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ABSTRACT

Alien expulsion has featured in the control of migration and has been used by states to various ends. In some instances where governments have used expulsion, there have been implications for diplomatic relations between the states involved. Within the West African sub-region, the nature of migration coupled with internal economic and security concerns have resulted in the expulsion of aliens at different points. Notable of these, is the Nigerian Alien Expulsion Order of 1983 because of the magnitude of people affected. This study explores the Expulsion Order in connection with Ghana which was most affected by the decision, against the backdrop of the nature of relations between the two countries at the time. The study also examines the Ghanaian reaction to the decision. It argues that national security concerns of the Ghanaian government, informed its immediate response of taking responsibility for the safe return of its affected nationals. It however finds that this incidence did not worsen already fragile diplomatic relations between the two countries. It highlights factors that may have been responsible for this. The study concludes that while national security concerns influenced Ghana’s response to the Nigerian Alien Expulsion Order, a number of factors contributed to why it did not react any further to show its discontent with the decision as in other cases of alien expulsion.
CHAPTER ONE

RESEARCH DESIGN

1.0 Introduction

Nigeria and Ghana have a long history of relations. The nature of these relations may, to an extent, be regarded as peculiar within the West African sub-region. According to Otoghole A. and Obaghedo N., there have been points of ‘departure’ and ‘convergence’ in the interactions between these two countries. Points of convergence have been identified as including the shared colonial heritage of both countries, the similarities in the circumstances that led to their independence, similarities in the nature of their economies and a shared ideological inclination which arguably accounts for the instances of agreement and cooperation in their interaction. This, however, does not preclude instances of unsavoury and difficult relations. Olajide Aluko identifies such instances as including ‘the leadership tussle between both countries for political hegemony in West Africa in particular, the ideological differences of leaders of both countries in the immediate post-independence period; economic inequalities between the two countries and Ghana’s lukewarm attitude to the Nigerian civil war between 1967 and 1970.’

By and large, one could consider the nature of government in power in the two countries at any given time, as playing a significant role in determining the relationship that exists between them. In 1983, the Nigerian government of Shehu Shagari decided to expel illegal aliens under the Aliens Expulsion Order. This affected mostly citizens of West African countries, majority of whom were Ghanaians. It may be argued that this point represented a low point in Nigeria-Ghana relations.
The fact that most of those affected by this decision were citizens of West African countries, may be derived from the nature of interaction within the sub-region and the role of migration therein. Migration in West Africa has been characterized by a number of factors. In pre-colonial times, movement of people was largely unrestrained. In colonial times, the nature of the territorial boundaries that separate African states had a part to play. Considering that the delineation of some borders during colonial times was imprecise, there are cases where the same ethnic group may be found in 2 or more countries. In addition, a major reason for movement of people within the sub region has been for the purpose of finding work. Contributing further to this was the implementation of the ECOWAS Protocol on free Movement of Persons in 1979, which allowed for a 90day visa requirement waiver for ‘community citizens.’ Also, the prevalent conditions within some of the countries had an impact on movement of people. In this regard, the Nigerian oil boom of the 1970’s for example, meant that a lot of people within the sub region moved to Nigeria.

Across board, states have an interest in controlling migration; whether it be restricting the number of people that come within their territory (immigration), or the number of people that leave (emigration). This control may sometimes be forced, a category under which expulsion falls. The policy decision adopted by the Nigerian government to expel aliens is therefore not new in history. There have been other cases of forced migration movement and expulsions some of the cases of which aliens were the category of people targeted. Within Africa, Asians in Uganda were expelled in 1972. In 1974, Nigerians living in Guinea had to leave in their numbers. Cases of alien expulsions include the implementation of the Aliens Compliance Order of 1969 by the Ghanaian government under Busia, expulsion of Ghanaians by Sierra Leone, Nigeriens by Dahomeans (present
day Republic of Benin), Togolese by Ghana and Côte d’Ivoire, Beninese by Gabon and a number of others. Some of these cases have had implications for diplomatic relations between the countries involved. This is usually manifested by a hostile diplomatic response from the country whose nationals are affected, in order to register discontent for the decision taken by the expelling state.

Although the Nigeria Alien Expulsion Order of 1983 was officially directed at all aliens living within Nigeria, it may be argued that the situation of Ghana was peculiar in a number of respects and may explain why it is largely known as ‘‘Ghana must go’’ in Nigeria. The Ghanaians made up majority of those expelled. It therefore follows that the effect of that decision by the Nigerian government was mostly felt by Ghana, more so as that was a difficult time economically for the country.

1.2 Problem Statement

Drawing from history, expulsion has the potential of adversely affecting diplomatic relations or worsening already shaky relations between the countries involved. This is usually manifested by a hostile diplomatic response towards the expelling state, from the state whose nationals are affected by the decision to expel. The 1972 expulsion of Asians by the government of Idi Amin of Uganda is a case in point. The already shaky diplomatic relations between Britain and Uganda were further marred. In the case of Ghana therefore, it could be argued that one may understandably expect that the Nigerian Alien Expulsion Order of 1983 had a major effect on diplomatic relations between these two countries. Although, diplomatic relations between Nigeria and Ghana at the time were not the best, the decision by the Nigerian government did not seem to affect diplomatic relations or cause the Ghanaian government to respond with any action that
would have further worsened relations, apart from the backlash from the Ghanaian head of state at the time. Following from this, this work seeks to answer the following research questions:

1.3 **Research Questions**

- What were the causes of the Nigerian Alien Expulsion of 1983 and how did Ghana respond to the expulsion?
- To what extent did Ghana’s response diverge from the norm of hostility towards the expelling state?
- What factors explain Ghana’s divergent response?

1.4 **Research Objectives**

Following from this, the study seeks to achieve the following objectives:

- To examine the causes of the Nigerian Alien Expulsion Order of 1983 and Ghana’s response to it.
- To examine how Ghana’s response deviated from the norm of hostility towards the expelling nation.
- To examine what factors explain Ghana’s divergence response.

1.5 **Scope**

Considering that the Nigerian Aliens Expulsion Order was implemented in 1983, this work considers the said year as its scope. 1983 is significant because, although a number of events that did not necessarily occur in this year accounted for the expulsion order, these events led to factors that reached a high point in 1983, thus making Alien expulsion an option on the part of Nigeria, and creating significant effects for Ghana.
1.6 **Hypothesis**

The study is guided by the following hypothesis:

That national security concerns and the operational environment within which Ghana responded largely account for its non-hostile diplomatic response to Nigeria’s implementation of the Alien Expulsion Order of 1983.

1.7 **Rationale for Study**

It may be argued that the expulsion of aliens by Nigeria in 1983 represented a critical point in Nigeria-Ghana relations. Although literature on the issue exists, academic writings that touch on what accounts for the Ghanaian response given the nature of Ghana-Nigeria relations at the time, are limited. This work seeks to bridge that gap thereby providing information to aid future research. It also seeks to highlight considerations to guide decisions of policy makers as it relates to other states. In addition, personal reasons contribute to why the researcher is undertaking this study, as some members of the researcher’s family were affected by the Nigerian Alien Expulsion of 1983.

1.8 **Conceptual Framework**

Considering that the response of the Ghanaian government to the Nigerian Alien Expulsion Order has to do with its action in relation to an external situation, this study will be examined using the input-output approach to the study of foreign policy. Foreign Policy may be defined as “official actions (and reactions) which sovereign states initiate (or receive and subsequently react to) for the purpose of altering or creating a condition (or problem) outside their territorial sovereign boundaries.” Following from this, the Ghanaian response to the problem created as a result of the decision taken by the
Nigerian government to expel illegal aliens, may be seen as a foreign policy decision. Foreign policy decisions and subsequent actions carried out by a state in a given situation through its decision makers, is dependent on several factors, considerations and influences.\textsuperscript{11} As a result, there are different approaches to analysing or studying foreign policy. These include the traditional or power theorists’ approach which explains state behaviour in the international system as being based upon a struggle for power and regards the self-help nature of the international system as influencing state behaviour.\textsuperscript{12} The \textit{innenpolitik} approach stresses the influence of domestic factors on foreign policy and sees the external behaviour of a state as a product of internal dynamics.\textsuperscript{13} There is also the decision-making approach as pioneered by scholars such as Richard Snyder, which sees the actions of a state in its international relations as a manifestation of decisions made by recognizable units and official decision makers.\textsuperscript{14} The input-output analysis represents another approach with different variants which include Comparative Foreign Policy Analysis as advocated by Rosenau.\textsuperscript{15} This work considers Michael Bretcher’s formulation of the input-output approach as apt in understanding Ghana’s response to the decision taken by Nigeria.

The input-output analysis approach sees foreign policy decision as a product of the interaction between internal and external variables where the operational environment within which the decision is taken influences actors that take the decision.\textsuperscript{16} The operational environment or setting ‘refers to a set of potentially relevant factors and conditions which may affect a state’s external behaviour.’\textsuperscript{17} According to Michael Bretcher, with regard to foreign policy decisions, components which may be classified in three general categories: inputs, process and outputs are identifiable. As such, all data regarding foreign policy can be classified in one of these categories.\textsuperscript{18} Inputs refer to the
operational environment or setting within which the decision is made, process refers to the formulation of the policy that falls within four issue areas while output refers to the product or result of the policy.

Input has to do with the operational environment which functions at two main levels: external and internal. External variables refer to conditions and interactions that exist beyond the territorial boundaries of the state. These could be at the following levels: Global, Subordinate or Continental, Subordinate Other (or sub-regional), and Bilateral including Dominant Bilateral (relationship between a state and a super power). In the same manner, the internal environment consists of 5 variables which include: Military Capability, Economic Capability, Political Structure, Interest Groups and Competing Elites. According to Bretcher et al, these key variables fluctuate and interrelate from issue to issue. As such, only some of these variables may be applicable in this case. For the purpose of this study therefore, the Global, Subordinate Other (sub-regional) and Bilateral levels are applicable at the external level; and the economic capability and Interest Group variables are applicable at the internal level.

Based on this approach, the place of the decision-maker is also important. As such, the decision maker’s perception of the operational environment determines the success or otherwise of the foreign policy decision. This is influenced by the ideology and idiosyncratic qualities of the decision-maker. However, not all relevant elite perceptions can be articulated in a particular case either as a result of the character of the political system or the nature of the specific issue. In addition, communication to the decision-making elite about the environment as well as policy suggestion and advocacy by certain actors or interest groups within this framework is important. Bretcher refers to
four types of interest groups which include institutional, associational, non associational and anomic. For the purpose of this study, the institutional interest group category is relevant, of which bureaucratic organizations are part. These bureaucratic organizations include the foreign ministry and agencies of government whose activities and reports relate to external issues and influence foreign policy decision.

Based on the input-output analysis, all foreign policy issues exist within four issue-areas which include military-security, political-diplomatic, economic-developmental and cultural-status. According to Bretcher et al, the motivation that leads to the decision may differ from the substantive content of the decision thus, classifying issues within these issue areas is based on its substantive content while the motivation emerges after analysis has been completed. This study considers the military-security issue area as relevant. The Military-Security paradigm refers to issues that concern violence, weaponry and alliances, or issues that relate to security threats. The relevance of this issue area to the study lies in the security aspect. There are several variations of what constitutes security and security threats. However, for the purpose of this study, the Ghanaian response is considered within national security confines. Wolfer defines security as ‘the absence of threats to acquired values.’ These values are not static and have sometimes been associated with the concept of national interest. This association with national interest links it to core values that the state is meant to protect which include aspects such as national prosperity and the wellbeing of citizens. According to Baldwin, these values refer to aspects which include ‘physical safety, economic welfare, autonomy, psychological wellbeing and so on.’ He further states that the object of security may be the individual, the state or the international system. Hermann states that threats in relation to security, refer to the anticipated obstruction of some value. He
therefore defines national security as security in relation to value outcomes desired by those who comprise the effective political base of a nation.\textsuperscript{30} In addition, the term has expanded in scope to include dimensions of human security which relate to the responsibility of a state to ensure the safety of its citizens.\textsuperscript{31} As such, the response by the Ghanaian government to take responsibility of its citizens by setting up a ‘National Emergency Relief Committee’ that was to ensure the safe arrival of the Ghanaian returnees, may be seen as projecting the national security concerns of the government at the time. This therefore situates it within the military-security category, based on its substantive content.

The input-output approach has been criticized for laying too much emphasis on the perception that the decision maker has of the operational environment, which it holds as essential in resulting in the success or failure of the policy decision.\textsuperscript{33} In spite of this, it is considered as relevant to this study because it helps to identify the factors and influences that account for why Ghana’s response differed from reactions to the expelling countries in other cases of alien expulsion. It explains foreign policy decision as a product of internal and external variables, decision maker’s perceptions and policy suggestions of relevant interest groups. As such, the framework considers elements from other approaches of foreign policy analysis. The significance of this to the study is that it provides an insight into the relevant aspects to be considered in examining what resulted in Ghana’s response

### 1.9 Literature Review

In his article *History and the Future of International Migration*, Goran Rystad indicates that mankind’s history has been a history of migration. People have had to move from
place to place as a result of several factors. According to him, although there is the
tendency to emphasize on economic reasons within the frame work of traditional
push/pull factors in explaining motivation for migration, there are other reasons.
Migration may take place as a result of the changing geographic distribution of
employment opportunities, demographic imbalances or in response to actions and
policies of nation states such as wars, expulsion and migration control.\textsuperscript{34} He notes that a
criticism of the push/pull theories of migration is that it neglects the role which states and
institutions play in regulating migration either to hinder or increase movement.

According to Aderanti Adepoju in \textit{Migration in West Africa}, although traditional push-
pull factors account for migration flows within the West African sub-region, search for
security and safe land for settlement and farming served as motivation for why people
migrated in pre-colonial times.\textsuperscript{35} However, the territorial boundaries delineated during
colonial times and the establishment of tax regimes and recruitment policies meant a
change in the erstwhile pattern of migration. In the late 60’s and early 70’s, deteriorating
socio-economic conditions in some West African countries led to an increase in the
number of skilled professionals moving from countries like Ghana to Nigeria, where
better conditions prevailed.\textsuperscript{36} At this time, the newly independent states had enacted
migration laws and regulations to control movement of people across their borders.
Enforcement of these laws were, however, problematic because delineated territories
between West African states were such that they split the same ethnic group between two
countries. The formation of ECOWAS in 1975 and the signing of the first part of the
Protocol on Free Movement of Persons, and the Right of Residence and Establishment in
1979 increased the mobility of labour within the sub-region at this time. Some of the
factors that Goran highlights in his article \textit{History and the Future of International}
Migration, as facilitating illegal migration may be applicable to the West African case. In his article, Goran Rystad indicates that population flow between different countries may be as a result of differences in economic development, comparative ease with which borders may be crossed, differences in standard of living between countries, differences in population density and growth, well established transportation routes, and the fact that social networks created by earlier migrants, make migrating easier for their fellow countrymen.\textsuperscript{37} As such, differences in economic conditions, the nature of the borders of West African states and the ECOWAS Protocol on Free Movement of Persons facilitated migration across West African borders, as Aderanti Adepoju indicates. In spite of this, as unemployment and economic conditions within some West African countries began to deteriorate, illegal immigrants within those countries were increasingly blamed. Consequently, policies of expulsion and deportation directed at illegal immigrants were favoured.\textsuperscript{38}

Indeed, policies of expulsion, deportation and forced migration have a long history and have been employed at different points in world history, as Benjamin Z. Kedar in his article Expulsion as an Issue of World History, demonstrates. He contends that expulsion is a characteristic of Western European civilization which took shape during the middle ages.\textsuperscript{39} On the evolution of expulsion, which he defines by distinguishing it from other types of displacements like deportation, he emphasizes the term ‘corporate expulsion’ which is the applicability of expulsion orders to a category of persons rather than to specific individuals which, in the case of the Nigerian 1983 expulsion order, would be the aliens. For example, there have been expulsions in the early centuries of the middle ages in Europe mostly aimed at Jews and non-believers for their lack of belief in the Christian faith as well as those who were sent away as a result of the detrimental
influence it was presumed they exerted on society. Although other civilizations had expelled certain groups at some point in their history, and in spite of the fact that deportation and imposition of political exile were forms of displacements employed by empires and city-states, cooperate expulsion occurred most frequently in the emerging European states system so that it served as ‘an important and radical tool of governance.’ From this historical backdrop, Kedar attempts to link incidences of alien expulsion to the expansion of European civilization to other continents. It is his submission therefore, that as Western European civilization spread to other continents including Africa, the use of alien expulsion by governments, as in the Ugandan expulsion of 1972, gained roots. If this is the case, then one of the core reasons given by the Nigerian government for the alien expulsion order as cited in Roger Gravil’s article, *The Nigerian Aliens Expulsion Order of 1983* which was that the aliens were illegal and Nigeria has a right to enforce its laws, could be seen as expulsion being a tool of governance.

In *Emigration and Expulsion in the Third World*, Alan Dowty speaks of the control of the right of citizens in the third world to leave their countries and their right to remain, as occurring side by side. This is to the extent that political and ethnic pressures associated with nation building may lead to forced emigration resulting in refugees and expellees on the one hand, and the need to curb brain drain for economic and developmental purposes may lead to the restriction of emigration on the other hand. On expulsion, he states that the need for nation-building may lead to a drive for homogeneity in order to strengthen national unity. Thus, ruling elites may turn on aliens to achieve this. Economic reasons also feature in this regard. He further states, however, that pursuing homogeneity for this end is more practicable in Europe where the core states are reasonably homogenous than
in Africa, where there are numerous ethnic groups- the differences of which colonial policies accentuated.\textsuperscript{44} He also states that the use of expulsions was bequeathed to African states by the colonial authorities,\textsuperscript{45} which Kedar makes mention of as well, in his article \textit{Expulsion as an Issue of World History}.

According to Alan Dowty, apart from internal reasons, some regimes are motivated to force population movements for external reasons. He notes that there was a wave of alien expulsions beginning in 1967, one of which is the expulsion of aliens by Nigeria in 1983. This expulsion is what Olajide Aluko in his article \textit{The Expulsion of Illegal Aliens from Nigeria: A Study in Nigeria's Decision-Making}, examines. In an attempt to answer some questions which he posed in the article, Aluko looks at internal and external factors that led the Nigerian government to take the decision as well as the role of the decision maker. According to him, Nigeria, under President Shehu Shagari, suddenly expelled about 3million illegal aliens who were mostly from West African countries in 1983. Following from this, he highlights what led to this decision by the Nigerian government, reasons why the decision was taken and the various reactions that it elicited. Of the West African nationalities affected, he notes that Ghanaian nationals were the largest and further states that the reaction from Ghana was ‘caustic’ against the background of the bilateral relations that existed between Nigeria and Ghana.\textsuperscript{46} Beyond this, no mention is made of any further effect the decision had on the relations between the two countries. In addition, he mentions that the involvement of Ghanaians in some crimes in Nigeria was crucial to the aliens law,\textsuperscript{47} among other reasons.

This is a view that Roger Gravil in his article \textit{The Nigerian Aliens Expulsion Order of 1983}, disagrees with. In his article, Roger Gravil examines the sudden nature of the
decision made by the Nigerian government to expel illegal aliens. He notes that there was no prior information or notice given to the affected countries or key departments and ministries of the Nigerian government. Although he states that the official reason given was the fact that Nigeria had the right to enact its laws and that the illegal aliens had contributed to the deteriorating economic situation of the country, he faults this justification and favours economic reasons as being a more valid explanation.\(^{48}\) Like Olajide Aluko, he highlights the situation of the Ghanaians who were affected by the decision. He gives some reasons why the Ghanaian situation was ‘controversial’ in relation to the alien expulsion order.\(^{49}\) One of the reasons given was the fact that Ghana, in 1969 had expelled illegal aliens most of which were Nigerians. It is his submission that although there have been sentiments that the Nigerian decision was taken in retaliation to the Ghanaian decision years ago, this is not the case. No mention is made, however, of any Ghanaian reaction to this decision.

Aremu J.O. in his article *Responses to the 1983 Expulsion of Aliens from Nigeria: A Critique* indicates that the 1983 Aliens Expulsion Order was a case of national interest at play. It is his submission that although the Nigerian government under President Shehu Shagari had been criticized especially by the international community for this action, it was in conformity with the Nigerian immigration law of 1963 and as such, was justified. Aremu goes further to list the various criticisms made against the Nigerian government regarding the Aliens Expulsion Order. He does this based on the work of other scholars such as Roger Gravil, and gives points in defence, centred around the principle of National Interest.\(^{50}\) In an attempt to exonerate the Nigerian government from the various criticisms against it, it would appear as if he perceives the responses from the international community as a ‘gang-up’ against Nigeria especially as there had been
cases of expulsion in the West-African sub-region before 1983 that did not attract much criticism. This notwithstanding, he concludes by questioning the effectiveness of the decision of the Nigerian government in the light of what it was meant to achieve.

The contribution of Olajide Aluko and Roger Gravil to this study is relevant in that, they approach the issue of the Nigerian Alien Expulsion from different angles that eventually give a clearer view. Aluko, in *The Expulsion of Illegal Aliens from Nigeria: A Study in Nigeria's Decision-Making*, gives a background to the decision and highlights the issues that may have triggered the decision. Roger Gravil, on the other hand, dissects the reasons given by the Nigerian government for the decision, analysing their validity. Although both of them highlight the Ghanaian nationals as being mostly affected by the Nigerian decision, their work concentrates on how the decision affected Nigeria and the projection of the Nigerian image regionally and internationally. In addition, although Aremu J.O. in his article *Responses to the 1983 Expulsion of Aliens from Nigeria: A Critique* highlights some responses that the decision of the Nigerian government triggered, he focuses more on the national interest dimension of the decision.

Lynne Brydon in Ghanaian *Responses to the Nigerian Expulsions of 1983* attempts to trace the relationship between Nigeria and Ghana from the time of their independence, up till 1983, when the decision was taken by the Nigerian government to expel aliens. Brydon gives a background to that decision within the context of the relationship that existed between the different regimes of the two countries in the years leading up to 1983. She also highlights the economic situation of Ghana at the time. This backdrop is relevant in giving an understanding as to how Ghana handled the effect of the decision taken by the Nigerian government. The article, however, focuses on the humanitarian
responses and the actions taken by the Ghanaian government to cope with the large number of its nationals returning home within a short space of time.

Although the decision by the Nigerian government aggravated the economic situation in Ghana at the time, little is said of any other form of response or reaction by Ghanaian government that would have registered discontent, apart from the sentiment expressed by the Ghanaian Head of State, that the aliens order was a ‘calculated plot against his government.’ This area is what this study seeks to look into.

1.10 Limitation to the Study

This study was limited by access to data. Given that 1983 is the period of study, getting access to records of events from that time, was challenging. Getting records from the Ghana Ministry of Foreign Affairs with regards to correspondence and exchanges with the Ghana High Commission in Nigeria as at the time of the expulsion, was not possible. This is because the records were destroyed in the fire incident that burnt down the Ghana Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 2009. However, the key persons interviewed provided the researcher with detailed information as well as their private libraries and personal notes. This enabled the study to obtain its objectives. Thus, the above noted limitation was extensively reduced, although not entirely eliminated.

1.11 Conceptual Clarification

**Alien:** An alien refers to an individual who does not have the nationality of the state wherein the said individual is present.
**Alien Expulsion:** Alien expulsion as used in this work refers to ‘a formal act or conduct attributable to a State, by which an alien is compelled to leave the territory of that State.’

**Diplomatic Reaction or Diplomatic Response:** This, as used in this work, refers to actions taken by states to express dissatisfaction over decisions in their bilateral relations with other states. These actions may include a retaliatory action, recalling of ambassadors, closing down of diplomatic missions or halting of joint projects.

**Ghana must go:** This phrase as used in this work, is meant to refer to the mass movement of Ghanaian nationals who were affected by the Nigerian Alien Expulsion Order of 1983.

**Operational environment:** Operational environment or setting as used in this study, ‘refers to a set of potentially relevant factors and conditions which may affect a state’s external behaviour.’

### 1.12 Sources of Data

This study relies on primary and secondary sources of data. Interviews were conducted to obtain primary sources of data. The researcher interviewed six people, four of which were with the Ghana Ministry of Foreign Affairs as at 1983 when the expulsion was ordered. They were able to give the researcher information based on their experience that gave insight into the subject of study. In addition, secondary sources such as journal articles and books were used. Internet sources were also instrumental for the purpose of this study. In addition, Newspaper articles were consulted in order to get an understanding of the event from the reportage by the press, within the period under study.
1.13 Research Methodology

This study is qualitative. Unstructured interviews were carried out using the purposive sampling method. This sampling method refers to when a researcher chooses specific people within the population with particular knowledge that is relevant to the study.\(^{57}\)

The key informant method was also used. This method involves interviewing knowledgeable participants with useful information of the area under study. The key informants extend the researcher’s insight into situations that he or she cannot observe directly or has not directly been involved in; and serve as a check on the information obtained from other informants.\(^{58}\)

The purposive sampling and key informant methods were relevant for this study because they were instrumental in helping the researcher to locate people with knowledge relevant to the work. The study made use of historical analysis and content analysis to review the literature and information gotten from interviews. A total of 5 people were interviewed. The people selected had knowledge and experiences that the researcher found relevant to the study.

1.14 Structure of the Study

The study comprises 4 chapters. Chapter one is the research design which has an introduction to the subject of study, problem statement, research questions and objectives, rationale, scope, hypothesis, conceptual framework, literature review, methodology, sources of data, limitations to study and structure of the study.

Chapter two looks at the nature of Migration, expulsions as a form of forced migration and effect on diplomatic relations in cases where it occurred.

Chapter 3 looks at the Nigerian Alien Expulsion Order of 1983, the peculiarity of the Ghanaian situation in relation to the order, how Ghana responded to the situation and what accounts for that response. It also looks into why there was on further reaction from
the Ghanaian government that would have registered discontent for the decision taken by Nigeria to expel aliens, using the framework of the ‘input-output’ analysis approach as propounded by Michael Bretcher.

Chapter 4 ends the study with summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations.
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CHAPTER TWO

OVERVIEW OF MIGRATION AND ALIEN EXPULSION

2.0 Introduction

Migration is arguably an important aspect of human history. Over centuries, people have had to move from place to place, triggering interactions that affected their eventual make up and shaped their ways of life. It may be said that “mankind's entire history has been an history of migration.”\(^1\) Globally and regionally, there have been factors and trends that may be identified as giving rise to and shaping migration. In Africa in general and the West African sub-region in particular, one finds that colonial heritage has had an effect on movement of people. Whereas in pre-colonial times long-distance movement of people was largely unrestrained, the delineation of territorial boundaries during colonial times gave rise to increased migration control across borders. This proved problematic, especially as these borders separated a number of ethnic groups living in different countries.\(^2\) By and large, states have had to control immigration and emigration across their borders for various reasons. This they have done by putting policies in place to regulate the number of people coming into their territories, or leaving their territories. There have been instances where this control has been forced and sudden in cases of alien expulsion and evacuation of large segments of migrant population from a country. Situations like this have had implications for diplomatic relations between the countries involved.

This chapter seeks to give an overview of factors that lead to alien migration, alien expulsion and the effect it has had on diplomatic relations in some cases where it occurred.
1.2 Overview of Factors that Lead to Alien Migration

Human migration has always been an important aspect of population change with attendant implications for development. Following from this, people may move from various regions within the same territory or across national borders. A working definition of alien migration is therefore pertinent so as to differentiate between those moving from one region to another within the same country, and those moving across national borders. An “alien” as referred to here, may be defined as a person who does not have the nationality of the state wherein the said individual resides. Alien migration therefore refers to the movement of people from their country of nationality, to other countries.

In examining global factors that lead to alien migration, economic considerations feature prominently. The desire to better economic conditions results in migration to areas where employment opportunities are available. Following from this, people move to locations with a high demand for labour or where they can earn higher wages. They may also move for sake of maximizing their skills to increase productivity. Some theories of migration explain motivation for movement of people in terms push and pull factors. In this regard, unfavourable conditions prevalent in sending countries may contribute to increased emigration. In the same vein, conditions in the destination or receiving countries may be attractive enough to result in increased immigration. Push factors may include low wages or high unemployment, war and unfavourable political conditions, and pull factors could include economic stability and high demand for foreign workers in the receiving country. The present migration crisis may be explained from this perspective considering that war, political instability and search for better economic opportunities have led to an influx of people into Europe, where conditions are perceived to be better.
Actions and policies of states also play a major role with regards to migration and has been identified as one of the decisive factors in this regard. This is so because policies put in place to either inhibit or stimulate migration flow, would have a bearing on the individual’s decision to migrate. Different reasons may account for this. Unavailability of labour may lead to increased restriction of emigration to curb brain drain for the sake of development and increased encouragement of immigration. States may also adopt policies to expel aliens or move large numbers of their population for purposes of ethnic and political homogeneity. In addition, actions such as war, may give rise to movement of people and the creation of refugees.

Worthy of note is the differentiation within international migration between permanent residents, temporary workers, illegal aliens and refugees. Illegal aliens refers to those who have not regularized their stay in the foreign country wherein they reside. Factors that lead to illegal migration may include differences in economic development of different countries and by extension, differences in standard of living, the fact that borders are relatively easy to cross, well established routes and inexpensive transportation and available social networks created by earlier migration of fellow countrymen. It may be said that these factors hold true in the case of West Africa, especially in the post-independence era.

Within West Africa, population mobility both regionally and internationally has a long history and has been linked to a myriad of factors. These factors include ‘’ long-distance trade, the search for pasture and better ecological conditions, urbanisation and the growth of administrative centres, the demands of mining, industrial production and plantation
agriculture, armed conflict, land degradation, drought and rural poverty. One could look as far back as the time of the trans-Saharan caravan routes which allowed for trading and exchange of scholars between West and North Africa, as an indication of movement of population in earlier times.

A phenomenon that greatly influenced patterns of movement was contact with Europeans through slave trade and colonization. With the demarcation of the frontiers of African countries by the Europeans with no consideration of the situation on the ground, one finds that in a lot of cases, the same ethnic group is split such that they are found on either side of an international border. Consequently, such borders are porous especially as inhabitants of those areas who need to cross such international borders to carry out their daily activities or visit relatives, may not consider themselves as international migrants.

As expressed earlier, a number of factors account for population migration. These factors are largely determined by the era/period being looked at. This is to the extent that in pre-colonial times, security and safety were major considerations as far as migration was concerned. During the era of the Trans-Atlantic slave trade, forceful migration of millions of Africans to Europe and the Americas took place. During the colonial era, political and economic structures were put in place. Tax regimes were imposed and territorial boundaries were established. As a result, there were compulsory recruitments that triggered migration. For example, regional migration took place from Mali, Togo, and Upper Volta (present day Burkina Faso) to road networks, mines and plantations in the Gold Coast (present day Ghana) and Ivory Coast. Construction of infrastructure such as road and rail that facilitated the growth of major cities like Dakar, Lomé, Accra,
etc., ‘‘triggered major rural-rural migration of farm workers and rural-urban migration of skilled and unskilled workers, traders and students.’’ Migration during this period was therefore such that people moved from mostly northern rural areas to the southern parts to work in plantations and mines within the same country, or from poorer countries to mineral rich ones. A major characteristic of this period was ‘‘organized labour recruitment’’ where annual quotas of labour were demanded by the colonial administrations. There was labour movement to areas in West Africa that were rich in resources especially as cash crops increased foreign exchange revenues in places like Ghana and Cote d’Ivoire where cocoa was cultivated, Cote d’Ivoire where coffee was cultivated, Senegambia which was known for groundnuts and cotton. On this account, there was movement of labour from land locked countries like Mali, Niger to relatively more prosperous West African countries with coastal borders like Ghana, Nigeria, Cote d’Ivoire etc. Even so, economies that could be considered as relatively more prosperous attracted internal as well as international migrants. Considering that this served as a pull factor, it follows that a push, such as a decline in the 1960’s of the Ghanaian economy spurred emigration and the oil boom in the Nigerian economy, attracted Ghanaian migrants.

Closely related to this is the connection between globalization and migration, and the susceptibility of the economies of African countries to changes in the world market economy. Just as a raise in the world market price of oil attracted migrants to Nigeria during the oil boom, a drop in the world market price of oil contributed to the adoption of alien expulsion by the Nigerian government. In addition, the interconnectedness that membership in an international organization allows has a role to play as well. By way of example, The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) which was
formed in 1975, adopted the Protocol on Free Movement of Persons and the Right of Residence and Establishment of May 1979. It was to be implemented in three phases the first part of which was free movement of nationals of the ECOWAS member states for a maximum of 90 days without visas.\(^{19}\) This has had an effect on the number of people migrating into ECOWAS countries.

### 2.2 Overview of Alien Expulsion

States have an interest in controlling migration. This control may be forced in a number of instances. People may be deported or expelled; wars and conflicts may produce refugees and displaced persons. Expulsion is a form of forced migration that has been used by states to achieve a number of ends. States have embarked upon expelling and transferring large parts of their population, thereby forcing them to leave their home country especially in conflict situations. Following from this, Goran Rystad indicates that the decades following the Balkan War of 1912-1913 and the expulsion of millions of Germans at the close of World War 2, falls under this sort of policy.\(^{20}\) Also, the Ugandan expulsion of Asians provides an example where nationals of a country are expelled from a country where they are nationals. Thus, nationals of a country as well as aliens or foreigners may be forcefully sent away. It may be argued, however, that the Ugandan case falls into both categories considering that most of them held British nationalities as well.

An alien refers to an individual who does not have the nationality of the state wherein the individual is present and expulsion “means a formal act or conduct attributable to a State, by which an alien is compelled to leave the territory of that State.”\(^{21}\) Alien expulsion and population transfer as a form of migration control, has functioned in
history and has been used by states for a number of purposes. It has been used to reinforce nationalism for the purpose of state creation. It has also been used for political and economic ends.

Migration has the potential of changing the very nature and outlook of societies. This is as a result of the fact that settlement of new groups of people change the composition of the resident population. This has attendant implications for national identity. As such, early modern Europe saw the expulsion and imposed transfers of population as a means of maintaining a form of homogeneity for sake of national consolidation. Jews and Muslims were therefore expelled from Spain and there were forced transfers of populations in European states in order to have the faith of subjects and rulers align. This homogeneity could easily be maintained largely as a result of the seeming unvaried nature of the core European states and could be understood as a characteristic of European nationalism, the maintenance of which alien expulsion would be useful. In spite of this, it may be argued that when the idea of the nation-state was transposed into Africa, the sense of nation could not be built upon homogeneity when one considers that there are diverse ethnic groups in Africa. This is as against the situation in Europe for example, where ‘ inhabitants of England or France share a sense of being ‘English’ or ‘French,’. Against this backdrop, it could be argued that alien expulsion, which is a characteristic of Western European civilization as Benjamin Kedar points out, has functioned in a more varied manner in the African society. It has also been argued that the spread of Western European Civilization to Africa took along with it alien expulsion as ‘an important and radical tool of governance’.
Alien expulsion has also been used by ruling elites to consolidate national unity, for political ends. As such, they may turn ‘‘on turn on groups whose language, ethnicity, religion, culture, political beliefs, or socioeconomic status do not fit in,’’26 to achieve this end. Following from this, some scholars argue that one of the reasons for the Nigerian Alien Expulsion Order of 1983 was for the government to gain popularity among the electorate, given that it was an election year.

Alien expulsion may also be carried out as a result of economic considerations. There is a tendency to turn against the alien population within a country, during times of economic difficulty. Idi Amin of Uganda in 1972 blamed the Asians for ‘’sabotaging the economy’’ and decided to expel them in order to transfer control to ‘’black Ugandans.’’27 The Ghanaian Aliens Compliance Order of 1969 and the Nigerian Aliens Expulsion Order of 1983 have both closely been connected to economic reasons. In both cases, it was believed that sending the aliens away would better the deteriorating economic condition prevalent at those times, thereby making jobs available for the local population.

It may also be important to highlight the role of xenophobia in cases of expulsion. Migrants are sometimes blamed in relation to declining economy, increased crime rates, overpopulation and erosion of cultural and moral values within the countries where they reside, which gives rise to xenophobic sentiments that refer to fear and hatred focused on foreigners by indigenous population of a country.28 When xenophobia is mentioned in Africa, Southern Africa comes to mind. This is because hostility to migrants is common place in the region.29 This notwithstanding, the blaming of the alien population for the high crime rate and usurping of available jobs which justified the adoption of the
expulsion policies in the Ghanaian as well as Nigerian case, has been perceived as manifesting xenophobic dimensions.\textsuperscript{30}

As indicated earlier, alien expulsion is a form of forced emigration and could be adopted by the government of the expelling country for various reasons. One thing that cuts across some of the alien expulsions in Africa especially in West Africa, is the specificity of the category of aliens to be expelled. They usually refer to ‘illegal aliens’ or those undocumented within their territories. Incidences of undocumented migrants in Africa are not uncommon. Aderanti Adepoju explains that this persistence is as a result of interrelated factors. Fore mostly, there is a long history of free movement of persons in Africa.\textsuperscript{31} Pre and immediate post-colonial era was characterized by not many restrictions being placed on migration within the continent. On this account, “population movement was of a clandestine nature and people moved over large areas- as farmers, nomads, traders, warriors, and pilgrims- unrestricted by "formal" regulations.”\textsuperscript{32} In addition and as indicated earlier, national frontiers in Africa divide “social, ethnic and economic communities” thus making migration regulation problematic, exacerbated by “absence or inadequacy of migration laws and regulations in both country of origin and destination.”\textsuperscript{33}

2.3 Cases of Alien Expulsion, Forced Population Movements and Diplomatic Implications

When a state expels nationals of another state out of its territory, there are effects. These effects could be economic in that the positions these migrants occupied and the roles they played in the economy are left vacant. Following from this, the economic impact of the exit of the Asians was felt in the case of Uganda given that the government could not
sufficiently expropriate their belongings to the native Ugandans.\textsuperscript{34} There are also political, social as well as diplomatic effects.

Alien expulsion may incite a number of diplomatic reactions with attendant implications for relations between the states involved. Given as a cardinal principle of diplomacy is reciprocity, a reverse expulsion may be carried out in retaliation, ambassadors may be recalled thereby stepping down relations, diplomatic missions may be closed down or joint projects may be stopped.\textsuperscript{35} Therefore, alien expulsion, when used by states, has the potential of leading to a break in diplomatic relations. In some cases, erstwhile relations may not have been very good, where sending off of non-nationals would signal a critical point. Nevertheless, it is important to note that severance of diplomatic relations does not necessarily preclude the practice of diplomacy or the carrying out of diplomatic functions. As Berridge indicates, ‘’Regular, flag-flying embassies might well disappear when diplomatic relations are severed, but diplomatic functions might still be performed by interest sections, consulates, representative offices and front missions.’’\textsuperscript{36} The manifestation of the severance meant here therefore, may not relate to an outright cutting off of relations, but to a significant deterioration evidenced by a change in the manner of interaction between the two states in question, in relation to what must have obtained prior to the expulsion. Also, in a number of cases, one finds that the relationship between the governments of the two states involved is usually shaky such that the expulsion of aliens contributes to worsening the situation.

The period between 1967 and 1972 has been described as being marked by a wave of alien expulsions in Africa.\textsuperscript{37} In spite of this, there have been cases of expulsions before and after this period. In 1958, Cote d’Ivoire and Chad separately expelled over 1000
Beninese and Togolese who were designated as illegal migrants. In 1964, Cote d’Ivoire expelled another set of 16,000 Beninese and Senegal had also, in 1967, expelled Guineans for the same reason. In 1978, Benin nationals were expelled from Gabon in response to a Beninese condemnation at an OAU meeting. Ghana and Cote d’Ivoire had expelled Togolese farmers and Nigerians had been expelled from Gabon, Equatorial Guinea, Sierra Leone, Cameroon, Cote d’Ivoire, and Ghana. Ghana had expelled illegal aliens in 1969. Uganda had expelled Asians in 1972 and Nigeria expelled illegal aliens in 1983. The case of Uganda in 1972 when Idi Amin expelled Asians provides an example of the diplomatic implication of alien expulsion.

President Idi Amin of Uganda on November 8th, 1972, issued a decree that all Asians, most of whom were British citizens and numbered over 60,000, were to exit the country within 3 months. The official reason given bothered on economic considerations. The Asians had, over the years, dominated the Ugandan economy. The plan was therefore to fore mostly expel these Asians who, it was believed, had taken up most of the jobs meant for the Ugandans, and allocate these Asian businesses to Africans. This action by the Ugandan government had diplomatic implications. However, these implications cannot be completely divorced from the situation that prevailed prior to expulsion and as such, it may be said that this decision by the Ugandan government contributed to aggravating an already bad situation.

The Asians were of Indian origin. India, as part of the expanding British Empire in colonial times, had supplied some of British overseas colonies in Africa with man power for the construction of railways. As a result, a section of the population of East African countries, Uganda inclusive, was made up of Indians at independence. These Indians
were entitled to British citizenship as residents of British ex colonies. It was as a result of this that the Ugandan government under Idi Amin declared Britain responsible for the Asians when the expulsion was ordered in August of 1972. Considering that the British government was one of the first to recognise the administration of Idi Amin in 1970, evidence of deteriorating relations became apparent when the British High Commissioner was ordered to leave Uganda under accusation of spreading malicious propaganda in October, 1972. When Asians were expelled, the resultant effect was the cancellation of a ten million Pounds development loan that had been arranged in 1971, and the winding down of aid and training programmes with Uganda. This also contributed to the reduction of diplomatic relations to Acting High Commissioner level.

Another instance where diplomatic relations were affected is the case between Nigeria and Guinea. In 1974, Nigerian nationals had to leave Equatorial Guinea in their numbers. The result of this may be better understood in the light of the existing relations prior to this time.

The relations between Nigeria and Equatorial Guinea had been dominated by supply of labour from the former to the latter, especially between the 1930’s and 1970’s. Nigeria supplied most of the labour that sustained the cocoa and coffee plantations of Equatorial Guinea. These migrants were however, subjected to appalling conditions both under Spanish colonial authority and under the repressive dictatorship of President Francis Macias Nguema who came into power at independence in 1968. This ill treatment greatly affected relations between the two countries. Towards the end of 1969, the country suffered an economic depression during which time Nigerian labourers were
denied their wages. Protests by these workers were ruthlessly repressed. In 1974, the Nigerian Embassy staff were targeted by Equatorial Guinean authorities, further worsening already bad relations. The conduct of the Guinean state compelled the Nigerians to leave such that, towards the end of 1975, the Nigerian government evacuated close to 30,000 of its nationals. At some point, the Nigerian Embassy was invaded, where 11 Nigerians were killed.\(^{47}\) The situation was so bad, that there were calls for Nigeria to react militarily.\(^{48}\) The state of affairs did not improve until the overthrow of Macias Nguema in 1979. In addition, considering that the major source of conflict was the treatment of Nigerian nationals that constituted a majority of the immigrants involved in plantation agriculture in Equatorial Guinea, a shift in the structure of the economy from agriculture to oil, changed the nature of relations.

It would also be interesting to highlight the case of Ghana’s expulsion of aliens in 1969. Ghana under Busia in 1969 expelled over 200,000 aliens under the Aliens Compliance Order\(^ {49}\)(some report 500,000).\(^ {50}\) Some of these migrants had been attracted by the financial boom as a result of high cocoa production and the construction of the Akosombo Dam which attracted migrant labourers. In addition, numerous economic opportunities accompanied the construction of the port city of Tema on the Atlantic corridor and mining of gold and bauxite at Obuasi and Konongo, thereby aiding migration flows from Nigeria as well as other West African countries.

As at 1969, when the economic condition and employment situation of Ghana had deteriorated, all aliens without valid residence permit were to regularize their stay or leave Ghana within 2 weeks. According to the government, the foreigners in Ghana had usurped jobs meant for the Ghanaian nationals and as such, the expulsion would serve to
relieve the 600,000 registered unemployed Ghanaians.\textsuperscript{51} As the Ghanaian economy was suffering from a balance of payment deficit, the government explained that remittances sent by the immigrants to their countries of origins contributed to the worsening of the economic condition, which was already bad as it were considering that external actors had been invited to help formulate an economic policy for Ghana as early as 1967(a move referred to as ‘economic or external co-optation’).\textsuperscript{52} Sending them away was therefore, to help solve this problem. The government also admitted to giving the Aliens Compliance Order for the sake of curbing lawlessness and crime in the country for which they believed the aliens were largely responsible.

This government decision had a negative impact on Ghana’s image abroad and had implications for good neighbourliness and regional integration. A consequence of this move by the government of Busia contributed to the expulsion of Ghanaian fishermen from the Democratic Republic of Congo (then Zaire), Sierra Leone, and Liberia.\textsuperscript{53} It has also been argued that the expulsion of aliens by Nigeria in 1983 which affected mostly Ghanaians, was done in retaliation to the Aliens Compliance Order.\textsuperscript{54}
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CHAPTER THREE

THE ALIEN EXPULSION ORDER OF 1983 AND GHANA’S RESPONSE

3.0 Introduction

Drawing from history, expulsion may incite a number of diplomatic responses with attendant implications for relations between the states involved. These responses may be in the form of a reverse expulsion for retaliatory purposes, recalling ambassadors resident in the sending state, closing down diplomatic missions or stopping joint projects in order to register discontent for the decision taken by the expelling state.

The decision by the Nigerian government in 1983 to expel aliens, was a general directive. However, citizens of neighbouring West African countries were mostly affected. In spite of this, it may be argued that the situation of Ghana in relation to this decision was somewhat peculiar. This is against the backdrop of the difficult diplomatic relations between the governments of Nigeria and Ghana at the time. This notwithstanding, apart from the initial expression of suspicion by the Ghanaian Head of State with regard to the motive of the expulsion, the official Ghanaian response to the expulsion did not go beyond actions taken to ensure the safe arrival of returnees.

This chapter examines what led to the Nigerian Alien Expulsion Order of 1983 and the peculiarity of the Ghanaian situation in relation to the Alien Expulsion Order. This chapter also examines the response of the Ghanaian government. In addition, considering that expulsions and forced migration have diplomatic implications for the states involved, this chapter analyzes why the Ghanaian government did not, in addition to acting to ensure the safe arrival of its affected nationals, respond in such a manner that
would have had diplomatic repercussions considering that it was dissatisfied with the decision. The analysis in this chapter is conducted using Michael Bretcher’s input-output approach to foreign policy analysis, in order to identify the factors and influences that account for why Ghana’s response deviated from the norm of hostility towards the sending nation, as in other cases.

3.1 Background to the Nigerian Alien Expulsion Order of 1983

The case of the Nigerian alien expulsion of 1983 is one, amongst others, which confirms the fact that ‘’the dynamics of relations among states change in accordance with the changing patterns of nations’ own internal dynamics as well as the international environment in which nations interact.’’\(^2\) This is substantiated by the reasons for the expulsion given by the Nigerian government at the time, as well as the significance of the timing of the adoption of this policy. In order to get a clear view of the situation, it may be important to touch on the background to the Nigerian Alien Expulsion Order of 1983.

It may be argued that the decision by the Nigerian government to expel aliens is intractably linked with the situation of the country at the time which, in turn, cannot be divorced from events preceding that time. The Nigerian ‘‘oil boom’’ in the 1970’s attracted a number of migrants from the West African sub-region, as they saw brighter prospects for themselves there. The discovery of oil in Nigeria transformed the erstwhile agricultural-based economy into a petroleum based one.\(^3\) Although the Nigeria Civil war had affected oil exports, oil production quadrupled to 2.5million barrels per day between 1969 and 1974 just as the world price of crude oil tripled.\(^4\) Oil revenues had increased and there was an increase in the demand for labour as the Nigerian government had
embarked upon socio-economic developmental programs. The various infrastructural projects that were embarked upon and the construction of the new federal capital at Abuja led to an increase in the demand for labour. As wage increased during this period, primary education expanded and absorbed a segment of the population that would have normally been engaged in some form of semi-skilled or unskilled job - a position which aliens readily occupied.

Just as Nigeria experienced this boom, "several factors acted as strong push from neighbouring countries: the problems of sluggish growth, food scarcity, foreign exchange deficits, unemployment; political instability in Ghana and Chad; drought in the Sahelian region - Mali, Niger, among others." Consequently, several professionals like doctors, lawyers, engineers, teachers, university lecturers as well as technicians and artisans were attracted to Nigeria in search of a better standard of living. The formation of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) in 1975 also had a crucial part to play especially with the signing of the protocol on free movement of persons, residence and establishment in 1979 which was ratified in 1980. The part of the protocol relating to the free movement of persons was the first to be implemented. It was to allow "community citizens" (nationals of ECOWAS member states) to enter the territory of a member state visa-free for a 90day period. This protocol, coupled with the economic opportunities facilitated by the oil boom led to an increase in the volume of immigration into the country. The number of Ghanaians that moved to Nigeria between 1978 and 1980 tripled, making them the largest group of aliens as at 1983. In order to understand the alien expulsion order of 1983, it is also pertinent to understand the situation Nigeria found itself in 1983 internally, regionally and internationally.
The internal economic environment that precipitated an increase in the population of migrants that moved to Nigeria had changed. The previously buoyant economy began to slump by early 1981 as a result of an oil glut in the world market and a consequent fall in foreign exchange earnings. This was manifest in a reduction in growth rate and a change from a balance of payment surplus to a balance of payment deficit as well as a reduction in foreign exchange reserve and increase in public debt inflation rate. Austerity measures had to be put in place in reaction. During this time, unemployment reached an alarming rate and expelling aliens seemed a step in the direction of creating job opportunities for Nigerian citizens as Alhaji Ali Baba, the then Minister of internal affairs, alluded to.

Noteworthy is the political atmosphere that was prevalent at the time. 1983 was an election year. The unpopularity of the austerity budgets and the general economic situation necessitated some form of political manoeuvring in order for the government, which sought re-election, to fall back in favour with the electorate. In addition, there was rising tension in the country regarding the large immigrant presence in the country. In fact, the Internal Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives had presented a report on the influx of aliens into the country, where it was recommended that immigration officers be trained to use fire arms and immigration tribunals be formed to try immigration offences. In the light of this, there was the possibility that the opposition could use the “immigration crisis” as a major campaign issue to the detriment of the incumbent government during elections.

Also, there was the perception that the security situation in the country was worsening as a result of the activities of aliens. It could be argued that this thinking is consistent with
the general apportioning of blames, meted out on immigrants and aliens when there is a
deterioration of certain conditions within a society. There had been a religious riot in
Kano, Nigeria as at 1980 in which over 4,000 people were killed including some police
men and army personnel.\textsuperscript{14} This riot was led by a certain Mallam Muhammed Marwa,
also known as Maitasine who was a Cameroonian. It was believed that a certain
percentage of Muslim fanatics that participated in the riots were from neighbouring
African countries which included Chad, Niger, Cameroon, Mali and Upper Volta
(Burkina Faso).\textsuperscript{15} In addition, the aliens were blamed for armed robbery incidences
across the nation especially as it was reported that the robbery at the residence of Dr
Alex Ekueme (the then vice president) in January of 1983, was carried out by aliens
including Ghanaians. These happenings fed into the perception that aliens were a threat
to the security situation of Nigeria.

Regionally, there was the ECOWAS factor. As indicated earlier, the Protocol on Free
Movement of persons was already in place as at 1983, having been signed in 1979. The
protocol, coupled with the oil boom led to an increase in the number of migrants that
came into Nigeria. That being so, most of them were able to stay within the country and
work without permits, staying well over the 90day period within which they could reside
visa-free, as a result of non-implementation of the internal immigration laws. In spite of
this, a good number of them were gainfully employed in both professional and small
scale sectors.\textsuperscript{16}

In the manner that African economies are easily susceptible to changes in the world
economy as a result of their structure and the dependence of these countries on primary
goods, the oil glut of the early 1980’s led to a reduction in oil production which, in turn,
led to a drastic reduction in the Nigerian government revenue (from 9.825 billion naira in 1979 to 5.161 billion naira in 1982). This, in turn, had ramifications on the internal dynamics within the country that led to the expulsion. Foreign exchange earnings largely accrued from the sale of crude oil. This was drastically reduced when industrial consumer countries began finding substitutes and reducing their energy consumption. Contributing to the glut was crude oil from the North Sea and Alaska, especially as the administration of President Reagan of the United States had accelerated the decontrol of oil prices. The agricultural sector had been largely abandoned as a result of the oil boom and “the illusion of an autonomous Nigerian state able to accumulate and allocate limitless oil surpluses was debunked.” Accordingly, measures had to be put in place to cushion the effect of this change. Yeboah indicates that the government reduced expenditure and money supply, embarked upon massive retrenchments in the public sector and temporarily halted government institution recruitments. By the Economic Stabilization Act of 1982, imports were controlled, capital projects were deferred, government increased interest rates by 2 percent and external borrowing by state governments was restricted. Following from this, there were negotiations with the IMF for a standby credit.

3.2 The Nigerian Alien Expulsion Order of 1983

On the 17th of January 1983, the Nigerian Minister of Interior, Alhaji Ali Baba announced a decision of the government that, according to Aluko Olajide, “created the worst international crisis for Nigeria since the end of the Civil War in January 1970.” This decision was taken without adequate notice. The seeming spontaneity of this decision is evident in the fact that, according to Gravil R., key departments of the Nigerian government like the Ministry of External Affairs and the Department of
Immigration were actually left unaware of the order. The Ministry of External Affairs first heard about it on television just as the Police Force ‘came across it in the newspapers. ’\textsuperscript{22} There was no official notification sent to Nigeria’s embassies and high commissions as well. By the alien expulsion order of 1983, all illegal immigrants were expected to regularize their stay or leave the country within 2 weeks.\textsuperscript{23} The explanation given by the government was similar to the sort of justification given in some instances of alien expulsions.

Fore mostly, the aliens were ordered to leave because, per the Nigerian immigration law, their presence was illegal as they were unregistered.\textsuperscript{24} The decision was therefore made in an attempt to enforce Nigeria’s laws. Another prominent reason put forward by the authorities, was that the expulsion of aliens would better the deteriorating security and moral situation in the country. This was in the light of the recent religious riots, increase in armed robbery incidences and increase in hotels and patronage of prostitutes.\textsuperscript{25} Some scholars have however, questioned the plausibility of some of the reasons given in spite of the fact that the Nigerian government had the right to enforce its laws. The first of the religious riots that was said to have contributed to the situation of insecurity, took place 2 years before the Alien Expulsion Order. Considering this, Roger Gravil finds it is questionable that the government would wait for 2 years to act in this regard; expelling mostly Christian immigrants for something perpetrated mostly by Nigerian Muslim fanatics, although led by an alien.\textsuperscript{26} Adepoju also argues that, aside from religious fanaticism, socio-economic frustrations could be identified as having contributed to the religious riots especially as there was another wave of religious disturbances in 1982. The plausibility of this line of argument, arguably lies in the consideration that outbursts and conflicts that seem to be religious in nature at first glance, may have some socio-
economic undertone. Consequently, he notes that expelling aliens on this account would not prevent social upheavals.\textsuperscript{27}

As earlier mentioned, key ministries and departments were not made aware of the Alien Expulsion Order before the announcement by the Minister of Interior Alhaji Ali Baba on 17\textsuperscript{th} January 1983. This may lead one to believe that the decision was taken largely by the Minister and the Head of State, President Shehu Shagari. This brings to the fore, the place of the Head of Government in foreign policy formulation and decision making processes. This is especially as, according to Olajide Aluko, private consultations between Alhaji Ali Baba and President Shehu Shagari led to the approval of the decision.\textsuperscript{28} Aluko however accounts that some consultation may have taken place. According to him, the Federal Government had advised all diplomatic missions in Lagos to ensure proper registration of their nationals or have them deported as at late 1979.\textsuperscript{29} Also, he recounts that after the robbery attempt on the residence of the then vice-president’s home, ‘the Federal government immediately authorised the Ministry of Internal Affairs (the Ministry having primary responsibility for immigration and internal security) to tackle urgently how to deal with what it called ‘the menace of the Ghanaians and other illegal aliens in Nigeria.’’\textsuperscript{30} The recommendation made by the top civil servants of this ministry, initially confined to Ghanaians but later widened to include all other aliens illegally staying in Nigeria, was accepted and approved by the Minister and later, the president. This notwithstanding, it may be argued that the implementation of the decision was problematic because due consultation with other Ministries was not made, the number of aliens involved were under-estimated and the governments whose nationals were involved were not forewarned.\textsuperscript{31}
3.3 The Case of Ghana in Relation to the Alien Expulsion Order

It is important to state that the Expulsion Order, as announced by the Nigerian minister of Internal Affairs on 18 January 1983, was a general directive to all illegal and unskilled aliens resident in Nigeria at the time. In spite of this, it may be argued that the Ghanaian situation was somewhat peculiar. The peculiarity of the Ghanaian case in relation to this decision taken by the Nigerian government could be seen in a number of respects. In a direct manner, majority of the expelled aliens were Ghanaians. This is because, at the time, they made up majority of the aliens resident in Nigeria.\(^{32}\) It could therefore be inferred that they were the most affected group. Against the background of push-pull factors that influence migration motivation, a decline in the Ghanaian economy that began as from the 1960’s and the oil boom experienced by Nigeria in the 1970’s meant that a lot of Ghanaians moved to Nigeria.\(^{33}\) The formation of ECOWAS in 1975 and subsequent adoption of the Protocol of Free Movement of Persons in 1979 contributed to an increase in the number of Ghanaians that chose to migrate to Nigeria.\(^{34}\) This was the case such that the phrase *Ghana must go* was used to refer to the expulsion order and is still used in Nigeria to refer to the type of bag majority of the Ghanaians used during the mass exodus.\(^{35}\) In the light of this, it is necessary to present an overview of the nature of relations between Nigeria and Ghana at the time, within the context of the December 31\(^{st}\) 1981 coup in Ghana. This is in order to enable an understanding of the nature of Ghana-Nigeria relations as at 1983.

By late 1979, the two countries were under civilian governments; Ghana was under President Limann and Nigeria was under President Shehu Shagari. This facilitated smooth relations between them, evidenced by the restoration of the 3months supplier’s credit arrangement for the purchase of crude oil that had been suspended after the first
coup of Flt-Lt. Jerry Rawlings of Ghana.\textsuperscript{36} However, when Jerry Rawlings staged another \textit{coup d’État} in December 1981 that ousted the government of Limann, the government of Shagari disrupted oil supplies yet again. This signalled a reversal of friendly relations. Following from this, a change in the form of government in Ghana truncated the ideological affinity that both civilian regimes shared before the coup.\textsuperscript{37} Shagari’s government was therefore displeased with Rawlings’ coup. In addition, considering that this was the Cold War period, Rawlings’ government was viewed as operating based upon a quasi-Soviet system which the Nigerian government was against.\textsuperscript{38} With the Socialist rhetoric that was sounded in Accra and overtures towards Gadaffi’s Libya, relations were increasingly difficult. Relations were so tense that the Rawlings government had accused the Nigerian government of preparing to invade Ghana to restore Limann back to power.\textsuperscript{39} It was against this backdrop that the government of Nigeria was accused of deliberately expelling aliens so as to destabilize the government of J.J. Rawlings.

Within the sub-region, the Ghanaian government encountered some problems. Rawlings had suspected that political dissidents and elements that were planning to topple his government were being harboured in neighbouring countries including Nigeria, Togo and Cote d’Ivoire.\textsuperscript{40} Consequently, by September 1982, Ghana had closed its border with Togo.\textsuperscript{41} This led to difficulties in 1983 for the Ghanaian nationals. Considering that they had to pass through 2 countries to reach theirs by road, the authorities of the Republic of Benin refused entry to Ghanaians that wanted to return home, in order to prevent a back log of people. This was because the Togolese government had also closed their borders with Benin pending when the Ghanaian authorities opened theirs. As at the time that the Ghanaian border was opened 2 weeks after the Alien Expulsion Order had been
announced, the number of aliens at the border between Nigeria and Benin had reached over 400,000.\textsuperscript{42}

Furthermore, the economic situation in Ghana was harsh at the time. Ghana had to go to the IMF by which action, ‘‘a harsh deflationary program was embarked on.’’\textsuperscript{43} This program sought to compress domestic demand. As a result, the Cedi was devalued. Basic food commodities and essential commodities were scarce. Food crops were also in very limited supply as a result of the rain shortages, severe harmattan and bush fires of 1983. This meant that the return of over a million Ghanaians within a short span of time as a result of the Nigerian Alien Expulsion Order would have threatened to break down the already fragile economy. As Lynne Brydon put it, ‘’ there is no doubt that the sudden influx of over a million Ghanaians (roughly 10\% of the total population) into a food-and-commodity-short Ghana was a catastrophe.’’\textsuperscript{44}

3.4 Ghana’s Response to the Alien Expulsion Order

As a result of the Alien Expulsion order, there was a need to manage the large number of Ghanaian returnees that were coming in within a short span of time, considering that their lives and safety were at stake. The delay in opening the closed borders of transit countries between Nigeria and Ghana, resulted in hardship for the returnees travelling by road as they could neither proceed with their journey nor return back to Nigeria.\textsuperscript{45} The Ghanaian government therefore responded by taking responsibility and mobilizing resources to ensure the safe arrival of its nationals. The Ghanaian Times reports that a National Co-ordinating Committee which was split in 4 parts, to handle the evacuation and repatriation of the Ghanaian nationals from Nigeria and their rehabilitation in Ghana, was set up.\textsuperscript{46} An appeal was sent out to international agencies as well as UN countries for
food and medical aid. Ghanaians returned back by air, road and sea. Negotiations were made with the Togolese government for the opening of their border with Benin, just as Ghana opened its border with Togo. The Ghanaian government assisted by providing transportation from this border to the Trade fair site in Accra from where the returnees proceeded to their various towns and villages.\(^47\) The situation was such that by July 1983, the ‘problem’ of the returnees seemed to have abated.\(^48\) Lynne Brydon indicates that the timely manner with which the committee was constituted and the efficiency with which members of the committee dispensed their ‘ad-hoc’ duty, contributed to reduction in the misery that the returnees could have experienced.\(^49\) The Red Cross, Women Groups, Ghanaian Churches also made their contribution to alleviating the situation.\(^50\)

Having taken responsibility, the Ghanaian government also made representations to its Nigerian counterpart, reminding the government of its responsibility to ensure the safety of Ghanaians awaiting evacuation.\(^51\) It may be argued therefore, that responsibility owed to the expelled Ghanaian nationals and concern for their welfare and safety was viewed as imperative and as such, influenced the government response. Following from this, the response projected the national security concerns of the Ghanaian government given that the safety of its nationals were at stake. Worthy of note is the fact that the emergency situation resulting from the bush fires, drought and famine, and the return of the Ghanaian nationals in 1983, contributed to the reasons why the National Disaster Management Organization (NADMO) was formed.\(^52\)

Indeed, this response from the Ghanaian government relates to a state’s responsibility to its citizens. In 1972 when Idi Amin expelled Asians from Uganda, the British government recognized its ‘moral and international legal obligations to accommodate
British passport holders from Uganda,’ given as they were British nationals.\textsuperscript{53} In the same vein, in the case between Nigeria and Guinea in 1975, Nigeria took responsibility for the evacuation of close to 30,000 of its nationals who were ill treated and suppressed under the dictatorship of Macias Nguema.\textsuperscript{54} Nevertheless, the response of Ghana differs from these cases when the effect on diplomatic relations is considered.

As alluded to earlier, in instances of expulsion like the Ugandan expulsion of Asians or where an alien population is compelled to migrate like the case between Nigeria and Guinea, there are implications for diplomatic relations between the countries involved. This is manifested in some form of hostile response towards the sending state, from the state whose nationals are affected. Thus, as a result of the expulsion of Asians in 1972, Britain cancelled a £10 million development loan and wound down aid and training programmes with Uganda.\textsuperscript{55} Already shaky diplomatic relations between Nigeria and Guinea worsened in 1975, when Nigeria had to evacuate its nationals.\textsuperscript{56} The implementation of Ghana’s Aliens Compliance Order in 1969 under Busia, contributed to the expulsion of Ghanaian fishermen from the Democratic Republic of Congo (then Zaire), Sierra Leone, Liberia.\textsuperscript{57}

However, in relation to Ghana’s response to the Alien Expulsion Order, beyond the setting up of a National Emergency Relief Committee to deal with the expected returnees, there was no official reaction that would have contributed to the worsening of already fragile diplomatic relations with Nigeria.\textsuperscript{58} It may therefore be argued that there was a deviation from the hostile response towards the sending or expelling country as in some other cases. The Ghanaian government was clearly dissatisfied with Nigeria’s decision to expel aliens. This dissatisfaction was manifest in the sentiment expressed by
Jerry Rawlings who saw the aliens order as a plot to destabilize his government\(^59\) and accused the Nigerian government of enacting the expulsion order ‘as part of an elaborate international conspiracy, to infiltrate his country with mercenaries.’\(^60\)

According to Mr Johnny Hansen who was the Ghanaian Secretary for International Affairs at the time, the decision to expel aliens by Nigeria created a ‘national crisis’ for Ghana.\(^61\) More so as the economic situation in the country was unfavourable. Irrespective of all this, by and large, diplomatic channels remained open as the foreign ministries in Accra and Lagos were in close contact.\(^62\)

It may be argued that the consideration of the safety of the Ghanaian nationals came over and above the possibility of a hostile diplomatic response. According to Osei D.K.\((\text{who served on the National Co-ordinating Committee that was billed with aiding the repatriation of Ghanaian nationals}),\) the work of the Committee would have been extremely problematic if diplomatic relations had been severed.\(^63\) In addition, according to a reliable source working at the Ghana High Commission in Nigeria at the time, diplomatic relations and communication seemed to continue as normal apart from the mobilization in place to send Ghanaian nationals back home.\(^64\) These views are supported by a report in the *Africa Now* news magazine which stated that ‘The charge by the Ghanaian leader that Nigeria had hatched a conspiracy against Ghana and was sending back subversives to infiltrate the PNDC government bore no relation to the attitude of the Ghanaian government officials in Lagos who came to seek clarification of certain matters—at least not at the level of Ministry of External Affairs.’\(^65\) Following from this, it may be argued that the Ghanaian government’s response was necessitated by a need to ensure the safety of its nationals; and that this objective could have been hampered if a hostile diplomatic response followed. Against this background a
diplomatic response may have been to the disadvantage of Ghana and may have contributed to the difficulty the affected Ghanaians encountered in returning home considering that communication was essential in facilitating their return. In addition, the government responsible for implementing the Expulsion Order did not last long enough to be at the receiving end of a hostile diplomatic response, in the event that Ghana opted to take further action. Beyond this, there are some factors which need to be considered.

In further investigating why Ghana’s response did not go beyond a decision to handle the situation by setting up a committee to ensure the safe return of its nationals, an examination of the operational environment within which this decision was taken, is necessary. This is in order to identify relevant factors that constrained Ghana’s options in responding to the alien expulsion order, such that there was a deviation from the norm of hostility towards the sending country.

3.4.1 Operational Environment of the Decision

The environment or setting within which the decision made by the Ghanaian government in response to the Nigerian Alien Expulsion Order may be situated, operates at two levels: external and internal environment.  

3.4.1.1 External Environment

The external environment refers to conditions and relationships that exist beyond the territorial boundaries of a state which could be Global, Subordinate or Continental, Subordinate Other (or sub-regional), and Bilateral including Dominant Bilateral (relationship between a state and a super power). The analysis revealed that the
Bilateral and Subordinate Other or Sub-Regional Levels strongly influenced why there was no hostile diplomatic response from Ghana.

In relation to the bilateral level, Ghana’s reaction to the decision of the Nigerian government may be understood against the backdrop of Ghana’s Aliens Compliance Order of 1969. Under the Ghanaian government led by President Kofi Busia, aliens were, in 1969, required to regularize their stay or leave within 2 weeks. Majority of those affected happened to be Nigerians. Indeed, similarities may be drawn between the two cases. Ghana at the time, was experiencing economic difficulties and a high rate of unemployment for which the aliens were blamed. Given this background, Daouda Gary-Tounkara opines that the decision was a nationalist revenge against Ghana and a political calculation by the Nigerian government. As such, he argues that the Nigerian Alien Expulsion Order was really a retaliation for the Aliens Compliance Order. If this is the case, it follows that, embedded within Ghana’s response was a recognition of the fact that since it had carried out a similar action in the past, the principle of reciprocity had evened them out. The use of expulsion for retaliatory purposes is identifiable in history. ‘In 1978 Gabon expelled Benin nationals in retaliation for a Beninois condemnation of Gabon at an OAU meeting’ and Ghana’s 1969 Aliens Compliance Order contributed to the the expulsion of Ghanaian fishermen from the Democratic Republic of Congo (then Zaire), Sierra Leone, Liberia. Against this backdrop, the argument that Nigeria expelled illegal aliens in retaliation for Ghana’s similar action years ago, is plausible.

On the other hand, Roger Gravil argues that the Nigerian decision was more circumstantial than retaliatory, taking the timing into consideration. In addition, Olajide Aluko indicates that the Shagari government would not have been opposed to collapsing
the Rawlings regime considering already strained relations between Accra and Lagos since the ousting of Limann’s government.\textsuperscript{74} This, therefore, hints at the fact that the timing of the Alien Expulsion Order may not be divorced from circumstances prevalent at the time, and were triggered by same. To say, therefore, that the decision was retaliatory may lead one to play down on the significance of the timing and context. Either way, it may be argued that because Ghana had taken a similar action against illegal aliens in the past that affected mostly Nigerians, there were no moral grounds to react in such a manner that would have aggravated the situation when Nigeria did same.\textsuperscript{75} As such, although there was the option of expressing discontent for the Expulsion Order by reacting in a hostile manner towards Nigeria, Ghana’s response was restricted to containing the situation created by the Nigeria’s actions.

Also, in spite of the fact that Jerry Rawlings perceived the Expulsion Order as a plot to topple his government, it may be argued that the Ghanaian response was influenced by the fact that Nigeria was implementing its immigration laws on a segment of migrant population that were, in fact, illegal.\textsuperscript{76} Indeed, this was one of the official explanations given by the Nigerian authorities. According to Aremu Olaosebikan, the government was simply implementing the Nigerian immigration law of 1963 which was in accordance with its national interest.\textsuperscript{77} A state has the right to enact its laws. As such, the fact that Ghanaian nationals who were affected by the Expulsion Order were those who had not regularized their stay in accordance with Nigeria’s internal laws, provided a legitimate reason for Nigeria to take action. The manner in which the law was implemented created problems for those affected. This is because there was no prior warning or official notice given to the Ghanaian government, or any of the other governments that were affected.\textsuperscript{78} In spite of this, the fact that Nigeria was implementing its law served to legitimate the
decision, thus explaining why Ghana did not respond beyond taking responsibility for its affected citizens.\textsuperscript{79}

In addition, it is arguable that the relations between Ghana and Nigeria have been largely cordial and cooperative, although there have been points of discord.\textsuperscript{80} The nature of relations have been largely affected by the relationship of the governments in power. In addition, there is the sentiment that commonalities like the shared colonial history between the 2 countries have created an affinity towards cooperation in their relations.\textsuperscript{81} In fact their historical ties date back to pre-colonial times. The \textit{Ogonis}, a community in the Niger-Delta area of Nigeria, are said to have migrated from Ghana.\textsuperscript{82} There is also a historical link between the \textit{Ga} people of Greater-Accra region in Ghana and \textit{Yorubas} of Ile-Ife in Nigeria.\textsuperscript{83} As a result, some have argued that this affinity accounts for why conflicts between the two countries do not usually escalate beyond reconcilable confines. For instance, in the 1980’s, a disagreement between the two countries at the All African Games in Lagos which arose as a result of Ghana’s defeat of the Nigerian national football team and the subsequent burning of Ghanaian buses, was timely resolved.\textsuperscript{84} Whereas, when a similar incident occurred in 1993 between Ghana and Cote d’Ivoire (when the Ivorian team was eliminated from a championship football match that took place in Kumasi, Ghana), the feud that ensued quickly escalated and was such that it took the intervention of a Togolese delegation to intervene and resolve it.\textsuperscript{85} Following from this, irrespective of the already hostile relations between Shehu Shagari and Jerry Rawlings and the fact that the Expulsion Order created difficulties for Ghana, it may be argued that the affinity between the two countries contributed to why Ghana did not respond in such a manner that would have worsened relations between them.\textsuperscript{86}
In addition, at that time, behind the scene negotiations were being carried out by Ghanaian representatives in Nigeria for the restoration of the supply of oil under the dispensation that prevailed in erstwhile times, under Hilla Limann. These negotiations were difficult given the state of relations between the two governments. Shagari’s government was not supportive of Rawlings regime and its actions showed that it was not opposed to collapsing the regime since the ousting of Limann’s government. In the light of this, a hostile response from Ghana would have served to worsen an already difficult situation.

At the sub-regional level, given that Nigeria and Ghana were members of ECOWAS whose member states were mostly affected by Nigeria’s decision, the reaction to the Expulsion Order at this level is worthy of consideration. Within ECOWAS, there were concerns as to the effect that the expulsion would have on regional integration and the ECOWAS Protocol on Free Movement of Persons. According to Olajide Aluko, top officials at the Nigeria Ministry of External Affairs feared that their contribution to the establishment of ECOWAS may be threatened. These concerns led the then ECOWAS Chairman, President Mathieu Kerekou of Benin to visit Shehu Shagari on the matter. The ECOWAS Protocol on Free Movement of Persons recognized that ‘community citizens’ could stay in other countries for a 3month visa free period. Beyond this period, they had to regularize their stay based on the internal laws of the country. Following from this, it was established that the Alien Expulsion was not clashing with the Protocol agreement. As a result, it may be argued that Ghana’s response was influenced by this understanding within the sub-region, more so as most ECOWAS countries recognized that Nigeria acted within the requirements of the protocol.
This recognition, however, did not preclude initial hostile reactions from some West African countries. President Traore of Mali and President Bongo of Gabon cancelled their planned visits to Nigeria. There was also a general dissatisfaction with the sudden nature and short time frame within which the aliens were expected to leave. Although the Expulsion Order did not contravene the ECOWAS Protocol, there was a stipulation therein that where ECOWAS citizens are to be expelled or deported, such decision to expel should be communicated to the citizen, his government, and the executive secretary of the organization. Given that the Nigerian government failed to do this, there were concerns as to the fate of millions of Nigerians who were illegal aliens in African countries that were affected by the decision of the Nigerian government. Against this background, the 2 weeks initially given within which the illegal aliens were to either regularize their stay or leave, was extended to one month for more qualified foreigners. Also, the Nigerian government arranged to send delegations to many African capitals to explain the decision in addition to which a $1 million cheque was presented to the ECOWAS Chairman, President Kerekou of Benin, to pacify the feelings of other ECOWAS states. Although the government of Ghana rejected any money from Nigeria, it may be argued that this reconsideration on the part of the Nigerian government contributed to why Ghana did not react in such a manner that would have altered diplomatic relations for the worse.

3.4.1.2 Internal Environment

In relation to internal considerations, the study considered the following variables: Military Capability, Economic Capability, Political Structure, Interest Groups and Competing Elites. However, the analysis revealed that Economic Capability and Interest Groups strongly influenced Ghana’s response.
Internal economic hiccups experienced by Ghana served as a push factor for both skilled and unskilled Ghanaian nationals to leave the country to more attractive conditions in Nigeria. According to Godwin Amonzem, one may contend that the decision made by the Nigerian government facilitated the return of the much needed man power and human resource that was needed to contribute to Ghana’s economic growth. Indeed, Daouda Gary-Tounkara indicates that Jerry Rawlings ‘called on his fellow citizens to return to Ghana in order to build an egalitarian society.’ In this regard, the Expulsion Order was beneficial in the sense that Ghanaian nationals whose input was needed in building the economy but would have ordinarily stayed away because of unfavourable conditions at home, were compelled to return. Thus, Ghana’s response to the Expulsion Order was to facilitate this return.

At the level of interest groups, the nature of the report sent by Ghana’s representatives in Nigeria to the home government, influenced Ghana’s response. Ghana was under a military regime at the time, under the Provisional National Defence Council (PNDC) led by Flt Lt Jerry Rawlings. In the political structure of the PNDC, there was a council of seven and later, ten members who took major decisions, and there were secretaries that constituted what was known as the Committee of Secretaries who were in charge of various ministries. Following from this, it is challenging to know the exact decision making elite responsible for the decision to set up the National Relief Committee and not respond in such a manner that would have worsened diplomatic relations between Nigeria and Ghana. However, the initial reaction from Flt Lt Jerry Rawlings was an accusation of the Nigerian government of taking the decision in order to destabilize his government. About 2 weeks after that, the government had set up a committee to manage the returnees beyond which, there was no further action following the initial voiced out
sentiment. It may be argued that a perception of the overall situation is accountable for this.

The Ghana High Commission in Nigeria, sent a report to the home government, assessing the situation. The nature of the report sent was an overview of the situation with an explanation as to the time limit given by the Nigerian authorities, an estimation of the expected number of Ghanaians that would be affected (over a million), logistics needed, recommendation to the government to negotiate with neighbouring Togo in order for closed borders to be open and the need for travel documents to be prepared for those affected. The actors at this level were able to suggest actions to be taken in this situation thus influencing the outcome of decisions, based on an understanding of the operational environment. As such, from the outcome of Ghana’s decision, one could say that these recommendations were considered. It may be argued that an overall understanding of the situation which the Expulsion Order created influenced the Ghanaian response.

Aside the fact that this period signalled a difficult point, the relations between Nigeria-Ghana later normalized. The government of President Shehu Shagari was, on 31 December 1983, toppled in a coup d’état led by General Muhammed Buhari. The change in government meant that Lagos and Accra could relate on the same ideological plane, considering that they were both military regimes. After the dust of the first expulsion order had settled, a number of Ghanaians began returning back to Nigeria. As a result of this, a second expulsion order was given yet again by the military government in 1985. The approach to the second order was slightly different as the Nigerian government had to clarify intentions on the issue. This regime, however, did not last
for long. The Buhari-led military junta was toppled by a bloodless coup in 1985. The Babangida led military government that emerged ushered the possibility of increasingly better relations between Accra and Lagos. Indeed, this was the case as Jerry Rawlings paid an official visit to Nigeria which Babangida returned. In addition, in April 1988, both countries established a Joint Commission for bi-lateral co-operation, there was supply of petroleum products to Ghana and both leaders regularly consulted one another on issues that affected both their countries.  

In sum, one may argue that the response of the Ghanaian government demonstrated concern for the safety of its nationals. The mobilization of resources and negotiations carried out with neighbouring countries for the opening of their closed borders was in order to facilitate and ease the return of Ghanaian nationals. However, considering that the Ghanaian government was dissatisfied with the decision and Rawlings was convinced that the Expulsion Order was directed at his government, there was a deviation from the hostile responses exhibited towards the expelling or sending state in some cases of expulsion. This is to the extent that, although the Ghanaian government condemned Nigeria for the expulsion, there was no further response or diplomatic reaction. The factors examined in this chapter showed that internal and external variables influenced why there was no hostile diplomatic response from Ghana.
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CHAPTER FOUR
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.0 Introduction

This chapter is divided into three parts consisting of summary of findings, conclusion and recommendation.

4.1 Summary of Findings

This study examined the Nigerian Alien Expulsion of 1983, Ghana’s response to the expulsion order and why this response deviated from the norm of hostility towards the sending nation as exhibited in similar cases. The study was based on the premise that national security concerns and the operational environment within which Ghana responded largely account for its non-hostile diplomatic response to Nigeria’s implementation of the Alien Expulsion Order of 1983.

The study began with an overview of alien migration and how expulsion features therein. It revealed that where alien population were expelled or forced to migrate, the countries whose nationals were affected responded in a hostile manner towards the sending nation, leading to a deterioration of diplomatic relations. Following from this, the study examined Nigeria’s Alien Expulsion Order of 1983 focusing on how Ghana responded to it. This is because, Ghanaian nationals made up majority of those affected by the decision. It was discovered that the response, apart from the backlash from Ghana’s Head of State at the time, deviated from the hostile response to the sending nation, when compared to other cases. In investigating why, the study employed Michael Bretcher’s input-output approach to the study of foreign policy. This approach helped to explain the
immediate Ghanaian response and identify internal and external factors which accounted for why Ghana did not take any further action that would have worsened already fragile diplomatic relations.

The study revealed that expulsion as a form of migration control, has been employed at different points in history to various ends which could be political or economic. Expulsion has also been used by states that perceive their internal economic and security positions are threatened by migrant population residents within their territories. Cases of alien expulsion represent instances where diplomatic relations have deteriorated between the states involved. This is usually as a result of the hostile reaction from the state whose nationals are affected, towards the sending nation. The study examined the case of the Nigerian Alien Expulsion Order of 1983, which stands out amongst cases of alien expulsions within the West African sub-region, because of the large population affected.

- The Nigerian Alien Expulsion Order of 1983 was a general directive to all illegal aliens in Nigeria at the time. Nevertheless, majority of those affected were nationals of neighbouring West African countries. The study found that the reason for this can be traced to the nature and the changing patterns of migration within the sub-region from pre-colonial times, up to the immediate post-independence period. Additionally, the atmosphere created by the ECOWAS Protocol on Free Movement of People and Goods in the late 1970’s at a time when Ghana, Togo, Benin and other ECOWAS states faced economic decline led to an influx into Nigeria with its oil boom.
• In examining the circumstances that triggered the Expulsion Order, the study found that the price of crude oil, which was the base of the Nigerian economy, began to fluctuate on the international market leading to economic difficulties in the country against the backdrop of widespread corruption and upcoming elections. As such, the government was compelled to take action, resulting in the Alien Expulsion Order.

• It was also established that majority of those affected by the Nigerian Alien Expulsion Order were Ghanaian nationals. The Ghanaian situation was peculiar as a result of the fact that Ghanaians made up majority of the illegal aliens resident in Nigeria at the time. Also, the fact that Togo and Benin (the transit countries between Nigeria and Ghana) had closed their land borders, created difficulties for the returnees. In addition, relations with the Nigerian government were difficult as the incumbent Ghanaian government under Flt Lt Jerry Rawlings had ousted the previous government under Dr. Hilla Limann, with whom Nigeria’s Shehu Shagari had good relations, in a military coup.

• The reactions and responses that the Expulsion Order elicited were also examined with focus on its link to Ghana. Jerry Rawlings of Ghana perceived the decision as an attempt by Shehu Shagari to destabilize his government. This was against the backdrop of the difficult relations prevailing between the two governments. Ghana responded by setting up a committee that was to coordinate the safe arrival of its nationals who were affected by the Nigerian decision.
The study found that Ghana’s response deviated from the norm of hostility that could have worsened already fragile relations as in other cases of alien expulsion that were examined. Ghana’s response involved the setting up of a National Committee to manage the affairs of Ghanaian returnees and the mobilization of resources to this end projected the national security concerns of the government. By so doing, Ghana exhibited responsibility for the safety and wellbeing of its nationals. As such, this may have been seen as more important than a hostile diplomatic response which, in any case, could have made communication necessary for the successful evacuation of the Ghanaians, difficult. Against this background a negative diplomatic response may have been to the disadvantage of Ghana.

The study examined factors explaining Ghana’s divergent response using the input-output approach to foreign policy analysis. An examination of the setting or operational environment within which Ghana responded revealed both external and internal variables that constrained Ghana from taking any action that could have worsened diplomatic relations with Nigeria on account of the Expulsion Order.

The study found that, externally, issues at the bilateral and sub-regional level were relevant. At the bilateral level, the study found that Ghana had taken a similar action in 1969 that affected Nigeria. The circumstances were similar and most of the illegal aliens expelled from Ghana, were Nigerians. As such, the Nigerian Expulsion made them even. Also, Nigeria was implementing its internal immigration laws, which legitimized its decision to expel aliens. In addition, the affinity between the two countries is such that misunderstandings between them
are timely resolved. This contributed to why Ghana did not take further action that could have further deteriorated relations with Nigeria. At the sub-regional level, other ECOWAS countries that were similarly affected recognized that the Expulsion Order did not contravene the ECOWAS Protocol on Free Movement. This understanding and the attempt by the Nigerian government to pacify the governments whose nationals were affected also had a part to play.

- At the internal level, the study found that Ghana’s economic capability and interest groups of which bureaucratic organizations within the state are part, were relevant. The economic situation in Ghana at the time meant that the returnees were needed to help rebuild the economy. From this perspective, the Expulsion Order contributed to the return of Ghanaian nationals who ordinarily would not have returned at this time. Considering that there was an advantage to this, it was more beneficial to concentrate on their return. In addition, the assessment of the situation by Ghana’s representative in Nigeria at the time, which considered the overall environment, contributed to Ghana’s response.

4.2 Conclusion

Following from this, it is evident that Ghana’s response was influenced by an appreciation of the circumstances surrounding the situation. The involvement of the government in facilitating the return of its affected nationals was influenced by an understanding of the fact that the safety of the returnees was at stake. In the same vein, an examination of the operational environment within which Ghana responded revealed that, although Ghana could have taken further action to express dissatisfaction with the Expulsion Order, certain factors influenced its options, thus limiting them, and confining
its response to the decision to set up the National Committee. It is therefore true to assert that the national security concerns and the operational environment within which Ghana responded largely account for its non-hostile diplomatic response to Nigeria’s implementation of the Alien Expulsion Order of 1983.

4.3 Recommendations

Based upon the findings of this study, the following recommendation has been made:

- Decision-making elites such as the Head of Government, should consider the suggestions of actors at the relevant bureaucratic organizations before taking foreign policy decisions. This is because, actors at the bureaucratic organizational level which include ministries, and representatives of the government in its embassies abroad, usually have an overall understanding of the operational environment and are able to advise appropriately. Good communication flow between these two units is therefore important for effective foreign policy decision making.

- Peculiar internal and external factors should be considered in order for effective foreign policy decisions to be taken.
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