

NIGERIA-GHANA RELATIONS: PERSPECTIVES FROM THE 1969 EXPULSION OF NIGERIAN'S IN GHANA

Alazor, Chinwe A.

Department of History and International Studies, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State
ca.alazor@unizik.edu.ng

Abstract

Nigeria and Ghana have had a longstanding relationship having experienced a common imperial domination. The two countries were also eminent in African nationalist movements and were core supporters of the ideology of Pan Africanism in the pre and post independent Africa. In spite of this past collective efforts, Nigeria and Ghana relations began to dwindle into antagonism, rift and mutual suspicion, thus undermining and stifling the objectives of the Organisation of African unity and the idea of Pan African movement. The study adopts a narrative research analysis and employed both primary such as archival materials and newspapers; and secondary sources like journal articles, books, institutional project reports, internet publications and academic projects to provide a historical insight of the post African independence challenges. This among other things encouraged massive labour migration among African nations particularly between Nigeria and Ghana, which later resulted into migrants expulsion from Ghana in 1969 that involved mostly Nigerians. The paper applied the Alexander Wendt's Constructivist theory to explain migrant's expulsion from Ghana during the period under study and finds that the expulsion of 1969 set a negative example for other struggling African countries and made a caricature of the objectives of the OAU. It however points out that continental unity cannot be obtained in the midst of antagonism and rigour; and as such, African nations should rise above national differences and ethnic challenges to form a formidable economic front with strict and promising leadership for eventual achievement of African's economic development.

Keywords: *Ghana, Migration, Nigeria, Pan-Africanism*

JEL Codes: *F15, F22, F63*

Introduction

Africa consists of fifty-four countries most of which had been colonized by various European countries like the British, French, Belgium and the Portuguese. Before the advent of colonialism, African regions have had relations with one another particularly by economic and social interactions across the Sahara desert. Ancient kingdoms like Songhai, Dahomey, Asanti, Oyo, etc. rose as a result of their trading relations that brought wealth to these ancient kingdoms. Colonialism however created boundaries and divisions thereby alienating people of the same racial stock. Racism as well as colonial administrative policies orchestrated and motivated the spread of Pan-African Movement from the West Indies to Africa by people like Marcus Garvey, Henry Sylvester Williams, Casely Hayford, Nnamdi Azikiwe, and Kwame Nkrumah among others (Eze, 2013).

Pan-Africanism is simply an expression of a desire for African unity. It can also be viewed in a broader way as an idea of common brotherhood and solidarity of black peoples all over the world for the rehabilitation of African past (Asiwaju and Crowder, 1980). Pan-Africanism as a

movement started by African slave descendants in the United States of America. It was a movement born out of the dissatisfaction by Africans in the diaspora and African elites alike such as W.E.B Du Bois, Marcus Garvey, Nnamdi Azikiwe, Kwame Nkrumah, Jomo Kenyatta, etc. Conferences were organized under this movement where a sense of solidarity of all peoples of African descent was preached. This was the first pronounced movement that was geared towards the decolonization of Africa. Pan-Africanism was an epiphany that enshrined the fight against colonization and motivated the formation of nationalist movements all over Africa (Asiwaju and Crowder, 1980).

At the embryonic stage of independence of African countries, the continent was engrossed in the noble dream of better economic and social development, but was confronted with unfortunate challenges such as inexperienced leaders, mass illiteracy, regional crisis, debt, poverty, underdevelopment, colonial heritage and neo-colonialism. During colonial era, Africa was dominated by the Europeans who monopolized the African economy and occupied superior and relevant economic and political positions in Africa; while relegating Africans to hewers of wood and drawers of water. Africa, apart from agriculture, based their economy on the extraction of raw materials which the European colonists monopolized, exploited and transported to Europe for production into finished goods to sell back to Africans on European economic terms. Africans were given little or no opportunity to gain experience on the rudiments of good governance and economic development, thus the post independent African leaders found themselves unequipped grappling with statecraft and economic/social challenges.

Africa at independence was faced with a new economic system which was peculiar to them. Independent African leaders at the time knew the importance of African integration as collective force against European economic control. Their desire and struggle was visible in the establishment of OAU in 1963 as well as other regional organisations later on. Although the pioneer independent African leaders had their shortcomings, they strived towards building a united Africa, unlike their successors who became more nationalistic in their dealings with other African States. The growing nationalistic tendencies among African States could also be as a result of underlying fear of domination of weaker African countries by stronger ones especially those of them that were propagators of African integration (like Ghana and Nigeria). Major independent African leaders also became silently competitive as to who becomes African leader.

Biney, Hajj Sanusi & Adu-Gyamfi have all supported that Ghana since the time of Nkrumah has established itself as the political leader of Africa, working for the unity of Africa. It is also included in Ghana's foreign policy objectives that Ghana will strengthen the socioeconomic development and restructuring of international economic system and international cooperation with all countries that have the desire, as well as obey the treaties of the various organisations they belong to (Sanusi & Adu-Gyamfi, 2017). While Ghana prides itself with the position of African Leader, it is yet to implement all the phases of ECOWAS Free Movement protocol, which is the main policy that allows for regional cooperation and collective development of Africa. Other countries of Africa are also guilty of this perhaps due to lack of harmonisation of immigration policies in Africa.

Some scholars pointed to the recent inflow of diseases in Africa, usually transferred through border crossing. With Ebola and the coronavirus pandemic, migrants are seen as disease carriers

and are often denied the proper flow of movement across African countries. (Zanker, Arhin-sam, and Jegan, 2020). These issues have risen because there is no harmonisation of policies among African regional groups. Countries are left to protect their borders the way they deem fit without recourse to the free movement protocol. Fagbyibo in agreement to the writings of Zanker *et al* states that inasmuch as some African regional organisations allows for some form of free movement of persons, “there is no definitive continental legal framework” (Fagbayibo, 2015). An effective and collective framework on the free movement of persons through the coordination of the African Union is the key solution towards combating this problem. By extension, Lorah Chepkorir supports that harmonisation of migration policies within the region would curtail human right violation, xenophobia, racism and discrimination (Chepkorir, 2011). It will ensure collective respect and protection of all persons irrespective of their nationality, gender, race and ethnic differentiation.

However, Nigeria and Ghana, the two major African countries that fought for decolonization of Africa, supported and propagated the idea of Pan Africanism and pioneered the establishment of Organization of African Unity (OAU) had unfortunately fell into the spell of aloofness and insensibility and could not maintain cordial and peaceful relationship. A lot of antagonism and bickering had ensued over the years between these countries at specific periods such as the expulsion of Nigerians from Ghana in 1969, the expulsion of Ghanaians from Nigeria in 1983 and the sporadic xenophobic attacks which most recently happened in 2020. In discussing the 1969 expulsion of Nigerians from Ghana, it should be noted that issues of antagonism had ensued even before the expulsion. But the expulsion showcased how far Africa was in actualising a united Africa fit for self-economic development. The study thus examines the cause and effect of the 1969 expulsion on both countries; how it has smeared their relationship and discouraged other African nations from pursuing the desire for the actualization of African unity in line with the dream behind the formation of OAU.

Theoretical Framework

Alexander Wendt’s Constructivist Theory is a theory of international relations. It was first published in Alexander Wendt’s work ‘Anarchy is What the States Make of it’ in 1992 (Mengshu, 2020). The theory is of the opinion that the structures of human association are determined primarily by shared ideas rather than material forces. He disagrees with the idea that the structures of human association are constructed by material phenomena as was proposed by neorealist and neoliberals; though he believes that the material element exists and cannot be ignored, but shared ideas are the most important elements in international relations. He is of the opinion that national interests are constructed by shared ideas rather than material factors.

Constructivism views the world as socially constructed. Constructivists go beyond material factors but more on the effects of ideas and beliefs in world politics. That is to say that what is real in world politics is always subjected to changes depending on the ideas and beliefs of actors at the time. This leads to Wendt’s position that “Anarchy is what the State make of it” (Wendt, 2018); this explains that anarchy can thus be interpreted in different ways depending on what the actors involved term or describe it as. Constructivist theory discusses issues about identities, interest and norms, which is said to be central to the theory. It beliefs that States can have multiple socially constructed identities by their interactions with other actors. Here, identities

represent how actors understand who they are; which usually determines their interest, meaning that actor's identity determines their interests and actions.

Norms on the other hand are appropriate or expected behaviours for actors with a particular identity; meaning that actors with certain identities have expected norms that are associated with them. Constructivism therefore sees beyond material reality but dwells more on the effects of ideas and beliefs of actors on world politics. Succinctly put, constructivism explains that in international relations, states or other actors are able to relate based on mutual ideology or shared ideas. Actors with ideological differences hardly cooperate and would always end up on a conflicting ground. This can be related to the problem of African unity and was first exhibited during the process of the establishment of OAU when divided ideologies – the Casablanca group, Brazzaville group and the Monrovia group emerged. This division in ideology formation has continued to linger in the affairs of African relations and has hindered cooperation and encouraged antagonism and suspicion. The major interest of a state is survival, independence; economic wellbeing and collective self-esteem (Mengshu, 2020). Nigeria and Ghana may have disagreed over the nature of African unity, which perhaps contributed to the difficulty of having a common ideology. The fact remains that both countries as well as other countries in Africa desire to have a united Africa without foreign exploitations; they also have the knowledge of who they are- identity; what they want- interest, but perhaps have no ideas that may illicit profitable action. However, Wendt may not have recognised the fact that identity and interest may not always result into action. It is a fact that identity and interest work interchangeably; but may not always result to profitable actions if the actors are clueless to the 'how' of their interest. In the case of Africa, Ghana and Nigeria in particular, the actors (i.e. their leaders) are perhaps not interested in the continental shared ideas but are more interested the indiscriminate amassing of national wealth for individual interest. This is why most actions of African leaders differ from their policies. These can consequently affect the shared interest of nations.

Literature Review

Since the independence of African countries, challenges have ensued especially as it concerns national leadership and interest, poverty, gross insecurity, and retrogressive economic development. These have over the years shaped the history and structure of Africa and have also formed a formidable challenge to the proper integration of Africa. Some scholarly works have deduced that national interest or rather political leaders personal interest in Africa have overshadowed the interest and development of the ordinary people in the society; while some others prefer to blame past history of societies for underdevelopment, as in the case of Africa, the European slave trade and colonial rule. The tragedy of inequality between the ruling class and the citizens, where the rich few get richer and the majority poor get poorer is the unfortunate situation of Africa, especially in the Sub-Saharan Africa. Perhaps this is why Acemoglu and Robinson in *Why Nations Fail* explain world inequality and the truth behind inequalities among nations of the world. In their opinion, "poor countries are poor because those in power make choices that create poverty" (Acemoglu and Robinson, 2013). Needless to say that the political influences the economic and social aspects as it drives a nation and shapes the content of the society. Although people are said to develop at their own pace, irrespective of the material and human resources available to them; development can thus be affected but not hindered by geography/climate, culture/religion, or ignorance (Acemoglu and Robinson, 2013).

To Paul Areo, however, “all nations are products of their past and there is no way they can move forward without taking into consideration their history and their peculiar circumstances” (Areo, 2017: 27). To him, the past still lives in the present. Inasmuch as the past can affect a people as Paul envisaged, it is better to take this view with a pinch of salt because as they say, the past is in your head, the future is in your hands. The past is not supposed to control the future, rather people control the future; in this case the political leaders control the future of their society and as such should be held responsible for unfavourable behaviours and decisions. It only requires the willingness of political leaders to harness available resources for development and total wellbeing of the populace. Considering these views with the reality of African situation, it can be perhaps concluded that African political leaders have not done their best to develop Africa. They still allow religious and ethnic differences to affect their national policies (Nigeria for example). Also, personal and political party interest has overtaken national interest, and this is evident in the ways in which resources are distributed and opportunities made available to the people. On Africa’s integration, Ghana and Nigeria have been in the fore front of African quest for unity, from the Pan African movement, the independence period, to the formation of integrating groups of OAU and ECOWAS. Both countries have claimed to continue to protect and propagate Africa’s integration agenda as found in their foreign policy objectives. The question is, to what extent are their pro-African policies apparent in their regional affairs, particularly the Free Movement Protocol.

Conclusively, African countries are conformations of different ethnic groups under one nationality. The major problem of Africa’s integration is imbedded on the various national political problems which are yet to be resolved, as well as on the diverging national interests that have overshadow the process and objectives of regional cooperation. With political instabilities and its effects on the economy, it is quite difficult if not impossible for African nations to unite and cooperate effectively without first achieving that feat at national level.

Nigeria-Ghana early Colonial Relations

As the major members of the former British West Africa, Nigeria and Ghana had shared institutional and cooperative relations and inherited the same colonial heritage. They were both members of the West African Currency Board, West African Airways, West African Line, among others. This had helped in no small measure to establish a relationship of some sort between the two nations. In the early 19th Century, educated elites were vigorously increasing in the two countries; they cooperated as students of international universities to address the issue of colonialism and independence. In the 1930s, Mbonu Ojike, K.O Mbadiwe and Nwafor Orizu (from Nigeria) and Ako Adejei, A.B Jones-Quartey and Kwame Nkrumah (from Ghana) came together to launch the African Interpreter in Lincoln University. They later became prominent personalities in their countries (Aluko, 1976). Unfortunately, after independence, it seemed that Africa’s unity was only held by nationalism and the common quest for freedom. This bond perhaps ended with colonialism. Inasmuch as the idea of Pan-Africanism was still afloat after independence, African leaders were found to have acted in ways that did not conform to the bases of this singular ideology but exhibited unhealthy competitive characteristics in their national affairs that eventually destabilised the practical realization of Pan-Africanism. This could be seen in the formation of divided ideologies/opposing doctrines (the Casablanca group

and the Monrovia group and Brazzaville group) regarding the future of Africa (Igué, 2010). Still commendable was their doggedness towards the formation of OAU in 1963.

There was also inter-colony migration between the countries for both trade and employment. Migrants needed no passports but only travel certificate to show their identity. During this period, Nigerians travelled more to Ghana than the other way round. Ghana prospered more economically although the Nigerian population at the time was about six times of Ghana. External trade, income per head and investment in the mining industry in Ghana were greater than that of Nigeria. For instance, the value of investment in the gold mining industry in Ghana in 1936 was about £2.7 Million compared to £156,000 in Nigeria mining industry. Nigerians however migrated to Ghana for better jobs and employment. This continued even up till independence when the Nigerian population in Ghana was estimated at 209,120 (Aluko, 1976). Meanwhile, migration from Ghana to Nigeria was done sparingly, as the economy of Ghana prospered more than that of Nigeria and thus had less attraction for immigrants. The estimated number of Ghanaians in Nigeria as at 1963 was 7,561, who were mainly in public service right from the colonial period, since the conditions of service were uniform in the whole of British West Africa (Aluko, 1976).

Problem of Independent African States

Political independence without economic independence is the reality of African situation. By the end of 1960s, most African countries had got their independence and had began to enjoy the dividends of self-government. The patterns of European administration in Africa left independent Africa in a perpetual state of dependency. Colonial foundation was a bad foundation for amateur African leaders at independence as European administration relegated African elites to the background. Profound positions were monopolized by the European officials while primitive jobs were reserved for the Africans; thus, giving little or no opportunity for Africans to learn modern forms of administration and leadership in the proper way. In some cases, the individuals who later became leaders were Africans who studied in the Diasporas but didn't know much about their country but only had the opportunity of joining nationalist movements and later became leaders at independence. The scenario however brought in inexperienced people into leadership positions in most African countries.

At independence, African countries including Nigeria and Ghana still maintained the age long agricultural production and primary trade as their main economic base, making Africa economically vulnerable in the international market. Africa depended on the European manufactured goods and could only get foreign exchange through the sale of raw materials. African leaders however continued in the European colonial trend of exporting raw materials instead of engaging in local/indigenous manufacturing and the ever-growing information technology. Another problem of independent African states is the problem of national identity. The era of scramble and partition of Africa destroyed nationhood in Africa as people of different culture and history were merged as one entity without consideration to their history and heritage. It made the idea of unity unrealistic, in other words creating antagonism, jealousy, mutual suspicion and ethnicity in many African countries including Nigeria and Ghana. Again, there is the tendency of one ethnic group to dominate the other which results into crisis between the dominator and the dominated. Lack of national identity has directly or indirectly culminated into

lots of problems in Africa because as Chinua Achebe said when things fall apart, the centre cannot hold (Achebe, 1958). This lack of unity created selfish African leaders who saw leadership positions as opportunity to fill their coffers, rather than fight for the peace and progress of their nation. There was so much mutual suspicion and antagonism within countries which transmuted into inter-state relations among African countries. This resulted to instabilities in different areas and sectors which pushed African countries to find solace in their erstwhile colonialists, giving room for the Europeans to continue their continued control of Africa in the form of neo-colonialism.

Another challenge was created in the cold war era, when the already divided continent became more polarized by the Eurocentric global politics. It further divided Africa against itself while trying to align themselves with their former colonists; although some countries like Nigeria and Ghana claimed to have adopted a non-alignment policy. The already unfavourable economic situations in Africa made them more vulnerable as European countries supported African countries with grants and aids used as bait for African countries to fall prey to their global politics and national interest. The case of Nigeria and Ghana could be said to be that of “struggle for continental leadership” (Aiguosatile et al, 2011) between two ideologies namely, conservatism and radicalism. As was stipulated by Aiguosatile et al (2011) who saw Nigeria and Ghana at independent as countries that were ruled by leaders with different attitudes and ideologies. Kwame Nkrumah was a radical nationalists/pan Africanist who intently advocated for the unity of African states; whereas, his Nigerian counterparts Tafawa Balewa and Nnamdi Azikiwe were conservative political elites who view the unity of African states with great caution.

However, the radicalism of Nkrumah conflicted with the conservative views of the Nigerian political elites. Nkrumah wanted political and economic unity of Africa, while Nigerian political elites desired a more subtle process that will not infringe on the sovereignty of individual nations. Conflict of ideas between Nigeria and Ghana metamorphosed into mutual antagonism and suspicion which was visible in the arrogance of some of their leaders; an instance of which is drawn in the statement of Maitama Sule, who was the then Nigerian minister of mines and power. When the minister was addressing the dangers of Pan Africanism, he stated that Pan Africanism was in the danger of the internal policies of some states, that Nigeria could not tolerate the attitude of someone who “thinks he is the messiah with the mission to lead Africa” (Aiguosatile et al, 2011: 135). This statement was perhaps referring to Kwame Nkrumah, who at the time was advocating for African political unity. The controversy was also pronounced in the formation of OAU prior to which two opposite camps were formed- the Casablanca group and the Monrovia group led by Ghana and Nigeria respectively. All these gradually plummeted whatever was left of the unity and cooperation between Nigeria and Ghana.

Migration of Nigerians to Ghana

The process of migration is as early as man and it is being propelled by many factors which can be a ‘push’ or ‘pull’ factor. A push factor is that factor which makes people to leave their place to another place; such as bad climate, natural disasters, wars, drought, unfavourable government, unemployment, etc. While pull factor is that which attracts people into another place; like better job opportunities, better climate, better standard of living, etc. Nigerians’ migration to Ghana

started to proliferate during the colonial rule. Ghana became an area of interest for Nigerians because both countries were under the British Colonial administration; and Ghana Cocoa industry was expanding tremendously at this time. It was thus a place to consider when the search for greener pasture comes to mind. This is an example of economic push factor. It is however motivated by both push and pull factors. People continued to migrate to Ghana and by 1931 Nigerians became the largest group of immigrants in Ghana totalling 57,400 and increased to 191,802 by 1960 (Aremu, and Ajayi, 2014). Ghana's economic prosperity during the colonial and early post-colonial years attracted more Nigerians to Ghana because Ghana had abundance of diamonds, gold and cocoa which created jobs and huge market, hence forming an economic pull factor. Nigerian migrants in Ghana during colonial rule were majorly traders, fishermen and nomadic farmers, while few were in the civil service; factory and industrial labourers also increased in the early post-colonial periods. (Adebowale, 2014)

Nigerian migrants were found in every commercial sector in Ghana; they served as workers in the construction companies, cheap labourers in industries, agricultural and even domestic workers. After Ghana attained independence in 1957, and most of the Portuguese merchant exited from Ghana, Nigerians who were petty traders were opportune to own stalls and became cocoa importers/exporters agents (and even wholesalers). They became more prominent in the trading and processing sectors; they were also largely in Ghana urban and rural markets. The level of prosperity attained by Nigerians in Ghana attracted even more Nigerians to Ghana, as the country was viewed as a thriving centre for businesses and lucrative jobs. Nigerian merchants however, became quite successful and lived in affluence. It was said that they built better houses and practically flaunted their massive wealth, which initiated vexation of the Ghanaian natives. Invariably, the Ghana merchants believed that Nigerian immigrants had displaced the indigenous Ghanaians in economic prosperity and thus detested the attitudes of Nigerians which they described as oppressive. (Adebowale, 2014)

Ghana's attainment of independence changed the stereotype for the Nigerian immigrants in Ghana. New laws and policies began to emerge which became detrimental to migrants in Ghana; some of which includes the Ghana Nationality and Citizenship Act (1957), the Deportation Act, 1957 (Act 15); the Deportation Amendment Act, 1959 (Act 65); and Employment of Visitors Act (1968). The Nationality and Citizenship Act of 1957 streamlined the understanding of nationality and citizenship, making migrants who already thought themselves as Ghanaians to reminiscence on their origin and nationality and what they may lose in the future. The Deportation Act of 1957 that was amended in 1959 gave the government the authority to expel any foreigner who it perceived proved to be a threat to the nation. Perhaps this Act was enacted by Nkrumah to enable him deal with his oppositions; because Deportation Act was employed against the opposition Muslim Association Party and some of their members from Nigeria like Alufa Osman Lardan and Ahmadu Baba were deported. (Aremu and Ajayi, 2014). It was based on this Act also that Busia issued the Aliens Compliance Order and expelled migrants from Ghana in 1969.

In the colonial era, Africans united to promote *Africanisation* (i.e. to make African or to give control of policy and government to Africans) of institutions and even government services to fight against European alien influences; but unfortunately, in the post-independence period, Africans saw people of African descent as aliens to be "eliminated" in order to achieve indigenisation (Adebowale, 2014). This is a practical opposition to the dream of Pan Africanism

and Africa unity. Attainment of independence came with the development of visa and passport regulations, regulations on international boundaries movement, improved requirements for foreign or migrant workers to obtain work permits among other restrictions. The new era put the Nigerian migrants on edge and undermined their privileges. It affected their socio-economic lives while giving the natives the opportunity to remind Nigerians of their status as aliens who are in the minority. This unruly attitude continued until the 1969 when the Prime Minister Dr K.A Busia instituted the quit order on November 18th, 1969, which required all aliens who had no resident permit to quit the country within 14 days (Adebowale, 2014).

Ghana's economy in the 1960s dwindled profusely and resulted to massive unemployment, which totalled 600,000 registered unemployed Ghanaians. The natives blamed migrants who were mostly Nigerians for their unfortunate situation, accusing them of posing threats to their economic prosperity and success in their own country. The indigenes however clamoured for indigenisation of their economy, which the government responded with the "Alien Compliance Order". The Ghanaian government gave the following reasons for this unpatriotic decision:

- The need to provide more job opportunities for the indigenous Ghanaians.
- To improve the balance of payment that was made worse by the migrant workers who remitted their income to their home countries.
- To curb criminal activities and maintain law and order. (Aremu, and Ajayi, 2014)

In order to achieve the above, it was required that migrants must vacate from Ghana. Non-Ghanaians without residence permit in Ghana were given 14 days from the date of the announcement (18th November 1969) of the quit order to vacate from the country or face arrest. It was an awkward situation for the aliens whose 80% of the population were Nigerian (Elebor, 1970). At first, the news was received with air of nonchalance; everyone was thinking and hoping that the quit order was not supposed to affect their category of persons. By the second week of the ultimatum period, the situation took another turn, with the natives harassing, molesting and looting the aliens. This was when the reality of the quit order stared migrants on the face. They needed more time to obtain their travelling documents or permit, for vaccination, transport-booking and even time to evacuate their residential areas. They closed their businesses; quit their jobs so as to find time to organise for their departure. This unfortunate situation created an avenue for massive extortion in the embassy. Embassy clerks charged exorbitant fees for supposed free documents, making a huge gain out of an unpleasant circumstance. Kingsley .C, who made a newspaper report on the matter said that these clerks charged 80 Peseswas for the application form, 40 peseswas for typing few words of information on the form and 2 to 5 Cedes for filing (Kingsley C, 1970). It was indeed an utter extortion.

Due to limited time allowed for the aliens, they resorted to selling their goods and properties at the buyer's price to raise money for their transportation fare which was hiked exorbitantly. Some migrants, who could not bear to sell their goods or properties at the buyer's callous prices, out of frustration set them ablaze. It is however not surprising that suicide cases also increased during this time (Kingsley C, 1970). The end of the 14 days ultimatum was completely devastating for the migrants. They were molested and driven out of their homes, while their properties like houses, shops, cars and important home appliances were confiscated by the natives. All warnings by the Ghanaian government to stop molestation of aliens fell on deaf ears. Nigerians who had

lived most of their lives in Ghana were evacuated like common criminals with nothing to hold onto; they ran with their families for dear life, while those who could not leave Ghana by December 2 were arrested and taken to prison (Akran, 1969). Thousands of people who were arrested caused congestion of many prisons in Ghana, where people stood in danger of suffocation. A significant number of deaths were recorded in the prisons as well as at the borders where aliens awaited transportation to their countries. It was a devastating situation for Nigerians who during this time lost their properties, jobs, and virtually all they had worked for, for many years. Some of them had no transportation fare to embark on their journey. Means of transportation were limited, while the available ones became very exorbitant. People were conveyed with Lorries and every other possible means of transportation. The borders were filled with stranded people who could not decipher what their fate could be. They were faced with the hamattan cold, suffocation and hunger.

Peoples of all ages were affected, including a 70 year old man who had lived in Ghana for forty years but could only leave Ghana with a mat and a bucket (Elebor, 1970). Another man called Mr. Ibodje on speaking to *Morning Post Newspaper* said that people who stayed back in Ghana after the deadline were beaten up and were not allowed to collect their money from the banks. According to him, Ghana was no longer safe for Nigerians and other aliens. He went further to recount that even after he obtained permit at the total sum of £25; he “ran for his dear life later because of beating by his Ghanaian neighbours” (Akran, 1969). The Nigerian High Commissioner in Accra reported that in Accra alone about 1000 Nigerians were held in prison for non-possession of residence permit (*Morning Post Newspaper*, Dec 8, 1969). These were some of the many problems and challenges experienced by the Nigerians in Ghana during the expulsion saga; it was indeed an experience with many consequences.

Reactions to the Expulsion

Nigerians were shocked at the news of the expulsion of their brothers by trusted brother nation. A lot of emotions were evoked; People felt disappointed and betrayed by Ghana to the point of calling on the Nigerian government at the time to retaliate by sending Ghanaian indigenes away from Nigeria. Considering the purpose and objectives of Pan Africanism and OAU (Organization of African Unity), which supports brotherhood and collaboration of African people, the expulsion could perhaps be regarded as betrayal to the dream of African unity. The sporadic situation was a blow to the Nigerian government and citizens who were already war battered, (this was the period of Nigeria-Biafra war of 1967-1970) and were socially and economically destabilized at the time. Notwithstanding, the Nigerian government did their best amidst the war challenges to remedy the situation. Thousands of people trooped in from Ghana, many were stranded at the borders, and while over 1000 were imprisoned(Sunday Observer, Dec 7, 1969).

The weekend before the 8th of December 1969, an official of the External Affairs Ministry was sent to Ghana to distribute over 20,000 travel certificates to Nigerians in Ghana, to enable them stay on. Then on the 8th of December 1969, the Commissioner for External Affairs, Dr. Okoi Arikpo flew to Accra to investigate the expulsion matter. He was scheduled to have talks with Mr. Victor Owusu, the Ghana Foreign Minister. On the other hand, the Nigerian High Commissioner in Ghana Mr. Victor Adegroye allowed his premises in Accra to be used as camping ground for the displaced Nigerians pending their onward journey to their destinations. The Nigerian Western region government also made efforts as rescue buses were sent to Idi-

Iroko, Nigeria- Benin border to convey returnees to their states. More so, the Nigerian shipping company incorporated the 'MV King Jaja' on a rescue operation to convey returnees to Lagos (Morning Post Newspaper, Dec. 8, 1969). Weeks after the alien compliant order was issued, the borders of Dahomey, Togo and Cotonou, were filled with thousands of Nigerian returnees where many people died out of hunger and stampede due to overcrowding. Many pregnant women gave birth at the border and few on board the "King Jaja". Notwithstanding the rescue operations provided by the Nigerian government, the refugees at the borders still had to wait for about 5 to 6 day before the boat arrives. (*Morning Post Newspaper*, Dec. 15, 1969).

As days went by, more Nigerians in Ghana decided to return home due to more impending problems. Besides the usual molestation experienced by the aliens in Ghana, the new permit issued to them was to expire between six weeks to three months, not minding the exorbitant prices. Many of the migrants resolved to use the few weeks/months allowed by the permit to wind up their various businesses and return home (*Morning Post Newspaper*, Dec.16, 1969).

Dr. Babs Fafunwa who spoke on the expulsion to the *Daily Times* was pleased with the Federal Military Government for their swift rescue mission in providing food, temporary accommodation and transportation for the stranded Nigerian citizens. He however expressed his dissatisfaction and displeasure for the expulsion policy as well the inhuman manner in which it was carried out and how it affected in no small measure the economic and social lives of the Nigerian people. He further queried the Ghana High Commission in Nigeria for describing Africans in Ghana (which Nigerians are greater part of) as "undesirable elements" to be gotten rid of. He thus concluded that since Ghana High Commissioner in Nigeria could refer to Nigerians who had lived in Ghana and had formed a significant part of Ghana economy as undesirable element, then the Ghana indigenes in Nigeria were also undesirable and should be ordered out of Nigeria as well. He however advised that the Nigerian Commissioner for External Affairs and the entire ministry should take possible action to repatriate Nigerians funds in Ghana which was calculated at over 20,000,000 Cedis. (Fafuwa, Jan 13, 1970)

Inasmuch as the expulsion affected Nigeria deeply, the Nigerian External Affairs Commissioner maintained that he would not present the matter before the Organization of African Unity (OAU). Meanwhile, Peter A.A Dakre drew the attention of the Ghanaian government to the aims of the OAU which he stated as follows:

- To promote the unity and solidarity of African States.
- To coordinate and intensify the efforts of African states to achieve a better life for all Africans, and
- To promote international cooperation through the United Nations Organisation.

He concluded that the expulsion order was plainly against the aims of the OAU, and urged Ghana to think again. (Dakre, Dec 19, 1969)

As Nigerians continued to react on the expulsion issue, labour unions were not silent on the matter. At the second annual conference of the Metaloplastic African Workers Union, the General Secretary in the person of Mr. M.C Ator said that "Busia's action is a complete negation of the objectives of the OAU". He continued unspecifically that Busia did not mind that thousands of Ghanaians occupied key positions in government and commercial sectors in

Nigeria. He was of the opinion that since Ghana could expel Nigerians from Ghana under the guise of immigration laws, the Nigerian Military Government should as a matter of urgency expel Ghanaians living in Nigeria. (The Nigerian Observer, Dec. 15, 1969).

Challenges of the Expulsion on Nigeria and Ghana

Prior to the issuance of the expulsion act, Nigerians in Ghana had established and contributed immensely to the growth of Ghana economy. As has been previously stated, Nigerians were significant in the economic and political wellbeing of Ghana especially from the Nkrumah era. It is however certain that the expulsion policy had adverse effect on both Nigeria and Ghana. From Busia's reasons, the expulsion order was socio-economic, which means that the economy of Ghana was expected to improve profusely after the so-called "undesirable elements" were evicted. On the positive aspect, expulsion of aliens reduced to an extent the unemployment rate in Ghana. It created more vacuum in most sectors of the economy were Nigerians operated, like agriculture, trade, industry, and service. Ghana indigenes also occupied migrant's vacated stalls on the payment of just N¢3.50. (Adjepong, 2009). Job opportunities became available even in the private sector. More so, in the process of migrants' departure, essential commodities became very cheap, as the migrants who were stall owners were eager to sell out their goods before leaving for their countries. This was an advantage for the indigenes because goods became as cheap as half the prices. The expulsion struck out a good number of "undesirable elements" from Ghana; like the destitute and beggars, prostitutes, smugglers and currency traffickers as well as criminals. This is not to say that only migrants were involved in these obnoxious activities, but with the demolition of slums where the migrants concentrated, crime related activities reduced in 1970 when compared to previous years of 1968-1969 (Adjepong, 2009).

On the negative aspect, the vacuum created by the expellees could not be occupied fully by the natives. Migrants did menial jobs like sanitary labourers and worked at the cocoa industries as cheap labourers; while the natives despised these jobs that they regarded as low standard jobs. The cocoa industries for instance witnessed continued decline in labourers and in production, which later resulted into a huge drop in Ghana's contribution to world cocoa production from 50% to 30% in 1970 (Adjepong, 2009). Although the Ghanaian government later exempted cocoa farm workers from the quit order to maintain continuous and massive production; but most of the cocoa farmers had fled after being threatened by the natives to leave. They fled to their countries and to other areas in Africa like Côte D'Ivoire where they were infused into cocoa farming. Enforcement of the Aliens Compliant Order and the subsequent takeover of migrants businesses by the natives, made commodities to become very expensive; Ghanaian traders doubled the prices of goods from food items to spare parts in their quest to get rich quick. One of the possible reasons for the hike in prices during the exodus period was perhaps the non-availability of transportation system. Taxies and lorries were burdened with the task of transporting migrants to the borders. Meanwhile, the massive demand for transportation caused hike in transportation fares; while the demand for transportation by the migrants decreased the availability of vehicles that should carry goods to and from the markets. Again some migrants who provided transportation services had fled with their vehicles while few who could not purchase immigration license abandoned their vehicles in Ghana (Adjepong, 2009).

Another effect was reduction in migrant remittances. Ghanaian government claimed that migrants' remittances to their home countries forced Ghana into balance of payment deficit. With the majority of the migrants out of Ghana, remittances reduced credibly, while the natives took over most businesses and jobs. The Ghana expulsion order of 1969 had devastating effect on Nigerians. It was carried out carelessly without consideration to the migrants or the countries where they came from. Nigerians in Ghana faced molestation and dehumanizing treatments from Ghana indigenes. It was rather a bitter pill to swallow when Nigerian migrants in Ghana who had been politically and economically supportive to the Ghanaian government were declared as criminals and aliens. Traders were forced by the circumstance to sell off their goods at cheap prices to enable them pay for their transportation back home. Most landed properties like houses, cocoa farms; stalls among others were abandoned and/or confiscated; while the banks refused to give more than £2000 to the returnees. Peoples lost the wealth they had accumulated over the years, while they were forced to return to the war torn Nigeria to start afresh (Olaniyi, 2008). Deaths were recorded in the congested prisons where arrested migrants were jam-packed for non-presentation of resident permit. More deaths of about 10 children were recorded at the various camps where Nigerian migrants awaited transportation in Ghana (Olaniyi, 2008). There were cases where returnees who had stayed for so long in Ghana could no longer locate their families in Nigeria; and some who married Ghanaians were separated from their families. The situation was an additional problem for Nigeria who had been passing through years of war and instability. Nigerians had to make room for their homeless and hungry kinsmen who returned from Ghana; whereas some received the unfortunate news of the death of their relations assumed to have migrated to Ghana in search of greener pastures.

Suffice it to say that the expulsion was an unexpected and unfortunate hit on Nigeria and her people; although many of the returnees with the help of their relations and community philanthropists as well as the experiences they had accumulated in Ghana were able to incorporate themselves in trading activities, artisanship, craftsmanship, smithing, etc. More so, Nigerians in Ghana who possessed resident permit were not left off the hook; they were required to carry their permit everywhere they went; the Ghana Business Promotion Act of 1970 denied them access to own stalls or even trade. According to Aremu and Ajayi, the Act reserved about 37 business activities especially small businesses exclusively for Ghanaians. Even those fortunate enough to own big business enterprises were mandated to set up training schemes for the indigenes. (Aremu and Ajayi, 2014). At present, the situation is even more intense; Ghana Investment promotion Centre Act of 1994 prohibits all foreigners from partaking in the sale of anything in the market, operation of taxi or car hire services, and other minor businesses like operation of beauty salons and barber shops. (AB Lex Mall & Associates, 2015). This has affected unskilled labour migrants who had travelled in search of better opportunities. Although some still adamantly engage in these businesses for survival and have most times incurred the wrath of the government or are at risk of facing sporadic xenophobic attacks from the natives who feel threatened by their activities. The recent close of migrants' shops and subsequent physical attacks which involved a good number of Nigerians as victims is a good case in point.

Conclusion

Nigerian has related significantly with Ghana since the colonial rule because both countries found themselves under the British West Africa. Nigerians were motivated to migrate to Ghana because Ghana at this time prospered more when compared to Nigeria. This was the reason why

there was constant increase in the number of migrants who moved to Ghana. Migrants who were of Nigerian decent, were about 80 per cent of the total migrant population in Ghana.

The post-independence relationship between Nigeria and Ghana has been that of mutual suspicion, antagonism and jealousy. In some regimes, the hostility became overly pronounced while in others it was inconspicuous. At independence, the political leaders of both countries had opposing ideological views where Nigeria's conservative moves conflicted with Ghana's radicalism. Perhaps one could say that by and large the underlining conflict between both countries was a battle over who would lead the African continent. From all indications however, both countries seemed to have experienced better peaceful coexistence and cooperation during military regimes (Aiguosatile et al, 2011). During the leadership of Busia, this rancor became more pronounced. Busia's policy of "Alien's Compliance Order" stiffened the already existing strain on Nigeria-Ghana relations. The suspicion and antagonism that was practiced among their leaders then extended to the citizens. It weakened cooperation and trust between the countries, making caricature of the relationship that should exist between brother nations.

Furthermore, the expulsion created negative precedence for other struggling African nations. Having seen two powerful nations who had worked assiduously towards the integration of Africa exhibit mutual hatred buried what was left of the faith they had on the dream of African unity. Other countries became more adamant on issues concerning free movement of goods and people as supported by African's dream of unity. The expulsion *inter alia* made caricature of the objectives of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU). It was an evidence to the rest of the world that Africa could not stand together to hold up their integrity and thus cannot form a united front against neo-colonialism. This knowledge perhaps created room for stringent policies by international Organizations against Africa, which further weakened the authority of OAU as a uniting front. It was rather unfortunate that Nigeria and Ghana who for the unity of Africa from the era of Pan African movement allowed national policies and interest to saturate the age long dream of African unity. With the two giant nations in Africa at a loggerhead, African dream has become an illusion, because weaker countries are being discouraged; the African Union foundation is shaky, thus giving the Western developed countries the leverage to indirectly dominate and control African nations. It is rather pertinent to note that the rights of a citizen should not override the right of a migrant especially in African countries where Pan-Africanism and African unity is preached. Protection of African migrants in Africa especially legal migrants should be one of the smallest practical ways of exhibiting African unity.

However, it has become pertinent for African leaders to come together to discuss on the various reoccurring challenges facing African countries especially as it concerns African integration and development; how to surmount the indirect domination of the Western developed countries, and utilize various available resources for a sustainable development. It is also very crucial for the AU to strengthen the organisation so that the policies and objectives of individual nation would not override that of the Organisation.

REFERENCES

- Acemoglu, D. and Robinson, J.A., (2013), *Why Nations Fail*, London: Profile Books Ltd, p.68.
- Achebe, C. (1958), *Things fall Apart*, Oxford: Heinemann, p. 95.
- Adjepong, A. (2009), The Origins, implementation and Effects of Ghana's 1969 Aliens Compliance Order; An MA thesis submitted to the Department of History, University of Cape Coast, p. 229.
- Aiguosatile, O. *et al*, (2011), Nigeria-Ghana Relations from 1960 to 2010: Roots of Convergence and points of departure African Research Review: *An Interdisciplinary Journal Ethiopia*, vol.5 No. 6, 131-145.
- Akran, T. (1969, Dec, 6), Ghana Exodus: FMG wants Molestations probed. *Morning Post Newspaper*, p.1.
- Aluko O. (1976). *Ghana and Nigeria 1957-70*, London: Rex Collings Ltd, 44- 47
- Aremu, O. and Ajayi, T.A., (2014), Expulsion of Nigerian Immigrant Community from Ghana in 1969: causes and impact, *Developing Country Studies*, vol. 4 No. 10, 176-180, ISSN 2225-0565.
- Areo, P. (2017), Theories of Development and Underdevelopment, in Aloysius-Michaels Okolie and Chidi Onah (eds) *Politics of Development and underdevelopment*, WillyRose & Applesed Publishing Coy, 26-28.
- Asiwaju, A.I. and Crowder M, (1980), Pan-Africanism, *Tarikh*, vol. 6 No.3, London; Longman Group Limited, 12-14.
- Ayobade A., (2014), Industrialization, Entrepreneurship and the cyclical migration flows between Ghana and Nigeria, *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 103, ISSN:1520-5509.
- Chepkorir L., Harmonisation of Immigration Policies within SADC and EAC to Achieve Free Movement of Persons, https://www.academia.edu/45003935/harmonisation_of_immigration_policies_within_sadc_and_eac_to_achieve_free_movement_of_persons, 1-15.
- Dakre, P. A, (1969, Dec. 19), Ghana Think Again, *Nigerian Observer*, 2.
- Elebor, J. (1970, Jan. 2) Busia's Ghana Episode, *Morning Post Newspaper*, January 2, 1970, 6.
- Eze, M. O. (2013), Pan-Africanism: A Brief Intellectual History, *History Compass*, 665, DOI: 10.1111/hic3.12074.
- Fafunwa, B. (1970 Jan. 13), Nigeria should take Ghana Govt. to court, *Daily Times Newspaper*, 6.
- Fagbayibo, B. (2015), Policy Discourse on the Possibility of a Pan-African Framework on the Free Movement of persons, *Politeia*, Vol. 34 No. 1, p.4
- Igué, J O., (2010), A New Generation of Leaders in Africa: What Issues Do They Face? *International Development Policy*, DOI: <https://doi.org/100.4000/poldev.139.115-13>
- Kingsley. C, (1970 Jan. 2), Miserable in Ghana. *Morning Post Newspaper*, 5.
- Mengshu, Z., (2020), A brief Overview of Alexander Wendt's Constructivism, *E-International Relations*, See-www.e-ir.info.
- Olaniyi R. (2008), The 1969 Ghana Exodus: Memory and Reminiscences of Yoruba Migrants *International Migration Institute*, 5, <https://www.migrationinstitute.org>
- Sanusi, H. and Adu-Gyamfi S., (2017), Ghana's Foreign Policy: Some regional and national Interests, *Journal of human sciences*, 2-12.
- Wendt, A., (1999), Social Theory of International Politics, *Cambridge University press*, 70.
- Zanker, F. *et al*, (2020), Free Movement in West Africa: Juxtapositions and Divergent Interests, *Mercator Dialogue on Asylum and Migration: Policy Briefs* by Arnold Bergstraesser Institute. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342748104>
- Zhan Mengshu, (2020), A Brief Overview of Alexander Wendt's Constructivism, *E-International Relations*, <https://www.e-ir.info/2020/05/19/a-brief-overview-of-alexander-wendts-constructivism/>.
- "Ghana Investment Promotion Centre Registration in Ghana", (2015), *AB LexMall & Associates, Ghana Law Firm HG.org Legal Resources*.
- _____ "1000 plus Nigerians jailed in Ghana." (1969 Dec.7), *Sunday Observer*, p1.
- _____ "20,000 more Nigerians are still stranded, Adegoroye visits Refugees at Tema", (1969 Dec.15) *Morning Post Newspaper*, p 2.
- _____ "Envoys Refused in Ghana cells" (1969 Dec. 16), *Morning Post* , p1.
- _____ "Travel documents sent to Ghana: Arikpo off to Accra," (1969 Dec.8) *Morning Post Newspaper*, p1.
- _____ "Workers urge Govt. to expel Ghanaians" (1969 Dec.15,) *The Nigerian Observer*, p1.