the potential to aid African societies to promote their indigenous languages in the different domains of African people's life. Mutasa and the other group of scholars seem to contest on what comes first, and on which gives birth to the other between linguistic nationalism and techno-economic development in a postcolonial society. They seem also to contest of whether linguistic nationalism is either a necessary or sufficient condition for Africa to enhance techno-economic advancement. It seems each one of them is foolhardy in his own way.

Commenting on Nkurumah's popular saying "Seek ye the political kingdom and all things shall be added unto you" Mazrui (1993) makes a distinction between what he has called a "sufficient" condition and a "necessary" one. Mazrui (1993: 105) says of Nkurumah,

> What Nkurumah overlooked [by saying seek ye first the political kingdom, and all things shall be added unto you] was a simple distinction in the science of logic – the distinction between what was a sufficient condition and what was a necessary condition. Political sovereignty [or the political kingdom] was indeed the necessary condition before Africa could fulfill or realize any of her other fundamental aspirations. But by itself political sovereignty was not enough – it was not a sufficient condition. It was simply not true that 'all will be added unto you.

For Mazrui, a sufficient condition, is that condition which when it has been achieved everything else that a people will be expecting will simply follow thereafter. For him, a necessary condition, is a condition, which when it is achieved, it will pave way to other conditions to be achieved too for a continent to fulfill and realize any of her other fundamental aspirations. In other words, a necessary condition is one

condition among many other conditions which when they are finally achieved they aid a people to achieve their fundamental life goals. Mutasa seems to dispute that linguistic nationalism is the sufficient condition for Africa to attain techno-economic development while Chimhundu, Mazrui and others view linguistic nationalism as the sufficient condition for that same purpose. The problem with Mutasa is that, after he disputes predecessor scholars for viewing linguistic nationalism as the sufficient condition to development, he proposes techno-economic advancement as the substitute sufficient condition to techno-economic development. It was better if he had proposed techno-economic development as a necessary condition and not a sufficient condition for Africa to attain linguistic nationalism in education and development.

The present researcher does not agree with scholars who hold linguistic nationalism to be the sufficient condition to techno-economic development. He also disagrees with scholars who assert that techno-economic development is the sufficient condition for linguistic nationalism to be attained in education and development. His view is that linguistic nationalism is not a sufficient condition to development. He also does not believe that techno-economic development is the sufficient condition for linguistic nationalism to be attained in education and development. It seems the present researcher, agrees with Mutasa's position in order to disagree with it. For the researcher, techno-economic development is a condition that is needed for African people to be able to have control over their linguistic destiny in education and development. However, the researcher holds that, techno-economic development is a necessary and not a sufficient condition to that regard. In other words, the researcher proposes that techno-economic development is a condition among other conditions that have to be attained for Africa to have control over its linguistic destiny in education and development. Some other conditions, as this paper will argue, include Africa's ability to attain true and genuine and not pseudo military, and political sovereignties.

CONDITIONS NECESSARY FOR AFRICA TO PROMOTE INDIGENOUS LANGUAGES IN EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT

There are three conditions, which are necessary for Africa, to be able to attain linguistic sovereignty in its different domains of life. One of the three conditions is the one Mutasa (2006) has spelt out. It is techno-economic development of the African people. The other two are spelt out by Crystal (2003). The two are military and political power. Crystal (2003: 9) asserts that, "A language has traditionally become an international language for one chief reason – the power of its people – especially their political and military power". In addition to this, Crystal (Ibid: 10) says, "It may take a

militarily powerful nation to establish a language, but it takes an economically powerful one to maintain and expand it."

Although Crystal is talking about international languages, however, his views apply to any discourse on language policy making and implementation. Some two important points can be established from what Crystal says. In the first place Crystal asserts that political and military powers are central to the promotion of a people's language to an International language. This paper uses the same line of thinking to propose that Africans need political and military powers to be able to stop the hegemony of English in education and development through promoting indigenous African languages in those same domains of life. The second point that Crystal makes is that military power is needed at the onset of the project of promoting a language to an International language after which it is economic power that will serve to keep the language in that position. This paper benefits from Crystal's line of thinking when it will lobby for the idea that Africa needs military power as the first step towards the project of promoting indigenous languages in education and development.

Of the three conditions one proposed by Mutasa and the other two by Crystal, this paper holds that, the most important condition of the three is attaining political power and/or political sovereignty. It is political sovereignty in its genuine sense that will give a country power and control over the means of production, over the production relations and over the industrial produce. Having control over the means of production (The economic base), production relations and the industrial produce will help a nation to develop economically and technologically. It is developments in economics and technology which will aid a country to have control over its socio-linguistic and socio-cultural destinies.

Although attaining political power and/or political sovereignty is the most important condition needed for a country to gain control over language choice and practice, however, it is not the very first step towards Africa's having control over its linguistic destiny. The very first step (condition) is military might and/or military sovereignty. Military might is a product of military engineering. Without the gun, no country can gain true political sovereignty, without true political sovereignty, no country can be able to advance in a meaningful way towards empowering its people on the levels of technology and economics. Without having attained techno-economic advancement, no country can have control over its linguistic and other forms of destiny. All these developments, military might, political sovereignty, techno-economic advancement are not each a sufficient condition for a country to be able to promote

its indigenous languages in education and development. Each of them is a necessary condition for that goal to be achieved.

It is noteworthy that, political sovereignty (at international levels) in its truest sense can be attained in a situation where the world has moved towards some form of military equity. Military equity leads transversal power relations to be of benefit to all (and not to some) the regions of the world. In this era of world history, military equity is a missing reality. At the moment, as the former Indian foreign minister (Cited in Muppidi 2005: 288) asserted when he was addressing the UN General Assembly in defense of India's nuclear activities of 1998, the world is divided into categories of states. The categories are the category of the nuclear-have-lots and the category of the nuclear-have-nots. The divide between the nuclear-have-lots and the nuclear-have-nots has resulted from the proposition and implementation of nuclear anti-proliferation treaties. Nuclear non-proliferation treaties, which are currently in force, include, the NPT (Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty, the CTBT (Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty), the FMCT (Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty, the CWC (Chemical Weapons Convention) and the BWC (Biological Weapons Convention).

The treaties in question allow the nuclear-have-lots of the world to keep their nuclear weapons but do not allow them to continue producing more. The same treaties do not permit nuclear-have-nots of the world to experiment in nuclear technology with the hope of producing nuclear weapons. In that way, those states, which already possess them, become perpetual nuclear powers and those states which do not possess them remain nuclear-have-nots. As such they appear and remain underdogs of the nuclear powers of the world. For instance no country, which is not a nuclear superpower, hold veto powers in the UN Security Council. That is why Mazrui (2004: 9) has come to the conclusion that, signing the nuclear non-proliferation treaties as most African countries have done is "a voluntary act of self-denial". It is because the nuclear-have-nots are not allowed to be in possession of nuclear and biological weapons that the govern of Sadam Hussein's Iraq has overthrown with the aid of the USA (Current superpower) and its allies. Iran is currently under United Nations sanctions after it insisted on experimenting with nuclear technology. President Robert Mugabe of Zimbabwe was warned early this year (2011) by Barak Obama the president of the USA not to use Zimbabwe's huge deposits of uranium to produce nuclear weapons.

Given that signing of nuclear anti-proliferation treaties has failed to produce some form of military equity between and among world states, the world is left with only two options if it has to foster some type of military equity in the present era. One of those is total denuclearization of the world. This is whereby a policy is agreed upon by the states of the world to disarm the nuclear-have-lots of all the nuclear weapons they currently possess. The policy should also forbid those countries to produce any more nuclear weapons. Generally speaking, this option targets at creating a world free of nuclear weapons. The other option which is there is that of nuclearization of the world. That option involves a deliberate move towards making sure the nuclear-have-nots of the world possess nuclear weapons. If there is an open policy that allows all the nations of the world to be in possession of the nuclear weapons, then some form of military equity, especially among continents will be achieved.

The real implication of what has been discussed up to this point is that the domain of language choice and practice, especially with regards to making choice between either using indigenous or foreign languages in education and development programmes, is deeply embedded in international power politics. This viewpoint is echoed by Bleiker (2000) when he makes some two powerful statements which are both of great value to this paper. At one time Bleiker (2000: 215) notes that, "languages are never neutral. They embody particular values and ideas. They are an integral part of transversal power relations and of global politics in general". At another time Bleiker (Ibid: 217) asserts that,

> Language then is no longer seen as mere medium of communication. It is also the very site where politics is carried out. Critiquing practices of global politics is thus a process that cannot be separated from critiquing the language through which these practices have become normalized and objectified

What that means is Bleiker links language matters in this age to politics at global level and to transversal power relations. The opposite of what he asserts when he says. "critiquing practices of global politics is thus a process that cannot be separated from critiquing the language through which these practices have become normalized and objectified" is informative to this. As a result of what Bleiker asserts, this paper argues that. "critiquing the language through which practices of global politics have become

normalized and objectified is thus a process that cannot be separated from critiquing the practices themselves". Therefore, the thesis of this paper rests on the idea that language choice and practices, especially in all countries that have been termed nuclear-have-nots cannot be understood outside global transversal power relations, which are conditioned by that divide of the nuclear have-lots and nuclear have-nots. If global politics conditions language choice and practice in the African continent – a continent of nuclear-have-nots, what it means is that, if Africa has to follow the example of Asian countries by promoting its languages in education and development it has to study and understand global transversal power relations with the hope of establishing her own position in those relations for the purpose of cracking a way forward.

A SKETCH OF GLOBAL POLITICAL POWER RELATIONS AND THEIR RELATEDNESS TO LANGUAGE CHOICE AND PRACTICE.

At the helm of global politics is the superpower. A superpower is a state that appears to be the Number 1 (one) Great Power of its time. In the present age of human growth and development, a state becomes a superpower by virtue of having heavy nuclear arms. It maintains that position through the support it gets from its de jure and de facto allies (The other nuclear-have-lots of the world). As the superpower that state defines an agenda for the world (Flint, 2006: 36). Its power depends on its agenda-setting capacity and capability (Ibid). The superpower's agenda for the world is carried and transmitted by the superpower's language. Thus the rise of a state to the position of a superpower is pivotal to the rise of the superpower's language to the position of a hegemonic force at international levels. The language of the superpower is a form of a "linguistic" superpower for it gains prestige over the other languages of the world. When a nation falls from the position of superpower, it follows that, its language starts to fall from the position of a 'linguistic' superpower. Of course the fall of the superpower's language will be gradual and not sudden. In other words, the language of the superpower may enjoy the hegemonic status well after the fall of the superpower. However the ultimate reality is that that language will always fall in relation to the fall of the superpower itself.

Greek was the common lingua franca for the Greek empire. It was because Greek was the common lingua franca of the Greek Empire that the bible was first written in Greek although it originated from the Ancient Near East. With the fall of the Greek empire and the rise of the Roman Empire, Greek lost the position of lingua franca for it was Latin, the language of the new superpower, which took over that position. When Great Britain became the superpower in the 18th and 19th centuries, English became the hegemonic language of those centuries. Unlike other languages of the past, English did not fall when

Great Britain lost the position of the superpower to the USA at the end of the Second World. Wright (2004: 141) accounts for why English did not fall with the fall of Great Britain from the position of the superpower. Wright asserts that, "The natural decline in the use of English was stemmed [at the end of the Second World War], however because the United States, the rising power that was in its turn becoming economically and politically, militarily and culturally dominant possesses the same language."

The current superpower is the USA. It started gaining that position bit by bit from the end of the Second World War. However it assumed the position in real terms after the fall of the Soviet Union in 1990. From the time the Second World War ended up to 1990, the USA and the USSR struggled for that position using Cold War strategies. Since the language of the USA is English. Therefore English is the language of the superpower. As the language of the sole superpower, English enjoys hegemonic status especially in the countries of Africa (nuclear-have-nots). Thus Crystal (2003: 59) rightly points out that,

> The present day world status of English is primarily the result of two factors: the expansion of British colonial power which peaked towards the end of the nineteenth century, and the emergence of the United States as the leading economic power of the twentieth century.

In order for the superpower to make sure that countries of the world accept its language, which is its agenda –generating and agenda-transmitting instrument, it uses its military stamina, its political power and its techno-economic development to make sure her language becomes the language of Education, of trade and commerce, of science and technology, of religion and ideology of the media and global mass communication, of economic development, of politics and the judiciary, of socio-cultural exchange etc (Wright 2004).

Once the superpower (USA) connects its language (English) to everything in the world, that is attractive and lucrative it automatically transforms the world environment into an English environment. In that environment, the world will then appear as if it cannot operate and cannot be lived without English - the language of the superpower. Once that happens, false myths which seek to glorify the language of the superpower (English) emerge. One of the myths is that one which Chimhundu (2001) has recorded. The myth goes,

...globalization comes along with fair play and it will ultimately benefit everyone and make them equal enjoying the same status and or access to wealth, if people everywhere adopt and communicate in one dominant language (English). Therefore, promoting multilingualism is a hindrance to progress.

The other false myth is the one that is proposed by Crystal (2003: 191) when he says that, "If there is a critical mass, does this mean that the emergence of a global language is a unique event, in revolutionary terms? It may be that English, in some shape or form will find itself in the service of the world community for ever". With these words Crystal seeks to convince Africa and the other continents of the world that they cannot do without English for it has already become a global language. The moment the environment becomes too English than anything else becomes the very moment it will be shrouded in false myths Once that occurs, the people of Africa and of the other regions of the world will then have a positive attitude towards English. They develop some insatiable hunger for the "global" language since it will be presented to them as the gateway to development to education, to technology, to religion and ideology to mass communication (that is to electronic and print media) and to success in general. This is why McPhail (2006) has called the period starting from 1950 up to this day the period of Electronic Colonialism. That Electronic Colonialism, as McPhail perceives it, is championed by the USA as the current superpower.

The question is, given this status quo, is it fair to blame Africa for failing to follow the example of Asian countries by promoting indigenous African languages in education and development?

IMPLICATIONS TO AFRICA

If Africa has to promote its languages practically in all the domains of African people's life it has first to gain recognition and general respectability from the superpower and the other nuclear have-lots of the world. If Africa is respected by the superpower and her de facto and de jure allies, then it can have a chance to minimize foreign intrusion in its process of panning policies and its process of implementing those policies. It is only in that way that Africa will be able to enjoy political, economic, technological, cultural and linguistic sovereignties. At the moment, most African countries are enjoying fake political sovereignties. Fake types of sovereignty do not serve in any way as avenues to techno-economic development. It is developments in

technology and economics that will aid Africa to have control over its cultural and linguistic sovereignties.

African countries are enjoying fake types of political sovereignty since in Africa, as a continent of the world, political independence did not bring with it genuine political respectability (sovereignty) from the international world. This is why wa Thiongo (1986: 7) mocks the type of independence African countries attained from the former colonial masters in this way, "To the majority of African people in the new states, independence did not bring about fundamental changes. It was independence with the ruler holding a begging bowl and the ruled a shrinking belly. It was independence with a question mark". Wa Thiongo has called Africa's post-independence era the stage of neo-colonialism.

Nkurumah (Cited in Slemon 2001: 102) says of neo-colonialism "The essence of neocolonialism...is that, the state which is subject to it is in theory independent and has all the outward trappings of International sovereignty. In reality its economic system and thus its political policy is directed from the outside". What that means is, For Nkurumah a neo-colonial state enjoys pseudo political and economic sovereignties. In principle, that state is independent while in practical terms it will be under colonial bondage. If African countries are neo-colonies by virtue of enjoying fake political and economic sovereignties, how then can they manage to have control over their linguistic destinies? The truth of the matter is that, neo-colonies are weak and failing postcolonial states. Their political, economic, linguistic sovereignties are directed from outside – from the USA and its major allies England and France.

It is Chinweizu (1987: 430), who directly equates neo-colonialism to Americanization of the world when he defines neo-colonialism as "The American style of empire being emulated by Europe". Americanization of the world takes place virtually on almost all domains of African people's life. It takes place on the levels of, the military, of politics, of economics, of technology and of culture and language. In fact, Americanization seems to connote to the sum total of the superpower's (USA) agendas for the world

The question that arises is this, if the military, the political, the economic and linguistic affairs of Africa are directed from outside, does Africa have any form of international respectability? The

other question which also arises is, who are the de jure and the de facto rulers of African countries between African leaders and the superpower and her allies? In principle, African leaders are the de jure rulers of Africa and the Americans, the English, the French and some other nuclear have-lots of the world such as the Chinese, the Russians and the Japanese are the de facto rulers. However in practice, the opposite is the truth: African leaders are the de facto leaders of Africa whilst the Americans, the English and the French and some other nuclear have-lots of the world such as the Chinese and the Japanese are the de jure rulers. That being the case, African leaders appear like middlemen and women who mediate between the Americans, the English, the French, the Japanese, the Chinese the Russians and the majority of African people. wa Thiongo (1998) has called the type of middlemen and women who mediate between the colonialist and the majority of the population of the colonized people."the Macaulay's men and women".

If African leaders are mere middlemen between the de jure leaders of Africa and the African people, can scholars have to really blame those leaders for lacking political will to promote indigenous languages in education and development? Scholars should learn to understand that a leader who has pseudo political power cannot exercise political will in any meaningful sense. This is because that type of a leader receives what to say to his/her people, what to recommend to them and what to do for them from his superiors (nuclear have-lots).

What marks African leaders to be the Macaulay's men, who mediate between the nuclear-have-lots of the world and the majority of the people in Africa is that, any leader who speaks against the USA and her allies finds his job as a Macaulay's man at stake. It is at this moment that one has to think of what became the fate of Mubarak of Egypt in 2011 of Ben Ali of Tunisia in the same year, of Bagbo of Cote Devoir, again in the same year. One also has to think of what will be the fate of Kaddafi of Libya and what will be the fate of Mugabe of Zimbabwe, who always opposes the superpower and her allies in public media, in the SADC, AU and UN meetings. The list of the middlemen (African leaders), who have either been sacked or are yet to be sacked, is endless. Therefore, some form of global military equity is needed if Africa has to

enjoy political sovereignty and techno-economic sovereignty. Those forms of sovereignty will give Africa a chance to have control over its linguistic destiny.

PROPOSED BREAKTHROUGH

Global military equity can only come when the divide between nuclear-have-lots and nuclear-have-nots is neutralized. The paper has already outlined the two major options which can be used to deal decisively with the divide. The options are, total denuclearization of the world and nuclearization of the world. Although total denuclearization of the world is an attractive option, it has since failed to bear fruit. From the early 1950s up to the 1970s, India campaigned fro the total denuclearization policy. That policy was not bought by the then nuclear-have-lots. Instead, they proposed signing of nuclear anti-proliferation treaties as the better option. It is the use of those treaties that has created and perpetuated the divide in question.

After discovering that those states, which were in possession of nuclear weapons, did not want to dispose off them, India embarked on its nuclear testing missions. India's latest nuclear test was carried out in 1998 against the will of the superpower (USA) and the other nuclear-have-lots of the world. The reason why India turned a deaf ear to the call of the superpower and its allies is captured by Muppidi (2005). The sole reason was that, nuclear anti-proliferation treaties served none other than dividing the world into nuclear have-lots and nuclear have-nots. Therefore even though total denuclearization of the world appears to be an attractive option of achieving global military equity, the option does not work in a world of superpower politics. Again total denuclearization implies destroying the already produced nuclear weapons. However, destroying the weapons is not destroying the skill to produce them. The nuclear-have-lots will destroy their weapons, but since they have the skill to produce those weapons, they will always produce them for use at timely moments. In that sense, total denuclearization will definitely fail to breed some form of military equity among world continents and states.

Nuclearization of the world is an unattractive option. It is unattractive since it will aid rogue states and terrorists in general to be in possession of weapons of mass destruction. Once that happens, the world will leave in perpetual fear of the unknown. While that claim may sound convincing at face value, in real terms it is a mendacious claim, a form of a political gimmick that is used by the nuclear-have-lots of the

world to make sure Africa and some other regions of the world remain nuclear have-nots. It is a cleverly constructed false myth that serves to perpetuate the divide between nuclear-have-lots and nuclear-have-lots. The divide is of benefit to the superpower and the other nuclear-have lots of the world, since it helps them to keep on plundering the vast raw materials, which are found in the militarily weak African societies. The question, who has the mandate and prerogative to determine who should posses nuclear weapons and who should not, who is a terrorist and who is not, which state should be labeled a rogue and which one should not in this world where the nuclear- have-lots are enjoying an unfair advantage over the nuclear-have-nots of the world? Probably that is why Mazrui (2004) concludes that for Africa to sign nuclear anti-proliferation treaties when other continents and states do have them is "a voluntary act of self-denial"

Probably what is important is that the world should let every continent and ultimately every country to be in possession of the nuclear weapons and of the skill on how to produce them. When that is achieved, then total denuclearization becomes a viable option towards enhancing military equity. Given that both signing of nuclear anti-proliferation treaties and the call for the total denuclearization of the world have already failed as options of trying to bring about global military equity, this paper lobbies for nuclearization of the world as the only option left. But that nuclearization of the world should be followed thereafter by total denuclearization of the same world. In fact the motto of the paper is, "nuclearize" the world in order to denuclearize thereafter". Nuclearization of the world can begin on continental levels. That happens when some and not all countries within the same continent are allowed to possess nuclear weapons. When continental nuclearization has been achieved, the world can then move towards total nuclearization of the world. This is when every country, that can afford, will be given a leeway to possess nuclear weapons and the skill to produce them. Total nuclearization of the world should then be followed by total denuclearization. The argument of this paper is that, it is relatively easy to negotiate for total denuclearization of the world after all the countries of the world possess both the nuclear weapons and the skill to manufacture them.

The other argument of this paper is that if every state (with the exception of those that cannot afford the costs), possesses the weapons in question, respectability between and among states will ultimately improve. Mazrui (2004) mentions that, the Afrikaners of South Africa developed atomic bombs with the help of Israel. Israel itself had developed nuclear weapons with the help of the USA. Given that Africa has deposits and deposits of Uranium nuclearization of Africa will become relatively easy. At the moment, what Africa needs is the know-how to mine uranium, refine it and make nuclear weapons. For

Instance, it has recently been discovered that Zimbabwe has some good deposits of uranium in its Matebeleland region. Such deposits should be used for the benefit of the nuclear have-nots of Africa. They should not be used to empower current nuclear-have-lots with more and more nuclear weapons.

CONCLUSION

Africa has to have nuclear weapons if it has to attain political sovereignty that will give it power over its economic resources needed for its programmes of development. When it is politically, economically and technologically powerful, Africa will have control over its culture of which language is part. Before Africa gains military sovereignty, that will give it genuine political sovereignty, it will be a bit worthless to blame Africans for lacking political will to develop and promote indigenous languages in education and development. Political will has roots in a genuine political sovereignty. Genuine political sovereignty has its own roots in military might.

The idea of blaming African countries for failing to follow the example of Asian countries by not promoting indigenous languages in education and development should be based on the understanding of whether or not Africa has the military, political and techno-economic powers to achieve that. The blame should only be posed after scholars have established that, just like African countries. Asian countries do not have military, political and techno-economic powers despite that they have managed to promote the use of indigenous Asian languages practically in all the domains of Asian people's lives. The thing is, if Asian countries have military might (nuclear weapons) and African countries do not have. If Asian countries are enjoying genuine political sovereignty and African countries are not, if Asian countries have managed to develop technologically and economically as the result of having acquired political respectability from the superpower and her allies whilst African countries have not, truly speaking, it is not worthy to blame African countries for failing to follow the example of Asian countries by promoting indigenous African languages in educational and developmental discourses.

What should be taken note of is that, most of the Asian tigers and the other Asian countries to which scholars make reference when they seek to give examples of states that use indigenous language practically in all the domains of the Asian people's lives, are countries that are among the nuclear-have-lots of the world. Those Asian countries include China, Malaysia, Japan, South Korea and Hongkong. These countries enjoy genuine political sovereignty when most African countries do not. It is this sort of understanding that seems to have pushed Mutasa (2006) to place those Asian countries within the category of states which use their indigenous languages practically in all spheres of life due to their

advanced technology and economic development. Truly speaking African countries need not be compared to these states since at the moment Africa has to seek military sovereignty in order to attain the other forms of sovereignty that are necessary for Africa to promote its languages in education and programmes of development.

Probably the case of India can illustrate better what the present researcher is lobbying for. Muppidi (2005) records the incident when after it carried out its second nuclear tests in 1998, India was sanctioned following the recommendation of the sole superpower (USA) and its allies. However, India was not scarred by the economic sanctions for it insisted on testing more nuclear weapons on the understanding that the world should not be divided into nuclear-have-lots and nuclear-have-nots. After the USA had discovered that India was foolhardy in its own way, it dropped the sanctions and immediately entered into trading deals with India. It is the process of nuclearization which earned India international respect and economic deals with the superpower. Those deals obviously proceeded on the level mutuality, dialogue and general understanding for India was no longer an underdog (nuclear-have-not).

Although the superpower has general respect for nuclear-have-lots, the problem comes when the superpower discovers that a particular country claims falsely to have become a nuclear powerhouse. If it makes that particular discovered it will mercilessly pounce, with the aid of its allies on that country. Like wise, if the superpower had not ascertained that India was now a true nuclear powerhouse, the superpower would have attacked India without much ado for the reason of breaching nuclear anti-proliferation treaties. This is what to Sadam Hussein's Iraq. Iraq was attacked by the superpower knowing very well that in reality, Iraq had not nuclear weapons. That is why after the defeat of Iraq in 2003 no weapons of mass destruction were discovered. If Iraq had nuclear weapons and was not just planning to develop nuclear weapons, the superpower and her allies would not have invaded it. A country with nuclear weapons cannot be readily invaded since it will threaten to defend itself with the nuclear weapons in its possession. It is not amazing that the USA is failing to deal decisively with South Korea, which is embarking a project of nuclearization. At one time South Korea dismissed nuclear weapon observers but nothing followed thereafter with the exception that the USA negotiated the imposition of sanctions on South Korea. Those sanctions seem to be dysfunctional.

From the discussion, it emerges that Africa cannot attain what Asian countries have attained on linguistic levels before it attains what Asian states have attained on military, political and techno-economic levels. Probably scholars, as it is now, have to blame African countries for upholding nuclear

anti-proliferation treaties which deter them from working towards becoming nuclear powerhouses. Once African countries become nuclear powerhouses, they will be able to move on to attain political sovereignty, techno-economic sovereignty and cultural-linguistic sovereignty. To assume that Africa can follow the example of Asian countries by promoting its indigenous languages to languages of education and development before Africa embarks on a nuclearization exercise is a form of self-delusion and not reality. Indeed Africa can follow the example of Asian countries if it attains military, political and techno-economic sovereignties. Of course, they may be other conditions which Africa has to fulfill if it has to follow the Asian countries' example by promoting indigenous languages practically in all domains of African people's lives, but the starting point towards achieving that goal will always be military might and genuine political sovereignty in transversal power relations.

REFERENCES

Achebe, C. 1988. *Hopes and Impediments*. New York: Doubleday

Bleiker, R. 2000. *Popular dissent, human agency and global politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brock-Utne, B. 2005. The continued battle over Kiswahili as the of instruction in Tanzania, in *Educational language contents and issues in postcolonial Africa*, edited by B. Brock-Utne, & A.K. Hopson. Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers: 51-87

Chimhundu, H. 2001. Indigenous language politics in Africa – Ideals and realities: An Anglophone perspective in *4 Excerpts from ZIBF INDABA* 2001: 19-25.

Crystal, D. 2003. *English as a global language: Second edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Flint, C. 2006. *Introduction to geopolitics*. New York: Routledge.

Magwa, W. 2008. Facing Challenges of mother tongue-medium education, in *Teaching and administering in African Languages: A road map to African renaissance*, edited by D.E. Mutasa and E.E. Ogutu. Pretoria: Simba Guru Publishers.

Mazrui, A.A. 1978. *Political values and the educated class in Africa*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Mazrui, A.A. 1993. Seek ye first the political kingdom, in *General History of Africa – viii: Africa since 1935*, edited by A.A. Mazrui & C. Wondji. Paris: UNESCO: 105-126

Mazrui, A.A. & Mazrui, A.M. 1998. *The Power of Babel: Language and governance in the African experience*. Chicago: University of Chicago

Mazrui, A.A. 2000. Indigenised approaches to globalization: Fundamental to African development. The Herald, 6 January 2000.

Mazrui, A.A. 2004. *Power, Politics and the African condition*, edited by R.L. Ostergard jr. Asmara: Africa World Press

McPhail, T.L. 2006. Global Communication: Theories, stakeholders and trends – Second edition. London: Blackwell

Muppidi, H. 2005. Colonial and post-colonial global governance, in *Power in global governance*, edited by Barnett, M. & Duvall, R. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 273-293.

Mutasa, D.E. 2006. African languages in the 21st Century: The main challenges, In *African languages in the 21st century: The main challenges*, edited by D.E. Mutasa. Pretoria: Simba Guru Publishers: 60-93

Slemon, S. 2001. Post-colonial critical theories, In *Postcolonial discourses: An anthology*, edited by G. Castle. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers: 100-116

Sorensen, G. 2004. *The Transformation of the state: Beyond the myth of retreat*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

wa Ngugi, M. 2003. *Conversing with Africa: The politics of change*. Harare: Kimaathi Publishing House.

Wa Thiongo, N. 1986. *Writing against neocolonialism*. Wembley: Vita Books

wa Thiongo, N. 1987. *Decolonizing the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. Harare: Zimbabwe Publishing House.

wa Thiongo, N. 1998. *Penpoints, gunpoints and dreams: Towards a critical theory of the arts and the state in Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press

Wright, S. 2004. *Language policy and language planning: From Nationalism to globalization*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan