

Xenophobia and Nigeria-South Africa Relations in Post-Apartheid Era: Myth and Realities

DR. OJUKWU, U.G.

Department of Political Science, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Igbariam Campus – Nigeria

Tel: 0703-333-1344

E-mail: ojukwuuche04@gmail.com

MAZI MBAH, C.C.

Department of Political Science, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Igbariam Campus – Nigeria

Tel: 0803-870-2687

E-mail: mbahclem2@gmail.com

OSUCHUKWU, N.C.

Department of Political Science, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Igbariam Campus – Nigeria

Tel: 0803-759-8685

E-mail: cn.osuchukwu@coou.edu.ng

Abstract: *Xenophobia and its consequent conflicts have been a recurrent issue around the globe. It has also constituted a source of worry among nations and their citizens as lives and property of unimaginable value have often been lost to the conflict. Xenophobia also threatens to destroy a rich history of brotherhood shared by most countries in the continent of Africa since the colonial era. Thus, scholars have discussed this problematic from different perspectives. This study therefore, contributes to the existing literature on xenophobia by studying its effect on Nigeria-South Africa relations in the post apartheid era. We adopted the documentary method for data collection and qualitative descriptive analysis method for data analysis. The Relational Conflict theory formed our theoretical framework which helped us locate the study in the existing body of knowledge. Our findings include, that xenophobic attacks have become big threat to the political, diplomatic, socio-cultural and economic integration between Nigeria and South Africa since the end of apartheid in South Africa. We therefore recommended that the South African government and people should imbibe the spirit of African brotherhood and work assiduously towards peaceful co-existence with citizens of other African countries in order to strengthen African integration. On the other hand, Nigeria and South Africa should enter into diplomatic agreement on protection of each other's citizens in their territories. This should be backed by sanctions against any defaulting party.*

Keywords: Xenophobia, African relations, African integration, Xenophobic attacks

Background and Problem Statement

Xenophobia has been as old as humanity itself. It dates back to early centuries emanating from the migration of people from one location to another in search of better opportunities and conditions of life. As human wants are limitless but the resources to satisfy them are limited, xenophobia often arise out of the struggle for possession of the scarce resources in a given area or territory. Often, it is ignited by global economic forces that have exacerbated inequalities among people and nations, increased global poverty and marginalized the majority of people in both developing and developed countries. Indeed, the glaring economic and development disparities between countries globally mean that migration remains an on-going process that cannot be stopped. Unfortunately, governments have failed to come to terms with this reality and consequently have not come up with viable responses to this global phenomenon, such as establishing mechanisms for integrating migrant communities into their local economies. More so, governments across the globe have failed to address adequately the issues of income inequalities, unbalanced economic development and poverty, which are critical factors that fuel tensions between local hosts and foreign nationals. This has been the case in Africa, Europe and North America etc. As a result, governments around the world have not been able to respond proactively to xenophobic crises; instead their responses have been ad hoc, incoherent and largely out-of-touch with realities.

In recent times, according to the Njamjoh (2006), the issue of xenophobia has become a paradoxical result of globalization's ideal of free trade and global human rights commitments. While governments often pledge openly to ideals of common humanity and commit to fostering free movements of goods and services, national immigration laws speak differently in response to the local communities' insecurities about foreign population influx and the

consequences of such influx on access to social security and welfare. In Europe, the treatment of migrants crossing the Mediterranean Sea from Africa, the Middle East and Eastern Europe, as well as the constant writhe by Western European states over the Strasbourg court's immigration policy decisions, evince this paradox and demonstrate the distant reality between international commitment and national implementation.

In Africa, this paradox is equally evident. Colonially imposed borders have become testaments of identity since the independence of many African states. According to Arthur (2000, p.19), the narrative of the 'foreign-other' which was not an essential component of pre-colonial societal orderings has become a powerful rhetoric for determining access to social security and welfare. In immigration policies, social classifications and behavioural patterns have also subsisted. While South Africa has emerged in recent years as the poster-child of the narrative of the 'foreign-other', it has not been alone in this identity crisis. Since the 1950s, occurrences in several African states have perpetuated this narrative.

Xenophobia is not peculiar to South Africa but common phenomenon that has global dimensions. However, the South African case has been unbecoming since after the demise of the apartheid regime in South Africa in April 1994. In this period, there has been an increased migration of foreign nationals from across Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asian countries as a result of the obvious availability of economic opportunities especially in the informal sector (Roosevelt, Idehen & Osaghae, 2015). In this light, the disparity among African states in socio-economic development is glaring. Therefore, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), in its 2016 Human Development Index (HDI), grouped African countries into three: high human development index, medium human development index, and low human development index respectively. It should be noted that the HDI comparatively measures life expectancy, literacy, education and standard of living across the globe. Accordingly, South Africa belongs to medium human development category, while Nigeria falls among the low development group. This explains why many Nigerians troop to South Africa in search of better opportunities.

It must be stated unequivocally that migration does not guarantee good standard of living for anyone. Rather, the influx of people into any country tend to stretch existing social infrastructure as well as make limited job opportunities even more competitive. For the local populace, this is totally unacceptable. This discontent over competition from 'foreigners', is often tagged 'xenophobia'. While much focus has been granted to the obligations of individual states in respecting human rights within its borders, little attention has been paid to the myths and realities of xenophobia. Again, the effect of xenophobia on Nigeria-South Africa relations has also received not much attention. This is therefore, the thrust of this study.

Scholarly Views and Theoretical Framework

The word 'xenophobia' derives from two Greek words, 'xénos' and 'phóbos', which translate into 'fear of a foreigner' (Bordeau, 2008). Generally, scholars have described xenophobia as attitudes, prejudices and behaviours that reject, exclude and often vilify persons, based on the perception that they are outsiders or foreigners to the community, society or national identity (ILO, 2001). Equally, xenophobia is perceived fear, hatred or dislike of a non-native or foreigner in a particular country (Centre for Human Rights, 2009). It is based on existing racist, ethnic, religious, cultural or national prejudice. Xenophobia and racism often overlap, but are distinct phenomena. Racism on the other hand, is based on physical characteristics such as skin color, hair type and facial features. Yet, xenophobia is based on the idea that someone is foreign to or originates from outside the community or nation in question. According to Klaude (2001), xenophobia is one of the principal causes of violence around the world.

Furthermore, Crush & Ramachandran (2014) posit that the large-scale anti-migrant violence that swept the country in May 2008, and continues in more isolated and sporadic fashion through to the present day falls into three general categories: "xenophobia denialism", "xenophobia minimalism" and "xenophobia realism." Their argument is that attacks on migrants and refugees are acts of criminality, not xenophobia, rather characterized attacks against migrants as "crimes of opportunity" where criminal or anti-social elements take advantage of the situation to engage in such misdeeds. They further argued that South Africans are not xenophobic and many cases of the attacks are merely crime. These views on the causes of violence against migrants and refugees come from the highest levels of the South African government. According to Crush & Ramachandran (2014), the looting, displacement and killing of foreign nationals in South Africa should not be viewed as xenophobic attacks, but opportunistic criminal acts that have the potential to undermine the unity and cohesiveness of our communities. One strand of minimalism sees the violence as a signifier of a broader, deepening social crisis in South Africa tied to the incomplete (some would say botched) post-apartheid project of equality and access for the disenfranchised black majority and intense competition for scarce resources

Another, study by Southern African Migration Programme (SAMP) has been monitoring the perceptions and attitudes of South Africans towards migrants and refugees since the late 1990s. The surveys provide unequivocal evidence of deep-rooted and pervasive hostility and animosity towards migrants and refugees in the

country. The general findings posit that the government of South Africa should be stringent on nature and strength of migrant and migration; as well as the level of public endorsement of coercive state measures to keep migrants out of the country and the degree of willingness to resort to coercion and violence against migrants. Furthermore, the survey showed that over a 36% agreed there should be a total prohibition on migrants entering South Africa to work and as many as 63% agreed that there should be “strict limits on entry. Only 8% agreed that government should let in anyone who wanted to enter.

More so, the South African state of xenophobic attacks is disturbing and worrying the minds and feelings of many people not only those residing in South Africa or outside the country but also the citizens themselves (Mistry, 2004). Foreign investors had lost confidence in the police and the judiciary that fail to protect them. In this regard, the majority of foreign investors lack community security. Consequently, this increase foreign investors’ exposure to abuse, crime and extortion by individuals and community leaders (Charman et al, 2012). In the long run, scholars agree that xenophobic attack is an evil wind that blows no one any good.

Theoretical Framework

The Relational conflict theory developed by Stephen A. Mitchell (1997) serves as the framework of analysis in this study. Relational theories attempt to provide explanations for violent conflicts between groups by exploring sociological, political, economic and historical relationships between such groups. Thus, the belief here is that cultural and value differences as well as group interests all influence relationships between individuals and groups in different ways. At the sociological level, differences between cultural values is a challenge to individual or group identity formation processes and create the tendency to see others as intruders who have to be prevented from encroaching upon established cultural boundaries.

Political economy for example, identifies power and the advantages that it confers as a key source of tension between different interest groups within a political system. In situations where multiple groups share a common resource that is fixed in nature, the chances that each will attempt to eliminate, neutralize or injure the ‘other’ (Coser), or monopolize such a resource (Maoz, 1982) is as high as the tendency to enter into a negative relationship.

A number of conflicts grow out of a past history of conflict between groups that has led to the development of negative stereotypes, racial intolerance and discrimination. Such a history of negative exchanges between groups may make it difficult for efforts to integrate different ethnic and religious groups within the society to succeed because their past interactions make it difficult for them to trust one another. Within the West African sub-region for instance, it has been difficult to get groups like the Hausa/Fulani, Igbo and the Yoruba in Nigeria; the Krio and Mende in Sierra Leone; the Bassa, Gio, Mano, Krahn and Kpelle in Liberia; the Akan, Ewe, Fante, Ashanti etc. in Ghana; the Hausa, Djerma, Fulani, Tuareg and Arabs in Niger; and the Bambara, Malinke and Sarakole of Mali to see themselves as partners in progress because they have a past history of conflict woven around control of resources (including political power) within their territories.

The fact that ‘others’ are perceived as different make us feel they are entitled to less or are inferior by reason of cultural values or skin colour. This disrupts the flow of communication between us and them and to that extent, twists perceptions that we have about each other. In the same way, the knowledge that two or more groups have to compete for the same resource (whatever it may be) creates conditions that increase the chances that interactions between them will produce conflict over how to share such a resource. However, each individual state has its own peculiar problems. One of such is limited livelihood opportunities due to slow economic development. Another is the threat to national security which uninhibited movement of persons can occasion. These generate xenophobic disposition and explain why xenophobia.

Xenophobia and Nigeria-South Africa Relations in the Post Apartheid Era

Nigeria and South Africa can be identified as the largest economy in the African region. Owing to their economic antecedents, these countries can be referred to as forerunners of continental development and regional diplomatic links in West Africa and Southern Africa respectively. The periodic and recurrent xenophobic attacks in South Africa on Nigerians and other fellow African counterparts is a worrisome phenomenon that has got very many negative ripple effects on the relations between Nigeria and South Africa. According to Nigeria’s one time Senior Special Adviser on Foreign Affairs and Diaspora, Abike Dabiri-Erewa, the country lost about 116 nationals between 2016 and 2017 due to the unlawful acts championed by some hoodlums in the host country (Salau, 2017). This remains a major setback and which poses a threat to the external relations of Nigeria and South Africa. The attacks and looting of goods belonging to Nigerian businessmen and women were confirmed by the President of the Nigerian Community in South Africa in the report issued by the News Agency of Nigeria. From the report, it was

confirmed that over five buildings occupied by Nigerian businesses were burnt with unprecedented looting (NAN, 2017). The incurred damages from the most recent 2019 xenophobic attacks on Nigerians are yet to be ascertained.

Economic Effect

One major implication of South African xenophobia on Nigeria-South Africa relations is that businesses of the citizens of both countries are at danger of reprisal attack and loss. Thus, the scattered conglomerates of South African investments across Nigeria are always at risk any time xenophobic attacks in South Africa erupt. For instance, during the 2016-2017 attacks on Nigeria, Nigeria’s National Assembly had a serious debate about the South African investments in the country such as MTN, SHOPRITE, SAB Miller, MTN and Multi-choice extending their activities to the frontiers of other African states etc. The aftermath of the debate resulted to some national assembly members appointed as Nigerian delegates to visit South Africa and agreement and MOU was signed. During the 2019 xenophobic attacks on Nigerians, there were also several reprisal reactions from Nigerian citizens towards South Africa’s business ventures in Nigeria in response to the killings and destruction of businesses against Nigerians in South Africa. Businesses and investments cannot thrive in volatile environments, and the security threat posed by the severe attacks on Nigerians and other blacks in South Africa might lead to economic sabotage not only in the host country but also in the affected countries. The viability of the bilateral economic relationship enjoyed by both countries can be drastically affected if the phenomenon of xenophobia is not adequately curtailed.

Political Effect

On the other hand, there is also danger of diplomatic row between Nigeria and South Africa as a fall out of the xenophobic attacks against Nigerians in South Africa. It could also bring about engagement by the two countries in unhealthy competitive cold war.

The history of the diplomatic relationship between Nigeria and South Africa is beyond two decades. During the apartheid policy, Nigeria was one of the strong agitators against the white dominance in South Africa. In fact, the Nigerian government issued over 300 visas to South Africans to travel abroad during the struggle for blacks’ recognition in the country. This was done to show her solidarity with the anti-apartheid movement in South Africa (Samuel, 2017). However, since the eradication of the apartheid policy in South Africa coupled with freedom of Nelson Mandela, the country witnessed political independence which allowed the citizens to control the socio-economic and political atmosphere of the country.

In spite of the fact that no Nigerian was killed in the 2017 attacks in South Africa, there were protests by some youths at the South African Embassy, Lagos against xenophobic attacks in South Africa. The protesters urged Nigeria’s acting President, Professor Yemi Osinbajo, to close down South African High Commission in Nigeria, declare the High Commissioner and other officials as ‘personae non grata’, as a measure to demand that, it was time for the safety of Nigerians to be guaranteed (Ibrahim, 2017). If this suggestion had been taken by the Federal Government, it would have resulted in a diplomatic row between the two countries. The agreement to co-operate on military weaknesses that was signed by the Chief of Air Staff, Air Marshall Sadique Abubakar, and his South African counterpart, after the attacks, would possibly not have come up (Ajibade, 2017). Similar reactions also played out during the 2019 xenophobic attacks in South Africa to the extent that Nigeria had to recall her High Commissioner from South Africa and also evacuated a lot of her citizens from South Africa.

Social Effect

Xenophobic violence affects social interactions among the nationals of the Nigeria and South Africa. South Africa is one of the important destinations of tourists from across the world including Nigerians. Thus, with the xenophobic attacks, tourism becomes difficult to undertake in South Africa and this no doubt, causes prejudice and also affects the economy of South Africa. Tourism which is not only a revenue generation model but also a toll for attracting foreigners to see the natural endowments of South Africa has relatively dropped. Safety has always been an important prerequisite for the attraction of international tourists like Nigerians. As tourism aids in building a nations image, this is damaged easily by xenophobic attacks and also international relation is impeded. Xenophobia in South Africa has destroyed the country’s economic structure which tourism has built.

Table 1: Xenophobic Violence in Democratic South Africa Timeline

S/N	YEAR	INCIDENT
1	2000	❖ In August 2000, seven xenophobic killings were reported in the Cape Flats district of Cape Town. Seven foreigners from different African countries were killed on the Cape Flats. Amongst those who were attacked by local South Africans were two Nigerians, one Kenyan, and

		two Angolans.
2	2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ On 8 January 2008, two Somali shop owners were murdered in the Eastern Cape towns of Jeffreys Bay and East London. In March 2008, seven people were killed including Zimbabweans, Pakistanis and a Somali after their shops and shacks were set alight in Atteridgeville near Pretoria. ❖ On May 11 2008, an outburst of xenophobic violence in the Johannesburg township of Alexandra triggered more xenophobic violence in other townships. Firstly, 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.
3	2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ From 14 to 17 November 2009, 3000 Zimbabwean citizens living in the rural community of De Doorns, an informal settlement near Breede Valley Municipality, in the Western Cape was displaced as a result of xenophobic violence. It selectively targeted Zimbabweans despite the presence of other foreign nationals (e.g. Lesotho nationals) living and working in the same area.
4	2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ On 27 February 2013, eight South African police officers tied the 27 years old Mozambican man, Mido Macia, to the back of a police van and dragged him down the road. Subsequently, the man died in a police cell from head injuries. The incident happened in Daveyton, East of Johannesburg, South Africa. ❖ On 26 May, 2013, two Zimbabwean men were killed by South Africans mob in xenophobic violence in Diepsloot, South Africa.
5	2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ In January 2015, Somali shop owner shot and killed a 14-year-old boy, Sipiwe Mahori, during an alleged robbery in Soweto Township. The boy was shot in the neck and died within 15 minutes. Lebogang Ncamla, 23, was another victim when he was shot three times in the arm. The incident triggered the waves of attacks and looting of foreign owned shops. ❖ On 5 March 2015, xenophobic attacks occurred in Limpopo Province. Foreigners on the outskirts of Polokwane left their shops after protesting villagers threatened to burn them alive and then looted them. Violence erupted in the Ga-Sekgopo area after a foreign shop owner was found in possession of a mobile phone belonging to a local man who was killed. ❖ On 8 April, 2015, a spate of xenophobic violence occurred after Zulu King Goodwill Zwelithini made comments that foreigners should go back to their home countries because they are changing the nature of South African society with their goods and enjoying wealth that should have been for local people. ❖ On 12 April 2015, Attacks on foreign nationals continued in KwaZulu-Natal when 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 of suspects. Five people have been killed. ❖ On 14 April 2015, Looting of foreign shops spread to Verulam, north of Durban following a day of clashes between locals, foreigners, and police in the city centre, KwaZulu-Natal. About 300 local people looted foreign-owned shops, and only two people have been arrested. A 14-year-old boy became the latest fatality. He was shot dead during looting in KwaNdlanzi, allegedly by two security guards.
6	February 24, 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ A group calling itself “The Mamelodi Concerned Residents” marched in Pretoria today to protest against African immigrants in South Africa. The march was opposed by foreign nationals, and triggered a wave of looting of shops owned by foreign nationals and clashes between the

		two groups.
7	September 3, 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ There were reports of attacks on dozens of shops owned by foreigners, including Nigerians in South Africa coupled with looting and destruction of properties in Johannesburg's Central Business District believed to be owned by foreigners. There were also reported cases of foreigners killed during the attacks. ❖ In Nigeria, several outlets of South-Africa owned businesses including retailer Shoprite and telecoms operator MTN were targeted around the country. In Lekki area of Lagos state, a clash between police and protesters at a mall housing a Shoprite outlet left one person dead. ❖ The Nigerian government responded by boycotting the World Economic Forum (WEF) in Cape Town, South Africa which was ongoing at that period and recalled its ambassador to South Africa. ❖ Nigeria's foreign minister also invited the South African high commissioner to Nigeria to protest the unacceptable burning and looting of properties belonging to Nigerians. The citizens of Nigeria in South Africa who were willing to leave the country were also lifted back to Nigeria through flights provided by the government and philanthropists in Nigeria.

SOURCE:<http://www.sahistory.org.za/article/xenophobic-violence-democratic-south-africa-timeline>.
<https://qz.com/africa/1701852/south-africa-xenophobic-attacks-result-in-reprisals-for-mtn-shoprite/>

Myths and Realities of Xenophobic Attacks in South Africa

Xenophobia is not just a recent development in South Africa. The first attacks in the country occurred in 1994; the year that South Africa had its first multi-racial elections (Kumolu, 2017). Foreigners had witnessed up to 15 attacks between 1994 and 2017 with blacks from neighbouring African countries like Nigeria, Somalia and Zimbabwe being victims (Kumolu, 2017). The most recent one is the 2019 xenophobic attacks on blacks from different African countries including Nigeria. Many questions have been asked by governments and analysts all over the world on the reasons for xenophobic attacks in South Africa and why such attacks have become very recurrent. To this question, many and varied answers have been offered by both the government and people of South Africa. However, most of the answers offered for xenophobic attacks in South Africa are generally regarded as myths as they are very far from the realities of life in South Africa as scholars and researchers have argued. Below, we discuss some of these myths and the realities of xenophobic attacks in South Africa.

Myth One: Foreigners are taking our jobs and causing unemployment for South Africans

Reports of research and discussions with South Africans and their government have often claimed that foreigners are the main cause of high unemployment rates for South African citizens. They further submit that foreigners are ready to take up lesser pay for jobs from companies and other employers of labour and therefore are easily taken by these companies. This in turn results to foreigners taking over all available jobs for South Africans and contributes to their being poor. They therefore see foreigners as rivals for jobs and employment in their country. As a result of this South Africans attack foreigners to force them out of their country so they can have access to the jobs taken by foreigners. However, against this myth, there is little evidence that foreigners are the problem. According to Tamukomoyo (2015), of the Institute of Security Studies, "research by the Gauteng City-Region Observatory showed that rather than causing unemployment, international migrants contribute to the economy by renting shops from South Africans, providing jobs to locals and paying value added tax. Foreigners that run businesses employ more South Africans than South Africans that run businesses do." Using data from Statistics South Africa, a study by the Migrating for Work Research Consortium showed that in 2014 just 4% of the working population was made up of foreigners.

Observably, some African countries such as Nigeria, Ghana and Zimbabwe have previously implemented xenophobic attacks and this definitely reflected on their economies after sending foreign investors back to their countries. In fact, these countries regretted their actions and undiplomatic decisions taken against the foreign nationals residing in their countries due to the bad economic effects it brought for them. In addition, the execution of impromptu xenophobic attacks by Nigerians, Ghanaians and Zimbabweans against foreign investors residing in their countries largely dissuaded many people who may wish to invest in their economies (Atsenwa & Adepoju, 2010;

Posen & Ross, 2012). This incontrovertibly implies that xenophobic attacks negatively affect the countries' direct foreign investments and causes unemployment in the country. Any country executing xenophobic attacks would definitely have a propensity to experience poverty because a country cannot grow or develop just on her own or through her citizens alone but must be able and willing to accommodate other foreign opportunities such as foreign investments, new technologies from abroad, new business idea generations, good vision and mission et cetera.

Again, the issue of xenophobic relations in contemporary South Africa is rooted in and conditioned by the structure of its apartheid economy. The apartheid economy was a totalizing one, in that it mobilized all the social forces at its disposal to further the interest of the apartheid South African state. Since the primary productive force in the apartheid South African economy was gold and the concomitant social relations of the mining process was by mostly black labour force, the industry attracted heavy migrant labour from Southern African regions notably Zimbabweans, Malawians and Mozambicans to the fast thriving industry. The immediate result of this was that, as the foreign labour force began to gain social mobility in the gold industry and the black South Africans continually subjected to the repressive policies of apartheid, social tensions rose in the political economy of the state and has since remained a dominant part of the social relations of the post-apartheid South African state (Konanani & Odeku, 2013; Chidozie, 2014).

Lester et al (2000) further argued that, while for the first time democratization in South Africa has translated to the poor having the same formal political power as the rich, the country remains one of the most unequal societies on earth. This gross inequality was engendered, according to him, by the fact that, when the country left apartheid behind, it did not leave behind the structures and processes which generated inequality. This problem continues to dominate contemporary discourse on the nature of post-apartheid economy in South Africa. Thus, this contradiction in the social relations of apartheid, resulting in limited opportunities for blacks in South Africa fuels fear and suspicions among the majority of them, especially for foreigners. The mounting poverty and unemployment rate among the majority of the South African blacks have intensified in post-apartheid South Africa prompting the various governments to initiate economic reforms to reverse the trend. Hence, even though policies such as the Growth, Employment and Redistribution Programme (GEAR) and Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) came under heavy attack, especially from the white minority in South Africa, it nonetheless, portrayed government's genuine intervention to redress racial (mis)representation in the country's political economy (Alozieuwa, 2009; Edigheji, 2012). Therefore, xenophobic violence is never about foreign nationals 'stealing jobs' or taking away jobs meant for South Africans. It's about deep economic inequality and the government's failure to implement policies that create jobs and grow the South African economy. It's about dire socio-economic circumstances for the majority of South Africans.

Myth Two: International Migrants Dominate the Informal Sector

Closely related to myth one above is the claim by South Africans that international migrants dominate the informal sector of the economy in South Africa (e.g. small shops) and they make better sales than South African shop owners thereby taking an upper hand in that sector, for instance small, informal shops in townships. This has been one of the reasons for xenophobic attacks on foreigners and their businesses by South African nationals. However, against this claim, a research published by the Gauteng City-Region Observatory (GCRO) as cited in Tamukamoyo (n.d) suggests that foreigners do not actually dominate the informal sector – at least not in Gauteng, the hub of the country's economy. According to the data, 18% (fewer than two in 10 people) of informal sector business owners in the province are nationals of other countries, 28% are South African nationals from other provinces other than Gauteng while 54% were people born in Gauteng. The research also shows that international migrants in fact contribute to the economy by renting shops from South Africans, providing employment to locals and paying value added tax.

Myth Three: Foreigners are threat to Our Physical Security through Criminality

One of the reasons for South African's hatred for non-nationals is based on an assumption that foreigners are threats to their property and physical security. South Africa implements an operation tagged 'Operation Fiela-Reclaim', which focuses mainly on the arrest of thousands of foreign nationals under the guise of crime prevention. According to Crush & Williams (2003), 48% of South Africans feel that foreigners are criminal threats to them. In South Africa, foreigners are often linked to armed robbery, drug peddling and abuse, and other crimes. However, in reality, while not all migrants in South Africa are law abiding, the stereotyped image of West African criminal kingpins being responsible for a corrupt South Africa as widely being reported is false and misleading. Tamukomoyo (2015) submitted that a 2014 report by the National Institute for Crime Prevention and the Reintegration of Offenders showed that foreign nationals make up just four percent of the total sentenced

population. Again, while some foreign nationals engage in crime, most do not. Tamukomoyo (2015) maintains that South Africans perpetrate a vast majority of crime in the country. This is acknowledged in Statistics South Africa's National Victims of Crime Survey released in 2014 which shows that 95% of the 30 000 households surveyed said crime in their area was committed by South Africans. Only 5% said that crime in their area was caused by foreigners.

On the other hand, criminal activities of African migrants have also fueled the incidences of xenophobic attacks in South Africa. For instance, out of the ninety-seven (97) deported Nigerians from South Africa in the first quarter of 2017, six were alleged to have had drug-related cases in South Africa. Ten of the deportees were arrested for other criminal offences, while the rest had migration offences against them (Hua, 2017). Alleged criminal activities of some Nigerians had not given the country a good image globally and in South Africa in particular. Reported ostentatious living of some Nigerians in South Africa arising from criminal activities had also made them source of envy and, therefore, vulnerable to attacks from the nationals in that country. But from the fore-goings criminal activities by foreigners in South Africa remains over exaggerated and should not warrant xenophobic attacks in its recurring decimals.

Myth Four: Foreigners are threat to our use of Social Amenities and Infrastructure

South Africans have often accused foreign nationals of using up and over-stretching the capacity of their social infrastructure like roads, hospitals, water, electricity and others. It is true that there has been the issue of dearth of basic infrastructure like electricity, frequent power cuts which has had severe impacts on the manufacturing sector (Schaefer & Edinger, 2016). As the manufacturing sector was adversely impacted, there is the multiplier effect on productivity, employment and economic growth. However, this situation cannot totally be blamed on foreign nationals alone. The truth remains that government's inability to provide quality service delivery for blacks in several parts of South Africa had resulted into frustration of its citizens, which in turn led to the spate of xenophobic attacks that were experienced by Nigerians and some other Africans living in the country. This situation has been further compounded by the seed of discord, manifested as hate speech, sown by some leaders and politicians to the effect that migrant workers are the ones responsible for unemployment in South Africa (Olawole, 2017). Furthermore, chronic shortages, understaffing and a lack of resources plague the public healthcare system in South Africa and the causes are multiple. But the degree of impact migrants really have on the healthcare system cannot be said to be the reason for the failure of such institutions. In South Africa, foreign citizens are protected from xenophobia by Article 14 of the Constitution. The Constitution declares that all the people shall be equal under the law, and that there shall be no discrimination in political, economic, or social relations because of race, creed, sex, social status or family origin. But in practice, this law is twisted and eventually not respected and the government looks away.

Conclusion

The study showed that the history of xenophobia has been the history of human origin and existence, as every human often has the fear of competition and domination by others in every environment. However, the South African version became problematic owing to the extent the citizens and their government have gone in demonstrating this fear.

We therefore argued that the xenophobic attacks in South Africa against the nationals of other countries have many implications for Nigeria-South Africa relations. These implications revolve around economic, diplomatic, socio-cultural implications and others. The implications affect both the government and citizens of both countries.

Furthermore, we found that the major fuel of the xenophobic attacks has been different myths making rounds among the South African nationals and also supported subtly by the government through politicians which are untrue and very misleading. Thus, the seeds of discord have been sown by politicians between the South African nationals and non-nationals because of their inordinate ambition to govern.

Lastly, the Government of South Africa has failed to implement policies that will create jobs and grow the South African economy. Rather the government has been employing excuses for their failures and riding on the back of the myths to manipulate the citizens.

Recommendations

Based on the findings from the study, we recommend that;

1. African countries should look inward on how they can improve the quality of growth in their countries and create jobs for their citizens. This is because it is the inability of African citizens to secure good jobs in

their home countries that push them to migrate to other countries where they consider better than their home countries in search of better opportunities. Eventually that decision can become a burden to the government and people of such a receiving country. Essentially, Nigeria should see how it could develop her economy to facilitate growth and development. This can be achieved by encouraging foreign direct investment. Foreign direct investment can only be achieved if Nigeria is able to eliminate the issue of insurgency, kidnapping, Fulani herdsmen attacks, youth restiveness in the Niger Delta and other forms of violence in the country.

2. Secondly, the South African nationals should be re-oriented in order for them to see the need to continuously accommodate people from other countries of the world. Blacks from the African countries, who have been frequently attacked, will then be perceived as their brothers and sisters. Skill acquisition also exists as a panacea to unemployment in the African states. South African government should come up with skill acquisition programmes for the restive and unemployed youths in that country.
3. Again, the state's intelligence agencies must be proactive in their duties and direct their efforts for better understanding the dynamics behind the violent attacks, to better predict where they may occur and to what extent they are organized. Then they should always act swiftly in quenching any of such attacks even when they eventually start.
4. Finally, the South African government and other leaders in the country at different levels must speak in a unified voice to dispel the myths about foreign nationals as this has been a major driving force of xenophobic attacks against foreign nationals.

References

- Ajibade, T. (2017). "Getting South Africans to love us". *The Punch*, Friday, July 7, 2017, p. 20.
- Alozieuwa, S.H.O. (2009). Beyond South Africa: Mbeki's resignation and the consolidation of democracy in Africa. *Nigerian Journal of International Affairs*, vol. 35 (1), 101-120
- Arthur, J.A. (2000). *Invisible sojourners: African immigrant diaspora in the United States*. Connecticut: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Atsenuwa, A. and Adepoju, A. (2010). Rights of African migrants and deportees: A Nigerian case. A report written for the justice without border project. Dakar: OSIWA Batlistella
- Bordeau, J. (2008). *Xenophobia : The violence of fear and hate*. New York: Rosen Publishing Group.
- International Labour Organisation. (2001). International migration, racism, discrimination and xenophobia (p. 2). Geneva: International organization for migration and office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.
- Centre for Human Rights. (2009). The nature of South Africa's legal obligations to combat xenophobia. Pretoria: Centre for Human Rights.
- Charman, A., Petersen, L and Piper, L. (2012). From South African survivalism to foreign entrepreneurship: The transformation of the Spaza Sector in Delft, Cape Town. *Transformation*, (78), 47-73.
- Crush, J. and Ramachandran, S. (2009). Xenophobia, international migration and human development. *United Nations Development Programme Human development reports Research paper 2009/47*.
- Deusch, K.W. (1957). *Political community and the North Atlantic area: International Organization in the light of historical experience*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Edigheji, O. (2012). "Affirmative action and South African state capacity for redress", *Nigerian Journal of International Affairs*, vol. 32 (2), 149-167.
-

- Haas, E.B. (1964). *Beyond the Nation-State: Functionalism and international organization*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hua, F. (2017). "South Africa deports 97 Nigerians". *Daily Sun*, March 1, p. 6.
- Ibrahim, A. (2017). "Xenophobic attacks: NASS threatens reprisals against South African Businesses," *Vanguard*, March 1, p. 5.
- International Labour Organisation (2001). International migration, racism, discrimination and xenophobia (p.2). Geneva: International Organization for Migration and Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.
- Kazeem, Y. (2019). Xenophobic attacks on African migrants in South Africa have been escalated by misinformation. <https://qz.com/africa/1701852/south-africa-xenophobic-attacks-result-in-reprisals-for-mtn-shoprite/>
- Klaude, B. (2001). NGO Working Group on Migration and Xenophobia for the World Conference, in *International Migration, Racism, Discrimination and Xenophobia*, 2001. A publication jointly produced by ILO, IOM, OHCHR, in consultation with UNHCR. Page 2.
- Kumolu, C. (2017). South African xenophobic attacks: 200 foreigners killed, maimed since 1994 investigations. *Vanguard*, February 26. Accessed at: <http://www.vanguardngr.com/2017/02/safrica-xenophobic-attacks-200>.
- Konanani, R.H and Odeku, K.O (2013). "Vicious Attacks on Foreign Nationals in South Africa: An Entrenched Culture of Impunity". Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences (MLSER Publishing), Rome, Italy. Vol. 4, No. 13. Pp. 801- 807
- Chidozie, F. C. (2014). "Dependency or Cooperation? Nigeria-South Africa relations (1960-2007)". *Unpublished PhD Thesis*. Ota: Covenant University.
- Lester, A., Nel, E. & Binns, T. (2000). *South Africa, past present and future: Gold at the end of the rainbow?* Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Mistry, D. (2004). Falling crime, rising fear: 2003 National victims of crime survey. *Crime Quarterly*, 8: 17 – 24. Available at www.iss.co.za/pubs/CrimeQ/No.8/Mistry.htm
- Mitchell, S.A. (1997). Mitchell's Relational Conflict Model: An analysis of its usefulness in clinical social work, *Clinical Social Work Journal*, December 1997, Volume 25, Issue 4, pp 391–405
- Njamnjoh, F.B. (2006). *Insiders and outsiders: Citizenship and xenophobia in contemporary Southern Africa*. London: Zed Books.
- Onuoha, J. (2008). *Beyond diplomacy: Contemporary issues in international relations*. Nsukka: Great AP Express Publishers Ltd.
- Patricia Erasmus (2015). Three powerful myths that fuel xenophobia. <https://mg.co.za/article/2015-06-24-3-myths-fuelling-xenophobia-in-sa>
- Posen, B.R. and Ross, A.L. (2012). Competing Visions for US Grand Strategy. *MIT Press Journals*, 21(3), 5-53.
- Roosevelt, O., Idehen, F. and Osaghae, S.O. (2015). Xenophobia in South Africa: Re-thinking the Nigeria foreign policy of Afrocentrism. *African Research Review*, 9(4)
- Salau, T. (2017, February 20). Nigerians suffer xenophobic attack in South Africa again. Retrieved from <http://venturesafrica.com/xenophobic-attack-on-nigerians-in-southafrica/>
-

Samuel, O. (2017, February 24). Xenophobia and Nigeria/South Africa relations. Retrieved from <http://thenationonlineng.net/xenophobia-nigeriasouth-africa-relations/>

Schaefer, S. & Edinger, H. (2015). "In search of harmony". *China Africa*, Vol. 7, June, pp. 32-33.

Tamukamoyo, H. (n.d). Xenophobia in South Africa: dispelling the myths, explaining the reality. Researcher, Governance, Crime and Justice Division, ISS Pretoria.

<https://issafrica.org/amp/iss-today/xenophobia-in-south-africa-dispelling-the-myths-explaining-the-reality>

Tamukomoyo, H. (2015). Xenophobia demands decisive and principled leadership. Institute for Security Studies (ISS).

<https://issafrica.org/about-us/press-releases/xenophobia-demands-decisive-and-principled-leadership>.