



Xenophobic attacks on Nigerians in South Africa: Ethical implications, and responses of the Nigerian government

Big-Alabo Sotonye¹, Big-Alabo Tamunopubo²

¹ Department of Philosophy, University of Port Harcourt, Choba, Nigeria

² Department of Political/Admin Studies, University of Port Harcourt, Choba, Nigeria

Abstract

This study examines the xenophobic attacks on Nigerians in South Africa, its ethical implications and responses of the Nigerian government. The study was guided by two objectives while it adopted the normative theory by Plato and Aristotle. The study looked at conceptual clarification like the concept of xenophobia. The study adopted ex-post research design while data was sourced through secondary source such as textbooks, journal articles, newspapers, magazines and internet while the data generated was analyzed through content analysis. The findings of the study showed that there are Nigerians that are employees of labor in South Africa as well as Nigerians that are lecturers in South Africa universities that have contributed to their educational sector and there are also Nigerian students in their schools who pay fees as foreign students and these have contributed positively to South Africa economy and thus the reasons for these xenophobic attacks are not in accordance to the universalization of the norms of any society. The study also found out that the Nigerian government has responded in several ways which include, summoning of the South Africa ambassador to express her displeasure over the attacks on Nigerians, in the same vain Nigerians have used social media to call on the Nigerian government to boycott South African companies such as MTN, DSTV and Shoprite and also the immediate evacuation or repatriation of Nigerians in South Africa. Based on the findings the study recommended among others that the Nigerian government should let the South African government to know that the actions that are carried out by South Africans that has led to deaths of Nigerians no matter the actions that must had led to that does not fall within the moral principles of any society and the government of Nigeria should establish a bilateral commission with South Africa that will be meeting regularly to ensure protection of the two countries' national interests.

Keywords: normative, xenophobia, universalization, utilitarianism and foreign

Introduction

Xenophobia is a worldwide occurrence that differs in intensity and manifestation in various perspectives. Notably, there are two things unique about xenophobia in South Africa. Firstly, it is mostly focused at black African foreigners, thus the inception of the term 'Afrophobia'. The discrimination that black migrants go through in South Africa is similar to that experienced by black immigrants in various or other continents (Morris, 1998). Regardless of the fact that South Africa is an African country and the bulk of its population is black. Nevertheless, African migrants in other parts of the world like in Europe, Asia or North America do also face similar attacks just like in South Africa because in this other parts xenophobia stems from competitiveness amongst nationals and non-nationals over limited resources and also clash of cultures. Secondly, is the violent manifestation of xenophobia away from xenophobic tendencies? According to Matsinhe (2011) ^[13] the 2008 pogroms, which were neither the first nor the last of xenophobic crisis, is a noticeable manifestation of a largely and deeply rooted disdain of black foreigners.

However, it is generally accepted that xenophobia is a strong dislike or fear of individuals that are from other nations or from that which is foreign or strange. Some definitions hold that xenophobia comes from the Greek words "xenos", which means stranger, or anything "foreign," and "phobos", which means "fear. As curiosity increases, Xenophobia became known as a manifest of

relations and opinions of an "in group" headed for an "out-group", together with a fear of losing identity, doubt of its happenings, violent behavior, and yearning to jettison its presence to secure a presumed purity. Other schools of thought led by Jonny are of the opinion that Xenophobia can also be unveiled in the form of an "uncritical exaltation of another culture" in this a culture is credited "an unreal, stereotyped and exotic quality". The Oxford English Dictionary (OED) describes xenophobia as a deep-rooted, irrational hatred towards foreigners, unreasonable fear or hatred of the unfamiliar. Continuing, Morris (1998) places xenophobia in two categories with specific connotations. The first being a population group present within a society that is not considered part of that society, they often are recent immigrants, but they can be a group which has remained extant for epochs, or turn out to be part of this society through subjugation and territorial expansion. This type of xenophobia can bring about or expedite hostile and violent responses, such as major eviction of immigrants, "pogroms" or as the case maybe, genocide. The second form is primarily cultural, and the objects of the phobia are cultural elements which are considered alien. Every culture is linked or tied to external influences, but then again cultural xenophobia is regularly narrowly directed for example, at foreign elements in a national language. It rarely leads to aggression against an individual but can result in political campaigns for cultural or linguistic purification. One of the many crises that have took the world by shock in

recent periods is the reoccurrence of xenophobic attacks on foreign nationals residing in South Africa, especially foreign nationals from other African countries. This revelation is as a result of the increasing reception of assumption such as those revealed by the Commission of Human Rights Report that racism, racial discrimination and xenophobia are now declared to be human rights violations. As a social problem, such outbreaks infringe the dignity as well as the rights of people in this globalized world; their reoccurrence in April 2015 has remained a great reason for concern. It should be pointed out that over the years, there are so many recorded circumstances of xenophobic attacks in the country; most remarkable were those of May 2008, April 2015 and in June, August, September of 2019. In the 2008 attacks, the documented death toll was sixty people: forty foreign nationals and twenty locals. Besides the deaths, there were the displacements of over 100,000 people, close to 700 were wounded, and a number of women and girls were raped, as well as the destruction of a number of properties (Landau, 2010). Additionally, 342 shops were looted and 213 were also burnt down. Just after these incidents, international communities, activist, and scholars condemned the outbreak. Seven years later, in 2015, a different attack happened in which it is assessed that seven people lost their lives and quiet a number of people were displaced and misplaced and in 2017 same attacks now in 2019 a reoccurrence of fresh attacks. This current attack has gotten a global attention and number of countries have raised up deep worries about the violence and inhumaneness connected with the attacks. There have also been a number of debates globally surrounding the causes and consequences of these brutal activities (Crush, 2008) [5].

Research Objectives

This paper addressed several objectives which includes to; (1) analyze the ethical implications of xenophobic attacks; and, (2) investigate the responses of Nigerian government and other groups to the xenophobic attacks

Theoretical Framework

The theory that was used for this study is the normative theory. The proponents of the theory are Plato and Aristotle and later expanded by other scholars like Cohen, Castaneda and Marti-Huang. The theory is concerned with norms or normative principles. A normative principle can be defined as 'a general directive that tells agents what (they ought, or ought not) to do' (Cohen, 2003) [3]. Broadly conceived norms are regularities of certain phenomena. In the social and political context, norms can be understood descriptively as standards of behavior of social and political action, or prescriptively as reasons which dictate a certain choice of action. In ethics norms mean moral standards. A normative theory tries to determine what standards ought to be followed in a political community (domestic or international). Normative statements refer to an ideal standard or model and this reference may involve a priori concepts that establish standards by which judgments can be made. Norms determine the value of social phenomena and are the major point of reference in the process of judging social phenomena as desirable or undesirable (Castañeda, 1988) [2]. Normativity allows for questioning the world we experience in order to render judgment on it so that we can say what measures are not being met, what standards are being overlooked. This is possible because of the clear

autonomy of 'what ought to be' from 'what is' although the relationship of the two dimensions will always be a matter of controversy (Marti-Huang, 1987) [12]. The relevance of the normative theory to this study is that it explains xenophobia within the context of social norms. From this standpoint, it is believed that people tend to conform to social situations in which they find themselves, hence, when negative thoughts and discriminatory behavior toward a particular group is expected, individuals feel compelled to think and act accordingly, thus the individual's social environment serves as a source for discrimination that leads to xenophobic behavior which has led to attacks on Nigerians and on the long run left loopholes for people to ask the rightness or wrongness of their actions.

Research Methodology

Given, the problem of the paper, this paper adopted the Ex Post Facto (After the Fact) research design. Materials for this paper was sourced through secondary sources of data which included here are textbooks, journal articles, newspapers and internet materials, among others. Content analysis was used to analyse data so generated. This is with a view to identify logical sequence of data as well as trends.

Conceptual Review

Concept of Xenophobia

The word "xenophobia" is derived from the Greek words "xenos" and "phobos" which mean "strange" or "foreign" and or fear, respectively (Crush and Ramachandran, 2009) [4]. The Merriam-Webster online dictionary defines the term "xenophobia" as "fear and hatred of strangers or foreigners or of anything that is strange or foreign". Nyamjoh (2006) captures the definition of "xenophobia" in the South African context, by describing it as "the intense dislike, hatred or fear of others, who are foreign". Continuing Nyamjoh argues that "xenophobia" often encompasses some ethno-linguistic and cultural identifiers that form the basis of distrust and suspicion of the "other". Bordeau (2010) [1] simply defines "xenophobia" as the irrational fear or distrust of foreigners or strangers. In the South African context, xenophobia is manifest in negative attitudes and perceptions together with accompanying acts of hostility, violence or discrimination against foreigners. In South Africa, "xenophobia" presents certain distinct elements, including, a demonstrated fear or hatred of foreigners, accompanying violent actions and resultant loss of life and property. Harris (2002) argues that the term, "xenophobia", must be reframed to incorporate acts, manifestations or practices such as violence or physical abuse which normally accompany "dislike" or "fear" of foreigners. Furthermore, Harris, "xenophobia" broadly describes negative social perceptions of immigrants, refugees and migrants and the resultant violent actions against them. Although xenophobic violence mostly targets foreign nationals, it can also target nationals who are seen as being "foreign" to the area or are perceived, albeit incorrectly, to be from another country. Xenophobia has over the years gained the status of a global phenomenon. It is not a one-continent affair as it has been practically experienced in one form or the other across different continents of the world. Literature is replete on the concept of xenophobia (Peil 1974; Harper 2010; Marsella and Ring 2003; Aremu 2013) [17] however, there are no adequate works on its dynamism, nature and divergent manifestations in Africa. Yakushko (2009) [23] defines

xenophobia as a form of attitudinal, affective, and behavioral prejudice toward immigrants and those perceived as foreigners. Reynolds and Vine (1987) ^[19] maintain that xenophobia is a psychological state of hostility or fear towards outsiders. Observably, xenophobia is intricately tied to notions of nationalism and ethno-centrism, both of which are characterized by belief in the superiority of one's nation-state over others (Licata and Klein 2002; Schirmer 1998) ^[11]. Watts (1996) ^[22] hypothesize that xenophobia is a "discriminatory potential", which is activated when ideology such as ethnocentrism is connected to a sense of threat on a personal or group level. For instance, there is a cultural perception that foreigners are snatching jobs meant for local workers. Watts further suggested that this prejudice produces political xenophobia, which results in the desire to create and apply public policies that actively discriminate against foreign individuals. Similarly, Radkiewicz (2003) ^[18] postulated that xenophobia is related to an ethnocentric "syndrome" with two separate dimensions: beliefs about national superiority, and hostile, reluctant attitudes toward the representatives of other countries.

Discussions of Findings

Ethical Implications of Xenophobic Attacks on Nigerians

Kant is said to be one of the greatest moral philosophers in the history of philosophy. His main works on ethics are metaphysics of morals, Groundwork of the metaphysics of morals and the critique of pure reason. For Kant, there is only one thing that is good without qualifications and this he called good will. According to Kant, every other thing that we see as good are not unconditionally good; rather their goodness needs to be qualified reason because they can become bad when it is misused. Various examples are given to prove this. For example, someone that is intelligent can misuse his intelligence by using it to commit crime and so some who is rich or wealthy can misuse his wealth to carryout evil things. For Kant, a goodwill is good in itself and is always good. Now the question arises what is a goodwill? For Kant a goodwill is simply a will which acts for the sake of duty. Thus, Kant differentiate between "acting for the sake of duty" and "acting according to duty". According to Kant, to act for the sake of duty is to act, not because one has intentions to gain anything from such an act, not also because one just feels like doing it or because one has a natural tendency of doing such things, but rather for the sake of reverence for the moral law. This in other words, taking an action because the moral law demands it even if one will at the end loss materially from such action. To act according to duty, on the other hand, is like acting out of prudent considerations for one's interest. For Kant, these actions are not bad but he also sees them as actions that do not have any moral value and thus are not morally praiseworthy. In addition, this also applies to actions done in accordance with natural tendencies. This kind of action Kant say could be good but they have no moral worth. According to Kant, for an action to have moral value, it must be performed strictly for the sake of duty. i.e., in reverence for the moral law. Kant makes us to understand that the moral value of an action does not depend on the result of the action, but on the fact that it was performed only for the sake of duty, that is, out of reverence for the moral law. Kant in his work linked together the notions of duty and the moral law. According to him, duty "is the necessity of acting out of reverence for the moral law." This leads to

some important questions that must be raised in Kant's moral philosophy which are; how can I find out whether the action I intend to perform is morally right or wrong? And secondly, what is the yardstick used in differentiating the actions that are right or wrong? Here Kant's answer is straight. According to Kant, the criterion is the principle of universalization (Timmons, 1997) ^[20]. For Kant if you want to know if the action you intend to perform is morally right or wrong, look at the maxim of the action i.e. its underlying principle and universalize it. Now the question is will you wish that the maxim of your action be universalized or become a universal law? If then your answer is positive, then it is a sign that the action in question is morally right; but if your answer is negative this means that the action in question is morally wrong.

Xenophobia as stated earlier in this work is the fear of a stranger or a foreigner. Xenophobic attack is simply the attack of foreigners or strangers in a place. Kant's moral philosophy makes us to understand that whatever action that we take we should use the maxim if such action can be universalized. Here the fundamental question is how can we know whether the action we intend to perform is morally right or wrong? Another question is what is the yardstick or criterion for differentiating between right and wrong actions? For Kant, the answer for these questions are straight, which is that the yardstick is the principle of universalization. Hence, if you want to find out if the action you are to take is morally right or wrong then you have to look at the maxim of that action, which is its underlying principle and then universalize it. Applying Kant's position of the rightness or wrongness of an action to the acts of xenophobic attacks of foreigners, especially Nigerians in South Africa, we will definitely come to a clear conclusion. There is a popular saying that "no man is an island on his own" in this context one can strongly say that no nation or country can stand on its own without needing the assistance of another country not even the world powers. Obviously, we all need each other to put heads together to make our various nations and the world entirely a better place for us all. For this reason, people travel and leave their countries for various reasons such as to get better jobs, for research, for holidays, for tourism and so on. In all nations we have strangers or foreigners who are there for various reasons. The big question now is will it be proper to attack these foreigners and chase them out because we feel they are not needed and do not contribute anything positive to the economy but rather that their presence is crumbling the economy? Secondly, if such is done will it be proper to universalize such an action? Thirdly, what will be the implication if such an action is universalized?

Answering the first question raised in this context we will say that Nigerians in South Africa have contributed so much positively to the economy of South Africa and that a society have laws binding the citizens and thus anyone that goes or acts contrary to the laws faces a penalty and this is applied to both natives and foreigners. The cry by the South Africans of some Nigerians involved in crime can be curbed by the laws of their country. This should not make them paint all Nigerians in South Africa bad. There are Nigerians that are employees of labor in South Africa, there are Nigerians that are lecturers in the universities there contributing to their educational sector and there are also Nigerian students in their schools. All these are Nigerians contributing positively to their economy and thus the

reasons for these xenophobic attacks are weak. Answering the second and third question raised using Kant's moral philosophy, we will have a direct answer to that i.e. such an action cannot be universalized because if it should be so then, no country will have his or her citizen in any other country in the world. The implication will be that the world would be static in development and the people in some nations will die of hunger and poverty because no country can actually isolate himself from the rest of the world because we all need each other to develop and make the world a better place for us all to leave. In summary Kant's moral philosophy if applied rejects xenophobic attacks because if the maxim of such is applied it cannot be universalized.

Utilitarianism as a moral philosophy began with the works of Scottish philosophers Francis Hutcheson (1694-1746), David Hume (1711-1776), and Adam Smith (1723-1790) and then moves into its classical stage in the persons of English social reformers Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) and John Stuart Mill (1806-1873). The emergence or birth of utilitarianism is frequently linked to the Epicureanism of the followers of the great Greek philosopher Epicurus. The Epicurean moral philosophy is hedonistic and clearly sees pleasure as the yardstick or criterion for accessing the rightness of an action. Utilitarianism is said to have two fundamental features namely: the consequentialist principle and utility principle. In other words, it's teleological aspect and its hedonic aspect. The consequentialist principle states that rightness or wrongness of an action is determined by the goodness or badness of the result that comes out from such action. Here, it is the end that is looked at and not the means, therefore, the end justifies the means. Hedonistic utilitarianism sees pleasure as the sole good and pain as the only evil (Louis, 2001). Utilitarianism is generally defined as an ethical theory that emphasizes on the greatest happiness for the greatest number of persons. Bentham postulates that man by nature is a pleasure-seeking and pain-avoiding animal and thus pleasure and pain are the two guides of all human actions. He went further to assert that "Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure. They govern us in all we do, in all we say, in all we think". This simply points to the fact that Bentham is a psychological hedonist i.e. man is by nature pleasure seeking, and that the search for pleasure is the motivating force of all his actions (Omorgebe, 1993)^[15]. Since Bentham holds that pleasure is the only thing people ought to seek and the only thing desirable for its own sake, he tries to help men in their choices of pleasure and thus he proposed a hedonistic calculus which is intended to serve as a guideline in the search for pleasure. This calculus consists of seven criteria which are; intensity, duration, certainty, propinquity, fecundity, purity and extent.

Using this ethical platform to analyze the rightness or wrongness of xenophobic attacks on Nigerians in South Africa we will raise some questions and answer to come to a proper conclusion. The main question is does these attacks bring about pleasure or happiness for the greatest number of people in the society? And what are the possible consequences of xenophobic attacks on Nigerians in South Africa? Responding to the former question, the obvious answer is yes, the act of xenophobic attacks on Nigerians and foreigners in South Africa brings about pleasure and happiness for greater number of South Africans. Records from various works and research shows that majority of

South Africans do not want foreigners especially Nigerians in their country. This is because they see Nigerians as competing and getting jobs meant for them. They also see Nigerians as corrupting their society by involving in various illegal things such as stealing, prostitution, drug trafficking and so on. Consequently, we will see that even in statements or comments of prominent South Africans and even the response of the South African police and government shows that to a large extent they are in support of these attacks which keep reoccurring because of their share negligence to the issue. But looking at it from another lens of the utilitarian principle, we would find out that outside the country South Africa, internationally the world frowns at this barbaric act of South Africans against other foreign nationals in their country. Both the African Union and the United Nations condemns these attacks and have also urged the government to be proactive and protect the lives and properties of foreigners in their country. Responding to the second question raised the direct consequences of these attacks will only end up soaring the relationship of Nigeria and South Africa. This will in turn also affect the businesses of South Africa in Nigeria. As we saw, so many Nigerians took laws into their hands and went into the streets to destroy and disrupt activities of South African businesses in Nigeria. This uproar has also been cited in other African countries. Conclusively, majority of South Africans have no problem or issue with the xenophobic attacks. This by implication means greater number of South Africans are ok and sees nothing wrong with the action. But internationally the world frowns at this barbaric act and sees it as wrong.

Responses of the Nigerian Government and different Groups on Xenophobic attacks

Reactions have been popping out from different angles with respect to the xenophobic attacks in South Africa. Different groups in Nigeria and individuals have come out openly to react to the menace. Furthermore, some have blamed the government of Nigeria for not doing enough to curb or in responding to this issue. South Africa and Nigeria have had a good relationship dating back to the period of apartheid rule in South Africa. History has it that Nigeria played a big brother role in assisting them to fight against the apartheid government back then. Notably, Nigeria financially supported the fight against apartheid government and at the end there was victory. It is very unfortunate to say that this same South Africa have always attacked Nigerians resident in South Africa. In fact, records have it that Nigerians are always the most affected when it comes to xenophobic attacks in South Africa. In the attacks of 2017 over 60 lives were lost in which Nigerians were involved and the response of the Nigerian government was not satisfactory to the citizens and there seems to be a repetition of this same response from the government. The big question now is what have been the response of the government on the current xenophobic attacks in South Africa within the month of August and September 2019? Nigeria government at the break of this attacks summoned the South African Ambassador to express her displeasure over the treatment of her citizens there in South Africa and also went further in making arrangement to send a special envoy. Whereas several Nigerians have used the social media to call on the Nigerian government to boycott South African companies such as MTN, DSTV and retailer Shoprite. The Nigerian government after making known their displeasure expected

the South African government to take strong and drastic actions but instead the South African government handled the matter with kid's glove. Although the African union chairperson Moussa Faki condemned the violence in strong terms but he took courage in the fact that the South African government was able to make some arrest in connection with attacks on foreigners. The Nigerian government in responding to the poor concern shown by the South African government boycotted the 2019 world economic forum held in South Africa in September 2019. Rwanda, Malawi and Democratic Republic of Congo also boycotted the forum showing their displeasure of the responses of the South African government. The president of the federal republic of Nigeria President Mohammed Buhari on Monday 2nd September, 2019 after getting a report from the special envoy that was sent to South Africa instructed for the immediate evacuation or repatriation of Nigerians in South Africa that are willing to come back home following the latest attacks of Nigerians and other nationals. Additionally, a private businessman called Oyeama who is the CEO of a private airline (Peace Airline) offered to make available a plane to bring back as many Nigerians willing to come back home and so far about 500 Nigerians have been airlifted back home.

Various groups in different parts of Nigeria and also prominent individuals came out loud to also condemn the barbaric act by the South Africans. The national association of Nigerian student made known their displeasure after the attacks of Nigerians in South Africa and stated clearly on the 5th of September 2019; that the South African government had done little or nothing about this issue and therefore gave the South African companies and businesses seven days ultimatum to leave Nigeria or be ready to dance to the tune of the music. The head of secretariat Nigerian union in South Africa stated that the Buhari led government was to be blamed partly for the spate of pains visited on Nigerians in South Africa recently. Mgbo said "we have not seen enough commitment on the part of the Nigerian government until recently. We believe the Nigerian government and its counterpart have what it takes to end this crisis. You only get to see the Nigerian government intervening when crisis has already erupted. I believe it should be more proactive". (Vanguard Newspaper, 2019). Mgbo also blamed the South African authorities of connivance saying that when the police was called upon they intentionally come late after the mayhem or damage would have been done. The reason for this blame is because there had been an audio of treats of attack in circulation and the government of South Africa was not proactive by deploying security agents to the targeted areas. A group Ohaneze Ndigbo worldwide through its president said "the xenophobic attacks on Nigerians and other Africans in the Republic of South Africa have been persistent, provocative and criminal. It smacks of absolute ingratitude on the part of a country Nigeria sacrificed so much for. It promotes divisive local conversations that our government have an opportunity to dramatize our unity of purpose". He pointed out that the federal government has to be courageous to announce retaliatory measures that will show that enough is enough. Such parameters should look into particular South African assets in Nigeria mostly in the communication, oil, banking and even the aviation sectors. According to him if the Nigerian government does not act it will portray us as weak, encourage a re-occurrence of these dastardly attacks

in the future and leave us a deeply angry and divided nation (Vanguard Newspaper, 2019). In another reaction, the Pan-Yoruba social-political organization Afenifere also called on the attention of the federal government led by president Buhari to sever ties with South African government stating clearly that sending an envoy at this critical time was meaningless. The national publicity secretary Mr. Yinka Odimakin said "it is unfortunate the Nigerian government has placed higher level value on the lives of cows more than human being and has been pathetically tardy on this (Vanguard Newspaper, 2019). Mr. Yinka said that a strong warning should have been issued to South Africa before things degenerated to this level. According to him, the Nigerian government can still get up from its lethargy to make dogged diplomatic actions that would make South Africa cringing. He went further to advice that the Nigerian government should improve on its economic policies to show it cares for its citizens. The national youth council of Nigeria called on Nigerians in South Africa to come back. Reacting to the issue of xenophobic attacks, the council is appealing to the federal government of Nigeria to aid the Nigerians over there in the evacuation process. Its spokesperson said "the agony of watching fellow African country and the pain of seeing Nigerian nationals degraded below animals is beyond our emotional ingest. National youth council of Nigeria is calling on all Nigerians in South Africa to start coming back home with immediate alacrity. A group representing the South-South coastal part of the country Pan-Niger Delta Forum (PANDEF), have commended the efforts so far that has been put in by the federal government of Nigeria. But PANDEF is of the opinion that the federal government has to double its effort in tackling and handling of this matter. The reason is because it is a very sensitive issue and advisable for the Nigerian government to exhaust all forms of diplomacy before taking any serious actions that will sour the bilateral relationship Nigeria and South Africa have. They are of the opinion that it is not yet time to act.

Conclusion

The study concluded that the xenophobic attacks that were carried out by South Africa (Africans) on Nigerians from the Kant's moral philosophy if applied rejects xenophobic attacks because if the maxim of such is applied it cannot be universalized. The study also concluded that greater number of South Africans are okay and sees nothing wrong with the xenophobic attacks on Nigerians but looking at their actions internationally the world frowns at this barbaric act and sees it as wrong. Furthermore, the study concluded that the Nigerian government as well as other groups have responded to the xenophobic attacks by summoning the South African Ambassador to express her displeasure over the treatment of her citizens in South Africa and also call on Nigeria government through social media to boycott South African companies such as MTN, DSTV and retailer Shoprite. Finally, the study concluded that groups like Ohaneze Ndigbo worldwide through its president said "the xenophobic attacks on Nigerians and other Africans in South Africa have been persistent, provocative and criminal and it shows absolute ingratitude on the part of a country Nigeria which has sacrificed so much for South Africa.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study it was recommended that:

1. The Nigerian government should let the South African government to know that the actions that are carried out by South Africans that has led to deaths of Nigerians no matter the actions that must had led to that does not fall within the moral principles of any society.
2. The government of Nigeria should establish a bilateral commission with South Africa that will be meeting regularly to ensure protection of the two countries' national interests.
3. The Nigerian government should fight systemic corruption which is largely the cause of poverty and the high unemployment rate in the country and that have made Nigerians move to South Africa to be killed in a manner that is shameful.

References

1. Bordeau J. *Xenophobia: The violence of fear and hate*. Rosen Publishing Group, 2010.
2. Castañeda H. *Ought, reasons, motivations and the unity of the social sciences. The meta-theory of the ought-is-problem*. Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi, 1988.
3. Cohen GA. *Facts and principles*. Philosophy and Public Affairs, 2003.
4. Crush J, Ramachandran S. *Xenophobia, international migration and human development*. United Nations Development Programme, Human Development Report Research Paper, 2009.
5. Crush J. *The perfect storm: The realities of xenophobia in contemporary South Africa*, 2008.
6. Southern Africa Research Centre. Canada: Queen's University.
7. Crush J. *The perfect storm: Xenophobia in contemporary South Africa*. Cape Town: IDAS, 2008.
8. Harris B. *Xenophobia: A new pathology for a new South Africa?* in Hook D & Eagle, 2002.
9. G (eds) *Psychopathology and social prejudice*. Cape Town. University of Cape Town Press
10. Landau LB. *Loving the alien? Citizenship, law, and the future in South Africa's Demonic Society*. African Affairs, 2010.
11. Licata L, Klein O. *Does European citizenship breed xenophobia? European identification as a predictor of intolerance towards immigrants*. Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 2002.
12. Marti-Huang D. *The 'is' and 'ought' convention*. Dialectica, 1987.
13. Matsinhe DM. *Africa's fear of itself: The ideology of makwerekwere in South Africa*. Third World Quarterly, 2011; 23:295-313.
14. Nyamnjoh FB. *Insiders and outsiders: Citizenship and xenophobia in contemporary Southern Africa*. Zed Books, 2006.
15. Omoregbe J. *Ethics a systematic and historical study*. Educational Research and Publishers Limited, 2003.
16. Pojman LP. *Philosophy: The pursuit of wisdom*. Pennsylvania State University, 2001.
17. Peil M. *Ghana's aliens*. International Migration Review, 1974; 8:3.
18. Radkiewicz P. *The national values as a concept helpful in explaining the development of nationalistic attitudes and xenophobia*. Polish Psychological Bulletin, 2003; 34:5-13.
19. Reynolds V, Vine I. *The socio-biology of ethnocentrism: Evolutionary dimensions of xenophobia, discrimination, racism, and nationalism*. London: Croom Helm, 1987.
20. Timmons M. *Decision procedures. Moral criteria and the problem of relevant descriptions in Kant's ethics*, 1997. Retrieved 2 February 2020 from <https://www.oxfordscholarship.com/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190203368.001.0001/acprof-9780190203368>.
21. Vanguard. *Xenophobic attacks: Era of diplomatic niceties over*, 2019. Retrieved 20 January 2020 from <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2019/09/xenophobic-attacks-era-of-diplomatic-niceties-over-nigerians-tell-buhari/>
22. Watts MW. *Political xenophobia in the transition from socialism: Threat, racism and ideology among East German youth*. Political Psychology, 1996; 17:97-126.
23. Yakushko O. *Xenophobia: Understanding the roots and consequences of negative attitudes toward immigrants*. Educational psychology papers and publications, 2009.