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Abstract: Nigeria and South Africa are globally seen as sister countries. These two countries have always had reasons to sign Memorandum of Understanding to strengthen their relationship. Nigeria invested heavily in South Africa’s struggle for freedom during the apartheid regime. From the time of the struggle till this democratic dispensation, Nigeria has been making it possible for the two countries to co-exist peacefully. Regrettably, South Africa, at one time or the other tends to exhibit xenophobic tendencies. Xenophobia in South Africa has been a threat to Nigerians living in South Africa. Nigerians have had a bitter taste of this cultural malaise including the attack of 2015. The most embarrassing display of this was that recorded on the 2nd of March, 2012 when 125 Nigerians were deported from South Africa. This socio-political crisis is the focus of this paper. The paper looks at the background of the relationship between the two countries, the causes of conflict from general perspective, the cloud behind the crisis as well as the marketing implications of the row. Being a theoretical work, the library forms its bedrock of information repository. The paper, as part of its recommendations, emphasizes the need for the last Memorandum of Understanding on Trade and Investment signed by these two countries to be implemented accordingly to avoid a relapse in the efforts made to build a strategic alliance. Concluding, the paper sees crisis as a common phenomenon which takes place even in families, but if not properly managed could degenerate to a level of ignominy; hence, the need to build a strategic alliance to form a common front that will reposition Africa in global politics and economy.
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Introduction
Nigeria has always seen South Africa as a big brother. During the apartheid era, the relationship between the two countries could be likened to what a former British Prime Minister, Winston Churchill in 1964 coined as a ‘Special relationship’ when he was trying to describe the tie between the United States of America and Britain which socio-political or economic crisis has not been able to break. Nigeria was one of the foremost supporters of Black South African Liberation Movements, including the African National Congress. She played a pivotal role in establishing the United Nations Special Committee against Apartheid in the1960s. According to NigeriaWorld.com (2008), the Nigerian government issued more than 300 passports to South Africans seeking to travel abroad. As part of Nigerian’s contribution, the late Sonny Okosun of Nigeria wrote the hit song “Fire in Soweto” in 1977 to commemorate the 1976 Soweto uprising against white-rule in South Africa.

South Africa and Nigeria have long-standing bilateral relations. They share a common commitment to the unity and prosperity of the African continent as well as a just and equitable world, though at one point or the other they find themselves disagreeing on certain issues.

The two countries were not in agreement when Sanni Abacha publicly executed nine
Ogoni leaders including the human rights activist, Ken Saro Wiwa, in 1995. The extra judicial killing by the junta leader in Nigeria strained the relationship between the two countries. Landsberg (2004) observed that after the execution of Ken Saro Wiwa, the then South African President, late Nelson Mandela pushed for a two year suspension of Nigeria’s membership in the Commonwealth of Nations.

The relationship between the two kept limping from that time until the emergence of a civilian rule under the leadership of President Olusegun Obasanjo in 1999 and the simultaneous election of President Thambo Mbeki in South Africa when what could be seen as a strategic partnership was born. It was also in 1999 that the Bi-National Commission (BNC) was established to strengthen the relationship between Nigeria and South Africa.

At this point, the sub-Sahara Africa’s largest economies were determined to eliminate conflict among them and ultimately build a platform on which growth becomes inevitable. In that spirit, a continental socio-economic blue print branded “New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) was designed to extinguish continental conflict, reconstruct the institutional architecture of the continent, among others. Unfortunately neither NEPAD nor BNC did much to actualize its set objectives. However, BNC met in 1999 to discuss the possibility of strengthening the much acclaimed economic and trade relations, but that never resolved conflicting issues.

The communiqué raised in the 2009 BNC session (see exhibit1) as reported by the Department of International Relations and Co-operation, South Africa (www.dfa.gov.za/) was filled with thought provoking ideas capable of building a strategic alliance between Nigeria and South Africa, but it is obvious that there was no structure or platform to implement those wonderful ideas and that explains the wobbling experienced by the duo in their relationship. In 2010, BNC could not convene due to South Africa’s refusal to grant visa waiver to Nigerian officials and diplomats. That further strained the relationship between the two countries. In 2012, the big bang slammed, culminating into crisis in the two countries. The 2012 socio-political crisis is the focus of this paper.

Conflict
Conflict has no single definition, as different people see it from different perspectives. Business Dictionary defines conflict as friction or opposition resulting from actual or perceived differences or incompatibilities. Rakhim (2010) defines conflict as an interactive process manifested in incompatibility, disagreement or dissonance within or between social entities. He further notes that a conflict may be limited to one individual, who is conflicted within himself (the intrapersonal conflict). He identifies the following common elements in the definition of conflict:

- there are recognized opposing interests between parties in a zero-sum situation;
- there must be a belief by each side that the other one is acting or will act against them;
- this belief is likely to be justified by actions taken;
- conflict is a process, having developed from their past interactions;
From the foregoing, it is obvious that conflict arises as a result of differences or incompatibilities on issues. Conflicts are seen where there are discordant voices within a person or among people, or even animals.

**Causes of Conflict**

It is pertinent to look at conflict and its causes, as crisis in some cases crop up when conflicts are poorly managed. To corroborate the assertion above, BBC English Dictionary sees crisis as a situation where a conflict has become so threatening or dangerous that people are afraid there will be fighting or war. Conflict arises due to various reasons. The famous economist, Malthus says that reduced supply of the means of subsistence is the root cause of conflict. Stressing the causes of conflict, he asserts that conflict is caused by the increase in population in geometrical progression and the food supply in arithmetical progression. According to Eric (2000), the tenet of that theory is based on the idea that if the number of people doubles every 25 years (unless checked), growing at a geometric rate (1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, etc) and food production increases at just an arithmetic rate (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, etc), then population will always outstrip food supply and when this happens, conflict may crop up.

Contrary to Malthus’ view, Charles Darwin sees the biological principle of “struggle for existence and survival of the fittest” as the main cause of conflict (Theodore, 2004).

Sigmund Freud and other eminent psychologists believe that innate instinct for aggression in man is the main cause of conflict.

It is quite obvious that there are innumerable causes of conflict, but this paper shall consider the following causes of conflict as enumerated by preservearticle.com:

1. **Individual Differences**
   In a society, men are not alike in their nature, attitudes, ideal, interest and aspirations. Due to these differences, they fail to accommodate one another and this may lead to conflict among them.

2. **Cultural Differences**
   Culture is the way of life of a group. It differs from society to society. The culture of one group may differ from that of another group. Cultural differences among groups, sometimes cause tension and lead to conflict.

3. **Clash of Interest**
   When people have different interests in a common issue or task, such clash of interest could result in conflict.

4. **Social Changes**
   Conflict also arises due to the difference in the rate of social change. The change in the moral norms of a society and man’s hope, aspiration and demand leads to conflict. The conflict between the old and new generations is owing to social changes. Conflict is an expression of social disequilibrium.

**The Crisis**

Crisis as defined by Encarta Dictionary is a situation or period in which things are very uncertain, difficult, or painful, especially a time when action must be taken to avoid complete disaster or breakdown.

Similarly, the online dictionary, Wiktionary, sees crisis as any negative change in the security, economic, political, societal or environmental affairs especially when they occur...
abruptly, with little or no warning.

To further elucidate, Seeger, Sellnow and Ulmer (1998) view crisis as having four defining characteristics. According to these authors, crises are specific, unexpected, non-routine events that create high levels of uncertainty, threat or perceived threat to an organization’s high priority goals.

Going by the definitions of crisis above, it is not a misnomer to qualify the 2012 South Africa/Nigeria feud as a crisis. What really happened between the two countries that culminated into crisis?

On the second day of March, 2012, a total of one hundred and twenty five (125) Nigerian citizens were deported from the Or Tambo International Airport (ORTIA) for allegedly being in possession of fraudulent yellow fever vaccine certificates. These Nigerians including women and children and even a serving Senator were delayed for twenty-four (24) hours, without water and food in an inhuman condition before being bundled back to Nigeria. Many Nigerians including the legislators bemoaned this inhuman treatment meted against Nigerians. Gbenga (2012) in trying to unveil the height of indignation unleashed on Nigerians, cited the then Chairman of the Committee in Diaspora, Nigeria House of Representatives, Mrs. Abike Dabiri-Erewa lamenting thus: “Why treating Nigerians with scorn and indignation? This is really appalling. Is this the way to pay Nigerians back for their kind gesture? This is unfair and un-African.” The legislature summed the action as “inhuman, hostile and unwarranted.”

This action by South Africa enraged the Nigerian government who saw the act as xenophobia and protested immediately through the then Minister of Foreign Affairs, Minister of Health and the National Assembly. To make her stand known to South African government, five (5) days later, Nigeria reciprocated South Africa’s action by deporting 86 South Africans. In addition to the aforementioned figure, fifty-six (56) more South Africans were barred from entering Nigeria through the Murtala Muhammed International Airport, Lagos. According to the Punch of 8th March, 2012, the Federal Government of Nigeria decided to bar the 56 South Africans from entering because despite the measures taken by Nigeria, the South African government failed to show remorse. Nigerian government had given South Africa five (5) conditions to end the diplomatic row between the two countries. According to African Herald Express, 7th March, 2012, these conditions are:

1. Unconditional apology to Nigeria over the deportation of 125 Nigerian travelers on Friday, 2nd March, 2012, from the Oliver Tambo International Airport in Johannesburg;
2. Compensation for all the victims of the harsh treatment;
3. Disciplinary action against all the officials involved in the cruelty to Nigerians;
4. A review of the yellow Fever Vaccination Card policy; and
5. A commitment that such a diplomatic slip will not re-occur.

These conditions by Nigerian government were made known to the then South African High Commissioner to Nigeria, Mr. Kingsley Mambo, with a threat that Nigeria was ready to retaliate in whatever way to prove that their sovereignty can no longer be taken for granted if South
Africa failed to apologize and review the Yellow Fever Vaccination Card, among others. On the 16th March, 2012, South Africa’s President in a letter to the Nigerian government apologized for what he branded a “regrettable incident, which the South African government believed could have been handled better” (The Nation, May 5, 2012). He, however, ruled out the issue of compensation, saying that it was out of the question, as South African government was at that moment conducting an investigation, the outcome of which will lead to severe punishment for those found to be culpable in that decision.

Xenophobia
According to Smelser. and Baltes (2001), the word, xenophobia, originates from the Greek words xénos, meaning 'the stranger' and 'the guest' and phóbos, meaning 'fear'. When these two words are joined, we have xenophobia which stands for 'fear of the stranger' or 'hatred of strangers.'

Xenophobia can be seen as a negative attitudinal orientation or disposition of natives towards non-natives, usually expressed in hostile manners. Xenophobia and racism are sometimes used interchangeably, but they are distinct phenomena. Whereas racism usually entails distinction based on physical characteristic differences, such as skin colour, hair type, facial features, etc, xenophobia implies behaviour based on the idea that the other is foreign to or originates from outside the community or nation (UNESCO, 2017).

Apartheid
Apartheid, according to Encyclopedia Britannica, is a policy that governed relations between South Africa’s white minority and nonwhite majority and sanctioned racial segregation and political and economic discrimination against nonwhites. The implementation of apartheid, often called “separate development” since the 1960s, was made possible through the Population Registration Act of 1950, which classified all South Africans as either Bantu (all black Africans), Coloured (those of mixed race), or white. A fourth category—Asian (Indian and Pakistani)—was later added.

Apartheid was a system of institutionalized racial segregation that existed in South Africa from 1948 until the early 1990s. Apartheid was characterized by an authoritarian political culture based on baasskap (or white supremacy), which encouraged state repression of Black African, Coloured, and Asian South Africans for the benefit of the nation’s minority white population.

The Cloud Behind Nigeria/South Africa Row
The South Africa/ Nigeria feud of 2012 may not be a yellow fever vaccination issue as different people raised many issues which may have contributed to the degeneration of the conflict. According to the then Nigeria’s Health Minister, Prof. Onyebuchi Chukwu, “possession of a valid yellow fever card was a condition for issuing visa to Nigerians in the first instance, as such the deportation of 125 Nigerians was politically motivated” (Nwaneri, 2012).

Since the two countries hold differing views on certain issues, it will not be out of place to say that the South Africa/Nigeria crisis was as a result of clash of interests.

Trying to pin down the crisis to clash of interest, Nwaneri (2012) opined that while the past President, Goodluck Jonathan, had in the thick of the Ivoirian crisis caused by power-struggle between Laurent Gbagbo and Alassane Quattara, advocated a United Nations backing
for military intervention in the country to prevent it slipping into a civil war that could destabilize the West African region, South African’s past President, Jacob Zuma, who claimed that there were some discrepancies in the manner in which the country’s election result was pronounced then, described Jonathan’s call as counter-productive.

Citing Nwaneri once again, similar scenario played out in the Libyan crisis in 2012. Whereas Nigeria backed the rebel-controlled Transitional National Council (TNC), South Africa supported the late Maummar Gadafi. Nigeria’s position was supported by 34 African countries, but Uganda and Zimbabwe teamed up with South Africa to align with the late dictator.

Still on the clash of interest, Uyo (2011) sees the battle for a potential African seat on the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) as a major source of contention between South Africa and Nigeria. As the most populous African nation, Nigeria’s permanent membership on the UNSC would more proportionately represent the African continent. As the most economically advanced country in Africa, a seat for South Africa could signify increased economic possibilities for UN operations in Africa. Fortunately for Nigeria, she was one of the five countries elected to serve as non-permanent members on the Security Council of United Nations for two year term starting from the 1st January, 2014.

Going by the points of difference above, it is obvious that the diplomatic row between the two countries was ignited by their clash of interest on international politics.

Marketing Implications of South Africa/Nigeria Row
According to the then South African Minister for Correctional Services, Mrs. Nosiviwe Mapisa-Ngakula, there are about two million Nigerians in South Africa as at 2012 (All Africa, 2012). These Nigerians may have gone to South Africa to look for greener pastures. The case of South Africa was different as most of them who lived in Nigeria then were corporate citizens who work with a good number of South African companies in Nigeria. The biggest mobile telecommunication company in Nigeria, MTN, a South African company with more than 42 million out of the 95 million total active subscribers is in Nigeria (Leadership Nigeria, 10th March, 2012). MTN Nigeria is the biggest and most lucrative market for MTN of all the 21 African and Middle East countries where they operate. According to Sule in Business Day of 23 July, 2012, the total revenue realized by the MTN group amounted to 2.57 trillion naira by the end of 2010 financial year. Of that amount, the Nigerian subsidiary (MTN Nigeria) made 794 billion naira representing 29% of the group’s total revenue for that financial year. In effect, MTN Nigeria contributed the most of the group’s gross income for that year. Stanbic IBTC is another company with major South Africa stake operating in Nigeria. Others are Shoprite (supermarket chain) which has many outlets in Nigeria, MultiChoice DSTV, among others. According to Jacob Zuma, 73,282 Nigerian tourists visited South Africa in 2012. This number shows a 13.8 percent increase from the previous year. He further states that their record shows that Nigerian tourists contributed a total of R720 million (about N1.5 billion). Having seen the gains made by South African’s companies in Nigeria, the question is, how many Nigerian firms are making such inroads into South Africa’s economy? Anyway, First bank has a representative office and Dangote cement acquired a Sephaku Cement Ltd. The list probably ends there. The fact that Nigerian firms in South Africa are not as many as theirs in Nigeria is an indication that South Africa gains a lot from Nigeria. Consequently, if the crisis had continued, South Africa would have simply deported those Nigerians whom they feel are economic saboteurs. Deportation of unemployed Nigerians would have increased the population of unemployed Nigerians and
possibly destabilized the polity, even security wise. On the other hand, if the crisis had continued, Nigeria would have sent packing, South African companies including those that have made giant strides in Nigerian market, like MTN, Stanbic IBTC, PEP and TFG. This action would have heavily hit the South African economy whose growth, these companies contribute to. Already, reports from Daily Maverick of 23rd May 2012 cited the case of Arise Magazine Fashion Week taking place in Lagos on the week of the crisis. The exercise was disrupted because South African designers meant to travel to Nigeria were caught up in the tit-for-tat standoff between the two countries. Again, if MTN had gone home, the then market challenger, Globacom Nigeria would have automatically stepped in to assume the market leadership position – a drift that would have greatly favoured Nigeria. But then, would Globacom have had the capacity to employ the thousands of Nigerians under MTN’s payroll? Would they have had the production capacity to deliver the desired services to Nigerians if they were taken aback? Certainly, this is going to be a herculean task.

Another sector that would have been badly hit is the advertising industry. Some adverts by Nigerian firms are shot in South Africa and finally broadcast in Nigeria. Further strain on their relationship would have meant South Africa losing the income from these firms in Nigeria.

Similarly, some Nollywood movies are shot in South Africa even as some South African soap operas are shown on Nigerian channels. This implies that whatever tax levied on these marketers would be paid to South African government, so if the crisis had lingered, these Nigerian companies, would have been forced to look inwards.

Finally, some powerful Nigerian Pentecostals like Love World (Christ Embassy) are making giant strides in South Africa, so if the crisis had continued, both countries would have been hit. What then should be the position of a marketing oriented government given that this crisis has dealt a devastating blow on the economies of the two nations?

Recommendations

1. On the 23rd May, 2012 at the 8th session of the BNC in Cape Town, Nigeria and South Africa signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on trade and investment shortly after the deportation feud, but there was no structure set aside for the implementation of their decisions. This was confirmed by Namadi Sambo who stated inter alia, “the outcome of our work today including the signing of MoUs and agreements would hardly yield the desired result without the political will to implement our decisions” (www.channelstv.com). To this end, both Nigeria and South Africa should build a platform on which the decisions reached at the two day meeting would be implemented.

2. The visa waiver for holders of diplomatic and official passports, which Nigerians are clamouring for should be tactically handled by South Africa as any mismanagement of this sensitive issue may end up giving room for some other African countries to hide under this guise and flood their country like Zimbabweans did and this may lead to further xenophobic actions like that of 2008 which left many foreigners, including Nigerians dead in South Africa. Visa waiver is a sensitive issue and should be handled diplomatically.

3. Both countries should see the relationship between them as strategic and be ready to protect it. America and Britain have been in alliance over the years, passing through thick and thin
without straining their relationship. Such strategic alliance should be the reference point of South Africa and Nigeria even when they are faced with challenging situations capable of igniting diplomatic row. Partnership between these two key players would be a starting point on which other cooperation initiatives are built to overcome the political and socio-economic quandaries that face Africa.

4. Nigerian government should take concrete steps to discourage the continuing spread of corruption, stop its capital flight to the detriment of the economy and repair the country’s battered international image. If the country’s image is positively rebuilt, countries like South Africa would see Nigerians in good light and would do anything to protect their relationship with them. A situation where Transparency International ranked Nigeria 148/180 in their 2017 Corruption Perception Index makes international community look at Nigeria with jaundiced eyes (Transparency international).

Conclusion
Crisis can take place in a family, community, state, country, among nations of the world and so it is not unprecedented to see two countries have diplomatic row. Nigeria and South Africa are two sister countries that have come a long way to build a strong alliance in Africa. This alliance does not exclude the possibility of the two having clash of interests at one time or another, but projects the continuing bi-lateral relationship enjoyed over the years between the two. Poorly managed misunderstanding could degenerate to crisis which may further detonate like a time bomb if mismanaged. To this end, the relationship between Nigeria and South Africa should be protected so as to create conducive international marketing environment as well as form a common front that will reposition Africa in global politics.
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that there are many universities in Nigeria, there are many graduates in Nigeria, there are many experts in Nigeria but there are few visible contributions the above named have made towards Nigeria’s development;
· that there is need for Nigerians in South Africa to strengthen themselves by forming collective units through which their contributions in South Africa could be visible so as to mitigate stereotype;
· that South African government in Nigeria uses the platform of governor’s forum to make necessary contribution and relaying of complaints or appreciating good gesture through the same medium;
· that the launching of the said Nigeria-South Africa Friendship Association is aimed at helping to harness the relationship between the two states;
· that South African government recognizes the importance of Nigeria and its contribution to South African citizens during the apartheid regime, citing President Thabo Mbeki as one of the beneficiaries;
· that Nigeria’s status as non-permanent member of the United Nations Security Council is of huge benefit for the continent;
· that South Africa will collaborate with Nigeria to produce positive results for the continent through Nigeria’s non-permanent membership status in the United Nations;
· that the Bi-National relations will improve trade relations and less the xenophobic tendencies;
· that South African government needs assistance of countries with longer years of experience from independence to deal with her shortcomings in inter-state relations;
· that ‘Ghana Must Go’ a common sack used in Nigeria derived its name from Nigeria’s intolerance towards Ghana at a given time in the past;
· that Nigeria has overcome xenophobia through interactions and engagements;
· that the then Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) was to empower all blacks in South Africa but failed;
· that exchange programme among students to be introduced to avail students the opportunity of working in their field of study, allowing Nigerian students who study agricultural science to come to South Africa to do internship in large scale commercial farms in South Africa;
· that through the bi-national relations, South Africa and Nigeria should improve on their VISA regime to allow each other citizenship and active participation in government within the framework that would be mapped out for the VISA regime;
· that technical know-how between the two countries must be advanced in order to tap from the human resources the two states are endowed with;
· that Nigeria must learn to care for its citizens because that is what democracy supports;
· that the educational system must be improved to give the best, that going to the USA and UK and other countries make travelling African children lose African cultural values on transit;
· that Nigerians have made positive contributions to South Africa, including the Durban National Stadium which a Nigerian architect, Prof A. Adebayo was part of the realization;
· that National Youth Service Corp (NYSC) becomes an internationally oriented programme to run between Nigeria and South Africa, to allow Nigerian students to do their service in South Africa and South Africans in Nigeria;
that South Africa must learn to be more accommodating and frustrate xenophobic ideas, that Nigerian government fought apartheid regime with all it has;
· that Nigerian students pay levies to sustain the struggle against apartheid and did modules on South African Zulu warriors to acquaint Nigerian citizens with the ongoing of the exit of apartheid.