RELIGION IN TANZANIA: A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF CHRISTIAN-MUSLIM DEBATES AND POWER STRUCTURES

Josephat Gabriel Mwakatundu[1] and Sophia Amina Ndalichako[2]

Article Info

Abstract

This paper explores the linguistic dimensions of the Christian-Muslim debates in Tanzania to assess whether the country's lack of unity can be attributed to the Ujamaa ideology. The political ideology of Ujamaa sought to consolidate a non-discriminatory and secular state by separating religion from government and allowing citizens to uphold their religious affiliations. Nonetheless, deep-seated suspicions persisted between Christians and Muslims, prompting an investigation of two separate debate meetings, using Conversation Analysis and Lacan's Divided Subject. The analysis showed that rather than being a friendly conversation, the dialogue had a competitive atmosphere, with parties competing for control of discourse resources, pointing to power struggles and animosity. Therefore, this paper concludes that Tanzania's divided-subjectness indicates that unification is a distant goal despite Ujamaa's objectives. This study contributes to the discussions of religious pluralism in Tanzania, as well as the historical context of Christian-Muslim relationships.

[1] University of Dar es Salaam
[2] University of Dar es Salaam

Introduction

This paper embarks on an examination of whether interreligious proximity or lack of it in Tanzania could be said to be a product of ideology. This paper opted for Ujamaa as an ideology since upon promotion of ethical and accountable leadership Nyerere declared Tanzania a secular state. This came in the wake of suspicion between Christians and Muslims. Did Ujamaa succeed in sustaining a dignified and non-discriminatory Tanzania through religious pluralism? Approaching this from a linguistic point of view, the paper is going to answer this question through examination of how discourse resources are shared in religious debates between Christians and Muslims.

This paper proceeds from the question "Is unity a product of ideology?" by the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies of the University of Dar es Salaam calling for papers to a conference that did not take place due to Covid-19 in 2020.

An ideology such as Ujamaa "presents a broad range of views which cover the central aspects of how society should be organised, answering such questions as what the role of the state should be, what forms of difference or differentiation between people should be accepted, and which rejected. …[it] thus offers answers to the question of what kind of society is desirable" (Schwarzmantel, 2008:25). According to Althusser ideology is "the imaginary relationship the subject entertains with his position in the social. This is universal in that all human beings need to be symbolically placed in the social structure" (Althusser, 1984). Ujamaa as an ideology was an economic political set of moral principles (Fouéré, 2014:1). Ujamaa was declared in Arusha in 1967 and later followed by the promotion of ethical and accountable leadership. A political ideology, like Ujamaa was, "is a set of ideas which is normative, setting out an ideal, aiming at arousing support on a mass basis for those ideas, seeking to agitate in their favour….[it is] a sharp edge pressed against the reality as it happens to exist at the time" (Bauman, 1999: 124). During Ujamaa Tanzanians were supposed to live as one regardless of their religious affiliations and ethnical backgrounds. This was meant to develop a sense of respect and human dignity. They were to learn to live without discriminating on the basis of gender, religion, race or tribe. Like other political ideologies, Ujamaa constituted a set of ideas critical of the existing order, seen as defective in the light of the ideal endorsed by Ujamaa. Ideologies are therefore projects, or at least encapsulate practical projects that give rise to political strategies and tactics, models of political action which seek to transform the real world (Schwarzmantel, 2008:25). Religiously, Nyerere believed and worked hard in separating religion from the state, respecting all religions and upholding religious freedom. With this he managed to suppress religiocentrism in the country and maintained

a secular government while leaving citizens free to choose their religion and mode of worship. He aimed at establishing a national identity based on the Ujamaaspirit of fairness. Today, traces of Nyerere and Ujamaa are to be found in collective debates about politics and morality - in short, in contemporary imaginaries of the nation. A shared historical memory of Nyerere is being built or contested to define, mediate, and construct Tanzanian conceptions of morality, belonging, and citizenship. Ujamaa, like other political ideologies, did not sit well with voices that did not to accept giving in their group identities, like religious identity. Some of these voices were not supportive of the Nyerere's national identity building project.

This paper will do a Conversation Analysis of two Christian-Muslim debate meetings and interpret the findings using Lacan's Divided Subject to find traces of Tanzanians living together with respect and human dignity regardless of their religious affiliations. If the findings suggest or reveal closeness, then we would be able to say, tentatively though, that this unity is a result of Ujamaa's effort towards a respecting and non-discriminatory secular state. After this introduction the paper looks at Christian-Muslim relations in Tanzania. The third section on Methods and Procedures presents Conversation Analysis and the Divided Subject. This section is followed by Data Analysis and Findings, which presents a brief context for the debates, the rationale for focusing on interactional control, and the analysis of wording and word choice, analysis of interruptions or overlaps, analysis of selection and change of topics, analysis of how interactions are established and finished. The fifth section is an interpretation of these findings with the application of Lacan's Divided Subject. After the findings follow the Discussion and Conclusion.

Even before their arrival in Tanzania, Islam and Christianity were suspicious of each other, back in the first century (Goddard, 2000). The earliest contact between Muslims and Christians in Tanzania was hostile and full of suspicion, that is, in 1822 before Tanganyika was an independent entity (Ndaluka, 2015: 23). Missionaries came to Zanzibar after the Moresby treaty had been signed in 1822 to abolish slavery in Zanzibar. Thus, apart from spreading Christianity they freed slaves and gave them a Western education (Henschel, 2000:5-6 as quoted in Ndaluka 2015:24). These activities did not sit well with Arab Muslims who were beneficiaries to this trade.

The relations between Muslims and Christians in Tanganyika (now Tanzania) can be summed up in three phases. The first phase was preindependence time. This time was marked by the dominance of Muslims in political leadership and activism as they were in the frontline to fight against colonialism. Muslims were part of the Tanganyika African Association (TAA) and later Tanganyika African National Union (TANU) (Mbogoni, 2004; Mesaki, 2011).

The second phase was post-independence (1961 – 1990). After independence the political landscape changed because Nyerere established a nation-building project and so he abolished the dominance of Muslims in politics by appointing a mixture of different politicians from different backgrounds to form the government. Nyerere appointed educated Tanzanians from cooperative unions; workers' union, chiefs, and some were English people who decided to retain Tanzania citizenship. The dominance of Muslims in government was falling. Unhappiness started showing from loss of status quo enjoyed during colonial times. Nyerere kept on with his agenda of nation building, insisting that the government ought to be secular despite the fact that people could maintain their religious affiliations. He wanted religion to be separated from the government. Of course, this is the phase in which Ujamaa was introduced (Mbogoni, 2004; Mesaki, 2011; Mukandala et al., 2006; Ndaluka, 2015).

The third phase was the multi party era. After the re-introduction of multi-party system in 1992, the religious sentiments resurfaced and penetrated into the society under the aegis of political parties. The 'liberalized society' was the song of the day and those who had felt suppression during the totalitarian regime of one party were now free to express their feelings of religious inequalities they faced after independence. They claimed that Nyerere and his successors had expressly decided to elevate Christians and sideline Muslims in the government and in other important posts, so it was the right time to rally for the liberation of Muslims through political movements (Mbogoni, 2004; Mesaki, 2011; Mukandala et al., 2006; Ndaluka, 2015). And this is where this paper dwells, examining the relationship between Christians and Muslims to determine if Tanzania under Ujamaa succeeded to create a peaceful secular state.

Recently, notes Ndaluka, there have been struggles between Muslims and Christians for dominance and control of social, cultural and state resources in the country. Some of these conflicts have led to physical violence, as happened during the 1993 Good Friday pork crisis, the 1998 and 2000 Mwembechai crises, and the 2001 Zanzibar riots (Ndaluka, 2015: 27). Amid this, some of the contemporary followers of Christianity and Islam seem to have owned it on themselves to bring Christians and Muslims together through friendly and peaceful conversations. Muslims are directed in Quran 16:125 to discuss peacefully about their faith in order to win followers.These conversations are mostly done through debates (mihadhara) which are hosted mostly by Muslims.

According to Mapima (n.d.) the origin of these debates can be traced from the writings and evangelizing efforts of Muslims of the likes of the South African Ahmed Deedat, Kenyan Professor M.H Maliki, Zanzibari Ali Muhsin and Sheikh Muzaffar Ahmad Durani, all propagating the Islamic faith through questioning the validity of the Christian

faith. On the Christian side, the Seventh Day Adventists make use of the debates (mihadhara) through the AMR (Adventist Muslims Relations) unit to evangelize among Muslims, defend the Christian faith in order to make friends with Muslims. He quotes 1Peter 3:20 and Acts 17:1-2 to say that defending one's faith is a biblical responsibility. It seems that for each part (Muslims and Christians) the debates are held as a religiousresponsibility. The hosts run these debates by the presentation of a topic after which they welcome questions from the audience. It is through these questions that the discussion begins.

In response to the question, however, this paper being a linguistic endeavor, seeks to find out how discourse resources are distributed among participants engaged in these debates. From this angle, it is a Faircloughian established view that discourse resources must be apportioned equally in a conversation of equals. Power struggle (and animosity) comes in when the interlocutors compete for the control of discourse resources on the interactional floor. Competition is seen when an interlocutor shows the desire to initiate more, assign himself more turns, take longer turns than it is necessary, and take a lead in topic management than the other interlocutor(s).

When we have power imbalance in conversation it is hard to see unification coming. Now in order to answer the question as to whether unity is a product of an ideology, one would need to see if there is any closeness shown in interaction between what is proclaimed by the two groups before every start of a debate and what exactly happens or is vivid as to the apportioning of discourse resources. So this is answerable through a conversation analysis and word choice of interlocutors' performance. In the end it is the disparity between what is proclaimed as the purpose of the debates and what is revealed in the performance is likely to reveal subject dividedness. So the major question on unity being a result of ideology will be answered, in this case, upon answering my own question, how do Christians and Muslims conduct themselves in debate in terms of sharing discourse resources? It is important to note, however, that the turn-taking system of the debates discussed in this paper does not exhibit instances of ordinary conversation but of institutional interaction with a very specific turn-taking format favoring the "home team".

Methods and Procedures

This section introduces Conversation Analysis and the Divided Subject as theories through which data from the two debates will be analyzed. It starts with Conversation Analysis and ends with Divided Subject.

Conversation Analysis

Conversation Analysis (CA) is "a form of ACD (Analysis of

Conversational Data) that accounts for the sequential structure of talkin-interaction in terms of interlocutors' real-time orientations to the preferential practices that underlie, for participants and consequently also for analysts, the conversational behaviors of turn-taking and repair in different speech exchange systems" (Markee, 2000:25). It involves aspects such as turn-taking, opening and closing a conversation, adjacency pairs and repair mechanisms. Turn-taking is a "system for sequence of talk which was initially used and continues to be used in various activities of varied nature, conversation being one such activity. Other speech exchanges include interviews, debates, meetings and ceremonies" (Sacks et al., 1974: 710). A turn is "a spate of talk that is collaboratively constructed by speakers out of one or more TCUs, whose projectability allows possible next and current speakers to identify when the current speaker's turn might hearably be coming to an end" (Markee, 2000:84). The turn is basic for this study because it is the first thing around which collaboration and resistance are seen. So I need Conversation Analysis to determine whether or not these debates are run in a friendly way.

The Divided Subject

With his psychoanalytic view of the divided subject, Jacques Lacan emphasizes the role of language as a medium in which the subject is constituted as an 'illusion of inner unity' (Angermuller, Maingueneau&Wodak, 2014:77). This unity comprises the three principal registers of being, namely, the symbolic (language or the normative regulations of the social order) which represents the Big Other (the master discourse, le nom du père), the imaginary (identifications with the Other) which corresponds to the illusion of uniqueness), and the real (that which resists representation) (Žižek, 1989). The symbolic "interpellates us into the normative regulations of the social order. The imaginary founds our conception of ourselves as individuals who possess unique personalities and the potential for exceptional existential trajectories ; and the real intrudes into our lives as an unruly vortex of bodily jouissance and unintelligibility that disturbs the reassuring (yet ever-fragile) coherence of our symbolic and imaginary configurations alike" (Ruti, 2012 :1).

Ruti elaborates that the subject is split or divided in a fundamental way, and it is through producing a seemingly suitably placed discourse (the symbolic) that the subject tries to overcome its constitutive lack. Lacan tends to privilege the symbolic over the imaginary and the real, linking the "truth" of the subject's desire to the signifier and banishing jouissance to the realm of "impossibility" (ibid). Maybe it is because of these tensions and antagonisms among these three components that Lacansays "the subject is a problem to be explained" (Althusser, 1996). Understanding that the symbolic is privileged over

the imaginary and the real, analysis in this ebater done on the performance of conversations, the symbolic.

Data Analysis and Findings

The Context for the Christian–Muslim Debates

When talking about Context of Situation and Culture, Halliday (1990) mentions Field, Tenor and Mode of discourse as components of analysis of Context of Situation. Field of discourse addresses what the discourse event is about, e.g., the events here are religious debates in Mwanza and Tunduma. Tenor of discourse, which is more important in this paper, is a description or treatment of participants to the field of discourse. Who are they and how do they relate to each other ? What are their cultural, academic and religious backgrounds, and how do these affect their participation to the field of discourse (the debates) ? Participants to these events are of normal social standing, divided into two groups seated separately. In these meetings Muslims form the bigger groups, being the home team. DrSulley is a quick-witted Muslim scholar, identifying himself as a medical doctor. Mazinge is as equally quick-witted but more seasoned in Christian-Muslim debates. BothMazinge and DrSulley are well versed in manipulation of their tools of the trade, the Bible and Quran. On the other side, there are Pastor Mwakajumba and Pastor Mwashilindi, who claim nothing about their educational qualification, and they do not seem as quick-witted as their Muslim counterparts. They are not as well versed with the Quran as the Muslims are with the Bible. They even denounce the Quran as legit material. In the exchanges Muslims have the privilege to apportion turns. There is a moderator who initiates a few turns performing tasks like welcoming the Christian questioner, asking the name, and hearing the questions itself. He has a team of religious experts to choose from, he only has to hear the question to decide who should go for it. As soon as he assigns the question he goes quiet till the end.

We now remain with three participants to this discourse. These are the 'responder' to Christian questions (who turns himself into the general questioner), the scripture reader and the Christian questioner (soon to be turned responder to questions). Now of the three active participants, there is a lot to note. The debate runs more like courtroom crossexamination in that the responder (originally questioner) is compelled to respond in the questioner's preferred style (originally the nominated responder to the question). This characterizes the debate sessions with a lot of interruptions to the responder. The power behind the discourse for being hosts and custodians of knowledge makes the responder now turned questioner and the scripture reader more superior to the original questioner now turned responder.

Need to Focus on Interactional Control

Since the exchanges in these two 'debates' are more antagonistic than friendly, there is need to focus the analysis on interactional control. A discussion of interactional control involves a focus on amount of interruption, the selection and change of topics, the control of the agenda and how interactions are established and finished. Focusing on these elements, suggests Fairclough (2003) can reveal how power relations are being constituted across a sequence of utterances. To this analysis I add and start with the choice of words.

Choice of Words

The analysis of word choice is done among participants because diction reflects on how interlocutors relate. In other words, this analysis helps to explain part of the context shaping or ensuing from such religious relations. The diction tells us the level of respect for each group, especially between interlocutors wrestling the interactional floor. DrSulley tells Pastor Mwakajumba 'unaanza uongo' (you start lying), unakuwa mwongo (you are becoming a liar), unaleta ujanjaujanja (you are cunning), mchungaji gani hata adabu huna (what kind of pastor are you, you are mannerless), kwenye nyumba ya watu ('in someone's place' means you don't belong here) unakimbilia tu kusema (you don't enter someone's place and rush at speaking). Mchungaji unakuwa na adabu (a pastor should be mannered), Maiki yako hiyo utaikimbia mwenyewe hiyo labda uislamu isiwe dini ya haki (you will run away from that microphone, or else Islam is not a just religion). This is announcing competition, indicating deep-seated animosity. As for uttering this in the presence of the one they are talking about, "Mchungaji wa leo amekuja na briefcase, kajana briefcase yake na biblia" (Today's priest came with his briefcase and a bible) is a bad joke. When the priest responds that his religion is Seventh Day Adventist, DrSulley cuts in with Swahili original: Duniani hakuna dini ya usabato acha uongo, sisi tunachokataa kwamba wewe mwanzoni mwa mahojiano tayari ushaleta uongo unasema dini yako msabato wakati biblia inasema usabato ni siku. Sasa kama uko mwongo mwanzo wa mahojiano, utakuwa mkweli mwisho wewe?

English translation: In this world there is no such religion as Sabbath, stop lying. What we are objecting is you telling lies at the beginning of the debate, that Sabbath is your religion while the bible says it is a day. If you are lying at the beginning at the debate, are you going to be truthful at the end?

On the other side, the pastor also uses negative terms " Umetumia ujanja" (you have lied) and "hawa ni waongo" (these are liars). Mazinge warns his interlocutor "hatutaki ujanja" (we don't want cunningness); "tayari ushaanza yaani unachanganyikiwa mapema" (you are getting confused way too early). "Jana ninyi [Christians] hapa mlipiga haleluya na sasa hivi swali moja unaondoka mpaka tumalize, mnasemaje waislamu? (43) (Yesterday

you Christians did a lot of hallelujah and today only one question you want to leave? We have to finish this, what do you Muslims say?; "kama unashindwa kujibu unakaa pembeni" (46) (If you cant answer that, step aside); [I know you don't have biblical evidence so if you supply one] mimi unanibatiza hapa unanimwagia maji (13) (you will baptize me); upon being asked to slow down, Mazinge responds "Kwani mimi nakimbia?"(52) (Am I running?); and Dr Sulley has his final words for the pastor, "atoke hapa na ka-briefcase kake kashilingi elfu mbili miatano" (let him leave with his 2,500 shillings' [inexpensive] briefcase).

Claiming success in the debate, Dr Sulley narrates a small anecdote to his audience

Swahili original: mimi ni daktari by professional (sic) kwa kawaida unapomchoma sindano mtoto…akipiga kelele ujue sindano imeingia na dawa imefika kwahiyo dawa ishafika msipate taabu, kwa sababu jana walinyamaza nilikuwa naandika dawa, juzi walinyamaza nilikuwa naelekeza namna, sasa nesi kesha tumbukiza sindano sasa lazima wapige kelele…

English translation: I am a medical doctor by profession, when you administer an injection to a kid, if he screams you know that the medicine has got where it needs to go. Yesterday and the day before, they were quiet because I was writing their prescriptions and giving directions to nurses. Now the medicine is in, they must scream…

Upon Pastor Mwashilindi giving an alternative understanding of the biblical verse, Dr Sulley plays the explanation down to 'teaching' saying "Kwa hiyo unachotaka kutufundisha kwamba maneno hayo…" (so you want to teach us…).

From the above we can see that interlocutors are at liberty to use diction as it suits their own purpose, especially those who feel at home, being hosts of the debate. We can say that the choice of words is demeaning, showing no respect to either side, and this plays against the 'acclaimed' purpose of bringing together Christians and Muslims on a table of friendship.

Interruptions or Overlaps

This part examines interruptions to find out which of the participants in each session dominates the interactional space, interruptions being an index of floor control. Interrupting the current speaker is normally occasioned by an equally powerful or more powerful party in a conversation. It is an indirect way of signaling to the interlocutor that they should stop talking because the one interrupting does not think the interlocutor is saying the right thing or he/she feels that the speaker is taking more time than is necessary. Interrupting is therefore an attempt at tearing apart the interlocutor's ego. We have examples here:

698.   Dr Sulley: Mtu akilaaniwa mbele za Mungu anakwenda wapi, Jehanamu au uzima wa milele? (When a person is

forsaken, where does he go? Hell or heaven?)

699.   Mwashilindi: Naomba niweze kujibu swali (I beg to respond)

700.   Dr Sulley: Jibu swali kwanza, mtu anapolaaniwa anakwenda Jehanamu au uzima wa milele? (Answer the question first, does the forsaken go to heaven or hell?)

701.   Mwashilindi: Aliyelaaniwa anakwenda Jehanamu- (The

forsaken goes to hell.)

702.   Dr Sulley: -Kwa kuwa Yesu amelaaniwa anakwenda wapi? (Where did Jesus go?)

703.   Mwashilindi: Ngoja kwanza nijibu (Give me time to answer.)

704.   Dr Sulley: Jibu, anakwenda wapi? (Answer, where does he go?)

705.   Mwashilindi: Tuelewane (Please)

706.   Dr Sulley: Wapi ana kwenda? Tunakubaliana kwamba Yesu kalaaniwa na kwa laana hiyo anakwenda wapi? (Where does he go? We agreed that Jesus was forsaken, so where does he go?)

707.   Mwashilindi: Unielewe sana ndugu mhubiri (Preacher please understand me)

708.   Dr Sulley: Anakwenda wapi mzee Mwashilindi, mchungaji anakwenda wapi? Tuwe wakweli anakwenda wapi? (Where does he go Old Man Mwashilindi? Pastor, where does he go? Let's be truthful, where does he go?)

709.   Mwashilindi: Naomba unielewe kwanza kabla bado sijajibu hilo swali na… (Please understand me before answering that

question and...)

710.   Dr Sulley: Kwanza ujibu swali halafu utanielewesha. Andiko linasema mtu… (Answer the question first and later you will make me understand. The word says someone.)

711.   Mwashilindi: Ni kwamba…. (It is…)

712.   Dr Sulley: Eeee

Findings in this section reveal that Dr Sulley occasioned interruption while Pastor Mwashilindi didn't occasion any interruption. Somewhere else Mazinge conducts himself like Dr Sulley does. Since interruptions are taken to be an index of floor control (Gnisci & Bakeman, 2007:239), Mazinge and Dr Sulley can be said to have more control of the interaction.

Selection and Change of Topics

Ones with questions are the ones' with the topic, apart from the major topic of Q&A. They happen only to have the power before uttering their question, after which their role

of questioners turns into responders. From there on the moderator becomes the questioner and changes the topic at will.

676.   Dr Sulley: Kwa hiyo unachotaka kutufundisha kwamba maneno hayo ni maneno ya Bwana Paulo anawaambia Wayunani waliokuwa wakiona kwamba kusurubiwa kwa bwana Yesu ni nini? (So you want to teach us that those are Paul's words to the Jews witnessing that if they saw Jesus' crucification as what?)

677.   Mwashilindi: Ni upumbavu (It is foolishness)

678.   Dr Sulley: Kwa hiyo wewe binafsi unaamini kwamba Yesu kasurubiwa na tena ni uokozi? (So you believe that Jesus'

crucification is salvation?) (The question whether Pastor Mwashilindi 'believes' that Jesus' death is divine is introduced]

679.   Mwashilindi: Ndiyo (Yes)

680.   Dr Sulley: Galatia 3:13 (Galatians 3:13)

681.   Msomaji: Galatia 3:13 "Kristo alitukomboa katika laana ya torati kwa kuwa alifanywa laana kwa ajili yetu maana imeandikwa amelaaniwa kila mtua angukwae juu ya mti" ("Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse for us, for it is written cursed is everyone who is hung on a tree").

From turn 676 to 681, for example, DrSulley has turned himself a questioner and sways Mwashilindi on whether or not Jesus was not wretched for his sinfulness. This is part of a longer stretch, from 597 where Mwashilindi says he wishes to ask three questions, and on 599 he asks the first, which, between the Bible and the Quran did God hand to disciples? Up to this point the questioner has been turned responder. He does not have power over the topic anymore. The controller only wants preferred second pair parts, normally in the yes-no direction.

Mazinge and Dr Sulley are quantitatively, topically and interactionally dominant as they manage the debate, moving to another issue in the debate only after they are satisfied that the current issue has been exhausted. The likes of Josephat, Mwakajumba and Mwashilindi do not have powers apart from knowing only the question they come in with. Moderators cum responders turning themselves questioners issue directives to questioners turned responders without expecting any objection. Despite moderators' interactional control, Christians vie for control with a few interruptions and response-initiations. Sometimes they resist moderators' manipulations with explicit statements to suggest that the debate is not going fine.

To link the concept of dominance to power, we need to consider other types of dominance relevant to this section, namely topical (or content) dominance and interactional dominance (Linellet al., 1988:415). A participant who is topically dominant would be one

introducing more concepts "into the socially shared world of discourse, he who places the most topics and subtopics on the floor" (Linellet al., 1988:416).

In this study it is moderators who are topically dominant as they utilize their institutional position as actors to lead the debate. On the other hand, an interactionally dominant participant is one "who manages to direct and control the other party's actions to the greatest extent and who also avoids being directed and controlled in his own interactive behavior" (Linellet al., 1988:416). A powerful person is likely to be topically and interactionally dominant, since a powerful person is one who has "the potential for exercising influence over other people's actions, decisions and thoughts" (ibid). A powerful person does not have to speak more to be quantitatively dominant; he or she can only make others speak more or less. Of the two groups of participants it is moderators who are the more powerful parties, making use of directives in managing and controlling other interlocutors' interactional behavior.

How Interactions are Established and Finished

With respect to how interactions are established and finished, one notes that these interactions are cordially established, everyone hearing them as chances to learn about the brother or sister on the other side of the aisle. They normally begin with a welcome note from the moderator, but they almost all end up with a dismissal. An example of near ending or the termination of these engagements are from lines 283 to 284 corroborated by Mazinge: Kama unayo [aya] toa, kama huna usipoteze muda (If you have the verse read it out, if you don't have it don't waste time). The moderator says: Eee ndugu yetu kama aya hiyo huna sasa

hivi kaa pembeni mpe mwingine,(You, our brother, if you don't have

that verse now, move aside, make way for someone else).

Discovering Divided–Subjects

When talking about divided subjects here, it does not mean focusing on the two religious groups of Christians and Muslims as divided. One needs to focus on each interlocutor as divided within himself or herself, and that when they meet on the debating floor they are already in their multiple selves. They all come with their imaginary registers projected, with the 'welcome our brother, take a seat and feel at home', at the beginning of the debate. Divided-subjectness is in this case revealed through choice of words interlocutors make, overlaps and management

of debates. Because interlocutors wish so bad to seem to identify with the other, they gather without ever mentioning their prime purpose of winning new converts by manipulating the ideological square. The real register resists representation but it is heard when subjects engage in squaring and stretching the ideological square a bit too far. What

we can take as heard, through conversational analysis, is that which they do not have the courage to confess in public since it is not welcome in polite civilized society, that the two groups don't and can't give each other the respect each deserves, and each would be happy in the absence of the other.

It is only the symbolic register that interpellates us into the normative regulations of the social order in which we succeed through producing a seemingly suitably placed discourse that enables the subject to overcome its constitutive lack. For example, if you respect a person, your diction would be decent; you would 'beg to differ' rather than call that person a liar; you would take time to wrestle a point to share something about his faith than telling him that their faith does not exist. There is more interruptions because there is a lot of 'ujanjaujanja' (cunningness) which does not push the debate farther. There is more management from the host because if you let them manage parts of the discourse they might take you too far. Secondly, each group is a hunting ground for the other to win converts. Dr Sulley takes a long time trying to convince Joseph to join Islam 'for his benefit', and the hosts are happier to welcome one coming to convert than one coming to raise turf.

Discussion

To answer the question to this study one needs to see if there was any closeness shown in interaction between what was and is proclaimed by the two groups 'to be holding a peaceful and friendly talk' before every start of a debate, and what exactly happens or is vivid as to the apportioning of discourse resources. So this was answerable through a conversation analysis of interlocutors' performance and their choice of words. In the end it is the disparity between what is proclaimed as the purpose of the debates and what is revealed in the performance that we see the divided subjects.

The choice of words indicates the level of respect for each group, especially between interlocutors wrestling the interactional floor. We have seen interlocutors taking their liberty to use diction to suit their own purpose. The choice of words is demeaning, playing against the 'acclaimed' purpose of bringing together Christians and Muslims on a table of friendship. More interruptions have been occasioned by DrSulley and Mazinge. Since interruptions are taken to be an index of floor control (Gnisci&Bakeman, 2007:239), Muslims would be said to have more control of the interaction. With the selection and change of

topics, we can say that the ones with questions are the ones with 'the topic', apart from the major topic of Q&A. They have the power only before uttering their questions, after which their role as questioners is immediately and unannouncedly turned into responders. From there on the moderator becomes the questioner and changes the topic at will.

Muslims are quantitatively, topically and interactionally dominant as they manage the debate, moving to another issue in the debate only after they are satisfied that the current issue has been exhausted. And with respect to how interactions are established and finished, one notes that these interactions are cordially established, everyone hearing them as chances to learn about the brother or sister on the other side of the aisle. They normally begin with a welcome note from the moderator, but they almost all end up with a dismissal.

These results, however, are from Muslim hosted debates, which partly explains why the distribution of discourse resources hangs on the Muslim side. A look at another debate (not for this paper), however, shows a more or less similar tendency, how Christian debaters aim to make Muslim brothers and sisters ashamed of their faith. Competition with cheers and plastic smiles make these debates pass for peaceful and friendly occasions, but following Lacan'sdivided subject, based on the choice of words and competition for discourse resources, we may confidently say that unity in the Tanzanian case cannot be a product of an ideology.

It is clear that these groups are preying on each other for domination, they know very well what they are doing, yet they are doing it because each one needs to pursue their interests…everybody had better convert

into our group and live like we are mandated to live, but none of them seems bold enough to say this. Žižeksays that "the stepping out of (what we experience as) ideology is the very form of our enslavement to it" (Žižek, 1994:6).For the two groups being asked to act secularly was a departure from their real ideology – sticking to their religious groups as Christianity and Islam gives them the central aspects of how society should be organized (Schwarzmantel, 2008:25), showing them which "difference[s] or differentiation between people should be accepted, and which rejected" and "what kind of society is desirable" (ibid). So for Nyerere trying to disallow these identities in some quarters for the sake of governance, their enslavement to their faiths comes up glaring, and everyone considering themselves civilized is ashamed to declare this fact as true. Žižek thinks that we are within ideological space when some relation of social domination ('power', 'exploitation') happens in an inherently non-transparent way. In other words, he says, "it is easily possible to lie in the guise of truth" (Žižek, 1994:8).

The divided subjects can be examined beyond an individual. I think a government too, being made up of a multitude of divided subjects, might be termed a government of the divided, not a divided government. Drawing from the example of Muslims and Christians here, no 'civilized person' will be bold enough to admit without a wavering heart that there is still a distance to go for these two groups to drink from the same cup. Why is it

unwritten but preferred that when you have a Christian president, you must have a Muslim vice president (and vice versa), and when you have a Christian as president this term, the coming term should come to a Muslim? How much, then, do the two groups trust each other to hold a real friendly conversation for unity?

Today, traces of Nyerere and Ujamaa are to be found in collective debates about politics and morality - in short, in contemporary imaginaries of the nation. A shared historical memory of Nyerere is being built or contested to define, mediate, and construct Tanzanian conceptions of morality, belonging, and citizenship

Conclusion

Establishing or expecting Tanzanians to live close together respecting each other's religion has not been possible yet, and it remains an illusive task. This study, using Conversation Analysis and Divided Subject has revealed enmity instead of friendship. It has revealed that the real register is more powerful, the divided subjects are more 'divided' and it is not easy to unite them. Some high caliber political and religious leaders say that these groups are supposed to cooperate very closely; I bet this is a soft brotherly and sisterly call that should be heeded. Recently, from September 2020 these religious groups were probably used politically during the General Elections in a larger group called the Reconciliation Committee, preaching peace in the country. Probably after elections that went "peacefully" we may not see these religious groups together for a while.

References

Althusser, L. (1984). Essays on Ideology. London: Verso.

Althusser, L. (1996). Writings on Psychoanalysis: Freud and Lacan. New York: Columbia University Press.

Angermuller, J., Maingueneau, D. & Wodak, R. (2014). The Discourse Studies Reader: Main Currents in Theory and Analysis. John Benjamins Publishing Company Amsterdam / Philadelphia.

Bauman, Z. (1999). In Search of Politics. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (2003). Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research. London: Longman.

Fouéré, M. (2014). Julius Nyerere, Ujamaa, and Political Morality in Contemporary Tanzania. African Studies Review, 57(1) (April, 2014): 1–24. Cambridge University Press.

Goddard, H. (2000). A History of Christian-Muslim Relations.Edinburgh University Press.

Gnisci, A. & Bakeman, R. (2007). Sequential Accommodation of Turntaking and Turn Length: a study of courtroom interaction', Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 26 (3): 234-259.

Halliday, M. & Hassan, R. (1990). Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective. Oxford University Press

Levinson, S. (1983) Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Linell, P., Gustavsson, L. &Juvonen, P. (1988). Interactional Dominance in Dyadic Communication: A Presentation of Initiative-response analysis. Linguistics, 26: 415–442.

Mapima, D. (n.d.). Shahidi wa InjilikwaWaislam. AMR.

Markee, M. (2000). Conversation Analysis, London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mbogoni, L. (2004). The Cross versus the Crescent: Religion and Politics in Tanzania from the 1880's to the 1990's. Dar es Salaam: MkukinaNyota.

McCarthy, M. (1991). Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mesaki, S. (2011) Religion and the State in Tanzania. Cross-Cultural Communication, 7(2): 249–259.

Mukandala, R., Othman, S. Y., Mushi, S. & Ndumbaro, L (eds.) (2006). Justice, Rights and Worship: Religion and Politics in Tanzania. Dar es Salaam: REDET/E&D Limited.

Ndaluka, T. (2015). Religious Discourse, Social Cohesion and Conflict.Muslim - Christian Relations in Tanzania.Radboud University Nijmegen.

Ruti, M. (2012). The Singularity of Being: Lacan and the Immortal Within.New York: Fordham University Press.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A Simplest Systematics for the Organisation of Turn-taking for Conversation. Language, 50(4): 696–735.

Schwarzmantel, J. (2008). Ideology and Politics. London: Sage.

Sinclair, J. & Coulthard, M. (1992). Towards an Analysis of Discourse. In M. Coulthard (ed.). Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis. London: Routledge.

Žižek, S. (1989). The Sublime Object of Ideology. London: Verso.

Žižek, S. (1994). Mapping Ideology. London: Verso.