

Center-Margin and the Quest for Global Citizenship: An Analysis of Adichie's TED *Talk-Danger of the Single Story* and Rudyard Kipling's Poem, "We and They"

Peter Okafor Ifeanachor¹, Festus Uwakwe Ngwoke^{2*}, Basil Okwudilichukwu Nwokolo³,
Henrietta Ifeoma Okafor⁴ & Walter Ugwuagbo⁵

1. The Use of English Unit, School of General Studies, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.

Email: peter.ifeanachor@unn.edu.ng

2, 3, 4, 5. Department of English and Literary Studies, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.

Email: ²festus.ngwoke@unn.edu.ng (*Corresponding Author), ³basil.nwokolo@unn.edu.ng,

⁴Okafor.henrietta@unn.edu.ng, ⁵walter.ugwuagbo@unn.edu.ng

Abstract

The world today is in dire need of peace, unity and progress. One of the ways to realize and sustain this is by being a global citizen. World leaders have harped so much on global citizenship, but are very inert embracing it in good faith. The effect is a palpable division across the globe economically, politically, socially, physically and psychologically. This division has brought about center-margin haunting the world from the time past to the present. In the wake of this, however, it is obvious that global citizenship may continue to remain a chimera if urgent steps are not taken to address center-margin realities. Based on this, the paper picks to pieces Rudyard Kipling's "We and They" and Adichie's TED Talk-Danger of the Single Story to ascertain the level of challenges centre-margin poses in realizing cosmopolitan citizenship. The paper is anchored on postcolonial theory. Data were sourced directly from the texts. While the paper discovers that both superiority and inferiority factors in center-margin are potential threats to peaceful global interdependence and diversity, it concludes that administration of equality and social justice will not only bond the world together, but also continue to upgrade dignity and humanity of all peoples.

Keywords: *Centre-Margin, Postcolonialism, Self, Other, Global Citizenship and Colonialism.*

INTRODUCTION

The world as seen in the atlas is cartographically stratified into continents. In these continents are countries of human races. They have their language, identity and cultural differences. Each country is entitled to peace, unity, progress and stability. Things that hold people together are always kept on the front burner and emphasized.

However, things begin to fray at the edges the moment belief in the superiority of races takes the center stage around the age of discovery. Colonialism emerges as a tool for all forms of structural violence such as enslavement, racialism, and ethnocentrism, which Tem and Collins (3) describe as injurious to collective fulfillment. The world then faces a dystopic future. There are exploitation, dehumanization and oppression across the globe. There are the super nations and the subalterns. The globe is eventually polarized into the center and the margin. This division is dominance-based. MacGill (3) submits that this forms part of a paradigm that has put our whole existence in peril on earth.

The center in the center-margin is the super nations. They are the lords. The *margin* on the other hand is the subalterns. They are marginalized and sidelined. Asaf (1) sees center-margin from the perspective of binary dichotomy of *self* and *others*, as developed by Frantz

Fanon in his writings. According to Asaf, while the self is ordered, rational, masculine and good, the other is chaotic, irrational, feminine and evil. He adds that the other lacks identity, propriety, purity and literality. Other divisive terms inherent in center-margin are superior-inferior, master-servant, civilized-savage, among others. These opposing terms show a lack of the ability to balance awareness of one's own realities with those entities outside the perceived self. Nobody sees the world again with 'washed-eyes' for a possible one race in one planet. The Sanskrit, "Vasudhaiva Kutumbakana", meaning "the world constitutes but one family", found in Maha Upanishad around 500CE in India, then becomes meaningless. Social cognition turns cataclysmic, with generations getting lost more and more in cultural schizophrenia.

These above, therefore, unsettle world leaders. Their intellectual openness is suddenly activated. They gradually begin to see that center-margin arrangement can never stand the globe in good stead. The need for solidarity becomes their mantra. Collaborations across boundaries are stimulated. They come to realize that a collective human experience will definitely guarantee a future with peace, prosperity, unity and stability in the world. All these are what informed the idea of global citizenship.

Global citizenship can be seen as a demonstration of feeling of fairness and equality in action and interaction within and across boundaries. This explains why someone who is a global citizen is a lover of social justice. In line with this, Andrzejewski and Alessio (1) define global citizenship as knowledge and skills for social and environmental justice. It abhors ignorance and intolerance, while giving an allegiance to community of humankind. Owing to this, one can see that there is the feeling of freedom, tolerance, adoption, integration and solidarity in global citizenship. These elements thereof form a fortress against the problems of centre-margin and ethnocentrism. Therefore, as we live in the world that is rapidly being engulfed in inequality, racism, religious persecutions, gender-based oppression, torture, slavery and migration, it is pertinent to share what unites humanity instead of what divides. There is also the need to show affinity and live in awareness of key global issues capable of making the world one family. By so doing, the world will definitely rise from the simmering center-margin dyad to a peaceful, cohesive and progressive global community. The lens through which one is viewed as a 'relative', and the other, a 'stranger' will be broken. The understanding of *self* in relation to *others* will be supreme. All these are ingredients of global citizenship. Despite this, world leaders still foot drag in embracing global citizenship in truth and spirit. The result is glaring. The world has continued to wallow in the woes of centre-margin realities till today. It is on this note that the paper seeks to find out the extent centre-margin poses a challenge to attainment of global citizenship. This it does through the examination of Adichie's TED Talk-Danger of the Single Story and Kiplin's poem – "We and They". The research is anchored on postcolonial theory. It submits that with genuine global citizenship, equality and social justice will not only guarantee a good fellowship as the cement of the globe but also humanize and dignify the peoples of the world.

Theory Used

The research is anchored on postcolonial theory. The theory is birthed by the postulations of the trio: Edward said, Homi, Bhabha and Spivak Gayatri. Robert Young refers to the three as the 'Holy Trinity' of postcolonial theorists.

Postcolonial theory emerges as a result of colonialism and its effects years after. It is obvious that the story of colonialism is both off-putting and dehumanizing, no matter the way one sees it. To buttress this, Osterhammel gives three features of colonialism to include: (i)

colonialism implies that one society completely deprives a second one of its potential for autonomous development; that an entire society is 'remote controlled' and reconfigured in accordance to the colonial rulers (2) that the ruler and the ruled are permanently divided by a cultural gap (3), that there is the intellectual 'yoke' of an ideology whose purpose it is to legitimize colonial expansion (189). It is a story of domineering cultural conflagration. One effect of this is that it has left generations of the subalterns (Eastern periphery) born and battered in cultural schizophrenia till today.

The western powers in their reductive action and show of majesty and surprise of flatulent intelligence give tattered recognitions to the Eastern periphery in the course of colonization. In their publications, they twist and twirl the experiences and truths about these Eastern peripheries and designate them as inferior, plebeian people. In view of this, Edward said avers that in order to bolster their claim of superiority, there is a condescending zeal by the west to inferiorise, marginalize and stereotype other history and cultures it knows very little about. He concludes that "the relationship between Orient (Eastern periphery) and Occident (Western powers) is that of power, domination and of varying degrees of a complex hegemony" (5). To cap it all, Fanon (170) contends that colonization is not satisfied merely with hiding people in its grip and emptying the native's brain of all form and content but by a kind of perverted logic, it turns to the past of the oppressed people and distorts, disfigures and destroys it. This prompts Soyinka to ask what it is that invests the human psyche with the need to dominate others", irrespective of race, state of development or environment...? (3).

However, colonialism creates 'self' and 'other'. Ashcroft (155) describes this 'other' as anyone who is separate from one's self. The 'self' is the center (Western powers), whereas the 'other' is the margin (alized) (Eastern periphery). The latter suffers exploitation, displacement and relegation from the former. In this regard, Deodato sees the center (self) as a repulsive force, while believing at the same time that problem with the center is their attempt to exclude, repress or marginalize others (4-5).

What is more, Said (39) points out more evils of colonialism when he says that colonialism recreates in center-margin consequences that still linger in the world today through modern slavery, inequality, civil wars, bloodshed, chaos, coups, corruption, discrimination and marginalization. Therefore, it is not right to feel that colonialism is gone in the globe. Ngugi acknowledges this categorically when he notes that even up till now in American universities, "Third World literatures tend to be treated as something outside the mainstream (10). Cabral refers to this act as neo-colonialism. He goes on to define neo-colonialism as "an outgrowth of classical colonialism" (120-121).

Apart from this, Nkrumah says that colonialism is analysed primarily as a practice by which colonial rule binds her colonies to herself, with a "primary object of promoting her economic advantages" (2). It is really identified by mechanisms involving power through direct conquest or through political and economic influence that effectively create a form of domination by one nation over another. So, it is not out of place for Ashcroft et al to define postcolonial theory as a discussion of "migration, slavery, suppression, resistance, representation, difference, race, gender, place and responses to the influential master discourses of imperial Europe (...) and the fundamental experiences of speaking and writing by which all these come into being: (12). All these above are indications that colonialism is still very much felt in our world today. Therefore, it is these domination, discrimination, displacement and enslavement against the subalterns or Eastern periphery through 'self' and 'other' or 'center-margin' concepts that set a stage for postcolonial theory to emerge. This is probably why

Ashcroft submits that postcolonialism is the effect of colonization on culture and societies (186).

Postcolonial theory from the available information given so far about colonialism can be seen as a theory of justice. It comes to challenge the position of the western powers over the Eastern periphery with the messages of fairness, equality and social justice. Smith agrees with this when he says that postcolonial theory challenges the superiority of the dominant western perspective and seeks to reposition and empower the marginalized and subordinated “other” (12). This may be why the thrust of postcolonial theory is to restore dignity, history and the humanity of the +Eastern periphery. So, it is futuristic and seems to bring an alleviating tenderness and resurrection to the subalterns all over the world buffeted by towering walls of oppressive burden of history immersed in dense smoke and mist. With this, it may be right to say that postcolonial theory or literature assesses the unfortunate conditions of the marginalized and presents their narratives. In view of this, some scholars tend to see postcolonialism as literature of the center-margin.

Postcolonial theory can also be seen as a protest against exploitation, racialism and enslavement. Considering this, Washburn in Ashma (29) believes that the critical nature of postcolonial theory brings about the disturbance of western thought, and thus giving room to the marginalized people to make their voices heard and find alternative to the dominant voices. Bhabha states that postcolonial criticisms “bear witness to the unequal and universal forces of cultural representation” that are involved in a constant competition for political and economic control in the contemporary world (171). To Young (7), the language of postcolonial theory is uncompromising, because it “threatens privileges and powers” by rejecting and challenging the superiority of some cultures over others. In fact, postcolonial theory protests against ethnocentrism. “It is the oppositionality which colonialism brings into being” (Ashcroft et al, 117). Gandhi in Asma refers to postcolonial theory as a theory that defends “marginalized other” living within “repressive structures” of domination (28). Ashcroft (11) believes that postcolonial literary discourse is a response to mono-centrism of the ‘center’ that serves to relegate the colonized to the ‘margin’. By extension, postcolonial writers opine that western powers should not arrogate the powers to define the world to themselves only. This can be seen from the perspective of Ngugi when he says that they (post colonialists) insist that the ‘center’ can be shifted ideologically through imagination and that this shifting can recreate history. This is what he implies below:

...there could never be only one center from which to view the world but that different people in the world had their culture and environment as the center. The relevant question was therefore one of how one center is related to other centers (9).

In view of the above, Mukherjee submits that... “postcolonial literature is presumably free of such centralist undertones: it suggests decentering, plurality, hybridity, a dismantling of authority...” (6). However, Loomba (12) views postcolonialism as “...contestation of colonial domination and the legacies of colonialism”. All these show that the relegating and discriminatory practices by the center (Western powers) over the margin (Eastern periphery) no doubt endanger equal humanity, as well as dignity of man globally. This explains why the protest by the postcolonialists (as one of the main targets of postcolonialism) is to establish equality and justice among the peoples of the world.

Again, postcolonial theory is there to re-write the history of the marginalized thereby serving as a meta narrative instrument to them. It is unmistakable that the power and discursive tools in the hands of the western powers (center) are used to control and take an undue advantage over the eastern periphery (margin) as seen in the novels of Conrad called *Heart of Darkness* (1899) and *Mister Johnson* by Cary. The two novels portray Africa for instance as a dark continent inhabited by barbarian. The story is from one perspective, and leads many to default assumptions and conclusions about Africa until Achebe and other post colonialists through *Things Fall Apart* and others re-write the African story. They adopt a dialectic method to prove that the ragged tales from the novels of Conrad and Cary are lies from the pit of hell. So, in their academic tasks, they revisit and remember all the experiences and truths twisted by the western powers through interrogation of the colonial past with a view to straightening them up. This is why Young (2003) believes that one of the aims of postcolonialism is “to demand equality and well-being for all human beings on earth”. In fact, its priority is to administer equality and justice to the peoples of the world. This it does by focusing on the oppression and coercive domination that operate in the contemporary world (Young,11). What is more, postcolonial theory allows people emerging from socio-political and economic domination to reclaim their sovereignty; it gives them a negotiating space for equity (Kenyatta 1968:36; Bhabha, 1994; Spivak, 1988;197-221; Ashcroft et al, 1989, 1995; Sugirtharajah, 1996:1-5, Dube, 1996; Segovia, 2000:11-34; Punt 2001 & 2005).

From the foregoing, we have seen that the importance of change has eventually set a stage for postcolonial theory to be a constant and continuing struggle in the existence of human kind. The theory is built around otherness concept. The aim is to restore the history, respect, acceptability, cultural contributions and global value of the subalterns/Eastern periphery) whose experiences have been placed within a world view that provided no way to include the “other” except through binary opposition. Apart from this, however, postcolonial theory is apt in this research because besides engaging center-margin realities which are the focus of the study, it also aligns with global citizenship in championing fairness, equality and social justice as panacea for global progress beyond the hegemonic notion of some countries today being ‘deciders’ to others socially, economically, politically and culturally.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Centre-margin are diametrically opposed terms. They are strongly visible during the colonial period, and still being felt till today (if looked at the world with gimlet eyes). They refer to relationship among countries of the world then (and even now).

This relationship is hierarchical in nature. Everything about it revolves around power. Power then (and now, even) is being exercised by the civilized and so-called developed countries. They are the centre. Every other countries outside the centre are at the margin or periphery. The centre is superior, while the margin or periphery is inferior. In view of this, Alfonso de Toro (1) describes the centre as the producer of power. He adds that whoever has power imposes the discourse. This is probably why Walker (2) refers to the margin(al) as that which is oppressed and dominated by the master discourse. Walker further submits that margin(al) or periphery is that which is silenced and limited by power structure hegemony. So, you can see that this asymmetrical structure is not just. In fact, it is a clear indication that the world cannot progress, or be made more peaceful, sustainable and fairer under center-margin realities.

From these above, it is pertinent and suffice to surmise that center is really the decider. They are the hand that holds the pencil. In fact, Viljoen while talking about the status of the margin(alized) states that to be marginalized is to be ‘looked down upon’, ‘considered unimportant’, ‘ignored’, ‘negligible’, or ‘pushed from the center’ (12). Therefore, they can be likened to the void or vacant point separating the writing or print on the page. In view of this, Crapainzno in his view on the power of center under deconstruction criticism in literature says that ‘centering’ can operate both precursively and recursively. This implies that the center is positioned to condition and determine the meaning of that which precedes and equally what comes after the center. By extension, Jacques Derrida, the father of deconstructive criticism describes the ‘center’ as a ‘point of presence, a fixed origin’ (278). This establishes center as the nucleus. On the other hand, Derrida refers to margin as ‘supplementary’ and says that it is binary opposition to the term, ‘center’. The idea of supplementary is to supplement. Therefore, it is not a major but a minor part of something. That is the lot of the margin(al) or periphery in the world then, and even today.

Away from this, center-margin as a binary opposition is a product of western metaphysics called dualist ideology according to Derrida. It is traced from Plato to Rousseau. The ideology has a hierarchical status.

The binary opposition is defined as a pair of related terms or concepts that are opposite in meaning (Al-bayyati and Al-atiyyah, 1). It is a notion in structuralism which echoes in many fields of endeavour such as linguistics, sociology and anthropology, psychology, among others. It operates in geometrical irregularity. However, Lotman in his analogy with the structure and functioning of semiosphere in biology establishes that semiosphere, “a universe of the mind” is constructed on only two basic principles – binarism (dualist) and asymmetry. He believes that asymmetry is obviously apt in the relationship between center and periphery (margin). According to him, the center is formed by the natural language of a particular culture as the organising core (Lotman, 123-128). He states further that semiosphere determines what counts as a deed, what exists. This explains why what is beyond the boundary of the semiosphere is unknown, and regarded as evil, demonized. Therefore, in the center, the norms and life are more or less coincide, but at the periphery, the norms contradict the semiotic reality underlying it (Lotman:129).

Apart from these above, *self* and *other* are other forms of binary opposition from which center-margin can further be construed. The terms are developed by Frantz Fanon in his writing where the other is “not me”, he is the other (Afaf, 1). Otherness, othering and alterity are terms used interchangeably with other. Othering is the designation of a person as a subaltern native, as someone who belongs to the socially subordinate category of the *other*. then, otherness is the result of a discursive process by which a dominant in-group (“us”, the self) constructs one or many dominated out-groups (“them”, other) by stigmatizing a difference, real or imagined presented as a negation of identity and thus a motive for potential discrimination (Staszak, 2). The *self* in the definition thereof is special, privileged, and dominant. The *other* on the other hand is unfortunate, disregarded and subjugated. Owing to this, Staszak (1) describes the *other* as member of a dominated out-group, whose identity is considered lacking and who may be subject to discrimination by the in-group. He states further that only the dominant group is in a position to impose the value of its particularity (its identity) and to devalue the particularity of others (their otherness) while imposing corresponding discriminatory measures (2). Therefore, the case of *self* and *other* shows how the former exercises control over the latter. In this regard, Asaf maintains that *self* and *other* represent colonizer and the colonized, politically,

socially and culturally. He goes on to define *other* as lacking identity, property, purity, literality (2). He adds that other is foreign (exotic), the one who does not belong to a group, does not speak a given language, does not have the same customs; he is the unfamiliar, uncanny, unauthorized, inappropriate, and the improper.

So, you can see that it is patently obvious that the *other* is akin to the margin(alized) relegated to the background and considered a subnormal human being. *Self* on the other hand is equated with the center associated with power, hegemony, domination and a place of hierarchy. In the ordinary sense of it, center stands for people or things that ‘matter’, while margin represents those that do not ‘matter’. They are excluded, and being excluded from the center leads to loss of self-esteem and dignity and a negative self-perception (Seshadri-Cooks, 50). He (Seshadri-Cook) emphasizes that marginal people lack recognition and respect and believes that it is the task of multiculturalism and decolonization to restore to them their sense of being themselves – to return them to their authentic selves and to open avenues of self-fulfillment and self-realisation to them. It is in a bid to rid the world of this discrimination, racialism, social marginalization, injustice, exclusion, inequality and xenophobia embedded in center-margin realities that ignites the quest for global citizenship.

On the other, global citizenship is not new-fashioned, or like nothing on earth before now. In the ancient Greece, for instance, Socrates and Diogenes declare themselves as citizens of the world. This assertion is to fight the limited civic ideal of the polis, which supports locally exclusive ties to one’s immediate political community. By this, what Socrates wants is a world citizenship that engenders a sense of affinity with all humanity and the universe, too. In view of this, Osiadacz (45) states that global citizenship is membership in a community made up of all the people in the world. This shows that global citizenship is internationalized, not parochial. It is multicentric, not ethnocentric. It bursts borders and barriers. No wonder UN sees it (global citizenship) as a new and vital force, which operates beyond the traditional sphere of power (The Melton Foundation, 3).

However, global citizenship begins to pan out from the angle of human rights. The colonial domination which stripped people of everything about their rights, dignity and humanity does not bode well for global sanity, affinity and stability. As a result, the pressure to find solutions over the years culminates in the formation of United Nations. Considering this, Leung and Lee refer to global citizenship as “recognizing rights and status of different subgroups, divided also by gender, ethnic, linguistic and religious lines” (26). Therefore, global citizenship can be tracked down to people’s consciousness and confidence in social justice and respect for human rights (Burgess, Reimer-Kirkham & Astle, 2014; Gibson, Rimmington & Landwehr-Brown, 2008; Martin, Smolen, Oswald & Milan, 2012; Osler & Starkey, 2003, Pallas, 2012). In line with this, Gibson et al state that global citizenship entails responsibilities that “require an attitude of respect for the rights of others and actions that are just for all” (17). This is probably why Karlberg (2008) notes that global citizenship can play a significant role in creating a more peaceful and just society. It is the demonstration of concern for the rights and welfare of others (Ladson-Billings, 3). So, in all these, it is apparently discernible that global citizenship has a moral imperative for an egalitarian society. It deracinates inequalities and injustice as well as discrimination. This is the reason it should be a new world order, a mantra capable of putting the kibosh on racial identities, social marginalization and oppression. It is an acceptance of global principles such as respect for cultural differences, human rights, social justice, empathy for others, as well as interdependence of life.

From this above, one can see that part of a focal point for global citizenship is acknowledgement and accommodation of multiculturalism (Clifford & Montgomery, 2014; Hendershot & Sperandio, 2009; Karlberg, 2008; Nussbaum, 1997; Snider, Reysen & Katzarska-Miller, 2013). In fact, Nussbaum believes that “awareness of cultural difference is essential in order to promote the respect for another that is the essential underpinning for dialogue” (68). This implies that every culture is important. There is no room for superiority and domination of any belief system, but recognition of them. This is why Urry describes global cosmopolitans as individuals who develop, often through international travel, “an ideology of openness towards certain *other* cultures, peoples and environments” (73). Moreover, the ex-Chilean President and former Executive Director of UN Women on global citizenship Michelle Bachalett, in a comprehensive term, submits that

“global citizens act without limits or geographical distinctions and they do so outside the traditional spheres of power. Their goal is to defend human dignity and to promote social accountability and recognition of diversity occupy pride of place in word and deed, reflecting the multiplicity of actors involved in the actions of global citizenship.”

Apart from this, there is also interdependence of life. Therefore, global citizenship is the recognition of interconnectedness and shared bonds among human beings, and within the environment (Ikeda, 2010; Khoo, 2011; Naddings, 2005; Obelleiro, 2012; Pallas, 2012; Sperandio, Grudzinski-Hall & Stewart Gabino, 2010). Following this, Bokova stresses that “an accomplished human being is one who recognizes coexistence and equality with all others, however far away, and who strives to find a way to live with them” (5). In addition, Nussbaum (1997) emphasizes this when he says that an essential criterion for the cultivation of one’s humanity is to appreciate that “human beings (are) bound to all other human beings by ties of recognition and concern.” In this regard, UNICEF sees global citizenship as persons who understand interconnectedness, values and respect diversity, take action in meaningful ways, and have the ability to challenge injustice. All these are captured in what Ikeda (112) refers to as the pillars of global citizenship and which include;

- the wisdom to perceive the interconnectedness of life and living
- the courage not to fear or deny difference, but to respect and strive to understand people of different cultures and to grow from encounters with them.
- the compassion to maintain an imaginative empathy that reaches beyond one’s immediate surroundings and extends to those suffering in distance places.

From the foregoing, we have seen that center-margin can be traced through different permutations. It is also unmistakable that center-margin as a binary opposition cannot keep the world in serried ranks. It creates problems of exclusion and oppression socially, politically, economically and culturally. What is more, superiority and inferiority are two factors inherent in center-margin. This has dealt a deadly blow to humanity by jeopardizing global interdependence and diversity. Owing to this, Kaps and Komlosy (237) submit that center-margin are no longer a model for analyzing the globalised present. This means that the ghost of ethnocentric bias and boundaries hovering in the world today must collapse and be rubbed out of mind for the globe to progress and prosper, hence, the quest for global citizenship. Global citizenship, no doubt, champions a new human spirit in today’s world as seen here so far. In fact, it makes a case for equality and social justice, while upholding the dignity of man through acceptance and accommodation of multicentric principles. It is also based on the understanding

or recognition of *self* in relation to *others*. Mittleton (2004) agrees with this when he says that globalised citizenship has to be de-centred, acknowledging perspectives of the other. Therefore, it is part of the thrust of this paper that the whole world should be seen as a family unit. The idea of seeing one as a relative and the other, a stranger will never stand the globe in good stead.

ANALYSIS

Center-margin relationship is built on superior-inferior binary structure. It assigns power to the center over the margin. This power is derived from language. The words that form this language led to knowledge, which provokes question, and generates change” (Ashcroft, 85). The power is used by the center to dominate the margin through narratives. In line with this, Toro (2) states that whoever has power imposes the discourse. The western world (center) employs this power in the discourse through colonialism to establish Eurocentrism across the globe. This Eurocentric perspective is really a narrative about ‘others’ (margin) and their situations. In fact, the European countries define the rest of humanity from ethnocentric standpoint. In her TED Talk, entitled, *The Danger of a Single Story*, Adichie refers to this ethnocentrism as a single story with dangers in it. She says that a single story is the one narrative that is simple, but stereotyped, and which consigns a complex group of people to a narrow set of attributes and experiences.

Adichie presents two incidents that underscore the power of stories and the danger of a single story. The first is her exposure to European literature. The perspective of this literature according to her forecloses the lifestyle of others (margin) while foregrounding the western (center) one. As the only narrative open to her then, she takes the literature as a blue print until she accesses African literature from Achebe and Laye. This, then, disabuses her of earlier belief in European narratives about others.

The second incident is what Adichie hears about their housekeeper from her parents. They tell her that everything about their housekeeper is beggarly. She lives with this picture until their visit to their housekeeper’s parents one day. What she discovers about the poor keeper does not tally with the narrative of her parents to her.

With these incidents, she then disapproves strongly of the use of one perspective of a story to make a conclusion about things, people and situations. She submits that such is not only dangerous but also leads to ignorance and default understanding. Apart from this, Adichie highlights the dangers inherent in a single story or perspective. The first is that it robs people of their dignity. The second is that it emphasizes what divides a people instead of what unites them (TED Talk: 1-3). That is why she says that a story can make or mar our entire existence. She however concludes that narratives should be approached from different perspectives, and by so doing, instead of relegating others, it can empower and humanize them (TED Talk: 6).

Center-margin structure right from the colonial time up to this present moment in the world does not support this Adichie’s position(s) in her TED Talk. It supports hegemony, rather. Hegemony as a postcolonial term is dominance over others. This dominance or superiority over others has been the focus of postcolonial theory. Therefore, Nair (4) is right when he says that postcolonialism interrogates a world order dominated by major state actors and their domineering interests and ways of looking at the world. Considering this, Adichie as a postcolonial writer does not only interrogate but also condemn domineering single story of Africans being described as “beasts who have no houses, ... people without hearts, having their

mouth and eyes in their breasts” (TED Talk: 2-3). This is dehumanizing. It does not give room for acknowledging the perspectives of the other. These discriminatory and denigrating attitudes suffered (and still being suffered) by Africans and others in the hands of their European counterpart then (and even today) cannot bring about a new order in the globe. It is rather the spirit of recognizing self in relation to others which global citizenship champions. This global citizenship emphasizes equal respect and concern for community of humankind. In fact, it preaches a new humanism. In other words, it reminds everybody that as human beings, we are bound to all others by ties of recognition and concern (Nussbaum, 1979), not otherwise. That is why postcolonial theory, according to Young (7) ... rejects and challenges the superiority of some cultures (center) over others (margin) for there to be an order. It advocates recognition of our equal humanity which Adichie says it is difficult in the face of a single story (TED Talk, 4).

On the other hand, Kipling in his poem, “We and They” presents a nuclear family unit, with medicine, diet and religion to paint more pictures of dangers of a single story, which according to Adichie, is always incomplete, stereotyped, and emphasizes how the people of the world are different rather than how they are similar (TED Talk, 4). The thrust of this poem is worthy of attention, especially, in the world today where there is a palpable prejudice against some persons as seen happening to some players in football game in Europe and Asia, for instance. The sinews of traction this prejudice gains in those continents stems from the denigrating stance of the fans. This is an exotic feeling of superiority simmering in them. It establishes the asymmetrical epistemology of western rationality. Therefore, if no conscious efforts to stem the tide of this racial prejudice chipping away at the humanity’s umbilical cord by the world leaders, not minding how belated, it will become chronic and hydra-headed with time.

However, the Kipling’s poem above has ABABCD CD rhyming pattern, with a total of five stanzas. The first stanza opens thus:

Father and mother and me,
Sister and Auntie say
All the people like us are We,
And everyone else is they.
And they live over the sea,
While We live over the way,
But would you believe it? They look upon We.
As only a sort of They!

The use of the subjective pronouns, “We” and “They” denotes that the poet is talking about two different groups of people in the poem, with different identities and cultures. Moreover, the “We” group of which the poet belongs is given superior attributes over the “They” group seen as inferior. The poet wonders why the “They” group cannot accept their superiority over them in the last line. Meanwhile, the fact of the “They” living over the sea and “We” over the way underlines two different geographical locations of the two groups.

Then, in stanzas two and three of the poem, the poet presents eating habits of the two groups, their hunting patterns and dressing. While the “We” group use modern system like fork, guns and “dress up to the ears” (Stanza 3, lines 1-4), the “They” group do the opposite, hence, look ignorant and disgusting to the “We”. The contrasting lifestyles of the two groups continue in stanza four, where the poet claims that the “We” as modern blueprint use trained doctors, pay them and at the same time, worship God, unlike the “They” who are the binary opposition and who use “wizards’ and witchcrafts and are ‘heathen’” (Stanza 4, lines 5 and 6).

In the concluding stanza, the poet states thus:

All good people agree,
And all good people say,
All nice people, like us, are We
And everyone else is They:

In the lines above, the poet makes it clear that the “We” are “good” and “nice” people, whereas the “They” are not. Kipling in this poem proves that Bhabha is right when saying that the colonial ideology rests upon “Manichaeic structures” that divide the world into dichotomous identity categories of the civil and the barbaric, the ‘us’ and the ‘them’. Considering this, Said submits that postcolonialism theory is hinged on Western powers (center) manipulating the image of the Eastern subalterns (margin/periphery) by presenting them as the primitive, uncivilized “other” such that they create the contrast to the advanced and civilized West (40) as seen in the ‘We’ and ‘They’ groups in the poem. All these x-rayed West-East phenomenon and relationship.

So, from the foregoing, the poem is built around binary opposition of good and evil, self and other, among other divisive terms. This does not show fairness but dominance, segregation and prejudice. Said in view of this states in *orientalism* that in Western literature, the East is exoticised, mystified, and represented as savage and seductive, carrying all the dark traits of humanity, such as decadence, cruelty and sexual desires, as opposed to the West being portrayed as civilized, rational and reasonable (Said, 1-4, Barry, 192). Ascroft (19) supports both Said and Barry above by saying that in the early representations of imperialism, western values are often contrasted against the hostile environments in the colonies. Marrouchi calls it “an encounter between the civilized and the wild” (29), whereas Sartre (quoted in Said’s *Culture and Imperialism*, 237) refers to it as “racist humanism, since the European has only been able to become a man through creating slaves and monsters.”

Therefore, both Adichie’s TED Talk and the poem by Kipling “We and They” are all rooted in the concept of “other” which is derived from a binary classification between ‘the others’ and ‘our own’ (Civila et al, 2020). This, in other words, is created from the common idea of ‘We’ against the ‘other’ groups. Civila et al (2020) in *Jilan* (2022) in view of this submits that this group could be expressed as ‘the one who does not do as I do, the one whose body – colour, size, facial features – is not like mine. The poem emphasizes superior-inferior binarism. Moreover, it submits that irrespective of differences in the world, there should be respect for other people and cultures. John Hume sums it up when he says that difference is of the essence of humanity. Though it is an accident of birth, it should therefore never be the source of hatred and conflict as seen in the globe today. The solution to the world as one family unit and our differences lies in respect for diversity. This is one of the fundamental foci of global citizenship.

DISCUSSION

From the analysis so far, it is obvious that the world is yet to rise from the ashes of European scrambles that polarize humanity into center-margin structure. The center is still a place of knowledge and power, whereas the margin is the binary opposition. If not, why would Adichie's roommates be surprised that she could speak English, having come from the marginalized continent of Africa? Why would the image of Africa and Africans in Western literature be that of beautiful landscapes, exotic animals, people who fight senseless wars, live in poverty and die of AIDS? Why would Adichie's Professor not believe that Adichie's characters in her story set in Lagos, Nigeria, were Africans because they were learned? Why should "We" group feel that they are superior, while the "They" group are inferior in Kipling's poem? They are all evidence of discrimination, domination, marginalization, oppression, racialism and inequality.

Therefore, from the above, center-margin cannot guarantee true humanism that the world is yearning for at the moment. What is more, it is not even the mot juste for tolerance, recognition and respect for others because of superior-inferior dyad inherent in it. This explains why the paper urges the world leaders to gird up their loins and make the quest for global citizenship both suras and canticles on their lips and actions. With this, the world will definitely blue-pencil the binary dichotomy between self and other which has been the world's greatest challenge in the history of mankind.

RECOMMENDATION

The paper recommends that world leaders should strive to achieve recognition of coexistence and equality of peoples of the world through active international policies and programmes. When this is done, there is no doubt that the Sanskrit: "Vasudhaiva Kutumbakana", which means "the world constitutes but one family" found in Maha Upanishad in India around 500CE will be realized in no uncertain terms. This is the aim of being a global citizen.

CONCLUSION

The world today is confronted with myriads of challenges. These challenges which include war, slavery, diaspora, domination, gender, difference and racism, marginalization, migration, oppression and suppression are all attributed to the menace of center-margin as seen in both the analysis and the discussion. The center-margin relationship is based on superior-inferior binary structure. From time immemorial up to the moment, this structure has not been able to heal the world of its woes, hence, the need to preach and push for an alternative arrangement. The alternative arrangement that will ensure restoration of dignity of all human kind through recognition of multicentric principles. This paper, therefore, submits that this arrangement is global citizenship. It will ensure that a peaceful, sustainable and just world is built both now and beyond.

Works Cited

- 1) Afaf, A. H. Post colonialism literature, the concept of self and the other in Coetzee's *Waiting for the barbarians: An Analytical Approach*. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*. 2014. 95-105.
- 2) Al-Bayatti, H. Alattiyah, T. Postcolonial Binary Oppositions in Spivak's "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *Journal of Historical Studies*, 1(2), 1-42, 2016.
- 3) Alessio, S. Globalization and Citizenship Education: Learning from the European Debate and Practices. *Journal of Universities and International development Cooperation (JUNCO)* <http://www.ojs.unito.it/index.php/junco/issue,2020>.
- 4) Alfonso, de T. *Borges/Derrida/Foucault:Pharmakeus/Heterotopia or beyond literature: Writings,phantoms, Simulacra, Masks, the carnival and...AtIon/TIon/Ykva/Uqbar,Hlaer, Jangr,Hron(n)/Hronir, Ur, and Other Figures. Alfonso & Fernando de Toro(eds) 1990. 129-153.*
- 5) Andrzejewski, J. & Alessio, J. *Education for global citizenship and social responsibility. Progressive Perspectives*, 1(2), 2-17. 1999.
- 6) Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths & Helen, Tiffin (eds) *Key Concepts in Postcolonial Studies*. London & New York: Routledge, 2004.
- 7) Ashcroft, B. Griffiths, G. & Tiffin, H. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Postcolonial Literatures*. London, Routledge.1989.
- 8) Ashcroft, B. Griffiths, G. & Tiffin, H. *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, London, Routledge, 1995.
- 9) Barry, P. *The beginning theory: An introduction to literary and cultural theory* (3rd ed). Manchester Manchester University Press, 2009.
- 10) Bhabha, H.K. *The Location of Culture*, London, Routledge. 1994.
- 11) Bhabha, H.K. "Postcolonial Criticism"Ed. Bryden, Vol 1, 105-133.
- 12) Bokova, I. A new humanism for the 21st century. Adapted from an address delivered in Milan (Italy) on October 7, 2010. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001897/189775e.pdf>.
- 13) Burgess, C. A., Reiner-Kirham, S. & Astle, B. Motivation and International Clinical Placements: Shifting nursing students to a global citizenship perspective. *International Journal of Nursing Education Scholarship*, 2014, 11:1, 1-8.
- 14) Cabral A. *Revolution in Guinea. An African People's Struggle*. London, Stage 1 1969.
- 15) Civilia, S. Romero-Rodriquez, L.M. & Aquaded, L. Otherness as a form of intersubjective social exclusion: conceptual discussion from the current communicative scenario. *Journal of Information, communication and Ethics in Society*, 2020.
- 16) Clifford, V. & Montgomery, C. Challenging Conceptions of Western Higher Education and Promoting Graduates as Global Citizens. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 68:1, 28-45, 2014.

- 17) Deodato, J. Deconstructing the Library with Jacques Derrida: Creating Space for the “Other” in bibliographic description and classification, Rutgers. The State University of New Jersey, Libraries Unlimited, 2010, pp4-5.
- 18) Derrida Jacques, *Of Grammatology*, Baltimore. Johns Hopkins University Press 1976.
- 19) Dube, W. M. Reading of Semoya: Bostwana Women’s Interpretations of Matthew 15: 21-28. *Semeia* 73, 111-129. 1996.
- 20) Edward, S. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage, 1994.
- 21) Fanon, F. National Culture, in Ashcroft, et al, 1995: 457-460.
- 22) Fanon, F. *The wretched of the earth*. Tr by C. Farrington. London. macGibbon. 1965 (1952).
- 23) Gavena, J. Global citizen Action: Lessons and Challenges. In M. Edwards and J. Gavena (eds). *Global citizen action*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2001, pp 275-287.
- 24) *Gandhi, L. Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. New York, Columbia UP. 1998.
- 25) Gibson, K. L. Rimmington, G. M. & Landwehr-Brown, M. Developing Global Awareness and Responsible World Citizenship with Global Learning. *Roeper Review*, 30, 11-23, 2008.
- 26) Grace, D. *Relocating Consciousness: Diasporic Writers and the Dynamics of Literacy Experience*. Amsterdam, New York Rodopi, 2007.
- 27) Hans Schattle, *Global Citizenship in Theory and Practice*, Yosei University, 2007, p 10.
- 28) Hendershot, K. & Sperandio, J. Study Abroad and Development of Global Citizenship Identity and Cosmopolitan Ideals in Undergraduates. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 12:1, 45-55, 2009.
- 29) Hooks, Bell. “Choosing the Margin as a Space of Radical Openness”. *Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics*. Boston: South End 1990, pp 145-153.
- 30) Ikeda, D. *Soka Education: For the Happiness of the Individual*. Santa Monica, CA: Middleway Pass, 2010.
- 31) Kaps, W. & Komlosy, A. “Centres and Peripheries Revisited: Polycentric connections or entangled Hierarchies?” *Review* 36 (3-4): 237-264 (Google scholar) 2013.
- 32) Karlberg, M. Discourse, Identity and Global Citizenship. *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice*, 20:3, 310-320, 2008.
- 33) Kenyatta, J. *Suffering Without Bitterness*, Nairobi, EAGH, 1968.
- 34) Khoo, S. Ethical Globalization or Priviledged Internationalization? Exploring Global Citizenship and Internationalization in Irish and Canadian Universities. *Globalization, Societies and Education*, 9:3,4,2011, pp337-353.
- 35) Ladson-Billings, G. Differing Concepts of Citizenship: Schools and Communities as Sites of Civic Development. In N. Noddings (ed) *Educating Citizens for Global Awareness*. New York, New Teachers. Colleges Press, 2005, pp 69-80.

- 36) Ladson-Billings, G. Differing concepts of Citizenship: Schools and Communities as sites of civic development. In N. Noddings (Ed.) *Educating citizens for global awareness*. New York, New Teachers College Press, 2005, pp 69-80.
- 37) Leung, S.W. and Lee, O. W. National identity at a crossroads: The Struggle between culture, language and politics in Hong Kong. In G. Alfred M., Byran and M. Fleming (es) *Education for intercultural Citizenship, concepts and Comparisons*, Cleredon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2006, pp 23-46.
- 38) Leung, S. W. & Lee, O. W. National identity at a cross roads: the struggle between culture, language and politics in Hong Kong. In G. Afred M. Byram and M. Fleming (eds), *education for Intercultural Citizenship, concepts and comparisons*, Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2006, pp. 23-46.
- 39) Lingard, B. & Rizvi, F. *Globalizing Educational Policy*. Florence, KY, USA, Routledge, 2010.
- 40) Loomba, A. *colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London. Routledge, 1998.
- 41) Lotman, J. *Universe of the Mind; A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. Shukman, Ann (trans), London New York: Tamris, 1990.
- 42) MacGill, V. Three Scales of Acephalous Orgnaisation. *Systems Journal, Univerisy of the Sunshine Coast, Australia*, 2016, pp 1-9.
- 43) Martin L. A. Smolen, L.A Orswald, R.A. & Milan, J. L. Preparing Students for Global Citizenship in the Twenty-First Century: Integrating Social Justice through Global Literature. *The Social Studies*, 103:4, 2012, 158-164.
- 44) Masonri, F. "The Global Citizenship Project: From Words to Action", Published by UNESCO, Paris.
- 45) McCulloch. J. *In the Twilight of Revolution: The Political Theory of Amikar Cabral*. London. Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983.
- 46) McIntosh, P. Gender perspectives on educating for global citizenship. In N. Noddings (ed.), *Educating Citizens for global awareness*. New York, Teachers College Press, 2005, pp. 22-39.
- 47) Michelle, B. *Global Citizenship: A New Vital Force; Address on the 71st Session of the United Nations General Assembly, 21st September, 2016*.
- 48) Mittelman, J. What is Critical Globalization Studies? *International Studies Perspectives*, 5 (3): 219-223. Oxfam. *Education for global citizenship. A guide for schools*, London, Oxfam GB, 2006.
- 49) Nair, S. *Introducing Post colonialism in International Relations theory*. E.-International relations. <https://www.e-ir.info/2017/12/08/postcolonialism-in-international-relations.theory>.
- 50) NgugiWa Thiong' O. (1993). *Moving the Centre: The Struggle for Cultural Freedoms*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann (Google Scholar) 1993.
- 51) Nkrumah, K. *Towards Colonial freedom*. London. Panaf, 1975.
- 52) Nussbaum, M. C. *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*. Cambridge, Masschusetts, Harvard university Press, 1997.

- 53) Nussbaum, M. C. Education for Citizenship in an Era of Global Connection. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 21,2002, 289-303.
- 54) Nyerere, K.J. *Ujamaa: Essays on Socialism*. Dar es Salaam: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- 55) Obelleiro, G. A Moral Cosmopolitan Perspective on Language Education: Critical Inquiry in *Language Studies*, 9:1-2, 35-59, 2012.
- 56) Osiadacz, E. global Citizenship. *Black Education Journal*, 27(2) 2018.
- 57) Osler, A. & Starkey, H. Learning for Cosmopolitan citizenship: theoretical debates and young people's experiences. *Education Review*, 55:3, 243-254.
- 58) Osterhammel, J. *Kolonialismus: Geshichu, Formen, Folgen* (2nd ed), Murich, 1997.
- 59) Osundare, Niyi. "African Literature and the crisis of Post-StructuralistTheorising", *Thread in the Loom: Essays on African Literature and Culture*. Trenton: Africa World Press, Inc., 2002. Pp 39-55 Print.
- 60) Pallas, C. I. *Identity, Individualism and Activism Beyond the State: Impacts of Global Citizenship*, *Global Society*, 26:2, 169-189, 2012.
- 61) Punt, J. Postcolonial biblical criticism in south Africa: Some mind and road mapping. *Scriptura* 37(1) 58-85, 2003.
- 62) Punt, J. The New Testament, theology and imperialism: Some postcolonial remarks on beyond New Testament theology. *Neotestmanetica* 35 (91 &2) 129-145, 2001.
- 63) Reysen, S. & Katzarska-Miller, I. A Model of Global Citizenship: Antecedents and Outcomes. *International Journal of Psychology*, 48:5, 2013,858-870.
- 64) Rizvi, F. & Lingard, B. Globalization and education: Complexities and contingencies. *Education Theory*, 50(4), 409-426
- 65) Rizvi, F. Global Mobility. In *Globalisation and the study of Education*. Popkewitz, T. &Rizvi, F. (Eds). 2009.
- 66) Reysen, S. & Katzarska-Miller, I. Student Pathways to Global Citizenship. In c. Boyle (ed.), *Student Learning: Improving Practice*, Hamppauge, New York: Nova science Publishers, Inc. 2013.
- 67) Roads, R. & Szelinyi, K. *Global Citizenship and the University: Advancing Social Life and relations in an Interdependent world*, Palo ALTO, CA, USA, Stanford University Press.
- 68) Rukundwa, Lazare and AndriesGvan, Aarde The formation of Postcolonial Theory. <https://www.researchgate.net>4568>. Retrieved in 2009.
- 69) Schattle, H. *The Practice of Global Citizenship*. Plymouth, UK, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc, 2008.
- 70) Schattle, H. *The practices of global citizenship*. Lanham, M.D: Rowman& Little Field, 1998.
- 71) Segovia, F. f. *Interpreting beyond borders*. Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

- 72) Seshadri-Cooks, K. At the Margins of Postcolonial Studies, *Ariel: A Review of International English Literature* 26, July 3:47-71, 1995.
- 73) Smith, D.G. The farthest west is but the farthest east: the long way of oriental/occidental engagements. In C. Eppert, & H. Wang (Eds.), *Cross cultural studies in curriculum: eastern thought, educational insights*. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- 74) Snider, J. S. Reyen, S. & Katzarka-Miller, I. How We Frame the Message of Globalization Matters. *Journal of applied social Psychology*, 43, 1599-1607, 2013.
- 75) Soyinka, W. *Of Power, Doctrine and Freedom*. Ibadan: Bookcraft, 2006, p. 3, Print.
- 76) Sperandio, J. Grudzinski-Hall, M. & Stewart-Gambino, H. Developing an Undergraduate Global Citizenship Program: Challenges of Definition and Assessment. *International Journal of Teaching Learning in Higher Education* 22:1, 12-22, 2010.
- 77) Spivak, G. *In other worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*. London. Routledge, 1988.
- 78) Spivak, Gayatri, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" Ed. Bryden, Vol IV, 1427-1618.
- 79) Staszak, J.F. Other/Otherness, Elsevier, Public dans *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*, 2008 pp 1-7.
- 80) Sugritharajayh, S. R. A brief memorandum on postcolonial and biblical studies. *JSNT* 73, 3-5, 1999.
- 81) TeachUNICEF. Global Citizenship: <http://teachunicef.org/explore/topic/global-citizenship>. 2015
- 82) Tem, E. N. & Collins, A. N. The center-margin Dialectics in the Poetry of Emmanuel Eru ooh and Bill F.Ndi. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, December 2019, vol. 6, No 4, pp 1-35.
- 83) Urry, J. 'Globalisation and Citizenship'. University Landcaster, Lancaster, LA14YN, UK at <http://www.comp.canacs.ac.uk/sociology/ppapers/urry-globalization-and-citizenship.pdf>.
- 84) Viljoen, H. *Marginalia on Marginality*. Center for the Study of Southern African Literature and Languages. *Journal Alternation*, Vol. 5, Issue 2 ,1998, pp10-22.
- 85) Walker, J. S. When Texts Collide: The Re-Visionist Power of the Margin. *Colby Quarterly*, Volume 35, No 1, March 1999. Pp 35-48. <https://digitalcommons.colby.edu/cq>.
- 86) Washbum, D. "Post colonialism: trying to regain Ethnic Individuality" 98.5 *English* 27, Brown University. Autumn 1997. Postcolonial discourse: theories of colonialism and Post colonialism.
- 87) www.meltonoundation.org.
- 88) Young, R. J. C. *Postcolonial: An Historical Introduction*. London. Blackwell, 2001.
- 89) Young, Robert, J. C. *Postcolonialism: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003, Print.