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Abstract: This study explored Nigeria and South Africa relation within the context of citizen diplomacy. We collated our data from qualitative descriptive method and hence relied on secondary data. We predicated our analytical framework on the basic propositions emanated from the theory of complex interdependent. The study among others, observed that with economic advantage as the major international political issues, states and their citizens are under anxiety not to be outwitted and outcompeted in the fast growing global interdependence and thus subscribe to the rule of reciprocal relations as foundation for cooperation. The study therefore underscored the effect of diaspora in national economic development within the rubric of international rule of reciprocity; while observing the checks of domestic values and culture of host states. Focusing on Nigeria’s diaspora defence in South Africa, the study explored the basic factors that determine Nigeria-South Africa relations especially as it concerns the contributions of the Diaspora to national development through the application of international best practice and social relations, it equally made useful suggestions aimed at strengthening the capacity of Nigeria to achieve the foreign policy goals and to provide adequate safeguards to her citizens living in foreign countries.
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INTRODUCTION
Understanding Nigeria’s diaspora within reciprocal relations in the globalising world of cultural homogenisation and hybridisation is both revealing and challenging in international relations governed by both domestic and international law principles.

In the words of Hear [1] and Vertovec and Cohen [2], as amplified by Onu and Bireenun-Nnabugwu [3], diaspora refers to “populations of migrant origin who are scattered among two or more destinations, between which there develop multifarious links involving flows and exchanges of people and resources: between the homeland and destination countries, and among destination countries. The duo noted that diaspora is an international phenomenon that cast better understanding and explains third/fourth world presence in the first/second than vice versa.

Meanwhile, Nigerian migrants face conflict of cultures which they offend in -their host countries, thus falling victims of discrimination or xenophobic treatment. Understanding the place of culture as standard mode of behaviour within society and its visitors, is most crucial compass in appreciating the discourse.

Culture is defined loosely as the accepted way of life of a people or society reflective, as it were, the Mores and Traditions and, more often, codified in the people’s domestic law principles. Culture moderates behaviours because it defines acceptable norms and behaviour and the general way of life of a people. It is, therefore, a truism that since the state exists for the harmonisation of public interests and values imbeded in the culture of the people, the conflicts and angers of communities in the society or nation-state are the natural and essential part of their existence and these are too, the justification for the creation of security organisations and ultimate need for high security consciousness. American President Robert F. Kennedy, once argued that every society gets the kind of criminal it deserves. Related to Kennedy's postulation is the Ashanti proverb that ‘the ruins of a nation begins in the homes of its people’.

With the interdependence of nations, as a goal of globalisation, cultures face inevitable homogenisation and hybridisation as national borders fast become practical utopia. Put more differently and coherently, the essentials of culture in the interdependent world is not the absence, but the preservation of values of good governance, transparency, accountability and human observance. Thus, local objections in diplomatic practice may be constrained by international laws and conventions that transform states’ citizens into global citizens.
Under the prevailing scenario referred to as “cultural globalisation”, states have been literarily forced into global culture of ‘best practices’ as standard Mores and Traditions in the conduct of international relations skew preponderantly towards achieving national economic interests via international politics.

Nigeria and South Africa share common historical origin of former African British colonies. South Africa’s larger landmass, continental shelf and economic power situated with Nigeria’s demographics as half of West Africa’s population hold enlivening promise for mutual relationship based on understanding, trust and benefits. The standard rule of reciprocity is that one state rewards or punishes another relative to behaviours in their relationship. It is also a guiding principle in law (domestic as international) that he who pursues equity must go with clean hands. The Nigeria-South Africa diplomatic row over treatment of their citizens based on the authenticity of Yellow Fever Card certificate is anchored on the rule of reciprocity and respect for national integrity brought about by interdependence of nations. In this paper, we shall explore the basic factors that underlie Nigeria-South Africa relations in the era of cultural globalisation and foreign policy of citizen diplomacy.

Theoretical Orientation

We anchor on the theoretical explication of complex interdependence as an immediate sequel of globalisation. Globalisation refers to the process of international integration of human interactions, which take place through exchange of products and ideas. In the interdependent world, the moment of culture is indispensable because it constitutes an intrinsic part of the whole process of complex connectivity (a global market place, international fashion code, an international division of labour, a shared eco-system) linking a myriad small everyday actions that impact global consequences. By the nature of globalisation and interdependence, Held et al., [4] observe:

Although in its simplistic sense globalisation refers to the widening, deepening and speeding up of global interconnectedness, such a definition begs further elaboration Globalisation can be located on a continuum with the local, national and regional. At one end of the continuum lie social and economic relations and networks which crystallise on the wider scale of regional and global interactions. Globalisation can be taken to refer to those spatio-temporal processes of change which underpin a transformation in the organisation of human activity across regions and continent. Without reference to such expansive spatial connections, there can be no clear coherent formulation of this term. A satisfactory definition of globalisation must capture- each of these elements: extensivity (stretching), intensity, velocity and impact.

Some authors, like Larsson [5], support the idea that globalisation cause world shrinkage, shorter distances and increasing ease for mutual benefits. The International Monetary Fund revealed that globalisation and interdependence elicit four basic essentials comprising trade and transactions, capital and investments, migration and movement of people, and dissemination of knowledge and technology. Although Chomsky [6], among the litany of bombastic critics of globalisation, would argue that the term ‘globalisation’ has been appropriated by dominant propaganda systems to refer to “the specific version of international economic integration that they favour, which privileges the rights of investors and lenders against those of people being incidental,” this pessimistic subject of international relations which has been approximated to cultural imperialism has entrenched global cosmopolitanism through cultural assimilation, homogenisation and hybridisation. In the interdependent world with shrinking boundaries, distances and closer interactions, cultures are forced to open up to embrace new and emerging trends, new ideas and new ways of how people behave in the light of progress and modernism [7].

The role of culture in international relation governed by interdependence of nations cannot be overemphasised. Above all else, culture gives a sense of identity, distinguishes man from other mammals and from a fellow man. The distinguishing force of culture comes from language, history, religion, custom, artifacts, cooking, values, tradition and also the means by man to transmit knowledge to succeeding generations. Koehane and Nye Jr [8] underscore the point that the social and cultural globalisation “involves the movement of ideas, information, images and people.” It is, therefore, a truism that the essentials of culture in the interdependent world is not the absence but the preservation of practices of good governance, transparency, accountability and human rights observance.

Cultural globalisation can be carefully understood within the concept of power; ‘soft’ or ‘hard’. While international actors are not in the political game of achieving their interest on mere altruism, the application of soft power (diplomatic persuasion) or hard power (military force) is a necessary option and how a state wields its power (hard or soft) indicates the success or failure in achieving its national interest within the comity of nations ruled by interdependence (a relationship in which each member is mutually dependent on the others).

The theory of interdependence and its basic essentials strongly reinforce the nexus between reciprocity and the mutual-benefit argument in the study of Nigeria-South Africa relations.
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Analysis of Nigeria-South Africa Relations

Nigeria-South Africa relations hing on a factor of regional geographical contiguity powered by desire in Pan-Africanism for common unity of free, independent and decolonised nations.

Nigeria was one of the foremost supporters of the Black South African liberation movements, including the African National Congress (ANC). South Africa, no doubt, benefitted from Nigeria’s membership of the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group (EPG) and Organisation of African Unity (OAU) frontline states (the only state outside South African axis) that engaged struggle, support, monitoring, contacts and dialogue [9] to liberate South Africa from a 350-year (1652-May 1994) white-minority domination, 45-year apartheid racist regime and 82-year liberation struggle - after the formation of ANC in January 6, 1912.

South Africa’s dark history took root despite that South Africa, Liberia and Ethiopia were the only fully independent African states at the end of the Second World War. While South Africa was fully independent (31 May 1910) in political terms through the amalgamation of four British colonies - Cape Colony, Natal, Transvaal and the Orange Free State - the arrogance, stubborn and ruthless determination of the semi-independent white settlers of Southern Rhodesia (the Boers, who were ruling the blacks under the Union of South Africa), like in Angola and Mozambique (the Southern strip), created halt in the process of full decolonisation in the continent of Africa. The discovery of diamonds in 1867 and gold in 1886 spurred the intensification of the subjugation of the native inhabitants. At one point of the dark history, was the 1976 Soweto uprising against white-minority rule in South Africa when Nigerian Singer, Sunny Okosun wrote and sang the Fire in Soweto’ in 1977.

Russia’s sympathy for colonised areas after her revolution gave impetus for decolonisation movements that resulted to independence of several states including Nigeria (1 October 1960), Ghana, Pakistan, etc., and further set the stage for African personality which helped in the united fight against apartheid bastion in South Africa. Since 1940, when apartheid was officially unveiled as a programme of strict, racial separation by the SmutsIlerizog United Party in South Africa and followed by rapid succession to subjugate the blacks by reason of ‘colour bar’, - ‘pigmentocracy’ or ‘negrophobia’ [10]; South Africa knew no peace as an independent state until the end of apartheid bastion in 1994 with the extraordinary support of Nigerian-State, among others.

South Africa is expected, therefore, without overly playing altruism, to realise and demonstrate gratitude for Nigeria’s big-brother sacrifices during its turbulent years.

Based on British government’s economic interest in South Africa, Nigeria not only indigenised two major British business concerns in Nigeria the Barclays Bank and British Petroleum, she also stepped up political campaign against military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa by the international community, denouncement of economic and political support by industrialised countries, the cessation of syndicated loans to South Africa, the passage, on November 4, 1977, by the United Nations Security Council, of all resolution 418, imposing mandatory embargo on the export of arms to South Africa, thereby designating the racial situation there, for the first time, “threat to international peace and security.” Calvocoresi [11] admits with relish that it was a period Nigeria’s capital city — Lagos — became “a necessary port of call for British, American and other politicians trying to resolve the Rhodesian crisis.”

Nigeria’s co-Chairmanship position of the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group (EPG) at the 8th Committee of Heads of Government Meeting (C11GM) in Nassau, Bahamas (16th — 20th October 1985), produced fruitful results in the Nassau Accord, which enlisted the following:

- declaration that the system of apartheid will be dismantled and specific and meaningful action taken in fulfilment of that intent;
- termination of the existing state of emergency;
- release immediately and unconditionally, Nelson Mandela and others imprisoned and detained for their opposition to apartheid;
- establishment of political freedom and specifically lift the existing on the African National Congress and other political parties; and
- Initiating, in the context of a suspension of violence on all sides, a process of dialogue across lines of colour, politics and religion, with a view to establishing a non-racial and representative government.

Despite the afore-stated, including the historic issuance of more than 300 passports to South Africans seeking to travel abroad, Nigeria went as far as establishing for the South African aborigines, a Relief Fund in 1976 for special educational opportunities, including scholarships to those of them in Nigerian tertiary institutions [12]. The enumerated are still a tip of the ice-bberg of Nigeria’s support to South Africa at its most trying times of historical journey to extricate the aborigines from white racist regimes.

Following the recap of Nigeria’s historical socio-political and economic support, South Africa has to appreciate that in the “no permanent enemy but permanent interest” international relations environment, there still exist much common interests for ties with moderation in cultural behaviours and practices. As both countries are multi-ethnic, multi-cultural, multi-
lingual and multi-religious, their shared rich diversities hold greater promise for interstate harmonisation of interests for greater African development. From table-2 below, it can be correctly posited that though South Africa is a quarter of Nigeria’s population, she can provide what Nigeria lacks in economic power in their mutual effort to make Africa great.

However, Nigeria too, is scrutinising the behaviours of her citizens abroad in order to stop the international opprobrium being meted to the country as a result of the conduct of her citizens. Nigerian government is aware that playing by the rules by her citizens abroad will enhance interational perception of her social systems and ameliorate the challenges in securing the lofty objectives behind her economic diplomatic relations with other countries.

Nigerian government appreciates the concern of South African government over the organised criminal activities in South Africa. Nigerian government is also aware that the deplorable situation in relationship between her and South Africa, exacerbated all the more by their respective nationals, is most regrettable. South Africa, on liberation from endemic and parasitic white-minority rule demonstrated good will in recompense to Nigeria by seeking for Nigeria’s professionals to immigrate to the country but more disappointingly, that good will faded due to the activities of organised criminals involving mostly Nigerians, Russians and Chinese. Shaw [13] agrees that: The growth of Nigerian organised crime groups in South Africa over the last five years has been phenomenal. Organised crime assessment completed by the South African government indicate substantial activity by Nigerian organised crime groups in South Africa. Despite this, there have been comparatively few arrests and fewer successful prosecutions. Street-level drug officers in Johannesburg admit that they are largely unsuccessful in countering Nigerian and central African criminal organisations and parts of inner city Johannesburg are increasingly dominated by the activities of Nigerian and central African ‘drug lords’.

Necessitated by the increasing crime waves by Nigerians and some citizens of other countries, especially of the Central African origin, South African security officials have kept certain categories of crime under close watch enlisting them under numerous projects as can be gleaned on table-2, as contained in the appendix.

Meanwhile, the history of Nigeria’s assistance to South Africa is still fresh. It was no mistaken happenstance that Nigeria, from independence, under Nigeria’s Tafawa Balewa Prime Ministership was supported by Governor-General Nnamdi Azikiwe, one of the Pari-Africanists, in enunciating the Nigerian concentric foreign policy. As it were, in the true African defence, Nigeria’s concentric foreign policy was anchored strongly on the ideology of Pan-Africanism: that blacks, wherever they are on this planet, must think Africa first. The Africans so referred to, also includes Nigerians. Nigeria, in her foreign policy, espoused: “the total eradication of all forms of racial discrimination” as one of the pillars of her foreign policy and second, “the total liberation of the whole of the African continent from domination” [12].

Pan-Africanism, which was championed by the likes of Nigerian Nnamdi Azikiwe, gave birth to the Organisation of African Unity (OAU, now AU), which became the veritable African instrument used in the fight-to-finish of the apartheid bastion in South Africa. Marable [14] agrees that the relevance of Pan-Africanism was demonstrated as a strategy of liberating African peoples through taking of progressive stance on global issues. It is, therefore, instructive from Marable’s assertion that Nigeria and South Africa should strive to imbibe the principle of mutual understanding and trust in their reciprocal relations in cooperation rather than conflict in pursuing their respective state interests. Taking different ways translates to forming opposing blocs of countries against African interests in global fora.

Nigeria-South Africa ‘Yellow Fever Card’ Diplomatic Row

Nigerians was visibly shocked that South African authorities, hanging on their fingernails, deported Nigerian travellers, on March 1st, 2012, from Oliver Tambo International Airport in Johannesburg on the immediate reasons adduced by the receiving country as relating to health and ‘fake’ yellow fever card certificates. Peeved by the disturbing ‘harsh’ and ‘cruel’ treatment of Nigerian citizens by South African Immigration officers, Nigerian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Ambassador Olugbenga Ashiru, supported by eminent Nigerians in the policymaking corridors, including former Minister of Foreign Affairs, Professor Bolaji Akinyemi [15] and the Chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on the Diaspora Affairs, Abike I I abiri-Erewa adopted the principle of reciprocity in defending Nigeria’s national interest, image and glory, however, the Nigerian government’s considered ill-treatment of her citizens drew a mixed-bag of reactions. Although The Nation [16] editorial opinion argued that: The basis of hostility to Nigerians is the apparent non-conformity of our citizens with the Mores and Traditions of the foreign societies where they live. Nigerians also have a reputation for carrying drugs across frontiers, for indulging in advance fee frauds and for exploiting the spiritual needs of their host and for general loud behaviour including wild parties and loud music.

South African Home Affairs Department spokesman, Ronnie as reported by Alli and Osa-
Okunbor [17], stated that the to deport Nigerians stemmed purely from health concerns. In his ‘it is not an immigration issue, it is a health matter... Nobody without a fever certificate is allowed into the country [South African and that is is’ [17].

Oppoing schools of thought, essentially among the policymakers, that Nigerians are not worst in internationally accepted code of product when situated with the Termite-on-the-till scams perpetrated against economy by citizens of the so-called developed, great and civilised of the world. For example, the Halliburton scam perpetrated by the TSKJ - a subsidiary of Halliburton; the Wilbros bribery scandal by Wihbros Group Incorporated (WGI) — an oil service company with sidiary in Nigeria; and the Siemens bribery scandal by the Siemens AG — a nan giant telecommunication company [18], etc. The group of renders of Nigeria’s citizen diplomacy through reciprocity — ‗tit-for-tat’, ‘an eye-for-an-eye’ diplomacy — condemned

Nigeria’s ‘Santa Claus’ foreign policy in relation to South Africa’s “flimsy excuse” for meting out disrespect and diplomatic cruelty against Nigeria and Nigerians. The group, represented by the Minister of State in the Ministry of foreign Affairs, agreed that ‘the recent mass deportation of Nigerians by south African authorities, on the 1st and 2nd of March 2012, allegedly on the ground that they were in possession of irregular Yellow Fever Vaccination Cards, has expectedly elicited reactions from several quarters in Nigeria’.

Again, Ashiru, cited in Alli & Ehikoya [19] remarked that ‘in accordance with its avowed policy of protecting the interest of, Nigerians wherever they are found, the Nigerian government had to take appropriate reciprocal measures, primarily to protest this inhuman treatment of Nigerians by overzealous South African Immigration officials’. Thus, while Nigerian government sent its complaint to South African Fligh Commissioner to Nigeria, Kingsley Mambolo, it directed also its Fling Commissioner in South Africa to lodge formal protest to the South African authorities. To justify the reciprocal action of the Nigerian government, Ashiru reiterated as follows ‘this is a government that cares for its citizens. Any Nigerian that is maltreated anywhere in the world will be taken up. This is a message to all the governments globally. We will not stand by where Nigerians are maltreated unjustly’ [19].

The ‘maltreatment’ meted to the Nigerian travellers, the government maintained, came from its understanding of international conventions and standard practices. Not only that Europe, the United States of America and many African States exempt Nigerian travellers from their yellow fever endemic list based on World Health Organisation (WFIO) report on Nigeria as yellow fever-free nation [17], the yellow fever card certificate is a conditio sine qua non for issuing travelling visa and not the cat-before-the- horse affair. Better still, and where necessary, a traveller without the card is quarantined, guaranteed, inoculated and allowed time upward of thirty (30) minutes (in case of an adverse reaction) before he is allowed to gain entry into his destination point in the host country. More disturbing too, is that Nigeria, in the spirit of Africa’s ‘big’ brotherhood, relaxes her procedures only to be spitten on the face by her so-called ‘small’ brothers.

Despite the immediate cause of the diplomatic row, some observers in The Nation [16] maintain that the logic of the diplomatic face- off between Nigeria and South Africa remotely stemmed from the “cold war” cloud built in the bilateral relations as a result of the Libyan crisis in which Nigeria was up against South Africa’s support for Muammar Gaddafi and backed the rebel-controlled Transitional National Council (TNC) that ousted the Libyan strongman. According to the source: In the last one year, there has been a cold war between Nigeria and South Africa, beginning with the Libyan crisis. At the time, the world was against Gaddafi, [Jacobi Zuma openly identified with the late dictator. He bulldozed his way to head a committee of the AU on Libyan crisis but the report presented to African leaders was wishy-washy and biased. Nigeria succeeded in persuading most of the AU States to recognise the TNC. Nigeria’s position was adopted by the UN. South Africa has not forgiven Nigeria for making it to ‘lose out’ in international politics. It was a major foreign policy setback for President Zuma, who is gradually being isolated by world leaders for opposing reforms in Libya [16].

As a hangover, one of Zuma’s wives, the 1-lone Affairs Minister Nkosazana Dlamini-Zuma, whom President Zuma projected to become Chairperson of the AU Commission as a replacement of incumbent Jean Ping, failed to secure Nigeria’s support at the election in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The failure of Nigeria’s support transferred Zuma’s aggression against Nigeria, which he suspected as wielding enormous political power. Nigeria’s action was guided by the time-honoured principle by the major powers to avoid occupying preeminent positions in the regional, continental and global institutions. Thus, Nigeria saw and reasoned Jacob Zuma’s projection of his former wife to the position as a breach and nepotism.

Still, in 2011 South Africa, against the position of Nigeria-led nomic Community of West African States’ (ECOWAS) and AU pressure resident Laurent Gbagbo to step down from power after loosing election Allasane Quattara, continued backing Gbagbo’s control of power in Cote Ivoire. By and large, two major institutions of the Republic of South Africa Police and Immigration — can be correctly identified as fueling
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the 3rd and hatred against Nigerians in South Africa, simply because Nigeria not intervened in the past.

Based on the unjustified embarrassment to Nigeria by the two South Africa institutions that aimed to drag Nigeria’s image to the mud, Nigerian hoities despite taking calculated reciprocal measures, marshalled out five conditions to end the diplomatic row. The conditions include: unconditional apology to Nigeria by South Africa over the deportation; compensation for all the victims of the ‘cruel’ deportation; disciplinary action against all the officials involved in the incident; a review of the Yellow Fever Card Vaccination Card policy; and a commitment that such a diplomatic faux pas will not reoccur [20].

The conditions were aimed to re-establish understanding, trust, confidence and respect for the mutual interest of the two countries in their socio-economic and diplomatic relations as Africa’s leading giants.

**Nigeria’s Economic Diplomacy and the Diaspora Defence**

Nigeria’s unrewarding spraying diplomacy to fellow African States and indeed the world, informed new emphasis on the doctrine of reciprocity in her citizen diplomatic relations with other nations under the biting global economic meltdown of the time. Thus, Nigeria’s citizen diplomacy is at the level of citizen-to-citizen; it is counter-strike diplomacy, payback diplomacy, or tit-for-tat diplomacy. By citizen diplomacy, Nigeria will defend the right of Nigerian citizens at home and abroad even when such citizens in diaspora have been accused of violating the laws of their host-countries.

While it could be thought out of fashion to consider yellow paper a serious validating document for international travel by a visiting foreign national, it does not altogether remove the fact that its absence, among compulsory travelling documents in a country that appears thorough, spells negligence, which might be treated differently according to the domestic law principles of respective states of the international community.

In Nigeria-South Africa bilateral relations under economic diplomacy, one would ask the burning questions: how has Nigeria-South Africa Chamber of Commerce impacted on the bilateral trade relations from the point of view of opportunities and the rule of international best practices? Can Nigerian diaspora in South Africa learn to leverage diaspora potentials for economic and technological development; to imbibe the more rewarding opportunities of globalisation in interdependence; to increase Nigeria’s surplus value from Nigeria-South Africa cross-border transactions in goods and services; and of capital flows through transparent, more rapid and widespread diffusion of science and technology?

Among one of the emerging global powers in the Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa (BRICS) nations, South Africa has assortment of thriving multinational corporations (MNCs) clputs - the largest telecommunication network, MTN and the electronics conglomerates, HiTv, Life’s Good (LG) Multi-Choice the owners of DSTV - in Nigeria netting trillions of naira into the South Africa economy. South African citizens in Nigeria, by clarity of their business practices, have their businesses well registered and recognised by business law in Nigeria with measurable concessions. Few of the Nigerian businesses in South Africa are owned by the Nigerian-based energy conglomerate- Oando which is listed in the Johannesburg Stock Exchange and the Dangote Group with investment of a whooping $378 million dollars in South Africa’s cement industry. As a member of BRICS nations, South Africa has the potential to increase Nigeria. BRICS nations trade relations that is presently at 10% and 7.8% with India and Brazil, respectively (www.cial/ni.html).

The success of South African business concerns in Nigeria pose great challenges to Nigeria diaspora in South Africa who are cast in the mould of good-for-nothing but idle, redundant drug-pushing and prostituting nationals - a bunch of unrepentant criminals who could engage in any dirty deals for the sake of their individual economic survival. It is worrisome that Nigeria has rapidly increasing demographics, which is presently half of West Africa’s population and skewed preponderantly 51.7 per cent in favour of the young (15-65 years) age-bracket who are not planned for. Nigeria’s educational system is in shambles and offers no promise for entrepreneurial activities that can solve the problems of unemployment, brain-drain and the attendant insecurity issues. However sore the behaviours of Nigerians in diaspora, it cannot be unconnected with the national malaise-Nigeria’s youth bulge in the midst of racheting unemployment and underemployment accentuated more by phenomenal leadership corruption under a mono-cultural weak economic environment.

**Evaluating Nigeria-South Africa High-Low Diplomatic Relations**

Nigeria-South Africa relations is based on the dynamic feature of international relations. Since international relations are not activities based on mere altruism but national interest guided by international law at best, in order to outwin or outmanouvre the opponent in the world of differing interests, covert and overt roles can dictate behaviours, thus the need for experts and analysis of cultural environment of international relations.
Regrettably, Nigeria’s unseriousness to the principles and tenets of good governance has always been the cassus beth for low points in diplomatic relations between her and South Africa. For instance, as a member of Commonwealth association of nations comprising United Kingdom its dependencies, and many former British colonies that are now sovereign states with common allegiance to the British Crown, Nigeria is expected, as subscribed under the association, to obey the common object of the group to advance democracy, human rights, the promotion of sustainable economic growth and social development within member states and other countries.

In 1995, for example, contrary to assurances from Nigerian Head of State, Sani Abacha to South African president, Nelson Mandela, Abacha executed nine persons including Ken Beeson Saro-Wiwa, the president of the Movement for the Survival of Ogoni People (MOSOP). Right up until the Commonwealth Summit in 1995, Mandela was misled by Abacha thus foiling South Africa’s experiment on quiet diplomacy to resolve Nigeria’s lingering political conundrum which altogether led to the arrest and curious sentencing for execution, 40 political opponents, including former head of state, Olusegun Obasanjo, as well as the adjudged winner of the 1993 Nigerian presidential election, Moshood Kashimawo Olawale Abiola.

The deceit and contrariety to civilised norms guiding Nigeria-South Africa relations forced President Mandela to champion the course for a two-year expulsion of Nigeria from the 52-member Commonwealth of Nations at its conference in Auckland, New Zealand on grounds of human rights abuses [21]. Mandela also criticised Royal Dutch Shell for going ahead with a US$4 billion gas project in Nigeria despite its unpopularity within Nigeria and the world. The South African government’s action was in defence of democracy, human rights and development. Although, Abacha saw nothing serious in expelling Nigeria from the forum of “common nations,” the Nigerian Chief of General Staff and vice-chairman of the Provisional Ruling Council, Lieutenant-General Oladipo Diya, spiritedly defended his boss, stating:

It is distressing to observe how President Mandela has descended to the point of hauling personal insults at our head of state and even issuing threats aimed at the dismemberment of our country... By his utterances, the South African leader is now clearly posing a serious threat to African unity. Certainly, any escalation in the Abacha-Mandela tangle will polarise the continent and make African unity a vibrant mirage” [22].

However jaundiced and self-serving, the defence, the stark reality remains that any form of confrontation (diplomatic or military) between the two African giants in whatever guise is capable of polarising the peoples of Africa and posing a grave challenge against the still-born continental unity of Africa. The point is clearer when juxtaposed with the perception of member-countries of African Union that South Africa was acting against Nigeria under the forces of Britain and America imperialism. The harsh position of some African States made South Africa to back-track and partner with African states instead of adopting the ‘go-it-alone’ policy. Following the back-tracking measures, South Africa government denied Nigeria’s pro-democracy groups travelling visas to hold political meetings in the country, one such case was the Wole Soyinka political conference saga. Some of the other sore points in Nigeria-South Africa diplomatic relations stem from the following:

- South African-sponsored Commonwealth punishment against Nigeria and, beyond that action, South African football authorities also withdrew its earlier invitation to Nigeria’s Super Eagles to a fournment duel in South Africa;
- South Africa’s establishment of military base in Equatorial Guinea under the sponsorship of Western imperialists to destabilise Nigeria;
- South Africa’s aid to son of former British Prime Minister Margret Thatcher, Mark Thatcher, for subversive moves to oust President Teodoro Obiang Nguema as a strategic ploy to enthrone an anti-Nigerian leadership in Equatorial Guinea;
- Between 2007 and 2009, South Africa’s Police and security operatives engaged in xenophobic and extra-judicial killings, maiming, destruction, harrassment, intimidation, brutalising and looting on Nigerian citizens living in the country; and
- Increasing competition for positions at multilateral organisations, for instance, Nigeria’s bid for Africa’s slot in the United Nations Security Council with South Africa and the like of Egypt.

Part of the less-than-expected Nigeria-South Africa diplomatic ations stem from Nigeria’s fast-tracking of her relations with South Africa cist regime at the tail-end of the struggle to dismantle apartheid in South froica, when the aborigines felt betrayed, abandoned and sacrificed for Nigeria’s perceived economic interest in South Africa [12] at a critical moment when Nigeria was the Chairman of OAU and was, therefore, expected to lead not only the African states but also, other six members of the frontline states.

CONCLUSION

Nigeria’s spraying diplomacy to ‘brother’ South Africa was based on the prospect of building friendly relationship that would drive African States to growth and development. Nigeria lent part her financial muscle to South Africa through the ANC-government that received handsome amount to conduct local government election in the country. Nigeria helped South Africa realise black-majority rule in the country
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with Nelson Mandela’s hard-won presidential victory immediately after release from prison incarceration on March 1990. It was also under Nigeria-born Chief Emeka Anyaoku, as the Secretary-General of Commonwealth of Nations, that apartheid was peacefully replaced by non-racial democracy through a process which brought South Africa a degree of unity and reconciliation.

In the Nigeria-South Africa fray over treatments of their nationals by the respective host states in their bilateral diplomatic relations, one wonders if the two states’ actions corresponded to the AU principles of “respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of each member state and for its inalienable right to independent existence” when situated with the expression that “the concept of an alien is purely legal and could stand contrary to the facts.”

RECOMMENDATIONS

- This research recommend that the culture of respect to rule of behavior is reciprocal to national obligations to secure and protect the lives, property and core values of the citizen.
- In the historic Nigeria –South Africa diplomatic relation. Nigeria as a matter of urgency and practice must learn to imbibe the culture of international best practices in order to be respected by follow African state in pursuing her national interest in the African region.
- Imbibing the culture of global; best practices to drive Nigeria’s economic diplomacy in adorably will promote the country citizen diploma and Diaspora defence in relationship with south Africa towards the overall Africa development.
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