



The Language of Propaganda in Governance: The Nigerian Situation

Ifeoma Nwosu-Okoli

Department of English and Literary Studies,
Federal University, Ndufu-Alike, Ikwo, Ebonyi State, Nigeria

Ngozi Anyachonkeya

Reader and Director, Directorate of Affiliation,
Collaboration & Linkages (DACOL),
Akanu Ibiam Federal Polytechnic, Unwana, Ebonyi State, Nigeria

[Doi:10.19044/esj.2023.v19n8p85](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n8p85)

Submitted: 22 August 2022

Accepted: 17 March 2023

Published: 31 March 2023

Copyright 2023 Author(s)

Under Creative Commons BY-NC-ND

4.0 OPEN ACCESS

Cite As:

Nwosu-Okoli I. & Anyachonkeya N. (2023). *The Language of Propaganda in Governance: The Nigerian Situation*. European Scientific Journal, ESJ, 19 (8), 85.

<https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n8p85>

Résumé

Language is a unique gift to humanity by the Omniscient God. By means of language, we build or end a relationship, forge alliance, build bridges of unity and cooperation among peoples and groups. By means of language, also, we find a viable instrument to achieve participation and exclusion in political and diplomatic maneuvering. Formal or informal discourse may be achieved through vocal utterance, written medium or even paralinguistic features. Language, in effect, plays inestimable role in all aspects of life. This paper, in a special way, examines the impact of language in governance. Since English is Nigeria's official language, the essay has, by purposeful random sampling, chosen the meta language of English, of all the myriads of languages spoken in Nigeria, to engage our discourse and to ascertain the impact of language in governance. Again, since charity, they say, begins at home (but should not end there), the essay has chosen Nigeria to query the impact of the English language in (political) governance. The paper upholds the platitude which holds that much is expected from the one to whom much is given. In view of this, the study asserts that political governance in Nigeria is hard work for the fact that Nigeria is a conglomerate of peoples, national groups and tongues yoked together by the Lugardian amalgamation of January 1, 1914.

The salient index that wields the fragile nation state together is diversity, amidst mutual suspicion among the diverse ethnic groups. The essay uses literary or library research to probe into the recesses of language and language theories for recommending to the political leaders in governance how they should manage language so that our beloved nation is not set ablaze as a result of language mismanagement.

Keywords: Language, Ethnic groups, Communication, Propaganda, Governance

Introduction

Fully aware of correctness and appropriateness as well as cooperative principle, the political leader saddled with the weighty task of governance *must* appreciate the fact that in nation-building, everybody is important, no matter how highly or lowly placed, and as such, carries everyone along through his idiolect especially when it comes to political maneuvering in governance; we need one another; it is song of cooperation for the egalitarian society and true Federalism to thrive and blossom. Nigeria is the largest Black nation on earth and giant of Africa, but is sadly beset with numerous challenges that threaten its unity and national cohesion. In the light of the above, the political leader, beginning from the Councilor, Local Government Chairman, the Honourable member of the State House of Assembly, the Honourable member of the Federal House of Representatives, the Distinguished Senator of the Federal Republic, the Honourable member of State and Federal Executive Council or the learned gentleman of the Judiciary, *must be* wary of his pronouncements, in the guise of propaganda while serving God and humanity. Right diction is likely to heal a wound, build a State or nation, contribute immensely in national integration, while wrong diction could overheat the polity and probably wreck the unity of the country, especially in moments of conflict management or crises (Anyachonkeya, 2017).

From ideation stage or intrapersonal communication, we begin to fashion our thoughts in readiness for interpersonal communication. In interpersonal communication, we use the spoken, written and paralinguistic features. The ideation stage manifests itself in interpersonal communication, even in our actions and pronouncements. How we share dividends of democracy is a linguistic matter. So, even when a leader has not said anything but we observe how he treats his subjects or the manner in which he relates with other citizens from diverse ethnic lines is an eloquent testimony of his language. In this essay, we will x-ray pronouncements of leaders and how they relate with others as well as their disposition in sharing national treasure as

they exemplify linguistic evidence, which exerts reasonable impact on governance.

We will evaluate excerpts of literature to ascertain language style and usage of political leaders so as to find out how they have managed language and what impact such has in their governance of the masses or electorate. The issues involved revolve around conflict versus conflict management and resolution. This study attempts to query the concept of conflict and conflict management as well as linguistic theories with which our political leaders should familiarized themselves with in order to build cohesion and national integration in a heterogeneous Nigeria.

This paper, by its nature, is not unaware of other leaders in governance; it recognizes other leaders such as those in the ecclesiastics, family heads, community leaders and all others. However, the essay focuses on political leaders of our contemporary Nigeria, who naturally fit into our discourse.

Conflict in Governance

Before we deliberate on conflict in governance, an examination of the term *conflict* and its shades is necessary as the knowledge of which will illuminate our discourse.

Conflict is clash of interests, literally speaking. Schwarz, the editor the *Chambers Dictionary* (1995:359), defines conflict as unfortunate coincidence or opposition; violent collision; struggle, contest, war, etc.; a mental or emotional struggle. From a literary vista, conflict is the struggle which grows out of the interplay of two opposing forces in a plot (Anyachonkeya, 2004:499). From these definitions, we infer that conflict takes place where one, two or more persons are involved over competing divergent interests. When the competing interests occur within a person, we refer to it as intrapersonal conflict. There is internal warfare going on within the individual and the internal judge is the person's conscience, an intricate psychological construct. When the competing conflicts occur between two or more persons, it is interpersonal conflict. Conflict can also take place between an individual and his society, in which case it is man versus society. Where the individual emerges victorious, like the case of Jesus Christ, he is a crusader; in a situation where the individual lacks the power to emerge victorious, he may succumb as a result of overwhelming odds beyond his compass. The conflict can occur between a person and cosmic or the supernatural forces. In this circumstance, the individual gets involved in supernatural combat; and more often than not ends up defeated.

In addition to intrapersonal and interpersonal conflicts, this work also identifies other shades of conflict, which include: Conflict between individuals and groups; intra group conflicts; intergroup and inter organizational conflicts.

Intra group conflict exists among the members of a group. We talk about intergroup and inter organizational conflict when the conflict exists between groups and organizations, simultaneously. When it is inter organizational conflict, the conflict exists among organizations (Anyachonkeya and Anyachonkeya, 2018:532).

The political leader of whatever cadre encounters these facets of conflict in governance. In whichever variant, language is at the epicenter. His style of language and diction, which, of course, includes his action and inaction, are also part of linguistic experience, determines his success or failure in governance. For instance, the turbulence that has characterized Nigerian leadership, for several years now, is an indication that our leaders have not been able to use the right language style; they have not been diplomatic enough to ensure that violence-prone language is not allowed a place in their leadership. The absence of the peace-prone language, therefore, exposes the country and her citizenry to the experiences that overheat the polity. This work hereby examines some publications with a view to unveiling the actions and pronouncements as well as inaction of our leaders in political governance, which have had adverse impact on the volatile population of Nigeria. Meanwhile, let us examine this subtask under propaganda and political maneuvering in governance.

Propaganda and Political Maneuvering in Governance

Language of political governance is often characterized by propaganda, especially where the political leader strives to convince his populace to adopt a certain point of view. He adopts this linguistic posture at times in conflict management. Of course, there must be crises which necessitate such language style and usage. Maybe we have to devote some attention to the term *propaganda* and find out how best a political leader may harness from the gains of propaganda without becoming selfish.

Propaganda

Propaganda, as language of political governance, is of 17th century origin. It has a pleasant beginning; however, with the passage of time it comes to acquire some controversial connotations, reveals *The New Webster's Dictionary of the English Language* (1994" 801). For instance, "propaganda" has its roots in Latin, when "Pope Gregory XV, (1554-1623)," in 1622 constituted a group of Roman Catholic cardinals known and called *The Congregation de Propagation Fide*, meaning *The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith*. This body is called *Propaganda*, in the short form; the Committee of the Holy Sea is charged with the responsibility of supervising foreign missions, adds *The Webster's*. As time passed, the word becomes synonymous with any attempt or effort to spread a belief. Thus,

propaganda, in its acquired connotation, becomes a kind of linguistic instrument exploited to convince and persuade people into action. Therefore, Warriner and Griffith (1965: 403) state:

When an organized group, government, an institution, (or) a business concern embarks upon a program to win over the public, the ideas and arguments it uses in its favor is called propaganda. So, we refer to political propaganda, Russian propaganda, labor propaganda, advertisement propaganda, etc.

With this acquired connotative meaning, individuals, governments, nongovernmental organizations, etc., engage in one form of propaganda or the other, the intent of which may be selfish or altruistic; but it must involve some modicum of persuasion, enticement with a view to winning their audience to toe their line of thought. For instance, Chaturvedi's *Academics Dictionary of Political Science* (2006: 252) observes:

There exists a large variety of groups carrying on propaganda in favour of one thing or another. Sometimes, their methods are open and straightforward, sometimes hidden and dubious. According to Walter Lippmann, the most significant revolution in modern times is the revolution that is taking place in the art of creating constraint among the governed. Within the life of the new generation now in control of affairs, persuasion has become a conscious art and a regular organ of popular government.

As already hinted, propaganda is of two kinds, namely, *positive* or *beneficial* propaganda and *negative* or *detrimental* propaganda, which is usually motivated by selfish interest. A government, for example, who says: "The People Benefit as the Nation Privatizes" may be involved in negative or detrimental propaganda; such government is likely to have some hidden agenda. The possibility is that the government that embarks on this propaganda may be poised to privatize a public utility against which members of the populace protest. On the other hand, the government that sensitizes its citizenry in the following, constructively, for instance: "The Federal Ministry of Health warns that cigarette smokers are likely to die young" is engaged in a beneficial or positive propaganda.

The political leader should be sincere in his use of propaganda and avoid being selfish. More often than not, negative propaganda dwells on

bending the rules of logic. By its nature, propaganda encourages short circuit rational thought and it does this by agitating the emotions, by exploiting insecurities, by capitalizing on the ambiguity of language, and by bending the rules of logic. Negative propagandists do so to achieve their whim by employing outright lies; they make generalizations, call names and play on the emotions of their audience as well as employ slogans and symbols. On this note, Mark Twain says of (selfish) propaganda: "A lie can travel half way around the world while the truth is putting on its shoes." Similarly, Adolf Hitler cited in Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of Pennsylvania. (2008), asserts that: "By clever and persevering use of propaganda, even heaven can be represented as hell to the people, and conversely the most wretched life represented as paradise." In the light of these revelations, the political leader, who hopes to leave a legacy and who wants his memory to be happy must distance himself from selfish propaganda as its impact on governance has a lot of adverse effects.

Closely associated with propaganda in governance is *negotiation* in conflict situation. A careful management of negotiation helps the political leader to watch his language if he must govern his people as a servant-leader.

Negotiation

Of course, negotiation is a veritable instrument in political governance. We cannot broker peace between two or among disputants without using negotiation in bargaining. Therefore, negotiation, according to Chaturvedi (2006: 208), is a way of

settling a dispute where each party has to express what it desires and makes an attempt to get as much as possible, but each party is obliged, also, to make concessions to the other party or parties. In international disputes, negotiations have to be the first step. This has been made obligatory by the UN Charter, prior to any intervention by the Security Council.

There cannot be a successful truce reached when using negotiation without concessions between or among the parties in dispute. Concession means compromise; you come closer; the other party comes closer, implying foregoing certain interests, and that is concession in action. The language of negotiation should be characterized by friendliness and trust. There should be no deceit. The impact of this will be peace, mutual trust, peaceful existence and development (Anyachonkeya, 2016).

Instances of Pronouncements and Actions That Militate against Good Governance

When negotiating, the disputants in conflict seek to make an agreement by establishing a temporary truce or even a lasting compromise. Put differently, we allude to *modus vivendi*. There is a serious problem with any leadership that lacks trust or through whose pronouncements and actions, one can deduce falsehood and fraudulence. Incidentally many political leaders make utterances that do not promote unity and national integration. The present Nigerian society is, unfortunately though, marked by malicious pronouncements, which is evident in all kinds of hate speech and fake news. For instance, *The Authority* newspaper of Friday, September 2, 2016, pages 1-4, carries this headline story: Obasanjo, YarAdua, (and) Jonathan Caused Economic Mess - APC. The paper then says:

Amidst public state of the economy under the administration of President Muhammadu Buhari which has been officially confirmed to be in recession, the ruling All Progressive Congress (APC) has said that its hands are clean. The party rather asked Nigerians to blame the current economic mess on former President Olusegun Obasanjo, the late Umaru Yar Adua and Goodluck Jonathan, whom it accused of plundering the country's resources for 16 years.

Any form of linguistic hostility, especially in a situation where a government refuses to work hard towards fixing a dwindling economy and rather resorts to pointing accusing fingers on past political administrations, is quite unacceptable in the language of governance. As though in reaction to the above stated linguistic misrepresentation, Balarabe Musa, former Governor of Old Kaduna State, issues a warning entitled Hunger in the Land: Don't Wait for Masses Revolt against Your Government. His warning is hereby summarized:

Nigerian masses may soon rise against the administration of President Muhammadu Buhari if the current economic hardship in the country is not addressed immediately. (He warned) that there is nothing that pushes people to revolt against government than hunger, pointing out that the primary responsibility of government is the welfare of the people and this

Buhari government must not shy away from it
(*Saturday sun* September 3, 2016:1,4,5,6).

A more alarming and security-threatening publication is carried by *Daily sun* of Wednesday, December, 28, 2016, page 8. The headline article is Anxiety in Presidency, Security over 2019 Polls. An excerpt of the article says:

THERE is growing concern in the Presidency and security circle over alleged moves and utterances of key politicians believed to be nursing presidential ambition in 2019. The development, a source in the Department of State Security (DSS) revealed, is considered a huge problem because the country is likely to be on fire if the unnamed politicians are allowed to continue in the direction they are going. With the way things are unfolding the (SSS) weigh politicians as being more dangerous than Boko Haram. Nigeria is being shattered by myriad of crises and then we read of this potential bomb, as it were. The language of the clandestine political mongers and jobbers, we do not know, is capable of destabilizing the country that at the moment is like the drunken giant that walks with the limbs of a mosquito. Both language of the newspaper reportage and the clandestine activities of pseudo-patriots of Nigeria portends calamity for the much stressed nation that is confronted with litany of challenges.

The language of governance, when misused, has dangerous impact on reconciliation and on healing the wounds of the dastardly pogrom. In the contemporary Nigerian society, such misuse of language has created a lot of unnecessary problems for the nation. For instance, on the 6th June, 2017, a group of Northern Nigerians announced, with impunity, that Nigerians from the Igbo tribe are given a month to quit the Northern part of the country. The announcement is captioned: THE KADUNA DECLARATION, BEING A JOINT POSITION PAPER ISSUED BY THE AREWA CITIZENS ACTION FOR CHANGE, AREWA YOUTH CONSULTATIVE FORUM, AREWA YOUTH DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION, AREWA STUDENTS FORUM AND NORTHERN EMANCIPATION NETWORK ON THE IGBO PERSISTENCE FOR SECESSION. A summary of the lengthy text reads:

From today, June 6, 2017 (when this proclamation is signed), the North, a critical player in the Nigerian project, hereby declares that it will no longer be disposed to coexisting with the Igbos and shall take definite steps to end the partnership by pulling out of the current federal arrangement. The North hereby openly calls on the authorities and other national and international stakeholders to acknowledge this declaration by taking steps to facilitate the final dissolution of this hopeless union that has never been convenient to any of the parties. In conclusion, we are hereby placing the Nigerian authorities and the entire nation on notice that from the 1st October, 2017, we shall commence the implementation of visible actions to prove to the whole world that we are no longer part of any federal union with the Igbos. Finally, all authorities, individuals or groups are hereby advised against attempting to undermine this declaration by insisting on this union with the Igbos, who have thus far proved to be an unnecessary baggage carried too far and for too long.

The declaration, above, triggered off many of such hostile announcements from other ethnic groups of the country against the Northern Nigerians a situation which breeds disharmony among citizens of the same country. Though the Northern Nigerians end up no longer insisting on carrying out the already pronounced and documented threat, there has been series of threats and counter threats issued by one ethnic or religious group to some other(s).

At this point, we want to pause and investigate the linguistic appurtenance of governance under the headings; the role of correctness and appropriateness and the role of cooperative principle.

Correctness and Appropriateness in Governance

Correctness and appropriateness hinge on certain variables in language usage which predicate on the language variety to use in sociolinguistic experience. In this circumstance, we cannot just say that a particular language variety is good or bad without considering those variables.

Before we examine those relevant variables, let us isolate the term *correctness*, a component of the duo in speech act before we apply the term in governance.

Correctness, according to Cuddon (2013: 159), refers to:

adherence and conformity with rules, convention and decorum. Adherence and conformity to rules still revolve around the variables that must come into the picture before we infer that any language variety is good or unacceptable. It is still along this linguistic tangent that Wales (2001:88) reasons that the notions of ACCEPTABILITY and APPROPRIATENESS are important, and adds that ill-formed utterances may be tolerated in certain contexts, or considered APPROPRIATE to a SITUATION or FUNCTION.

The linguistic variables which Cuddon and Wales allude to are *situation*, *audience* and *purpose* which determine the idiolect or variety a speaker or writer may exploit. Using the English language for illustration Anyachonkeya (2004: 52) observes that we cannot say that there is any form of English that is best. He explains:

(T)here is no such thing as good English in the abstract or in isolation of *situation*, *audience* and *purpose* which will predicate why we do write. Under these (variables), correctness and appropriateness hinge. As a matter of fact, it is dialect or register that determines correctness and appropriateness.

The political leader in governance should screen his language while administering the needs of his people in the process of even disbursement of the dividends of democracy. We now address another linguistic theory which the political leader should be aware of.

Cooperative Principle in Governance

Language is at the front burner in political governance and conflict resolution. We do not play with language, for it can boomerang. The leader or opinion moulder should internalize speech act semantics and Co-operative principle. The conversational rules are pivoted on the *conversational maxims* as enunciated by Paul Grice (1975), quoted in Yule, in his Cooperative Principle. Failure to apply the rules of these maxims can result in communication breakdown or overheating the polity. Besides, the political

elite must not overlook the principles of the maxims; he should not say or publish what he believes to be false, and a matter for which he lacks adequate evidence. The principles are *quantity*, *quality*, *relevance* and *manner*, the details of which are as follows:

Maxim of Quantity

1. Make your contribution to the conversation as informative as necessary.
2. Do not make your contribution to the conversation more informative than necessary.

Maxim of Quality

1. Do not say what you believe to be false.
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

Maxim of Relation

1. Say only things that are relevant.

Maxim of Manner

1. Avoid obscurity of expression.
2. Avoid ambiguity.
3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary wordiness).
4. Be orderly (qtd. in Yule 2004: 145).

Therefore, a re-reading of the excerpt cited below and which has been quoted at the outset shows that the mouthpiece of APC Federal Government errs in the Maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relation and Manner.

Amidst public state of the economy under the administration of President Muhammadu Buhari which has been officially confirmed to be in recession, the ruling All Progressive Congress (APC) has said that its hands are clean. The party rather asked Nigerians to blame the current economic mess on former President Olusegun Obasanjo, the late Umaru Yar Adua and Goodluck Jonathan, whom it accused of plundering the country's resources for 16 years.

From this re-reading, we notice that the speaker has said that which he believes to be false; has said that for which he lacks adequate evidence; failed to say only the things that are relevant; has not been brief and has not been orderly. Also a careful reading of *The Authority* newspaper of Friday, September 2,

2016, pages 1-4, reveals that the mouthpiece not only flagrantly violates Grice's Cooperative Principle but also begs the question. Were this source aware of the nitty-gritty of this linguistic theory of speech act semantics, he would have done a rethink during ideation stage before rushing to press for the public to consume unsuitable language for governance. Indeed, were we to equally scrutinize the pronouncements of the political leaders we will find out that a great many of them fell short of expectations in line with the dictates of Cooperative Principle. In sum, political leaders should carry their subjects along by not making sensitive comments that run counter to correctness and appropriateness as well as the language theory under consideration.

Implication of Findings

This subheading seeks to ascertain the impact of language of governance on the case of fragile and volatile Nigeria, vis-à-vis, its unity, diversity, ethnicity, linguistic divergence, ethnic mistrust, challenges etc. against the backdrop of the ill pronouncements of the political dramatis personae. We will further query some literatures, already cited, to find out the views of opinion moulders, political leaders, past and present, in order to determine the genuineness of their patriotism when weighed against their utterances in political governance. There is no household that has no leaking roof. Nigeria is no exception especially a unique household that was founded by mercenary Imperial Government, a household whose members are like members of a joint family and whose members are not of the same siblings, but half brothers and sisters and cousins, more or less. With the scenic picture of this family so painted, Onwumah (2013: 252) graphically levels charges against Nigeria in the manner and posture of a High court Judge as follows:

The charges are many; Count One: Nigeria is a mere geographical expression. Count Two: She is a political contraption. Count Three: She is a land of irreconcilable contradictions. That is the case against Nigeria, a land of over 200 ethnic nationalities, forced into a union by the British in 1914.

Onwumah (2013) has certainly not exhausted the charges which are more than what he has counted. This study is also careful not to dwell on them so that the authors may not appear biased and pessimistic. Going further, we present an elaboration of these charges as corroborated by high profile Nigerian political juggernauts of the 1st Republic, after we pause and speculate on the prospects of Nigeria as an indissoluble entity as well as reflect also on the impact of political governance for such a complex household. The political stalwarts of the 1st Republic are Sir Ahumadu Bello, the Saduana of Sokoto;

Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa; Isa Kaita; Mallam Baba Garuba, and others. Alhaji Ahumadu Bello declares in his book, *My Life* (135), quoted in Ojukwu (1969: 147):

The Colonial master who ruled Nigeria introduced a system of unitary government not for the present or future unity or well-being of all the indigenes of the country but for his own administrative convenience. Lord Lugard and his amalgamation were far from popular amongst us at that time.

This highly respected political heavyweight is not done; Ojukwu reports that the self-government motion in the Central Legislature in March of 1953 prompts the late nationalist leader to reply this way:

It is true that we politicians delight in talking loosely about unity of Nigeria. What is now called Nigeria consisted of large and small communities all of which were different in their outlooks and beliefs. The advent of the British and the Western education has not materially altered the situation and these many and varied communities have not knit themselves into composite unit. In 1914, the North and South were amalgamated though the administration of the two sections (is) distinctly different. Since then, no serious attempt has been made by the British or by the people themselves to come together and each section has looked upon the other with suspicion and misgiving.

Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa adds his voice to share the Saduana's pessimism, as quoted in Ojukwu (1969: 147). The Prime Minister states:

Since the amalgamation of the Southern and Northern Provinces in 1914, Nigeria has existed as one country only on paper. It is still far from being united. The country is inhabited by peoples and tribes who speak different languages, who have different religions, different customs, and traditions and entirely different historical backgrounds in their way of life, and who have also attained different stages

of development. We do not want our southern neighbours to interfere in our development

The highly respected and admired Premier says further: “There were agitations in favour of secession; we should set up on our own; we should cease to have anything more to do with the Southern people; we should take our own way. I must say it looked very tempting.”

We are not in a hurry to dismiss Onwumah’s charges: “The charges against Nigeria are many.” Those charges are linguistic paraphernalia incompatible with language of governance.

We can see, from the foregoing, that the impact of language in governance is enormous. When it is properly managed it yields good results; but when mismanaged, the outcome can be lethal. That is why the political leader should *shine his eyes*, to use colloquial parlance, as he makes pronouncements to avoid setting woodland afire as a result language misuse. Our utterance the moment it leaves our mouth, we no longer have control over it.

The essay recalls that the salient index that wields the fragile nation state together is *diversity*, amidst mutual suspicion among the diverse ethnic groups. Nigeria, no matter its leadership posture, sadly, is beset with numerous challenges that threaten its unity and national cohesion.

Conclusion

Language plays inestimable role in all aspects of life. That is why this paper has examined the impact of language in governance. This investigation has shown that by means of language we build or end a relationship, forge alliance, build bridges of unity and cooperation among peoples and groups. Since English is Nigeria’s official language, the essay has, by purposeful random sampling, chose the meta language of English, of all the myriads of languages spoken in Nigeria, to engage our discourse and to ascertain the impact of language in governance. The study focuses on Nigeria, our country, to query the impact of (the English) language in (political) governance.

In view of the incontrovertible role language plays in governance, the paper upholds the platitude which holds that he who much is given much is expected of him. So, the study asserts that political governance in Nigeria is hard work; reason being that Nigeria is a conglomerate of peoples, national groups and tongues yoked together by the Lugardian amalgamation of January 1914. The essay observes that the salient index that wields the fragile nation state together is *diversity*, amidst mutual suspicion among the diverse ethnic groups. Nigeria, unfortunately, is beset with numerous challenges that threaten its unity and corporate existence. In the light of the above, the political leaders, of whatever calling or name, *must be* wary of his pronouncements, in the guise of propaganda while serving God and humanity.

Right diction is likely to heal a wound, build a State or nation, contribute immensely in national integration, while wrong diction could overheat the polity and probably wreck the unity of the country especially in moments of conflict management or crises.

Fully aware of correctness and appropriateness as well as Cooperative Principle, the political leader saddled with the weighty task of governance *must* appreciate the fact that in nation-building everybody is important, no matter how highly or lowly placed and so carries everyone along through his idiolect especially when it comes to political maneuvering in governing; we need each other; it is song of cooperation for the egalitarian society and true Federalism to thrive and blossom.

Recommendations

The political leader should be meticulous in language usage to avoid dividing his subjects rather than uniting them through unguarded utterance.

Right language of governance is hard work; the political leader should strive to cultivate the etiquette of good speech through reading and practice.

The political leader should acquaint himself with the language theory of Grices Cooperative Principle familiarize himself with correctness and appropriateness in language use.

He should bear in mind that his actions and thoughts while in governance are all linguistic experiences. Therefore, the political leader should bear in mind that public service and political office appointments are all linguistic actions under which he may be judged either as unbiased, detribalized or otherwise. In effect, his appointments should be guided by merit as well as distribution of dividends of democracy.

References:

1. Anyachonkeya, Ngozi. (2004). *The English language usage: Form and style*. Owerri: Hudson-Jude..... (2007). *The English language and communication*. Owerri: Chukwuemeka Printers and Publishers. (2016).“Language, Peace-Building and National Security: Epistemological Considerations.”
2. A Paper Presented at the 3rd Annual Conference of Association of Communication Scholars and Professionals of Nigeria (ACSPN), Held at Immaculate Suites and Apartments, Plot 110 Adetokumbo Ademola Crescent, ABUJA, from August 30. (2017). A Paper Presented at the Third Biennial International Conference of the Faculty of Arts, University of Ibadan, Nigeria, from March, 14 - 18, 2017, (Tuesday, June 28).
3. Anyachonkeya, Ngozi and Chinwe Anyachonkeya. (2018).*The anatomy of English studies*. Owerri: Lui House of Excellence.

4. Ayankola, Martin. (Tuesday, June 28). *The Punch*. Ed. Ikeja: Punch Nigeria Limited.
5. Chaturvedi, A. K. (2006). *Academic's dictionary of political science*. New Delhi: Academic (India) Publishers.
6. Cuddon, J. A. (2014). *Dictionary of literary terms and literary theory*. London: The Penguin Books.
7. Malogo, Bruce. (November 5, 2016). *Saturday sun*. Ed. Ikeja: The Sun Publishing Limited.
8. Momah, Sam. (2013). *Nigeria: Beyond divorce, amalgamation in perspective*. Ibadan: Chief Joop Berkhout.
9. Oladeinde, Abdulfatah. (September 3, 2016). *Sunday sun*. Ed. Ikeja: The Sun Publishing Limited.
10. Onumah, Chido. (2013). *Nigeria is negotiable: Essays on Nigeria's tortuous road to democracy And nationhood*. Abuja: African Centre for Media and Information Literacy.
11. *The Authority*. (2016, Friday, September). Abuja: Authority Media and Publications, Ltd.
12. Schwarz, Catherine. (1995). *The Chambers dictionary*. Ed. Edinburgh: Chambers. *Daily sun*. (2016, Wednesday, December 21). Ikeja: The Sun Publishing Limited..... (2016). (Wednesday, December 28). *Daily sun*. Ed. Ikeja: The Sun Publishing Limited.
13. *The Webster's dictionary of the English language*. (2004). New York: Lexicon Publications, Inc.
14. Wales, Katie. (2001). *A dictionary of stylistics*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
15. Warriner, E. John and Francis Griffith. (1965). *Warriner's English grammar and composition*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.
16. Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of Pennsylvania. (2008). *Awake!* New York: Watchtower Bible and Tract Society.
17. Weisler, E. Steven and Slavko Milekic. (2000). *Theory of language*. Boston: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
18. Yule, George. (2004). *The study of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
19. WWW. Tekedia.com, The Kaduna Declaration, June 12, 2017.