

## Analysis of Citizen Diplomacy: A Case Study of Nigeria-South Africa Bilateral Relation in the Fourth Republic (2007 - 2015)

**Jamila Rabi**

Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Abuja, Nigeria.

\* Author Email: [rabiujamila548@gmail.com](mailto:rabiujamila548@gmail.com)

Received 9 November 2023; Accepted 20 December 2023; Published 5 January 2024

**ABSTRACT:** The aim of this study is to examine the concept of citizens' diplomacy and its influence on Nigeria-South African relations, with a specific focus on the period from 2007 to 2015. This research utilizes the liberal theory, which seeks to mitigate conflicts and hostilities between nations. The Nigeria-South Africa case holds significant importance due to the xenophobic attacks that transpired during this timeframe, resulting in tragic fatalities among Nigerian citizens in South Africa. By analyzing this issue through the liberal theory framework, our objective is to gain deeper insights into the underlying dynamics and identify potential resolutions to prevent similar conflicts in the future. The study used a combination of primary and secondary data sources. Questionnaires were distributed to approximately 150 respondents selected from a variety of organizations including the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, South-African Embassy in Nigeria, Nigerian Embassy in South-Africa, National Intelligence Agency (NIA), Ministry of Trade and Investment, Ministry of Tourism and Culture, as well as lecturers from departments such as Political Science and International Relations History, Economic Department among others. Alongside the questionnaires, secondary data was collected from electronic media sources like Aljazeera, Cable News Network, journals, and textbooks. The utilization of these diverse data sources enabled a comprehensive analysis of the research topic. The analysis of the collected questionnaire data revealed that the relationship between Nigeria and South Africa can be characterized as competitive, displaying elements of hegemony. This dynamic is often described as a mixture of good and evil, with periodic oscillations between love and hate. The study also identified several factors contributing to xenophobic attacks on Nigerian citizens in South Africa. These include foreign criminals' fear of unemployment, concerns over immigration work ethics, local business competition, the dissemination of fake news by the South African media, and the actions (or lack thereof) of South African politicians and elites. To address this issue, it is recommended that Nigeria urgently reviews and re-packages its foreign policy in light of the realities of the globalized world order. This would involve making the policy more efficient, responsible, dynamic, and proactive, with a focus on citizen diplomacy. Additionally, the Nigerian government should prioritize addressing internal challenges such as terrorism, kidnapping, corruption, nepotism, and armed banditry. By tackling these issues effectively, Nigeria can create an environment that attracts foreign investors and encourages Nigerian citizens to stay within the country rather than seeking opportunities abroad.

**Keywords:** Bilateral relation, citizen diplomacy, fourth republic (2007-2015), Nigeria-South Africa

Citation: Rabi, J..(2024). Analysis of Citizen Diplomacy: A Case Study of Nigeria-South Africa Bilateral Relation in the Fourth Republic (2007 - 2015). Direct Res. Soc. Sci. Edu. Studies. Vol.12 (1): Pp. 18-40.

### INTRODUCTION

Nigeria and South Africa are respectively the first and second largest economies in the African continent. These countries are viewed as forerunners of the continental development and epitomes of regional diplomatic links in West Africa and South Africa respectively. Nigeria and South Africa had made concerted efforts to position the region as a critical global actor in international political and economic relations. The relations of the major African powers had been strengthened by the need to resuscitate Africa's ailing economy and mediate the consequences of imperialism. The Nigerian state became pre-occupied with decolonization in Africa. The decolonization process assumed a defining context of its Afro-centric foreign policy which was partly meant to engage the horrendous system of the apartheid in

South Africa. The Nigerian confrontational and hostile engagement of South-Africa began in 1960's amid apartheid enclave status of the pariah state. The country was diametrically opposed to the apartheid system and led the campaigns that culminated in the expulsion of South Africa from the Common Wealth of Nations in 1961 after the Sharpeville massacre in March 1960.

However, the inauguration of South Africa's democracy in 1995 vitiated its status as a pariah state and enhanced its re-admission into the global community. It assumed a leadership role in African affairs as exemplified in its membership of the BRICS bloc (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) and the struggle for the resources in Africa. The new South African posture ineluctably pitched it against Nigeria that asserts itself as

the Giant of Africa.

However, the inauguration of South Africa's democracy in 1995 vitiated its status as a pariah state and enhanced its re-admission into the global community. It assumed a leadership role in African affairs as exemplified in its membership of the BRICS bloc (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) and the struggle for the resources in Africa. The new South African posture ineluctably pitched it against Nigeria that asserts itself as the Giant of Africa.

The claim of South Africa as a de facto giant in the region gained currency with its demand for the restoration of democracy in Nigeria during the tenure of late General Sani Abacha. The democratic deficit in Nigeria offered Pretoria the leeway to assert itself in Africa despite its claim of not competing with Abuja's leadership role in the region (Banjo, 2010:83). The execution of Kinsola Oki, the Ogoni rights activist and the 'Ogoni Eight' compelled South Africa to sustain international campaigns, which led to the suspension of Nigeria from the commonwealth of Nations.

The restoration of democratic rule in Nigeria on 29<sup>th</sup> May 1999 signified the "Fons et on go" for building partnerships between the two states with the launch of the Bi-National Commission. BNC, in October 1999 and the New partnership for African Development (NEPAD) in 2001. The bi-lateral relation between Nigeria and South Africa Largely improved between 1999 and 2008 when the volume of trade increased to 22.8 billion South Africa Rand from 174, 000,000 million. This bi-lateral relations suffered setbacks in the tenure of Presidents Goodluck Jonathan and Jacob Zuma as a result of the Xenophobic attacks on African migrants especially Nigerian citizen living in South Africa and the refusal of Nigeria to support the nomination of Nkosazana Dlamini-Zuma of South Africa for the chair of the African Union (AU). With the foregoing, the relations between Nigeria and South Africa have been ominum-gatherum of good and evil which assumes a zig-zag dimension with periodic oscillation that scholars describes as love and hate relationship (Agbu, 2010:43).

The Nigerian and South African relation was described as an unspoken rivalry (Games 2013a and b) and the struggle for the Africa's leadership role that is not predicated on conscious and explicit plan to offer direction to the region. The struggle is rather defined by the Afro-Centric philosophical foundations of Nigeria and South African Foreign policies. From the Afro-centrism foreign policy of Sir Tafawa Balewa, of 1960 and the Obasanjo foreign policy of 1999 known as the global – centric Foreign policy which showed that the Afro-Centric policy is a past event and apathied had become a thing of the past (Akinterinwa, 2011:23). After Obasanjo's Administration a repositioning of Nigeria's foreign policy was rationalized by late President Umaru Musa Yara'dua in 2007. Which, was articulated by the former Minister of foreign Affairs of Nigeria, Chief Ojo Maduekwe. It was

called citizen-centric diplomacy where the interest of the Nigerians at home and abroad as the centre of the country's national interest. This is however, a new Nigerian, new international behavior and actions in the protection of its citizen interest and well being anywhere around the world. It was a shift from the traditional Afro-centric foreign policy to a mere citizen centric foreign policy (Folarin, 2013:110) which introduced citizen diplomacy.

## RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- I. What is the nature of Nigerian South African bilateral relations and citizenship diplomacy in the fourth republic with special emphasis to 2007 – 2015
- II. What is the impact of citizenship diplomacy to the citizens of Nigeria in South Africa in the promotion and protection of their welfare and security in the fourth republic? (2007 - 2015)

## OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The overall objective of this study is to examine the Nigerian South African's relations in the fourth republic on the analysis of citizen diplomacy. Thus the following will be the specific objectives of this study.

- I. To critically examine the nature of citizenship diplomacy on Nigeria-South Africa bilateral relations in the fourth republic.
- II. To examine the impact of citizenship diplomacy to the Nigerian citizen in South Africa in the promotion and protection of their welfare and security during the fourth republic (2007 - 2015).

## HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

- H<sub>O1</sub> - The nature of Nigerian foreign policy and citizenship diplomacy has significant impact on Nigeria-South Africa bilateral relations in the fourth republic (2007 - 2015)
- H<sub>A1</sub> - The nature of Nigerian citizenship diplomacy has no significant impact on Nigerian-South African bilateral relation in the fourth republic (2007 - 2015).

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### DIPLOMACY

Although Diplomacy has been variously defined, scholars have argued that, no general definition of diplomacy can be very satisfactory or very revealing (Palmar and Perkins, 2004:84). A charming characterization, though attacked to be vague and inadequate, is given by Ernest Satow (1966:1) who defines diplomacy as "the application of intelligence and tact to the conduct of official relations between the governments of

independent states". This definition was criticized for obvious reasons – not all diplomats are either intelligent or tactful, yet they all take part in diplomacy (Ogunsanwo, 2000:1).

Geoffrey McDermott (1973:37) sees diplomacy as "a science which permits its practitioners to say nothing and shelter behind mysterious nods of the head..., a science whose most successful exponent is he who can swim with his head above streams of events he pretends to conduct". Morgenthau, one of the leading exponents of realism (1978: 529). Described diplomacy as "the technique for accommodating conflicts of interest, and the promotion of national interest by peaceful means." According to him, taken in its widest meaning, comprising the whole range of foreign policy, the task of diplomacy is fourfold:

*First, diplomacy must determine its objectives in the light of the power actually and potentially available for the pursuit of these objectives. Second, diplomacy must assess the objectives of other nations and the power actually and potentially available for the pursuit of these objectives. Third, diplomacy must determine to what extent these objectives are compatible with each other. Fourth, the diplomacy must employ the means suited to the pursuit of its objectives.*

He exhorted that, failure in any of these tasks may jeopardize the success of foreign policy and with it the peace of the world. However, a more comprehensive definition which underscores its essence and *raison d'etre* is that:

*Diplomacy is the political process whereby states establish and nurture official interrelations, direct and indirect, to pursue their respective goals, interest and substantive and procedural policies in the international environment (Plischke, 1977:41).*

Scholars overwhelmingly subscribed to the above definition as being the most comprehensive or all encompassing because, if statesmen or diplomats are asked why they take particular actions in their relations with certain international organizations, their response is likely to underscore the primacy of the national interest, thus implying that a nation's foreign policy is the expression of its national interests vis-a-vis those of other nation. Thus, whatever may be his country of accreditation, the principal duty of an Ambassador is to preserve and advance his country's national interests.

In the view of Ogunbambi (1986:162), as it pertains to Nigeria, for instance:

*The national interests of Nigeria which Ambassador, ideally, should sell and prosecute include political stability, security, export promotion, access to external*

*resources and technology, foreign aid, the protection of its citizens abroad, the cultural and moral expressions of Nigeria and a fair, effective and vigorous presentation of Nigeria's point of view on regional and global issues.*

Robinson (in Rosenau, 1986:189) corroborates the above viewpoint by maintaining that, the primary interest of all nations consists in the security of national territory and in safeguarding of the lives and values of the citizens. In the same vein, Holsti (1992:83) identifies the common objectives of states as falling into such categories as self-preservation, security, well-being, prestige, power and promotion and the protection of ideology. Cutting a dichotomy between foreign policy and diplomacy, J. R. Childs (1984:64) posits that the foreign policy of a state is "the substance of foreign relations", whereas "diplomacy proper is the process by which policy is carried out". He argues further that, policy is made by many different persons and agencies, but presumably on major matters in any state, whatever its form of government; it is made at the highest level, though subject to many different kinds of controls. Then it is the purpose of diplomacy to provide the machinery and the personnel by which foreign policy is executed. One is the substance, the other is the method.

In the view of Karen Mingst (2004:113-114), diplomacy entails states trying to influence the behaviour of others by negotiating, by taking a specific action or refraining from such an action, or by conducting public diplomacy. According to him in using diplomacy to project power, a state might:

- i. Express to the target state, either publicly or privately, unhappiness with its policy choice.
- ii. Suggest that a better relationship would follow if the target state's actions changed in a specific way.
- iii. Threaten that negative consequences will follow if the target states continue to move in a specific direction.
- iv. Turn to an international body to seek multilateral legitimization for its position, thus enlisting the support of other states on its behalf.
- v. Give the target state what it wants (diplomatic recognition, foreign aid) in return for desired actions.
- vi. Remove what the target states wants (reduce foreign aid, withdraw diplomats, sever diplomatic tie) when it takes undesirable actions.

Diplomacy usually begins with bargaining, through direct or indirect communication, in an attempt to reach agreement on an issue. This bargaining may be conducted tacitly among the parties, each of which recognizes that a move in one direction leads

to a response by the other. From pre-historic times till date, every state has to operate within an international political environment in which her values compete with those of others such that states in the international system gear their efforts towards the maximization of the political, economic and social values. In order to minimize the effect of conflict and maximize individual states chances of realizing her objectives, diplomacy becomes the principal technique of state action or the main instrument for the execution of foreign policy - the principal device by which a state transmits or communicates its desire and designs into the decision-making apparatus of other states, whether in the form of persuasion and the modification or adjustment of one's position through coercion or negotiation.

### **CITIZEN DIPLOMACY**

The concept of Citizen Diplomacy originated from the United States of America. It was first coined by David Hoffman in 1981 through an article on Dr. Robert W. Fuller's work (2011). Dr. Fuller was an American Physicist who travelled frequently to the; Soviet Union in the 1970s and 1980s in effort to alleviate the cold war between the US-led capitalist West and the Russia-led socialist East. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, Dr. Fuller continued the tension-dissipating visits to the political hotspots around the world and developed the idea of reducing "rankism" to promote peace (2011). In the course of developing the concept, different scholars described citizen diplomacy with various terms: (Gullion 1965) earlier called it public diplomacy in 1965 at the Fletcher school of Law and Diplomacy when he explained it as involving the transnational flow of information and ideas through the interaction of private groups and interests of different countries. Montville (1987) addressed citizen diplomacy as "Track Two Diplomacy" when he distinguished it from traditional (Track One) diplomacy as unofficial informal interactions among the citizens of countries. Also, John McDonald and Louise Diamond referred to citizen diplomacy as "Multi-track Diplomacy" and suggested that there are many ways to bring people together in addition to official negotiations (Montville, 1987). Without prejudice to the various terms used to describe "citizen diplomacy", it implies that individual citizens are not just the centre-piece of state policies, but also have the rights and even the responsibility to help realise the country's national interests through their interactions to complement official diplomatic activities. Hence, though citizen diplomacy has varied interpretations among scholars, it centrally implies the transnational flow of information and ideas through the interaction of private groups and interests of different countries which influence the formation and execution of foreign policies in the pursuit of national interests

(Montville, 1987). The varied interpretations and definitions of citizen diplomacy accentuated two critical elements: the participation of the citizens in the foreign policy processes and protection of the citizens by the state (PAC, 2005; Ojo, 2007; Eke, 2009; Eze, 2009). These two elements of participation and protection are very instrumental in the foreign policy of any country towards realising the stated national interests (Aja, 2009). While the concept of "citizen" qualifies a 'legitimate' member of a State, "citizenship" is a concept used to describe the processes and methods of becoming a citizen of a nation or society. Drawn from this position, a nation irrespective of its level of interaction with another nation puts into consideration its national interest, which should be noticeable on its citizenry (Chandler, 2011). Here, diplomacy is one of the means of implementing or achieving a state's national interest. Considering it as a means to an end, suggests that it can be bad or good. Diplomacy is the peaceful process and skillful method of negotiation by which the government of nations manage their external relations with other actors in international politics (Saliu. 2015).

In other words, Citizen Diplomacy, which, describes the protection of interest and welfare of the citizen which is sacrosanct, and constitutes the essence of any country's domestic or foreign policy. It is the application of tact and intellect in an environment of conflicting international interests and belligerency. When every government comes into power in Nigeria, with respect to its interaction with international arena, it tends to articulate a particular vision of thrust of its foreign policy. Nigeria's Foreign Affairs Ministers overtime like to give a distinctive appellation to their own foreign policy style. The appointment of Chief Ojo Maduekwe as the Foreign Affairs Minister in 2007 coincided with the adoption of citizen diplomacy as a thrust of Nigerian foreign policy. For emphasis the coinage attracts deluge of attack from both 'town and gown' of Nigeria's foreign policy communities (Akinterinwa, 2010).

Indeed, Chief Ojo Maduekwe, puts the policy thrust as a rebranding of the country's *raison d'etre* of interstate behaviour in Nigeria's conduct of relations with others. According to Maduekwe (2009), citizen diplomacy "is diplomacy conducted at the behest of and the benefit of the people, the true custodians of sovereignty, '...is a foreign policy initiative that will be citizen-oriented in its approach, objective and outcome". Thus, citizen diplomacy is as old as Nigeria's diplomatic history. Reemphasizing Nigeria's external relations which will manifestly benefit the interest of Nigerians and enhance their noticeable involvement of the citizen in the diplomatic environment, irrespective of where

they live across the globe, necessitated the formal introduction of the concept as a foreign policy thrust. Consequently, in the view of Mbachu, (2009) of Nigerian Defense Academy, Citizen Diplomacy aimed at economic recovery and increased democratization with the potential of ushering in increased export opportunities for Nigeria, increased foreign direct investments in Nigeria, financial assistance as well as bringing about technological transfer to Nigeria, especially from Nigerians in Diaspora (Mbachu, 2009). While Eze (2009) sees Citizen Diplomacy from two legal perspectives: State duty to the citizenry and sanctity of pacts or agreements, Akinterinwa (2010) opines that it is a technique and strategic use of millions of Nigerians, irrespective of where they reside abroad, as Nigeria's diplomats.

However, citizen diplomacy denotes a reorientation of Nigeria's external policy pursuits for the purpose of benefitting the politico-security and socioeconomic engagement, and enhancing citizen welfare and image building. This new direction in Nigeria's foreign policy may sound prosaic, but its normative implications and transformative potentials are enormous because it is a major development on concentric foreign policy. Based on these conceptualizations, it is obligatory that Nigeria's foreign policy focus should be on individual Nigerian. Citizens, *cib initio*, are important stakeholders and made first beneficiaries of any external engagement that Nigeria embarks upon in its foreign policy concentric circles (Agbu, 2015; Akinterinwa, 2013).

Nevertheless, the operative word of citizen diplomacy in Nigeria is on purposes of conception and action is *treatment* or *Nigerianness*. This explains how citizens are treated at home and abroad in order to have oneness conception of national unity. In other words, the Law of Nations requires that all citizens be treated as human beings. Citizens are entitled to enjoyment of fundamental human rights and there must be acceptable and legitimate basis before any of such rights may be denied. Without doubt, it is the crescendo of all the various thrusts on Nigeria's external relations since time immemorial, responding to the challenges of globalization (Akinterinwa, 2013).

However, governments may embark on the protection of their citizens through the philosophical foundation of citizen diplomacy, but the style, principle and effectiveness in Implementation remain blurred. Without losing focus, both the domestic and external environments are involved in diplomacy, and there is a thin line of demarcation between domestic and international politics. Hence, the interface between the two is inseparable. With this, Citizen Diplomacy articulates implicitly the

major goal of Nigeria's policymaking, for the protection of all Nigerians and image building. (Eze, 2009; Saliu, 2010). It is therefore expedient to analyze the provision of the peculiarities, intellectual contents and scorecards of Citizen Diplomacy in Nigeria's image building. The following are the eight major pillars of Nigeria's citizen diplomacy according to Chief Ojo Maduekwe cited in Akinterinwa (2010):

- i. Nigeria and Nigerians should be at the centre of Nigeria's foreign policy;
- ii. Nigeria's foreign policy must meet her development aspirations and objectives in a manner that impacts more directly on the lives of the citizenry;
- iii. Nigeria's foreign policy must seek a synergy with domestic policy to ensure that the former benefits ordinary Nigerians. Indeed, the boundary between domestic policy and foreign policy has collapsed into national security for collective well-being of Nigerians;
- iv. In line with the Servant-Leadership philosophy of Mr. President, Nigerian Missions abroad must actively engage the Nigerian community and Nigerian Diaspora and render quality consular and other services as a matter of rights, duties and obligations;
- v. Foreign policy making and implementation must be democratized to involve Nigerians from all walks of life, and not left for a small circle of experts and practitioners alone;
- vi. Every foreign policy endeavor must meet the litmus test of determining the extent to which it protects and advocates what is best for Nigeria and what will best benefit the Nigerian people;
- vii. Nigeria should be guided by the principle of reciprocity or 'diplomacy of consequence' in its interactions with the rest of the world; and
- viii. Nigeria and Nigerians will not accept being criminalized by the international community simply based on the despicable conduct of a few of their nationals. Due recognition must be given to the remarkable feats and tremendous contributions of Nigeria and Nigerians to world civilization, socio-economic and scientific development, as well as international peace and security.

Going by the above, Nigeria's citizen diplomacy has multifaceted outlook to the state (Eze, 2009). This includes the country's renewed determination to reposition itself in the global democratic arena; to rebuild its battered image; to address the clutches of economic crisis; poverty; politico-security crunch; and scourge of diseases among other internal vices coupled with the external pressures like the new face of international terrorism, and the deepening

implication of globalization. The immediate implication of all these, without any jot of doubt, is the need for re-articulation of Nigeria's image building within an acceptable framework that takes into account, as a matter of priority the survival of Nigerians as a people.

Sequel to the above, citizen diplomacy is an instrument that can change the negative perception of Nigeria. How realistic it is? In this regard, it is a legitimate desire for Nigerian state to shape outcomes of contestations in a way that suit its preferences. This implies from the diplomacy of consequence that Nigeria will reciprocate whichever treatment meted on Nigerians by any country. From the foregoing, the philosophical instrument for the advancement and protection of the interest and dignity of the Nigerian citizen at home and abroad is the essence of Nigeria's citizen diplomacy. This conception leads to public reactions on its conceptual, functional and oppositional. Indeed, the functional reactions raise arguments on the workability of citizen diplomacy as a policy, especially in light of the little or no means available to Nigeria to execute citizen diplomacy as a policy thrust of 'consequence', which is synonymous with the principle of reciprocity. In an in-depth interview with Professor Alade Fawole, he opines that for Nigeria to implement diplomacy of consequence, the country must have at best, equal means at its disposal to be able to reciprocate any shabby treatment on Nigerian nationals in diaspora (Fawole, 2016). Debatably, Nigeria has not arrived at that climax. However, while the functionalists are opposed for operational reason, there are those who opposed citizen diplomacy for different considerations that have not been justified (Akinterinwa, 2010).

On the conceptual reactions, within the internal dimension, citizen diplomacy is multilayered and to some extent diffuses in various chapters as constructed in the 1999 constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, from the politico/pseudo legal manifesto among others on one hand (Chapter II, III on Citizenship, and IV on Fundamental Human Rights of the 1999 Nigerian Constitution). On the other hands, its external dimension is regulated by public international laws which has increasingly converged in many areas, particularly in those of individual rights and on the country's image, with domestic law, thus rendering nearly nonexistent the wall between the "monists" and "dualists" (Maduekwe, 2007). Saliu (2010) finds this quite strange and puzzling. He observes that the Nigerian government tries to be discriminatory in operationalizing the concept by maintaining that the country will not be using the opportunity of citizen diplomacy to defend lawbreakers.

True to Saliu's view, how else can state display irresponsibility towards its citizens. It seems the state has bought the argument that most Nigerians are fraudulent. The standard practice in the international system is to reasonably assume that all citizens undergoing judicial processes are tagged 'guilty' until pronounced otherwise by a competent Court of law and their state is expected to get involved in the judicial processes. The important point emphasizing here is that citizen diplomacy in its conceptualization does not make any distinction between law abiding and law breaking citizens. Consequently, the foreign policy of a state is to achieve national interests that are domestically structured and exercised at the external environment (Renshon and Renshon, 2008). Hence, all Nigerian citizens should get Nigeria State's protection irrespective of where they reside.

Despite the pool of confusion, and its poor intellectual development notwithstanding, Nigeria's citizen diplomacy is develop to emphasize the *Nigerianness* in the conduct of Nigeria's foreign policy. Citizen diplomacy has created the awareness among organs of Nigerian foreign policy about the need to get more Nigerians involved in the conduct of their country's foreign policy. The Foreign Missions of Nigeria are really gearing up to meeting the expectations of Nigerians in the Diaspora (Saliu, 2010). The feeler getting from most of the commentators and respondents confirmed that the Foreign Missions are responding to questions bordering on harassment by security agencies in their countries of abode.

The above commendations notwithstanding, the appraisal of citizen diplomacy under President Yar'Adua administration was not entirely satisfactory. The empirical exegesis of the challenges of Nigeria's citizen diplomacy and the nature of the cases of maltreatments of Nigerians both at home and abroad is not only complex but also vindictive (Akinterinwa, 2010). Without doubt, some Nigerians have committed offences that are punishable under the laws, however, the law enforcement agents, more often than not, taken laws into their hands in mistreating Nigerians even before they are proven guilty or not.

In a similar manner, on September 18, 2014, the Amnesty International launched the released of a report accusing some security operatives of extra-judicial killings in some parts of the North-East, where the Army is battling with insurgency. The Amnesty International shared their findings on conflict torture right on their own soil, an incommunicado detention centers, and other inhuman and degrading treatments on Nigerian citizens (National Human Rights Commission, 2016).

2016). The disturbing aspect of the foregoing scenarios, which are just few in a thousand cases of citizen ill-treatments by the Nigerian security agents, is the lackadaisical attitude of the government. The government seems not to have come to terms with the domestic content of Nigerian Citizen Diplomacy. Under an ideal situation, Citizen Diplomacy, through the officials conducting Nigerian policymaking and implementation that represents the state and the people, is to galvanize the domestic environment, which does not seem to be excited about the policy. Meanwhile, as the governmental institutions seem to be weak in the services of citizen *welfarism* and protection, cases where the citizens are also retaliating by engaging in an unholy and unpatriotic activities are abound (FGDs with some Respondents in 2016).

While analyzing the role of security agencies on Nigerians at home, Dickson (2010) observes that:

*Reconnecting the state with the citizen and vice versa is a major area of needed intervention for all Nigerians. Back home, the average Nigerian is treated badly by the authorities. For instance, the Nigerian Police Force vested with the responsibility of maintaining internal peace and security have in all ramifications become agents of terrorism engaging in extra-judicial killing, arrest, and detention of innocent citizens, extortion of multifarious dimensions, and brutality.*

In view of the above, one may be cynically assumed that Nigerian government has ever been more security concerned about the protection of wellbeing of every Nigerian at home let alone those outside the shore of the country, despite the introduction of Citizen Diplomacy

Undeniably, the issue attached to Nigeria's Citizen Diplomacy is complex. A field survey to both the Lagos and Abuja offices of the High Commissions and Embassies of major Asian, American and European countries shows a picture of the anguish and ill-treatment Nigerians undergo, simply because they (Nigerian) want to visit some countries. Nigerians are treated with disdain and disrespect. Most of these embassies do not have waiting rooms for visitors or even entry visa applicants. At times, the applicants who are mostly Nigerians are subjected to stay under the sun and in the rain for merely seeking visa to visit some of these countries. This suggests that the application and implementation of citizen diplomacy in Nigeria has not been holistic. Outside the shore of Nigeria, the impact of Citizen Diplomacy on Nigerian traders in Ghana is another case of citizenship diplomacy that needs to look into in this study.

On the 28<sup>th</sup> day of November 2007, a task force set up by the Ghanaian government sealed the shops owned by Nigerian traders in Ghana up. A commentator corroborating Akinterinwa (2010) position, in an in-depth interview, confirms the event on the basis that Ghanaian government had asked the Nigerian traders to pay three hundred thousand dollars (\$300,000) to the Ghanaian Investment Promotion Center before they could continue to do business in Ghana.

To get the order reversed, the Association of Nigerian traders made concerted efforts but to no avail. Hence, they wrote a petition to the House of Representatives, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the representatives of the traders were at the National Assembly on Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> February 2008 to brief a House committee on the matter (Enikanolaiye, 2013). Is the payment discriminatory and limited only to Nigerian traders? Is the sum to be paid by individual Nigerian traders or collectively settled by the Association of Nigerian traders in Ghana? These are some of the unclear questions about the assault of Nigerian traders in Ghana.

According to Stanley Nkwazema of *This Day* on February 21 2008, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, represented by Professor S.U. Ahmed, could not give satisfactory answer on State efforts to address the plight of Nigerians in Ghana. Professor Ahmed revealed that the law about which the Nigerian traders are complaining about became law in 1994. This suggests that the law has general application and do not specifically or restrictedly meant for Nigerians doing business in Ghana. Any responsible government, like Ghana, would ensure compliance with its laws. The chairperson, House Committee on Foreign Affairs in the Federal House of representatives, Hon. Nnena Elendu-Ukeje confirmed that a Committee of enquiry was empaneled but regrettably posited that the Committee was 'piqued' because the Ministry was not proactive in protecting the interest of Nigerians outside the country.

The 'Afrophobic' widely known as xenophobic attacks in South Africa especially the May 2008 was horrendous and noteworthy. Nigeria's citizens and their businesses were the target in 2008 attack. According to Ashaver (2014), the attack claimed over 62 lives and displaced several others. Many lost their properties and their shops were looted, an indication of an orchestrated attack on the businesses of Nigerians in South Africa (Charman and Piper, 2012). In fact, this is an indication that South Africans harboured morbid hatred for other Africans and Nigerians in particular. Just as Okeke-Uzodike et al (2013) would believe that the agony Nigerian people face was baseless, "just by being citizens of the most populous Black nation in the

world". Indisputably, however, some of the perpetrators of the May 2008 xenophobic attacks had alleged that foreigners were responsible for taking their jobs, which the some media had reported that foreigners are the ones engaging in crime and corruption (Charman and Piper, 2012). Eke (2009) confirms, "Many Nigerians were killed in the 2007 extra-judicial circumstances, besides cases of harassment, intimidation and brutalization by South Africa police and security agencies". This suggests that if there are enough jobs opportunities in Nigeria for employable citizens, the number of Nigerians glamouring to travel to South Africa or other foreign countries for employment opportunities would have been minimal let alone exposing Nigerian nationals to hazard and horrendous treatments.

More worrisomely, in the mid-March 2010, Muammar Gaddafi of Libya, while addressing some students in his country, pessimistically advocated the partitioning of Nigeria into two new countries, based on ethnicity religion, North-Muslim and South-Christian, as a possible antidote to the sectarian violence in the Northern part of the country (Akinterinwa, 2013; *Daily Trust*, Tuesday March 20, 2010). This is not only to shows the hatred for Nigeria but also diminished Nigeria's status and credibility. Without prejudice, all these are attributes of envy and external contradictions. The brutalization of Nigerians is not limited to African states. The maltreatments of Nigerians in some European, Americans and Asian countries are more notorious. This is not to suggest that Nigerians have become unwanted persons in all countries of the world, but to justify the motivations and curiosities in this study. Meanwhile, there are pockets of problems of Nigerians in these countries that are associated with violation of immigration laws and involvement of some Nigerians in one crime or the other. Nevertheless, the lackadaisical attitudes of Nigeria's diplomats in those missions relating to renewal of passport and other diplomatic issues, reports of mistreatment, as it is the case in countries, like the United Kingdom (UK), the United States of America (USA), France, China, Poland and Indonesia to mention but few, are cases in point.

In some specific cases, the ill-treatment of Nigerians is ridiculous and unexplained. The global contempt and disdain for the country and its citizens cannot be divorced from the image climate of the country. The energy exacerbated in security checks of Nigerians at many gateways are ostensibly embarrassing. Worst still, when security apparatuses clear them, they are usually trailed and monitored. On April 28 2008, a former state governor of Ogun, one of the Southwest states in

Nigeria, Commodore Kayode Olofin-Moyin, was humiliated at the Heathrow Airport in the United Kingdom (UK). According to Akinterinwa (2016), Mr. Olofin-Moyin who was not only accosted by the British Customs Officials, but was also handcuffed, like a criminal, and taken to the Red Zone where he had his chest and stomach x-rayed. At the long run, the security operatives did not discover anything incriminating on and in his body. This act was barbaric and inhumane to humankind let alone a former military governor.

He was released and simply told; "there was insufficient evidence for prosecution as there was nothing incriminating found on him" (Akinterinwa, 2010). One would have believed he be compensated for human right violation, unfortunately, that was not the case. Without doubt, this kind of molestation cannot be without diplomatic row if meted on a Briton or American. It was equally perplexing, despite the complaint lodged by Commodore Olofin-Moyin at the Nigeria's Embassy in the UK, the embassy did not do anything to address the abuse of human rights on the Nigerian national. A Nigerian diplomat in the UK confirmed the incident. Though he said he was new at the Embassy but confirmed there was no record of follow up on the matter.

More disturbing is the internal contradictions in Nigeria towards the drive of Citizen Diplomacy, which are contributing factors for ill-treatment and image crisis. High rate of unemployment, poverty, bad leadership as perceived by the international community, electoral malpractices, security challenges and lack of national cohesion, dwindling economy, and the effects of globalization on the country are consensus opinion from extant literature and respondent (during interviews) that exacerbates the challenge of citizen diplomacy and image crisis in Nigeria. These obviously environmental problems for the teeming population of Nigerians at home propel high rate of humiliation and maltreatment of Nigerian citizens in their various host countries (Bangudu, 2013). This is sufficed to say that Nigeria government seems not to understand the domestic content of its foreign policy.

Under an ideal situation, citizen diplomacy is to galvanize the domestic environment, which does not seem to be excited about the policy. Not many issues of foreign policy importance are in public domain as against the cardinal principle of citizen diplomacy of benefitting the people who are true custodians of sovereignty (Saliu, 2010). The cause of loss of morale and high appetite for graft are gaining prominent.

It is inevitable to highlight the state response to the above challenges. It is suffice to state that

President Yar'Adua's own principles for good governance in Nigeria are noteworthy traits. He became the chief advocate of 'zero tolerance for corruption' and peaceful approach to solving problems. He encouraged the application of dialogue in the management of domestic terrorism and unconditional respect for the rule of law, cum electoral reforms. He demonstrated unflinching level of integrity as the first Nigerian president to publicly declare his asset, and acknowledged the shortcomings in the elections that brought him to power, which necessitated the constitution of Justice Uwais led Electoral Reforms Committee. (Akinterinwa, 2013).

According to Joseph and Kew (2008), "Yar'Adua, though came to power under a cloud, has plaudits for his modest demeanor, for his frankness regarding the conduct of the 2007 elections, and for his accommodating approach (so different from Obasanjo's autocratic style)" in his view Mbachu (2007:9) agreed that citizen diplomacy is an organized action that government takes to achieve the objectives that have been set by policy makers. And that the concept, as currently being employed denotes re-orientation of Nigeria's foreign policy pursuit towards beneficial economic and political engagement so as to meet up with the United Nation's Millennium Development Goals for Africa. According to him, this arose from the realization that the progress, prosperity and survival of the nation must be the concern of every Nigerian at home and in Diaspora. According to Okocha and Nzeshi (2007:3) citizen diplomacy is geared towards "protecting" the image and integrity of Nigeria and realities against countries who are hostile and who brand Nigeria as corrupt (Okkocha and Nzeshi, 2007). Giving reasons for the adoption of the policy (Cited in Adejumo, 2007) explains further:

*Our foreign policy has come of age and the age of innocence is over. We remain proud of our track record from Tafawa Balewa up till now. The country that is the largest black nation in the world could not have done otherwise. A world where every sixth black man is a Nigerian could have done otherwise, or where every four Africans is a Nigerian could not have done otherwise. We should ask ourselves some hard questions to what extent has our foreign policy benefited Nigerians? To what extent has our foreign policy put food on our tables? In order words where is the citizen in our foreign policy?*

Quoting Williams Dubois, the Minister said:

*The colour of the skin remains the defining paradigm of international relations. And I think that it would not be out of naivety for the largest black*

*country in the world not to be conscious of the fact that colour of corruption is black, so long as the colour of corruption is black, so long as the colour of HIV/AIDS is black, so long as the colour of ethnic conflicts is black... all black people all over the world, whether they are Congress men in the United States or the United Kingdom, they will never walk proud anywhere in the world.*

However, in the view of Aklutewaju,(2017) Citizen-Centered Diplomacy: refers to a nation's reactive response to the way its citizens are treated or handled by other nations. By this approach, the Foreign Policy attitude of a nation towards other countries would no longer be based on geopolitical arrangements, just like the situation in the South Africa, they act aggressive to their fellow Africa state of citizen but political, and in socio-economic activities which the xenophobic act has affected their bilateral relations with some African nations e.g Somalis, Kenya, Ghana, Burkina Faso and especially Nigeria's. Each nation would therefore account for its own stewardship towards the nations of a particular country and expect same measure of treatment, like in the Nigeria context, as put by the former foreign Affairs Minister in his own words.

*If you are nice to our citizens', we will be nice to you; if you are hostile to us, we will also be hostile to you (Maduekwa, 2007:2).*

The former Foreign Affairs Minister, Chief Ojo Maduekwe has since called citizen diplomacy from a different tangent of articulation and understanding; citizen diplomacy is construed by Nigeria to mean that Nigeria's foreign Minister, this is not necessarily a departure from the country's traditional approach to foreign relations in which Africa is taken as the centre-piece; however, the policy is rebranded to focus on the citizens (Bakare 2007:7). The country will strive for a synergy between foreign policy and domestic affairs in such a way that the citizen is taken as the focus of foreign policy. In the view of (Mbachu, 2007: 9), The basic thrust of the new foreign policy initiative revolve around concerns for the basic needs human rights and socio-economic welfare of Nigerian citizens in bilateral and multilateral engagements with other countries. Also from 2007 to date, citizen diplomacy seems not to have yielded the envisaged dividend due to some factors that are both domestic and international. According to (Ruben Abati, 2009), placing the citizen at the centre of the national programme reinforce the original purpose of the government and when those in power provide necessary leadership, they will without much effort secure the trust of the general populace and create centres of national solidarity and more agents for national progress. In Nigeria, we don't seem to get this. Our governments do

not value our lives. One Nigerian was killed in Spain, another one was brutalized in Asia, routinely, our people are beheaded in Saudi Arabia at home and in Diaspora, Nigerians are left to their own survival tactics; many have learnt not to expect anything from their government..Regretting the plight of Nigerians abroad, he stated further by saying;

*Those who live abroad often complain about the cruelty of Nigerian embassy official; to renew their passports, to get Nigerian passport or visas for their dual nationality children could be a nightmare.*

Also reconnecting the state to the citizen and vice versa is a major area of needed intervention for all Nigerian back home, the average Nigerian is treated badly by the authorities for instance the Nigeria police for a vested with responsibility of maintaining internal peace and security have in all ramifications become agents of terrorism engaging in extra judicial killing, arrest, and detention of innocent citizens, extortion of multifarious dimensions, and brutality etc. On Sunday, January 3, 2009, a detachment of policemen on patrol in Ilorin, the Kwara State capital shot a taxicab when the driver allegedly failed to stop for inspection and subsequent payment of amount ranging from N20.00 to 100.00, while the bullets hit on a nursing mother, Titilayo Olu Tunde, aged 20 years and her eight months old baby Lati Anuoluwa died. Titilayo and her daughter's brutal murder by the police have since occupied front burner in legal interpretation (Jimoh, 2010).

The question now is, what kind of citizen diplomacy are we talking about? In recent time, instances abound that when an innocent citizen is kidnapped by the perpetrators of this dastardly act, on informing the state government or police authority, instead of rising to the challenges posed by this act of criminality, they will ask the relatives of the victim to negotiate with (kidnappers) and to pay a ransom as may be demanded. Then what is the role of government in the security of its citizens? Also in addition to the pervasive in human condition of everything, human lives are worthless in Nigeria. Internally, over 750 persons have been killed in the course of sectarian violence in the Northern Nigeria in recent time on recurrent crisis in Jos, (Sanya Oni, 2010) argues that 150 people were killed and stuffed in wells and sewages in a small village called Kuru- jantar. Innocent lives have been lost. But nobody knows who the victims are because there is no citizens database, also in the views of (Abba Mahmood, 2009), with the president is lacking international exposure and most of the ministers in the ministry of Foreign Affairs also lacking any broad experience in diplomacy, there is no wonder that, in foreign policy, that the government has not made any appreciable impact. Nigerians voice is not heard in major international fora; Nigeria has initiated nothing spectacular in the last two years at the dynamic global

arena and apart from bilateral agreements which are hardly followed up, Nigeria has gained nothing from diplomatic activities under Yaradua's administration. This is not what is expected of the other nations of the Black World.

In the immediate sub-region of ECOWAS whose institutions Nigeria is hosting and substantially funding, Nigeria are not' even employed as drivers. As succinctly put by (Andrew Obinna Onyeam 2009), not only did the country - Nigeria donate substantially towards ECOWAS set up costs including the secretariat, it regularly paid its annual contribution of approximately 32.5% of the community's budget which was subsequently revised upwards to 40% in the ECOWAS Community Court of Justice only 7 percent of the staff are Nigerians, and it is situated here in Abuja. At the African Union since 2003 when Obasanjo fielded two female candidates from Nigeria for the same post, making the country look unserious, no Nigerian has been elected in the AU Commission for the last six years. A nation that has the largest population in Africa is not represented in the African Union Commission. Burkina Faso defeated Nigeria in 2007! Really what manner of citizen diplomacy is it when the citizens lack representation?

Another case in point which undermined Nigerian Citizen diplomacy is the matter that involved Dr. Ngozi Ugo. Abba Mahood named that she is a citizen of Nigeria who had done so much for the UN for so many years especially in the area of human right, international law, conflict transformation and peace building etc and was able to win a host of international awards. The UN found her worthy of being nominated for the position of Assistant Secretary-General of the UN on three different occasions including under the government of Barrak Obama. From 2007 to date, she has been nominated for the position of UN Ombudsman, deputy special representative of the secretary-general etc, all equivalent to the position of assistant secretary-general, a position that required the endorsement of her home government Nigeria. But between the Ministry of foreign Affairs and the utterly discredited office of the Attorney General of the Federation, they kept dribbling her until she lost. What manner of citizen diplomacy is it when on merit a citizen is found worthy of holding a very important position by the whole world but her country refused to endorse her Mahmood also observed that;

*Dr. Ugo's presence in the UN system could have enhance Nigeria's position for the UN permanent seat. Other more serious countries campaign for their citizens and that is why the highest ranking African in the UN system is a Tanzanian woman. Also go to the common wealth secretariat in London you may think you are in India's Ministry of Foreign Affairs because of the number of Indians there. And this is where our own Chief Anyaoku served for almost four decades, when is Nigeria going to stand and recognize its own? It is sad,*

*unfortunate and indeed painful (Mahmood, 2009).*

Also Akintokumbo Adejumo (2007) asked "how helpful have been Nigeria Foreign Missions all over the world towards Nigerians living abroad, for instance" In fact, coming to think of it, in generality, how helpful have Nigerian government been to even Nigerians living in Nigeria, not to talk of the ones abroad? In his thought provoking answers, he said; there are too many instances of neglect to be mentioned, but it is all the same sad stories Nigeria diplomats have never taken care of either our image or the Nigerians living abroad. In fact, Nigerian diplomats have never taken care of either our image or the Nigerians living abroad. There have been several instances of Nigerians in several countries languishing in prisons on death row, departed, marginalized, detained, tortured, and most of the time the reasons are unknown. Out of the estimated 85,000 inmates in the UK, 11,000 are foreigners, amongst them largely are Nigerians; in 2010 some Nigerians in Togo were detained unjustly and treated with harsh and severe inhuman conditions for offences they did not commit except for being Nigerians (Akinterinwa, 2010:20-21). In 2010 also it was reported that over 200 Nigerians were on death row, out of which 18 persons were killed in Tripoli and Benghazi with exclusive refused to part with their identities (Akinterinwa 2010b:22). More recently, in 2012, it was reported also that there were 53 Nigerians in Indonesian prisons, 18 on death row, 5 imprisoned for life and 53 others under detention (Akinterinwa, 2012a: 17). It is evident that since independence in 1960, Africa has remained at the forefront of Nigeria's foreign policy. This nucleus of her foreign policy saw the country committing herself fanatically to decolonization of the African continent and eradication of racial discrimination and domination. According to Onouha (2008) "the first opportunity for Nigeria to implement her foreign policy on anti colonialism was provided by the Sharpeville massacre of 21st March, 1960 during which the white South African Police attacked and killed 72 South African blacks protesting against /acial discrimination and domination. Many blacks were wounded that marked the beginning of Nigeria's diplomatic confrontations with South Africa. This incidence and other ugly racial incidences in South Africa saw Nigeria spearheading the call for political and economic sanctions against the apartheid South Africa in International Community. Example were the suspension of South Africa from the Common Wealth in 1961 and the imposition of trade embargo under the auspices of OAU. As a result of the pressure mounted by Nigeria and other world's nations, NGO's and influential individuals, the racist regime of S/Africa collapsed in 1991. With the obituary of apartheid in 1991, the need for change in diplomatic strategies arose (Onuaha, 2008).

However, at the dawn of democracy in South Africa, Nigerians, especially the professionals, were part of

those that started to migrate to South Africa in order to contribute to the much needed nation building in post apartheid South Africa. South Africa has been a cesspool of sporadic xenophobic attacks against foreigners with Zimbabweans, Somalis, Mozambicans, Ethiopians, Kenyans, Angolans and Nigerians among others victims since 1994. The relationship of Nigeria and South Africa has been soured for along period of time since the beginning of xenophobic attacks. The main reason for the xenophobic attacks was that during apartheid, South Africans were in control of their territory, now, foreigners have taken over the territory, which is a loss to the South Africans. There are also issues of political elite fueling the situation with their comments. So-called the rise of nationalism all over the world today; also helps to fuel the situation (Keshi, 2017). Another reason is the issue of unemployment, to them, some foreigners have taken their jobs, hence a bit of gang war (Keshi, 2017). In fact, a xenophobic attack is a combination of both criminality and anger. There are criminals on the streets trying to take control in this kind of situation; certainly people will capitalize on it to do what they want to do (Keshi, 2017).

For instance, in December 1994 and January 1995, armed youth gangs in Alexandra Township outside of Johannesburg; Gauteng province, destroyed the homes and property of migrants and marched the individuals down to the local police station where they demanded that the foreigners be forcibly and immediately removed- This was followed by a series of more violent attack across the country in 1988, 2000, 2008, 2009, 2013, 2015 and 2016. In August 2000, seven xenophobic killings were reported in the cape flats districts of Cape Town. Seven foreigners from different African countries were killed on the Cape flat. Among those attacked were two Nigerians, one Kenya and two Angolans. On May 11, 2008, an outburst of xenophobic violence in other townships of Alexandra triggered more xenophobic violence in other township first, it only spread in the Gauteng province, after two weeks the violence jumped to other urban areas across the country, mainly Durban, Cape-town and Limpopo province. In January 2015, a Somali shop owner shot and killed a 14 years old Sipiwe Mahori, during an alleged robbery in Soweto Township. The boy was shot in the neck and died within 15 minutes. Hebojanj Ncamla, 23, was another victim when he was shot three times in the arm.

The incident triggered waves of attacks and looting of foreign owned shops On March 5, 2015 xenophobic attacks occurred in Limpopo province, foreigners on the outskirts of Polokwan left their shops after protesting villagers threatened to burn them alive and looted shops. Violence erupted in the Ga- Sekegopo area after a foreign shop owner was found in possession of a mobile phone belonging to a local man who was killed. On April 8, 2015, a spate of xenophobic violence occurred after Zulu King, Goodwill Zwelithini made comments that all foreigners should go back to their home countries,

because they were changing the nature of the South African society with their goods and enjoying wealth that should have been for local people, for almost a week, the attacks on foreign national reigned. On April 12, 2015, In Kwazulu Natel, shops in Umlazi and Kwamashu, outside Durban, were torched in V section. A shop owned by a foreign national was set on fire by a mob where five people were reportedly killed. On April 14, 2015, looting of foreign shops spread to Verulam, north of Durban following a day of clashes between local foreigners and police in the city centre, Kwazulu-Natel. About 300 local people looted foreign - owned shops, senate urges harder stance against South Africa piqued, the senate and condemned in very strong terms. The recurring and renewed attacks on Nigerians in South Africa had asked the federal government to take a harder stance against the country. In 2016 alone, about 20 Nigerians were killed in extra - judicial manner.

Generally however, the latest wave of violent attacks on the Nigerians living in South Africa has generated local and international condemnations. This research work will critically, examines the core issues of racial intolerance and dislike for foreigners particularly, Nigerians in South Africa, within the broader historical framework of the apartheid regime and the post apartheid socio-economic relations which have over time shaped the existential notions of false community, vague entitlement and empty sense of belonging amongst a number of black South Africans.

On the issue of cooperation and development in the Nigeria and South Africa bilateral relation which give birth to Bi-National Commission (BNC) different scholars like Nwagwu and Obi argued that; Ngwenya (2010) and Obi (2015) agree that the relation between Nigeria and South Africa improved dramatically with the creations of the BNC as the mechanism for re-invigorating the inaction engagement. Obi reiterates South Africa's position on economy in global governance; and how the development of Africa is predicted on South Africa strategic partnership with Nigeria, which is the single continental economic power without BRICS. He insists Nigeria and South Africa should co-operate and avoid competing with a view to attain regional development aspirations.

More so, Obi advice that the Nigerian state is a significant partner of South Africa in projecting a meaningful African agenda and engaging with global power. He attributes the diplomatic setbacks in Nigeria-South Africa relation to the failure of leaderships to build relations that would endure. Obi (2015) agrees with Otto, (2012) that the relation maintained by Thabo Mbeki and Olusegun Obasanjo was built on personalities rather than independent foreign policy structures and institutions. To Otto, the relations have been cordial in trade and investment relations; but it has suffered at the political level. Obi and Otto cohere that the unstable political situations explains the inability of Nigeria and South

Africa to sustain cordial relations beyond a few years of Obasanjo and Mbeki's tenure. Otto reasons that despite the problems in the bi-lateral engagement of the continental giants, the development of the region can be achieved when the states go 'beyond contest and rise above petty rivalry and unhealthy competition'. He canvasses for the implementation of the development of the developmental policies and the prioritization of mutual interest for their citizens and region.

Amuwo (2014) illustrates the dwindling influence of Nigeria in continental affairs amid South Africa strides in the economic realm, governance and infrastructure. He argues that the Nigerian governing elite are preoccupied with domestic issues at the expense of Africa policy. Amuwo advice that bi-relations have been marred by conflict citing the struggle for Chair of African Union, and the seizure of Nigeria's \$15 million (ZAR 164.6 million) meant for arms purchase by the South Africa government. Agbu (2010) examines the prospect of future relations and interrogates domestic obstacles to healthy bi-lateral relations. He asserts the South Africa bureaucracy is largely occupied by white who are less willing to forge relations with the most populous Black Country in the region.

Conversely, the Nigerian infrastructure power supply and poor road network are major impediments to its growth. The Nigeria-South Africa relations have been described by Agbu (2010) as bumpy albeit cordial political relations. He argues, however, that the rivalry and the competition between Nigeria and South Africa should not justify the fragile relations; and prescribes a strategic partnership in different aspects of relations.

Banjo (2010) relies on the collision between Nigeria's former Head of State, Abacha and South African's icons, Mandela to discuss the contradictions inherent in Nigeria and South Africa relations. He observed, however, that the Bi-National Commission (BNC) aided diplomatic re-approachment in Obasanjo and Mbeki's tenure. He insists on the actualization of African potentials and the need to give credence to the probable impact of foreign relations on ordinary citizens. He avers that the strengthening of BNC is critical to improving synergy through the convergence of resources. Segal and Lekaba (2014) appraise Nigeria-South Africa relations amid the rebasing of Nigeria's GDP in April 2014. The scholars examine the competitive and co-operative pattern of existing bi-lateral relations and the likely future gains at bi-lateral and regional level. In their view, the economic growth recorded by Nigeria as shown in the rebasing of its GDP signpost the likely gains of flourishing intra-Africa trade. Segal and Lekaba (2014) contend that the economic growth in Nigeria cannot be disconnected from the huge investment of South African companies in the Nigerian economy. South Africa is, therefore rated by these scholars as a major player in the expanded and liberalized Nigerian economy. Segal and Lekaba (2014), the economic growth in Nigeria has been achieved

through the co-operation of Nigeria and South Africa albeit the domestic challenges and contradictions that confront the respective national economies. The scholars argue these problems, particularly the Boko Haram Challenge, could be contained through a collaborative effort relying on South Africa's strong military base rather than solicit external intelligence.

He insists that the Nigerian state cannot be a regional leader as a result of its internal challenges especially the inability to recover the abducted Chibok girls from the Boko Haram sect. This argument is faulty and ignores the global nature of terrorism which makes counter-terrorism measures difficult. This research concedes that Nigeria's security architecture was not at its best when the school girls were abducted, but it is not sufficient to undermine the country's regional status and influence.

Adekeye and Landsberg (2003:171-204) appraise the rivalry in Nigeria-South Africa relations to fill the hegemonic lacunae in the region. These scholars contend the role of Nigeria and South African as hegemons would likely induce anti-hegemonic alliances and deepen regional rivalries. Olaitan (Nigerian Tribune, 29 April 2003) shares the view of Adekeye and Landsberg (2003) when he compared leadership roles of Nigeria and South Africa. He describes Nigeria's leadership role as mirage and predicates his submission on the predatory nature of power politics of the political class in Nigeria as against the engagement of young generations in the governance of South Africa. Olaitan (Nigerian Tribune, 2003) insists there is no competition in a real sense and argues the most populous country is chasing the shadow of leadership without popular recognition.

### **US' Citizen Diplomacy**

*"if only people will get together, then so eventually will nations." President Dwight D. Eisenhower*

America's citizen diplomacy, which also is also referred to a cultural diplomacy, is as old as the American nation itself. It is rooted in the nation's history, and its history is a product of its traditions (Matthew, 2006). From the dependence in 1776, to the writing of the federal papers by Alexander Hamilton, John Jay, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, the founding fathers, the average American citizen was considered also as a diplomatic, or ambassador or representative carrying the full diplomatic baggage of the nation. President Kennedy had in the 1960s called on every American to consider himself as a national servant-leader who first should conceive what to offer the nation and not what the nation could offer him. To this end, the involuntary service and enlistment in the draft to fight in Vietnam was considered as an act of citizen diplomacy- war diplomacy, in which every soldier is a war diplomat of the United States. The idea of citizen diplomacy became clearer after the Second World War

when average citizen from the academia, military, science and medicine, and entertainment industry were actively involved in U.S international diplomacy. The citizen diplomat was considered as an informal character in the foreign policy process with a strong pull or influence-and in some cases people with cross-continental popularity who could help increase the approval rating of the international image of an administration or government of the nation (Patterson, 2007).

The creation of the public affairs section (PAS), formerly US information service (USIS) of the post (embassies) by the department of state became a more effective but informal way of engaging citizen in foreign policy. The PAS, and its other components such as the bureau of education cultural affairs, et cetera, promote public diplomacy by the Fulbright fellowships and other academic scholarship programs, in which American fellows are sent to African, Asian, Latin American, and European universities for different periods, while scholars from other nations are also selected on merit as Visiting Fellows to U.S universities. Public diplomacy can be seen as the transparent means by which a sovereign country communicates with publics in other countries in other aimed at informing and influencing audiences overseas for the purpose of promoting the national interest and advancing foreign policy goals. This diplomacy includes educational exchange programs for scholars and students, visitor programs, cultural events and exchanges et cetera (Johnson-Pizzaro, 2007). By these, it can be inferred that public diplomacy may be official state-to-state kind of diplomacy, it however, facilitates very informal or citizen diplomacy. By opening their homes, offices and schools to foreign visitors participating in exchange programs across the U.S, citizen diplomats foster international understanding and cooperation, constructive economic connections and peaceful interaction (Gelder, 2006:12).

Citizen diplomacy was a central emphasis of President Carter's administration. Using this informal network, he encouraged meaningful cross-continental interaction between the U.S. and Africa and Middle East, to boost U.S image and strengthen ties with its traditional allies in the regions. No wonder the Carter era is regarded as the peak of America's Détente. No era in the foreign policy history of the U.S. has however taken fuller advantage of citizen diplomacy than the Bush era. Two factors explain this. After 9/11, the American nation realized the attack represented the peak of global disdain, which required their being more friendly with the world. Secondly, after Bush had bungled the war on terror in Afghanistan and Iraq, it dawned on him that he needed for himself and America an image damage control, which could not have been done by his mostly war-mongering neo-conservative Cabinet, but by the ordinary and popular citizens of the nation. More American citizens, including academics, tourists, celebrities, entertainers (on concerts

or charity missions) visited Africa and Asia more during this period more than anytime else because the U.S. government encouraged it despite the fear of being terrorist targets (Segal, 2004; Chait, 2003). The notable visits of American Hollywood and musical stars to Iraq and other areas where Bush had created misgivings towards America were instances of citizen diplomacy.

The US citizens diplomacy has some elements of Nigerian typology. However, it is significantly different. For the U.S. it is basically the concept that the individual has the right, even responsibility, to help shape foreign relations; it is woven round the idea of "one handshake at a time". Citizen diplomats can be students, teachers and athletes, artist, business people, humanitarians, adventures, tourists and journalists. They are motivated by a responsibility to engage with the rest of the world in a meaningful, mutually beneficial dialogue (Matthew, 2006: 23). It is believed that when official diplomacy fails, citizen diplomacy is employed by the American government because of its effectiveness.

The implications of citizen diplomacy are multiple. These include the fact that public opinion would be a player in the foreign policy as, indeed, the foreign policy can be called a civil-society foreign policy even if the American Constitution grants the President almost exclusive powers to direct external affairs (Rosati, 2006: 56-58).

The Congress and Senate would also be active players because of the fact that they are citizen's' representatives, just as other bodies which Beasley *et al* (2001) have termed as "decision units" would also be active. The foreign policy decision units include research institutes such as The Brookings Institution and Carnegie Institution; and think-tanks such as the Center for a new American Security (CNAS), United Nations Association of the United States of America (UNA-USA).

The American citizen diplomacy also manifests in the Nigeria-type citizen-centered diplomacy such that the U.S. government is first and foremost concerned about the welfare of its citizen anywhere in the world, and other considerations in international politics is also about the wellbeing of its citizens. On the one hand, its sets out to protect all economic, military, security and socio-cultural interests of its citizens; and on the other hand it behaves locally and internationally in such a way that its citizens would walk tall wherever they are and be proud to be called Americans (Bardes, 2007). It is important to note that the U.S. may go to war, or deploy a hundred marines, ten jetfighters, a war-ship and sophisticated munitions just to save one American life.

### **Lesson for Nigeria**

Citizen participation in the foreign policy process cannot be overemphasized, makes it a diplomacy that may need to borrow from the American citizen diplomacy so as to give the citizens the opportunity to participate directly and

indirectly in the foreign policy process. Moreso when Nigeria's image problem now, even requires persons more credible and respected internationally than government, such as Wole Soyinka, Chinua Achebe, Yakubu Gowon, Mathew Hassan Kukah, Pastor Adeboye, Bishop Oyedepo, et cete, to engage in visits, meetings, business, and other levels of informal diplomacy to launder Nigeria' image abroad. Put differently, like in the case of the U.S., the Nigerian authorities could expand the base of this citizen centered diplomacy to also include the participation of civil-society (students, teachers, entertainers, pastors, etc), and should strongly consider public opinion and pursue a more people-oriented and not elite-driven national interest.

Secondly, by borrowing from the American citizen diplomacy, Nigeria could better accomplish its long – range objectives of becoming most significant African power when it rather institutes cultural, educational and social programs of exchange in which scholars and students, cultural groups, nationals of Africa, are brought into the country to foster a better understanding and cooperation, and open doors for constructive connections and peaceful interaction. By this, a Pax Nigerian may be more successfully achieved than frittering away the nation's wealth in endless African Conflicts with the view to just be called "Giant of Africa". The big powers in the world today use such subtle socio-cultural and economic instruments to establish unquestionable hegemony than wasting resources on nations that would later turn against them like in the case of Nigeria. For instance, Liberia and Sierra Leone-two countries it helped out of wars- have been scrambling with Nigeria to occupy the only African slot in the UN Security Council's Non-Permanent Seat, and Ghana (on whose behalf Nigeria supplies electricity to Togo and Benin), Egypt (for whom Nigeria mobilized African support during the Arab-israel Wars) and South Africa (for whom Nigeria fought for its liberation from apartheid), have been contesting Africa's slots of the UN security Council's Permanent Seats.

Thirdly, the Nigerian authorities should also emulate the U.S practice of going the extra mile to save Nigerian lives in trouble anywhere in the world. America had to swiftly evacuate its nationals in Somalia, Rwanda and Liberia on the outbreak of war. The Nigerian life should be cherished and protected both from the trigger-happy security agencies at home and the racist elements abroad. Damilola Taylor was assaulted to death in England, soldiers were killing Nigerians along the Cameroonian borders for years. Libyan authorities have been subjecting Nigerian illegal immigrants to physical and psychological torture, killing them sometimes, aliens including oil companies' expatriates in the Niger Delta have been subjecting Nigerian to dehumanizing conditions even right here in Nigeria. These are vices against Nigerians, and indicators of the high point of disregard for Nigeria, which governments has to take

seriously.

### **Empirical Review on Nigerian–South African Bilateral Relations Bilateral Diplomacy**

is a key building block of international relations i.e. the way a pair of countries such as Nigeria - South Africa deals with each other. Bilateral diplomacy is therefore, discussions and agreements between two nations. It tends to be focused on the embassies and can be cultural exchanges, trade agreements, joint military exercises or simply talking between the heads of state.

However, bilateral diplomacy goals may be to make your country look good, increase tourism from there, get access to the market of that country, protect your citizens traveling there, have a joint protection treaty, get development money, or have the country follow a value your country espouses (such as democracy of communism). Bilateral diplomacy determines when, where, and how is specific country to country relation will become more relevant. When we talk of unilateral diplomacy it is simply ignoring other countries by promoting a certain agenda or taking a course of action without consulting others. While multilateral diplomacy is carried out through discussions and votes at multinational organizations like UN, EU, World Food Program or IMF.

Generally However, Nigeria and South Africa are the two most powerful nations on the continent of Africa. There exists a bilateral relation between the two nations. However, right from inception, during the apartheid regime till date the bilateral relations has been based on hate and love relations and also hegemony in nature just as reported by Landsberg (2012) and Games(2013).

The leadership styles differ between the early post apartheid regime and during the ruling of the Military Junta Gen. Sani Abacha. In as much as President Nelson Mandela of South Africa portrayed a democratic attitude, the military Junta of Nigeria portrayed a despotic and disposition between 1995 and 1999. This however caused unfriendliness between the two nations. You will recall that Nigeria was suspended from committee of commonwealth of nations in 1995 as a result of pressure from South African Government due to lack of release of MKO Abiola, the presumed winner of June 12, 1993 Nigerian election; and also the killing of human right activist Ken Saro Wiwa all by Gen. Sani Abacha which violated the human right laws. These human right violations by Nigerian military Junta Gen. Sani Abacha that led to Nigerian Suspension from commonwealth organization adversely affected the political and diplomatical relations of Nigeria globally. This consequently gave an edge to South Africa over Nigeria as evidently shown by Games, in the year 2013.

In the same vein the invitation of Nigerian Super Eagles to the fourth Nation's tournament organized by South Africa was withdrawn by the South African government in 1996; which followed by the withdrawal of South African

high commissioner to Nigeria, Amb. George Nene by President Nelson Mandela for being close to Gen. Sani Abacha as reported by Adebayo and Banjo in 2000; also separately by Banjo in the year 2007.

However, that withdrawal of invitation of Super Eagles to the fourth Nations tournament by the South African Government was highly protested by the Nigerian Sports Authority to FIFA, noting that sports should not be mixed with politics. Thereby FIFA was called upon to punish South Africa for that action. This was also argued by Banjo and Omediran in the year 2000 that the killing of the nine Ogoni human right activists by the Nigeria military leader, Gen Sani Abacha which led to the Nigerian suspension from common wealth was political which doesn't warrant. South Africa to suspend Nigeria super eagle from the fourth nation tournament in 1996.

The Nigerian-South African relations which had gone soured over the years was however revived after the untimely death of Gen. Sani Abacha in 1998 with courtesy visits by Deputy President of South Africa Mr. Thabo Mbeki and a return visit by the new Nigerian military leader Gen. A. Abubakar to South Africa. This was further fostered when Gen A.A. Abubakar handed over power to democratically elected president of Nigeria Chief Olusegun Obasanjo in 1999. These bilateral relations between Nigeria and South Africa got stronger when Nigerian President Olusegun Obasanjo attended the inaugural ceremony of his friend Mr. Thabo Mbeki as President of South Africa in June 1999; this led to the establishment of Bi-National Commission in October 1999 for strategic economic coordination between the two states as explicitly stated by Banjo, 2010.

The BNC established in October, 1999 has been found to immensely provide a frame work for joint effort in order to bring Africa into the mainstream of global political, social and economic development; provide the basis for the government and private sectors of both countries to consult with each other in order to promote bilateral trade and industry to improve relations in the fields of technology, education, health, culture, youths and sports, use both country's human and natural resources to maximize social economic development through collective effort and establish the mechanism to promote peace, stability and social economic integration in Africa. Adebayo submits that in 2007 Nigeria and South Africa held six BNC meetings, alternating them between the two countries. Those meetings were held in October 1999, April 2000, March 2001, March 2002, December 2003 and September 2004.

One major objective of establishing the BNC between Nigeria and South Africa was to checkmate some grey areas of diplomatic concerns in order to help sustain the bilateral agreements between the two nations. For instance, the BNC tried to wave into the embarrassing incidence that occurred in South Africa when the Nigerian president Olusegun Obasanjo was stopped at the airport for checks with the accusations that he was carrying

cocaine into South Africa when he came for inauguration of Mr. Thabo Mbeki in June, 2004.

In the view of the aforementioned the Nigerian Government under President Umaru Musa Yar'adua, adopted a new foreign policy approach in 2007, which was based on what the former foreign affairs Minister, Chief Ojo Maduekwe has since called 'Citizen Diplomacy'. It is a diplomacy that a citizen centered and not Africa as its centre-piece (Bakare, 2007:7). Whatever the case, the most important factor which is very crux to the Nigeria-South-Africa bilateral relations is the newest of citizen diplomacy, its misunderstanding and/or its challenge of its application towards actualization of Nigerian project in the fourth Republic; a time when Nigeria is touting its rebranding ethos and image building. This consequently has adversely affected the Nigerian citizens in South-Africa which lead to the barbaric xenophobic activities by the South-Africans as there were spate of killings of foreign Nationals especially Nigerians. The 'Afrophobic' widely known as xenophobic attacks in South-Africa especially the May 2008, was horrendous and noteworthy. Nigerian citizens and their businesses were the target in 2008 attack. In his view Ashaver (2014), the attack claimed over 62 lives and displaced several others. Many lost their properties and shops were looted, an indication of an orchestrated attack on the businesses of Nigerians in South-Africa (Alli, 2010, Chermend piper, 2012). In fact, this is an indication that South-Africans harboured morbid hatred for Nigerians in particular. Just as Okeke et.al (2013) would believe that the agony Nigerian people faced was baseless, "just by being the citizens of the most populous black nation in the world".

Many Nigerians were killed in the 2007 extra-judicial circumstances, besides cases of harassment, intimidation and brutalization by South-African police and security agencies (Ekel, 2009). The President Umaru Musa Yar'adua had tried his best to see that Nigerians living all over the globe are well protected in line with the new foreign policy citizen diplomacy before his demise in 2010.

The bilateral relations suffered set-backs in the tenures of President Goodluck Jonathan and Jacob Zuma as a result of the xenophobic attacks on African migrants. Increasing competition between the two countries for positions at multi-lateral organizations is also thought to have worsened the relations. Nigeria acted against South-Africa to replace the incumbent Jeen Ping, who Nigeria supports, with South-African home affairs Minister Nkasazana Dlamini-Zuma for the powerful position of the African Union Commission chairperson AU, Ali (Mueleke Charles 2012) reported the relation further deteriorated when South-Africa backed incumbent President Laurent Gbagbo for control of Cote d'voire in 2011 in his view (Charles 2012) President Gbagbo, who refused to abdicate power on his defeat at election. The Nigerian government mobilized West-African forces to displace

Gbagbo from power, which contradicted the preference of South-Africa on the crisis in Ivory Coast. For a political negotiation.

The position of South-Africa on the crisis in Ivory Coast was perceived as interference in a sub-regional issue and attempt to foster its African leadership agenda.

The issue of arms scandal during Jonathan regime was another problem between the two countries in 2014, where the Pretoria seized about \$15million from the Nigerian government and almost crumbled their relationship. The seizure of \$5.7million that was found in two suit cases in a Nigerian private jet and then confiscation of \$9.3 million nearly threatened their engagement as Nigerians asked its government to summon the African ambassador to Nigeria (Fadeyi, 2012).

Also, the (Moene, 2012) issue of yellow fever card deportation aroused, when some 125 Nigerians were deported back home from South Africa because of lack of adequate documentation for vaccination against yellow fever. This gesture was however reciprocated by the Nigerian Foreign Affairs Minister Mr. Gbenga Ashiru when in 2012 he deported some 131 South Africans between 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> of March, 2012.

Moeng argued that, these incidences made Nigeria-South Africa bilateral relations to become soured, hence gave birth to the xenophobic tendencies in South Africa.

The yellow fever card issue which caused some diplomatic turbulence between the two giant countries of Africa was defended by the spokesperson of South Africa international relations and cooperation dept, Clayton Monyela. He argued that Nigeria just blew things out of proportion, thereby mixed the whole issue, he stressed that it was only a health matter brought to a diplomatic issue by Nigeria (Moeng, 2012).

It was claimed that South African department followed standard international protocol in the deportation saying that the public should understand that communicable diseases must be controlled.

However, a gentleman's agreement was reached after the South African government formally sent a letter of apology to Nigeria's Minister of Foreign Affairs, Olugbenga Ashiru, apologizing for banning 125 Nigerians from entry into South Africa over alleged possession of fake yellow fever vaccine cards. Nigeria also accepted the apology on behalf of her citizens. Meong, (2012) reported that both countries agreed to put a certain mechanisms to ensure that a similar problem does not reoccur. He was to protect he bilateral relations and agreements between the two countries.

The five measures Nigeria and South Africa agreed upon included;

- The revival of the Bi-National Commission between South Africa and Nigeria and the immigration working group as soon as possible.

- South Africa's national department of health and the Gauteng health department to reconsider reopening the vaccination clinic at or Tambo international airport so that passengers without yellow fever card can be vaccinated upon arrival at the airport to avoid undue deportation.

- The South Africa and Nigeria health authorities would exchange vaccine batch numbers and details about the official institutions that administer the vaccine for verification purposes at the port of entry. This information would also be made available to the missions in Lagos and Abuja who issue visas based on proof of a yellow fever certificate. All the air lines will also be informed about the verification process.

- Immigration officials would be the first officials that deal with the travelers at the port of entry and if they should experience challenges, they should invite other units such as health to help and not the other way round.

- In the case of mass deportations, senior officials at the department of international relations and cooperation including protocol, should be consulted by the immigration and health officials at the airport before undertaking such action. This will provide opportunity to senior officials to consult with the department before deportation of large numbers of people.

Accordingly to Ajaebili (2011) the core principles of Nigeria's foreign policy as generally agreed upon by scholars include;

- The principle of non-alignment: This is a rejection of an alliance with existing ideology and military power blocs of the capitalist west led by the United state and the communist east led by the former soviet union during the cold war era. It was particularly important because Nigeria gained independence during the heat of cold war.

- Legal equality of states; Nigeria adopted the principal of respect for legal equality, sovereignty and territorial integrity of all state, big or small and newly independent states from domineering influence of the developed nations.

- Non interference in the domestic affairs of other states; Nigeria upheld the principles of non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries.

- Principle of multilateralism: This implies the freedom to seek membership of both continental and global multilateral organizations.

- Africa as the centre piece of Nigeria's foreign policy; Africa has remained the cornerstone of Nigeria's foreign policy since independence.

A cursory look at the above core principles, one can deduced that a vibrant foreign policy derives its strength from domestic imperatives that is from the needs of the country and its populace. Africa has remained the centre piece of Nigeria's foreign policy since independence in 1960 (Ajuebili, 2011). It is also good to recall that Nigeria struggled harder and spent heavily in pursuit of the

decolonization of the Africa and terminating the apartheid regime in Pretoria, also as the giant of Africa aggressively championing the freedom of Africans. In various countries such as Congo, Angola, Mozambique when they were under the yoke of colonialism and others under the majority racist regimes in Zimbabwe and South Africa. The Afro Centric foreign policy of Abubakar Tafawa Balewa in 1960 played a very good role and show an example of African big brother in dismantling the apartheid and racist discrimination of the White Rule of the South African state (Ajaebili, 2011).

Another angle to the relationship between Nigeria and some African countries especially South Africa, was that Nigeria has been playing an unmatched role in restoring piece to conflict ridding in African countries such as Congo, Liberia, Sudan and Sierra Leone (Ajaebili 2011) to which she always commits huge human and material resources.

This made Nigeria to be mocked by several African States, not withstanding her big brother's role in Africa. For instance, some neighboring francophone countries embarrassed Nigeria and show outright hostility by subjecting Nigerians living in their midst to various forms of torture and other humiliations as rightly reported by Ajaebili 2011. The poor perception of Nigerians in international community could be bloomed on unscrupulous political leadership and economic breakdown which the country had experience for several years owing to the opportunity squandered by the successive military regime in the country.

With the aforementioned, the South African apartheid hero and ANC leader, Nelson Mandela published a detailed exposition of the philosophical pillars that supported South Africa foreign policy. Accordingly to him, this includes;

I.Those issues of human rights are central to South Africa's international relations and extend beyond the political to economic, social and environment issue.

II.That just and lasting solutions to the problems of humankind can only be achieved through the promotion of democracy in the world.

III.That consideration of justice and respect for international law should guide the relations between South Africa and other nations in the world.

IV.That peace is the goal for which South Africa and all nations should strive and where this fails, internationally agreed but non-violent methods, including effective arms control regime must be employed.

V.That the concerns and interests of the continent of Africa should be reflected in South Africa's policy.

VI.That the economic development of South Africa depends on growing regional and international economic cooperation in an interdependent world.

However, the concept of Africans renaissance comprises a philosophy which calls on African people and nations to

overcome the current challenges confronting the continent. The concept was popularized by former South African President Thabo Mbeki during his term of office as Deputy President and later President. When you consider the big brother Nigeria and Neo-imperialist South Africa, Nigeria staged the second world black and African festival of Arts and culture (FESTAC) in 1977. According to Campbell (2006), the festival was used to examine the problems standing in the way of Nigerians moved towards new leadership in the present century. Campbell revealed that FESTAC showed a society drifting in the wrong direction. Though the organizers claimed that the festival was an arena for bringing together peoples of African descent to exhibit and celebrate their shared heritage. Another claim was that FESTAC was aimed at exploiting Nigerians newly attained economic strength and muscle for political advantage on the global scene. But all hopes were dashed away because of ethnic and regional division and corruption in the country. But Campbell argued that FESTAC was an avenue for looting money; it amounted to big waste in a society in urgent need of economic reform and political revival.

The violence act against the African citizens especially the Nigerians citizens in South Africa has affected the bilateral relations between Nigeria and South Africa. Nigeria have lost many of her citizens in South Africa due to xenophobic act killings on her citizens despite the cordial relations Nigeria have with South African Government and the struggle which the Nigeria government offered to South Africa during the apartheid regime or liberation of Africa. Nigeria struggled for South Africa to gain her independence against the minority white leadership in South which was dismantled by the Nigerian government during the regime of General Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida and the Afro Centric Foreign policies implemented. South Africa hated Nigerians residing in their state believing they will take their wealth and land from them and socio-economic lives which make the South Africa aggressive and resulted to killings innocent Africans.

So many scholars of political science and international relation gave different definitions to the term xenophobia. The term xenophobia is two Greek words "Xeno" and "Phobia" meaning "strange" and "phobia" respectively. Scholars like Chinomona and Mazazriri (2015) defined xenophobia as an action as attitudes, behaviours and perceptions that discriminate individuals on the assumption of not being an indigene, outsiders, or people from other community different entirely from theirs.

Another scholar also defined xenophobia in his own view as the hatred of foreigners that is characterized with all sorts of abuses, violations and discriminations of the highest order. The scholar also explained the factors that are responsible for the cause of xenophobia in South Africa. The factors include the anxiety of loss of identity and social status, fear of succession on the part of the economy, superiority feeling among the indigenous, fear

of boundaries in a national crisis and misinformation from the culture and media and the elite or politician of South Africa government which increase the tension in South African on the Nigerian citizens residing in their country (Akindes 2004).

Crush and Ramachanden (2017) believed xenophobia as highly negative perception and practice that discriminate against non-citizens group on their foreign origin and nationality."

Dassah 2015 and Mc Donald 2001) argued that "the concept of xenophobia is seen as originally emanates from the beliefs and the perception of a group of people categorizing the non-natives as being inferior to them in terms of socio-economic and political affiliation of the land where they are residing.

Mesenya and Danso (2017) also says the issue of xenophobia can be attributed to a higher rate of number of poverty, unemployment and above all when the government of a country is not showing concern for the protection of individual rights and freedom. Also Mesenya argued on the difference between xenophobia and racism where he pointed out that the two words share similar attributes in the literature but the latter is branch to the former. Racism is a form of discrimination focused on biological or skin colour, while xenophobia comprises all form of segregation or discrimination against those categorized as non nationals.

Akinola, (2018) gave a typical example of demonstrated by South African's when locals seem to accommodate citizens from Ghana, Senegal, Kenya while displaying acute hospitality to those from Nigeria, Zimbabwe, Somalia.

In the argument of Masanya and Kaluba (2016) on the issue of xenophobia and racism. Kaluba pointed out the relationship between the racism and xenophobia. In his point of view the look at racism as countries where people of different races live. Xenophobia and racism often overlap although they are distinct phenomena since unlike xenophobia racism usually entails a distinction based on physical characteristic differences such as skin colour, hair type, facial features while xenophobia implies behavior based on the idea that foreign originates from outside the community or nation.

Hence, xenophobia covers all forms of hostility and intolerance meted on those categorized as non-nationals or foreigners. This could manifest through several forms such as racephobia (racism) ethrophobia (ethnic conflict), genophobia (genocide) afrophobia (hatred for foreign things) (Akinola 2018). In another development Harris, (2002), Williams, (2008) described the term xenophobia as a social psychological, attitudinal, either overt or indirect, hostility and tension towards foreigners manifesting as physical violence, social conflict or mere latent dislike or foreigners.

Fungarai, (2015) share the views that the act of nursing or keeping grudges for foreigners without any course is known as xenophobia.

Benyere (2018) according to him the forms of xenophobia range from the use of derogatory languages to physical violence such as insult, assault and arson. Gomo (2010) equally viewed xenophobia as a way by which foreigners are often perceived in a negative derogatory and dehumanizing manner that categorizes them as inferior people enabling them to be subjected to unfair treatment characterized by extreme nationalism expensive economic protectionism, identity formation, blatant intolerance and hostility towards the others and violent acts against non-locals.

Generally, however the Nigerian South African relations was characterized by the theory of frustrations and aggressions particularly in relations to xenophobic attack on Nigerian national in the country. Basically, Plater, (2005) cited in Ogunnubi (2015), Webia and Smith (2014) expressed that Nigerian-South Africa relations has been cordial due to some similarities in the two country's foreign policies. This has made the duo to have been in good times with one another and have a common vision for the African continent (Colliers et al., 2015).

Similarly the South Africa's attitude towards the foreign nationals residing in South Africa especially Nigerians, may lead to frustrations to the Nigerians after they might have returned to their homeland which might also consequently lead to harms on South Africa investments in Nigeria such as MTN DSTV, shoprites etc. as a result of retaliations (Whitley and Kite, 2010).

### Liberalism theory

Liberalism was dominant from 1900s to 1930s it was one of the early approach to international relations studies which was motivated by the desire to prevent war because not all idealist believe that the economic principles of free trade will lead to peace (Hobson 1902) argues that imperialism was becoming the primary cause of conflict in international politics as the outbreak of the 1st world war shifted liberal thinking towards a recognition that peace is not a natural phenomenon but one that can be constructed.

Luard (1992:465) argues that peace and prosperity required consciously device machinery but a famous advocate of international relations was former President of USA, Woodrow Wilson who stated that peace could only be secured through creation of an international institution in order to regulate international anarchy. In his famous 14 point speech addressed to congress in January, 1918, Wilson argued that; "A general association of nations must be formed to preserve the coming peace (cited in Dunore, 2001:167)" The League of Nations was an organization that was formed which the liberalist scholars believe will usher in peace. For the League of Nations to be effective, all state should have military power to deter aggressions when it's necessary to use force. This is the idea of the collective security

system in League of Nations. The collective security is a system where state or nation come together to fight the aggressor, the nation state agreed to join together in their decision. (Roberts and Kingsbury, 1993:30) believed the collective security can be differentiated with the alliance system of security where some member state join together to fight external threat sometimes known as collective defense.

The first assumption of liberalist scholars was that national self-determination within Europe would remove one of the major source of war. Each nationality should be organized an independent state. A second assumption was that was often resulted from secret agreements between states and that if citizen of these state were aware of such agreements, they would not be tolerated just like the case of Nigeria – South Africa relation the liberalist called for an end to secret diplomacy and urgent greater public participations in the liberalist called for an end to balance of power in favour of a system of international collective security that would require states to reduce their military preparedness to the lowest possible level and to rely on the combined military capacity of the world community for their security against armed aggression. It also assumed that;

i. A world governing body would exist to determine whether aggression had occurred and to co-ordinate a global response.

ii. States would automatically join in collective responses to aggression anywhere in the world (Maghoori, 2002:10)

Basically, the liberalist embraced a world view based on the following belief.

i. Human nature is essentially good or altruistic and people are therefore capable of mutual aid and collaboration.

ii. The fundamental human concern for the welfare of others makes progressive possible.

iii. Bad human behavior is not product of evil people but of evil institutions and structural arrangement that encourage people to act selfishly and to harm others including making wars.

iv. War is not inevitable and its frequency can be reduce by eradicating the institutional arrangement that motivate people to act selfishly, an harm other.

v. War is an international problem that requires; collective or multi-lateral rather than national effort to eliminate it.

vi. International society must re-organize itself to eliminate the institutions that make war to likely occur. However, with the aforementioned world view liberalism could be classified into different types.

i. Neo-liberalism or liberal institution

ii. Sociological liberalism

iii. Trade and inter-dependence or commercial liberalism

iv. Democratic peace theory

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### Population of the study and sample size

The target population is Nigeria, the giant of Africa using the 2006 population census (because it is the only official figure available now, even though the population of Nigeria has naturally increased; this figure will be used) the population of Nigeria is over 140 million (Cited in [http://www.nigeriamasterweb.com/Nigeria\\_of\\_census\\_fig.htm](http://www.nigeriamasterweb.com/Nigeria_of_census_fig.htm)). However since it is impossible to reach everyone in Nigeria, therefore, a sample of the population will be chosen as a representative of all. The population of the study will be Nigeria based on purposive sampling and Igbo speaking in particular. This is because they are the one's adversely affected by the xenophobic barbaric acts in South Africa due to their high level of trade both nationally and internationally. Nigeria consists of 36 States and Abuja with a population of 140 million according to 2006 population census, the Igbo speaking people of Nigeria majorly live in five States of the South Eastern Nigeria. However, they are found virtually in all nooks and corners of Nigeria and abroad hence they are our sampled population. The Nigeria population is projected to be more than 180 million now, this research will make use of the projected population. The researcher used simple random sampling technique to select the respondents who were met in their offices and public places. The researcher also selected 20 respondents from the Nigeria Ministry of Foreign Affairs, South-African embassy in Nigeria and some diplomatic security agents who were so helpful during the research work.

### Instrument of data collection

The instruments of data collection for this study were open interview and structured questionnaire designed by the researcher. The questionnaire was divided into two parts: part 'A' and 'B'. Part 'A' is designed to collect the information on personal data, while part 'B' was divided into four sections, each containing items related to the research questions meant to elicit responses designed to guide the study. Each part of section 'B' has four clusters of questions meant to address each question. The response option was in Yes and No.

### Validation of the instrument

Face validity was used for the instrument validation. The researcher submitted the questionnaire to the experts, the experts validated the questionnaire. They also restructured the items which help to ensure that the items measure exactly the expected constructs.

### Reliability of the instrument

Reliability refers to the consistency with which a measuring instrument produces the same results from

repeated measurement of the same subject. To establish the reliability of the instrument, test-retest approach was used. Copies of the questionnaire were administered to the respondent within the study Area. After two weeks the questionnaires were re-administered to the same group again. Then the researcher collected the result for comparison and reliability. Coefficient of 0.75 was obtained after it was subjected to person product moment correlation coefficient analysis. This was high enough for instrument to be reliable.

### Method of data collection

The researcher was directly involved in the collection of data from the Nigerian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, South African embassy and other foreign services agent. The researcher collected the completed copies of the questionnaire after filling by the respondents.

### Method of the data analysis

The data collected from the questionnaire was analyzed using percentage and the results evaluated.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Age distribution of the respondents and geo-political zone origin of the respondents are shown in (Table 1). In (Table 1), respondents were asked to their ages so as to ensure that only matured persons were contacted. The number of the respondents per each age brackets is indicated in the table. Table indicates that 25 percent of the respondents were between the age of 18 and 35 years, while 40 percent were between the age of 35 and 49 years 35 percent were between the age of 50 above. Table 2 shows the respondents Geo-political zone of origin.

The data indicates 30 percent of the respondent were from the south east zone, 5% are from south west, 25% from south south zone, 10% from the North Central, also 15% are from North East while 15% are from the North West. The questions were answered using the structured Questionnaire. The responses were converted into percentage representation value as shown in (Tables 3 and 4). The research questions results shows that 100% of the respondents to question one answered that Nigeria and South Africa have good bilateral relations in the Fourth Republic (2007 - 2015). The above result answered my number one research objectives which are "to critically examine the nature of Nigeria-South-African bilateral relations between 2007-2015". The result indicated that the relationship between Nigeria and South Africa is of good and evil. Which is in line with the view of Agbu (2010) where he said that the bilateral relation between Nigeria and South Africa is Ominium Gatherum meaning of good and evil "with a zig-zag dimension and a periodic oscillation that scholars described as "love and

**Table 1:** Age distribution of the respondent.

Age	Frequency	Percentage %
18 – 13	5	25
35 – 49	8	40
50 and above	7	35
Total	20	100%

**Table 2:** Geo-Political Zone of origin of the respondents.

Geo-Political Zone	Frequency	Percentage
1 South East	6	30
2 South West	1	5
3 South South	5	25
4 North Central	2	10
5 North East	3	15
6 North West	3	15
Total	20	100

**Table 3:** Summary of research questions responses.

S/N	Research Questions	Options	Responses	Percentage
1.	Does Nigeria and South Africa have good bilateral relations.	Yes	20	100
2.	Does the Nigeria South Africa bilateral relations have impact on foreign policies and citizenship diplomacy.	Yes No	15 5	75 25
3.	Is the Nigeria – South Africa bilateral relations profitable to the citizens of Nigeria – South Africa	Yes No	12 8	60 40

**Table 4:** Summary tests of hypotheses

S/N	HYPOTHESES	OPTIONS	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
1.	The nature of Nigerian foreign policy and citizenship diplomacy has no significant impact on Nigeria – South Africa bilateral relation in the Fourth Republic periodized (2007-2015)	Agree Disagree	20 0	100% 0
2.	The Nigerian citizenship diplomacy has no significant impact to the Nigerian citizens in South Africa in the promotion of their welfare and security during the Fourth Republic 2007 to 2015	Agree Disagree	5 5	25% 75%

Sources: Research Questionnaire

hate" relationship (Bamidele, 2017). But only 75% confirmed in question two that the Nigeria-South Africa relations have impact on foreign policies and citizenship diplomacy in the Fourth Republic (Table 3). 60% of the respondents said Nigeria and South Africa bilateral relation was profitable to the citizens of Nigeria – South Africa in 2007-2015 because that was the period Late President Umaru Musa Yaradua re-introduce citizenship diplomacy in Nigeria foreign policies and citizenship diplomacy influence the living standard of Nigerian citizen in South Africa (Table 3). While only 25% of the Respondents disagreed that the citizen diplomacy and Nigeria foreign policies. Have impact on Nigeria-South African relations between 2007 and 2015. The research result answered the number two research objectives of this studies which is "To examine the impact of citizen diplomacy to the Nigerian citizens in South Africa in the protection and promotion of their welfare and security between 2007 and 2015 which is in line with Ojo Maduekwe's view (2009) where he said that Nigeria's external relations manifestly benefits the interest of

Nigerians and have noticeable involvement of the citizens in the diplomatic environment, irrespective of where they come line across the globe also in his view foreign policy is properly calculated and implemented it will us help in building a better image for the county and Nigerian abroad. If foreign policy is properly articulated and implemented, it will help to build a better image for the country.

The hypotheses test result shows that 100% of the respondent accepted the null hypothesis  $H_0$ , which said that the nature of Nigeria foreign policy and citizenship diplomacy has significant impact on Nigerian-South African bilateral relation in the Fourth Republic periodize to 2007-2015; while 75% percent of the respondents accepted the alternative hypotheses  $H_{a2}$  that the Nigeria citizenship diplomacy has no significant impact to the Nigeria citizens in South Africa in the promotion and protection of their welfare and periodize to 2007-2015. It is observed that both the research questions answered and the hypotheses tested are in agreement with one another in respect to the responses by the respondents.

The relation between the two strongest countries of Africa is termed profitable during the Fourth Republic especially between 2007-2015 when President Umaru Musa Yar'adua introduce citizenship diplomacy. The Nigerian Foreign Policy and citizenship influence the living standard of Nigerian citizens in the South Africa during the Fourth Republic which led to xenophobic attacks on them.

## Conclusion

Nigeria's citizens diplomacy is not simple to understand because it is holistic in scope, very challenging in implementation, but remain an indispensable instrument for a positive image building and national development of Nigeria for instance, Nigeria –South Africa is concluded to have very good bilateral relations during the Fourth Republic (2007-2015) and that Nigeria –South African relations have impact on foreign policies and citizenship diplomacy during the same Fourth Republic. However, it was unanimously agreed that Nigeria- South African bilateral relations was profitable to the citizens of Nigeria in South African during the year 2007-2015 because that was the period Late President Umaru Musa Yar'adua re-introduced citizenship diplomacy in the Nigerian government.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Encourage the formation of effective and functional implementation of citizenship diplomacy in Nigeria.
2. The Federal government should sit up and study Nigeria's foreign policy machinery and try to make it more dynamic, more focused, responsive to the needs of vibrant citizen diplomacy. This is because the success of citizen diplomacy requires serious review of Nigeria foreign policy must be fashioned to be result oriented and direct at aggressively pursuing her interact in African and around the world. The era of Father Christmas, Big Brother and free breakfast should be considered to be in view of the new economy realities at home and globe.
3. The staff of the ministry of foreign affairs should be given adequate training to perform their duties more effectively.
4. Nigerian foreign policy should be urgently reviewed and re-packaged in the light of the new realities of the globalized world order, to make it more efficient, responsive, dynamic and protective based on citizen diplomacy.

## REFERENCES

- Adejumo, Akintokumbo (2007) "Re-OjoMaduekwe's Citizenship Diplomacy". Available on INTERNET at <http://209.85.129.132/search?q=cache:R5j9cuj4sJ:www.nigeriasinamerica.com/articles/20...>
- Adekeye A, Landsberg C (2003). "South Africa and Nigeria's Regional Hegemons." In: M. Baregu and C. Landsberg (Eds.); From Cape to
- Agbu O (2010). "Nigeria and South Africa: The Future of a Strategic Partnership." In: O. Eze (Ed.); Beyond Fifty Years of Nigeria's
- Agbu, O. (2009). "Nigerian Foreign Policy under President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua: Challenges and Prospects" in Eze, O. (ed.) *Citizen Diplomacy*, Nigeria Institute of Foreign Affairs, Victoria Island, Lagos, pp. 41- 62.
- Akinola, A. O. (2018a). Introduction: Understanding xenophobia in Africa. In A. O. Akinola (Ed.), *The political economy of Xenophobia in Africa* (pp. 1-8). Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Akinterinwa, B. (2009). "Rebranding Nigeria and Citizen Diplomacy" *THISDAY Newspaper*, April 26<sup>th</sup>, p. 21.
- Akinterinwa, B. (2010a). "Togo: Citizen . Diplomacy and Maltreatment of Nigerians" 20<sup>th</sup>, pp. 16-17. .
- Akinterinwa, B. (2012b). "Overview of Nigerians Foreign Policy, 1960-2010: Challenges and Recommendations" in E. Anyaoku (ed.) *Review of Nigeria's Foreign Policy: Issues and Perspectives*, Lagos : NIIA, pp. 15-34.
- Bangudu, (2013). "World Bank Indicts Jonathan's Government, says massive poverty, unemployment, killing of Nigerians", Premium Times, June 12.
- Bakare, Waheed (2007). *The Punch*, July 31. Childs, J. R (1948) *American Foreign Service*. New York: Holt.
- Banjo A (2010). South Africa-Nigeria Diplomatic and Economic Relations, 1994-2004, *Afr. Rev.* 2(1):83.
- Charman, A., Piper, L. (2012). *Xenophobia, Criminality and violent Entrepreneurship: Violence against Somali Shopkeepers in Delft south, Cape Town, South Africa*. South.
- Colliers, J., Schunemann, J., & Moyer, J. D. (2015). Power and influence in Africa: Algeria, Egypt, Ethiopia, Nigeria and South Africa. Institut Chinomona E., & Maziriri, E. T. (2015). Examining the phenomenon of xenophobia as experienced by African immigrant entrepreneurs in Johannesburg, South Africa: Intensifying the spirit of 'Ubuntu'. *International Journal of Research in Business Studies and Management*, 2(6), 20-31.e for Security Studies - African Futures March Paper, 14, 1-28.
- Congo: Southern Evolving Security Challenges, Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Crush, J., & Ramachandran, S. (2017). *Migrant entrepreneurship collective violence and xenophobia in South Africa*. Cape Town, South Africa: Southern African Migration Programme. *Culture in Nigeria. African studies review*, 49(1), 132-133.
- Danso, R., & McDonald, D. (2001). Writing xenophobia: Immigration and the print media in post-apartheid South Africa. *Africa Today*, 48(3), 122-131.
- Dassah, M. O. (2015). Naming and exploring the causes of collective violence against african migrants in post-apartheid South Africa. Whither Ubuntu I? *The Journal for Transdisciplinary Research in Southern Africa*, 11(4), 127-142.
- Dickson, M. (2010). "Citizen Diplomacy in President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua's Nigeria, 2007-2009: An Assessment" *International Journal of Politics and Good Governance*, Volume 1(1.3), Quarter III Dickson, M. (2010). "Citizen Diplomacy in President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua's Nigeria, 2007-2009: An Assessment", *International Journal of Politics and Good Governance*, Volume 1, Number 1.3, Quarter III, pp. 1- 13.
- Enikanolaiye, S. (2013). "Nigerians African Policy: An Overview (I)" *THIS DAY Newspaper*, September 22<sup>nd</sup>, p.19.
- Eze, O. (2009). *Citizen Diplomacy*. Nigeria Institute of Foreign Affairs, Victoria Island, Lagos
- Fadeyi R (2012). When South Africa's Envoy Came to Apologise. *National Mirror* (Nigeria).
- Folarin, S. (2013). "Nigerians New „Citizen-Centred Diplomacy”: Any Lessons from the United States?" *BIBISEM: Journal of African Culture and Civilization*, Volume 1, pp. 110,123.
- Foreign Policy: Issues, Challenges and Prospects, Lagos: Nigerian Institute of International Affairs.
- Games D (2013a). Nigeria-South Africa Baseline Study. (SAFPI Policy Brief 44, South Africa Institute of International Affairs, Johannesburg. <http://www.safpi.org/publications/nigeria-south-africa-baseline-study>. Accessed on 10 May, 2015.
- Games D (2013b). Nigeria-South Africa Baseline Study: Key Findings. (SAFPI Policy Brief 45), South Africa Institute of International Affairs, Johannesburg. <http://www.safpi.org/publications/nigeria-south-africa>

- baseline-study-key-findings Accessed on 10 May, 2015.
- Gelder, M. (2006) *Meeting the Enemy, Becoming a Friend* (Bauw Institute).
- Geoffrey, Mc. (1973). *The Diplomacy and its Apparatus*. London: Plume Press / Ward Lock Ltd.
- Harris, B. (2002). *Xenophobia: A new pathology for a New South Africa?* In D. Hook & G. Eagle (Eds), *Psychopathology and social prejudice* (pp. 169-184). Cape Town, South Africa: University of Cape Town Press.
- Jimoh, Adekunle (2001) .“Extra-judicial Killing: Victim’s Father Recounts Ordeals”. *The Nation*. January 8.
- Johnson-Pizzaro, M. (2007) “Pre-Departure Orientation”, Interactive Session with Fulbright Scholars Departing for the USA, June 5th, 2009.
- Keshi, J (2017, March 20). South Africa’s Political Elite fuelling Xenophobia attacks. *Arise, News Abuja, Nigeria*.
- Landsberg C (2012). *Nigeria South Africa Tension Leave Africar Leadership Gap*. *World Politics Review Brief*, <http://wpr.vu/amwta> Accessed on 20 March, 2015.
- Maduekwe, O. (2007) “Time for a Citizen-Centered Diplomacy” Retrieved February 25 2009 from <http://www.nigerianvillagesquare.org>.
- Mahmood, Abba (2009) “What Manner of Citizen Diplomacy?” Available on INTERNET at <http://209.85.129.123/search?Q=cache>:
- Mbachu, O. (2009). “Citizen Diplomacy: The Challenges for Nigerian Defence and Security in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century in Eze, O. (ed.) *Citizen Diplomacy*, Nigeria Institute of Foreign Affairs, Victoria Island, Lagos, pp. 63-79
- Nwogbaga, D. (2013). “The Diaspora Question and Nigerians Foreign Policy”, *Journal of Social Sciences and Public Policy*, Volume 5, Number 1, pp. 44-55, Cen. Res. in Publications.
- Matthew, W. S.(2006). “Best practices in crisis communication”. *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 34., no.3 (August-2006): 232-44.
- Meong, k. (2012, march 8). Stand off after SA deports 125 Nigerian. *Sowetan*, p.[?Http://www.swetanlive.co.za/news/2012/03/08/stand-off-after-sa-deports-125-nigerian-s](http://www.swetanlive.co.za/news/2012/03/08/stand-off-after-sa-deports-125-nigerian-s) accessed July 20, 2913.
- Mingst, K. (2004). *Essentials of International Relations* (3rd Edition). New York: W.W.W.Norton& Company.
- Ngwenya XN (2010) *Giant of Africa Limp along South Africa and Nigeria*, (opion and Analysis). Johannesburg South Africa Institute of Affairs.
- Ogunsanwo OA (2000). *Modern Principles and Techniques of Management*. External Studies Programme, Ibadan: Department of Educational Management, University of Ibadan, Pp.24-90.
- Okeke, V.O.S., Aniche, E.T. (2014). International political environment of Nigerian foreign policy and implementation of Citizen Diplomacy under Yar’adua/Jonathan administration (2007-2011): A linkage political approach. *American Journal of Social Issues and Humanities*, 4(1), 72-83.
- Okocha, C. and O. Nzeshi (2007).“Nigeria to Adopt Citizenship Diplomacy” *Nigerian Bands*, September 12th. Data accessed on 20th October, 2013. Retrieved from: <http://nigerianbands.blogspot.com/2007/09/nigeriatoadopt-citizenshipdiplomacy.html>.
- Palmer and perkins, (2004:84). *The national Intelligence agency (NIA and Nigeria’s Diplomatic Relations in contemporancy times*.
- Pfister R (2005). “Apartheid South African and African States: From Pariah to Middle Power, 1961- 1994.” London: Tauris Academic Studies. Cited In: Ogunnubi, R. O. (2013). *Hegemonic Order and Regional Stability in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Comparative Study of Nigeria and South Africa*, (University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg, South Africa, PhD Thesis. Population by state and sex. Population.
- Robinson, T. W. (1986). “National interest” in Rosenau, James N (ed). *Politics and Foreign Policy: A Reader in Research and Theory*. New York: The Free Press.
- Robinson, T. W. (1986). “National interest” in Rosenau, James N (ed). *Politics and Foreign Policy: A Reader in Research and Theory*. New York: The Free Press.
- Reshon.,J. and Reshon.,S.A. (2008). *The Theory and Practice of Foreign Policy Decision making*. *Political Psychology*.,29(4)., 509-536.<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.L467-9221.2008.0064-7.x>
- Saliu, H.A. (2010). *Citizen Diplomacy and the Future of Nigeria’s Foreign Policy*, in: Osita C. Eze (ed.), *beyond 50 years of Nigeria’s foreign policy: issues, challenges and prospects*. Lagos: The NIIA, pp. 311-338.
- Sanya, Oni (2010) “Re – The Slaughter at KuruKarama” *The Nation*. February 2.
- Sega D, Lekaba F (2014). *Nigeria’s Economic Boom: A Positive Outcome for Intra-Africa Trade*, (Policy Brief 111). Pretoria: African Institute of South Africa.
- Williams, V. (2008). *Xenophobia in South Africa: Overview and analysis perspectives*. *Political Analysis and Commentary from Southern Africa*, 3(8), 2-6.