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ABSTRACT

This paper sets out to present immigrants’ efforts and contributions in making Kano the largest textile trade entrepôt and production centre. It covers the span of seven centuries from pre-colonial, colonial to post-colonial times. This paper argues that immigrants played central role in the transformation of the Kano textile industry. The transformation of Kano from a tribal backwater to a remarkable textile hub was made possible through the assimilation and integration of different groups of immigrants. Importantly, it discusses the Chinese immigrants’ phenomena in occupying Kano market, where they forcefully drew back the wheel of Kano textile growth to the disadvantage of the local economy with their competitive advantage. This paper concludes that exploitations by immigrants have changed the historical narratives of Kano textile industry from one based on local economic growth to external power exploitation.
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INTRODUCTION

Kano’s prosperity in textile production and trade is hugely drawn from immigrant activities from the early beginnings, along with the establishment of constituted authority dated to the 9th century when Abagayawa immigrants settled at Dala Hill to excavate iron ore (Mahadi, 1983; Musa, 2013; Uba Adamu, 1998). For more than ten centuries, the inhabitants of the Kano province has attracted people for the growth of the economy. Kano has been and continues to be in constant connection with the outside world for immigrant talents to boost its development. Human migrations have transformed the entire aspect of Kano textile economy.

The expansion and industrial accomplishment of Kano spanned centuries back. Kano textile industry heavily relied on entrepreneurial skills of immigrants in developing local technology and materials for production in the pre-colonial period (Hopkins, 1973). Immigrants played a great role in the establishment of modern factories in colonial and post-colonial times. The success recorded by the immigrants’ ingenuity was driven by firm government backing, powerful managerial capacity and complemented by improved technology. Several movements of people within and from outside Kano and to other places had shaped textile trade and production for centuries despite challenges during the colonial period.

China is a significant element that represents the latest phase in the growth of neoliberal economic design in Kano textile industry. This strategy has made the world becoming more integrated to the advantage of forces of market exploitation. Previous scholarship has extensively discussed the role played by immigrants in the
transformation of the Kano textile trade and production (Chen & Liu, 2015; Hu & Liu, 2014; Monson, 2013). Scholarly works on this phenomenon have also proliferated, in terms of its role in growth and economic transformation (Agyemang & Lehman, 2013; Rahikainen, 2007; Robinson, 2011). Chinese immigrants are an established community that are willing to adopt the vagaries of the local culture (Mahadi, 1983; Uba Adamu, 1998). Convenient immigration policies are also put in place to welcome skilled and unskilled migrants (Shea, 1975). Huge supplies of appropriate labour enhanced local techniques and skills for mass production. Authorities in pre-colonial Kano introduced growth-enhancing strategies with positive resultant effects. Specialization was encouraged to ensure the control and acquisition of surplus for mass textile production (Mahadi, 1983).

Past researchers have however either ignored or failed to conceptualize the phenomenon sufficiently. Chinese immigrants are not permanent settlers, rather they come to Kano to massively flood the market and reap high returns. Based on this, this paper intends to provide an in-depth and extensive discourse on the role of immigrants in the transformation of Kano textile economy. This paper is divided into five parts. Section 1 discusses Kano as the city of immigrants. Section 2 examines mercantilism and the development of Kano textile industry. Chinese migrants’ occupation of the industry is discussed in section 3. Conclusion is then provided in section 4.

KANO, THE CITY OF IMMIGRANTS

The Kano phenomenon as the city of immigrants has fascinated many scholars, explorers and merchants (Andrae & Beckman, 2011; Lovejoy, 1982; Shea, 2006; Uba Adamu, 1998). Information indicated that Kano had emerged as a commanding centre for immigrants when several immigrant groups from the Middle East, North Africa and Eastern Sudan settled in Kano in the very beginning (Mahadi, 1983). It is on record that immigrants who first settled in Gaya, some few kilometres away from Kano played a key role in its establishment. The development of weaponry and hunting apparatus attracted the first set of immigrants to Dala Hill. From the onset, the immigrants came along with skills and expertise in weaving, spinning, tanning, and dyeing. They set up a modest cottage industry to provide products and services in their areas of specialization. Arguably, immigrant labour had, way back into the 6th and 7th centuries, contributed to the transformation of Kano into manufacturing clusters.

The later arrivals included the Wangara (1380), Tripolitanians (1463), Beriberi (1527), Arabs from Agalawa (1563), North Africa (1632), Tokarawa (1678), Kambari (1693), Lebanese (1903), Syrians (1905), and Yemeni (1919), among many others (Uba Adamu, 1998). The arrival of different settler groups enhanced external trade and tremendous exchange of manufactures. The economic growth experienced was the result of the establishment of many manufacturing industries from skills provided by the arrival of different groups of migrants. Uba Adamu (1998) and Shea (2006) argued that the migratory trend attracting diverse and heterogeneous groups from far and near had developed Kano into an area of immense interchange and mixing of ideas, practices and experiences from other cultures. The integration of divergent cultures bolstered Kano’s growth. The immigrants had generated wealth from production and trade activities, which in turn had provided the basis for the development of a better system and structure for Kano’s textile industry.
Kano gained a strong identity - whose prominence was recognized in the 14th century. Its high growth propensity in manufacturing and agriculture, coupled with territorial integrity due to strong military presence, served as attractions for others to migrate and settle in Kano. But, perhaps what made it appeal to Muslim scholars in other parts of West Africa and Maghribi was the information reaching them on the campaigns of its leaders against idol worshipping. Kano had been receiving Wangara scholars for trading and also for propagating Islam since the 14th century. This had then maintained the trend of migratory influx that came along with continuity and change throughout Kano’s history.

The assertive authority of leaders in the pre-colonial times starting with the Habe rule, which included Yakubu Abdullahi Burja (1452-1463), Muhammadu Rumfa (1463-1499), Abdullahi (1499-1509) to Babba Zaki (1768-1776), had encouraged the migratory influx. Rumfa’s introduction to radical reforms had led to Kano gaining a cosmopolitan city status. It was also during the reign of Rumfa that Al-Maghili’s ideas were used in reorganizing the justice system, and a structured administration came to Kano. Just like Al-Maghili people from Tripoli, Libya became identified with Kano, which thoroughly altered the character of the region. The 18th century Jihad that established the dominance of Islam had provided avenues for wealth generation and free flow of goods. This harmonious condition further attracted merchants, scholars and adventurers to trades in Kano. During the same period, there were also groups from North Africa, Yemen and Sudan.

Leading to the 19th and 20th centuries, Kano later attracted European explorers, wanderers, and historians among others, which later led to colonial occupation. Mungo Park (1794-1797), Hugh Clapperton (1822-1826), Dixon Denham (1821-1824), Alexander Gordon Laing (1822-1825), Richard Lander and John Lander (1825-1832), Heinrich Barth (1825-1827), James Richardson (1845-1851), and Adolf Overweg (1849-1851) were among the architects of the 20th century occupation. Following British colonial occupation of Kano in 1903, the Lebanese came in to settle, bringing a great deal of effect on Kano. Unlike the North Africans who came earlier through the trans-Sahara route, Lebanese, like the British colonialists, came via the Atlantic Ocean. Later on, immigrants who came from Igbo, native soldiers from Yoruba, Nupe and Hausa settled in Sabon Gari. Later immigrants had clearly defined the transformation of the manufacturing industry - textile sector in particular, and the economy in general.

MIGRATION, MERCANTILISM AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE KANO TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Kano, thus, fascinated migrants and became a centre for merchant capital and emporium for textile industrial development. Rational economic policies encouraged immigrant labour to settle and participate in remarkable textile production and trade. This provided the impetus for the insurance of high turnover (Shea, 1975). The first settlers were hunters who later turned farmers and used the proceeds to become rich merchants in short and distance trade. Accumulation of capital and massive exchange of tradable items made Kano to be known in North Africa, Middle East, and to the Mediterranean shores as the centre of economic activities in the Sudan. For centuries,
the main migratory corridor to the outside world had been the trans-Saharan caravan routes and other overland pathways. The prosperity of Kano received a boost because of the mass migration of Arabs through Zinder in the present-day Niger Republic and Katsina. These Arabs settled at Kulkul, Jingau and Dandalin Turawa largely to exchange goods. As the commercial and industrial nerve centre of Sudan – south of the Sahara huge patronage by the Arabs accelerated the growth of the textile industry. With huge returns, the Arabs started to finance the industrial and commercial activities by providing advanced payments, which bolstered mass production. The success recorded in the establishment of the Caliphate after the Jihad increased the demand for cloth by the Arabs.

The textile sector that enjoyed the advanced-free stimulus coming from the Arabs was the dyeing sub-sector that produced Turkudi or Dan Kura and other colored products. With powerful Arab capital and patronage, more dyeing clusters were established within the Arab quarters in the city of Kano which included places such as Karofin Kofar Mata, Karofin Sheshe, Karofin Zage, Karofin Kwalwa, Karofin Sudawa, Karofin Wanka da Shuni, Karofin Dagauda and Karofin Dala in addition to Karofin Kura and Karofin Bunkure in Rano district. Famous among the endogenous groups involved in long distance exchange were the Tokarawa, Agalawa and Kambarin Beriberi. While the Agalawa and Tokarawa had Tuareg origins, Kambarin Beriberi had Borno ancestry. Apart from their known settlement within the city – Darna, Dala, Madabo, Sabon Sara, Bakin Ruwa and Salga, the Agalawa and Tokarawa could also be found in places outside the city, which included Utai, Kura, Bebeji, Garko, Bichi, Madobi and Kumurya (Uba Adamu, 1998).

Kano, under the quasi-confederate arrangement established by Sheikh Usman Danfodio in the 19th century, brought about a remarkable transformation of the caliphate. The caliphate system, rather than deflate the prominent position held by Kano for centuries, provided a phenomenal impact. The huge Sokoto caliphate - comprising of western and eastern confederate entities, accommodated large number of people and extensive landmass with a number of emirates as districts, spurred production and trade in textiles. Moreover, business ventures were allowed to prosper with unrestricted access to markets in the emirates and unrestricted movement of goods within and across the emirates (Shea, 2006). Kano took advantage of the size of the caliphate to reap enormous profits. It received tremendous economic advantages in long distance trades. Huge landmass provided large provision of raw materials at competitive rates. It also spurred big internal market supported and secured by a powerful state. This made it possible and more flexible for labour supply than it would have been in a smaller environment. Large supplies of quality labour provided improved skills and techniques at the bigger state level. In the 19th century, textile industry was essentially the most significant in the Sokoto Caliphate with perhaps agriculture immediately trailing behind. It is believed that the philosophical underpinning of promoting appropriate dress sense by the authority according to Islamic provisions resulted in a rising desire for huge textile production and especially of premium quality prestige. This undoubtedly seemed to have been the situation and accounts during the 19th century and at the time of the British colonization. Essentially, the most populous and by far the most textile-driven economy within the greater caliphate economy was Kano (Shea, 1975; 2006).
Kano then operated a liberal market economy without the structural distortion experienced in the modern world. The local economy was by no means strictly regulated by the state. These strategies helped boost agriculture and the craft cottage industries, especially the textile sector (Lovejoy, 1982). The competitive strength of the industry increased. Large-scale production was realised. Local textile technology was improved. Increasing number of dyeing centres whereby a number of professionals participated in several ways also meant enhanced specialization. Remarkably, industrial activities in the 18th century were run based on professionalism and managed in the manner of the guild system. In particular, in the textile industry, people wanting to engage in it would be trained in dyeing, weaving, embroidery or tailoring. Hopkins (1973) holds that pre-colonial Kano had a range of manufacturing industries, which closely resembled those of pre-industrial societies in other parts of the world. He shows that critical to these industrial enterprises was textile production that included weaving, spinning, dyeing, carding, and ginning. The weaving and dyeing industries for instance, made huge impact during the trans-Sahara trade activities to satisfy the home demands, and the import and export trade was established to an advanced degree with regards to volume, variety and quality of goods and in terms of management. A network of trade routes between towns in the territory was established. Hence, internal trade based on the industrial and agricultural goods produced in the country was robust (Tambo, 1974). The cotton utilized was grown by both men and women, but spun into threads by only women. Both men and women, with women using vertical looms and men utilizing horizontal type, performed weaving. Men were tailors, and were also engaged in embroidery works.

By the late 17th century, the Europeans noticed that the Niger trade was booming and profitable, and set the machinery for occupation of the hitherto free territories. The British occupation, rather than enhanced local economic activities, had instead created a colonial system that granted maximum exploitation of the colonized territories. The British colonialists came in purely as masters and with a precise goal of economic control and exploitation unlike groups preceding them that settled and became integrated to contribute to the growth of Kano’s economy. The presence of the Lebanese who came in later after the colonialists took control did not change much of the economic structure of the local community, as the Lebanese, just like the European colonialists, had stayed aloof from integrating into the Kano’s social domain unlike the earlier immigrants from Libya and other North African groups. In essence, they vigorously pursued their agenda of promoting their commercial interests by settling in remote areas unlike the British who resided mainly in urban areas.

To further entrench the exploitative structure, railroads linking Kano and Lagos were completed in 1911. Rail and road infrastructures opened Kano and other regions in the hinterland to penetration from the coast. The Lebanese migration to Kano and other parts of the world increased in the 20th century. The Lebanese migration from Lagos to Kano started in 1903 by two brothers. These brothers permanently settled in Kano in 1907. Uba Adamu (1998) claimed that Seman Naoum - a trader selling European wares was the first immigrant to permanently settle in Kano in 1912. The colonial authorities carved out 12 plots for the Lebanese “coloured traders” to develop their houses in 1913 close to Kano railway station. The area attracted non-European settlers, housing their businesses and residences. In 1915, the place later came to be known as the Syrian quarters with Lebanese dominance therein.
Seman Naoum who first settled in the city relocated to the area. By 1928, several local merchants had been substituted by immigrants. Among the important Lebanese merchants were the Akle brothers, George Ferris, the Minaise brothers, the Shour family and Mohammed Chiranci (on number of migrants see Table 1). The most prominent of the immigrant groups in Nigeria before World War II were the Lebanese (Forrest, 1994).

Table 1: Number of Immigrants

| Year | Greek | Indian | Lebanese/Syrian |
|------|-------|--------|-----------------|
| 1921 | 26    | 17     | 143             |
| 1931 | 67    | 97     | 419             |
| 1938 | 168   | 68     | 818             |

Source: Forrest, 1994.

The growth of industries garnered impetus in the last quarter of the 1950s with Lebanese immigrants playing key position in promoting industrial development. Their shift to small-scale industries was to some extent a response to increasing demands and challenges from the local entrepreneurs who begrudged their enterprises in the retail and produce businesses, road haulage and the wholesale trade in imported textiles. This resistance to foreign interests, especially Lebanese interests, led eventually to the appointment of the Zanna Laisu Commission in 1960, which recommended that the retail trade, distribution from local industries, the produce trade, and transport should all be reserved for Nigerians (Forrest, 1994). The first two decades after independence in 1960 remained the glorious interval in Nigeria’s past. During the period, many sectors of the economy experienced unparalleled energy. The period contributed considerably to the Gross Domestic Products (GDP). The manufacturing sector performed a tremendous role in stabilizing the engine of the country’s economic development in terms of employment, export and agriculture, which served as a source of foreign exchange earnings. Kano became the greatest centre of commerce in Nigeria and the second most industrialized, immediately after Lagos. What led to the development during these years were the availability of finance from conventional banking and developmental funds, low interest rates, availability of electricity, government patronage, and sustainable and good governance.

Immigrants’ skills and expertise had played a great role in the transformation of the textile sub-sector of the economy up to the late twentieth century. The arrival of Chinese migrants in droves in the late 1990s and in the year 2000 was devastating to the textile industry. The overwhelming dominance of Kano in West and Central Africa and in sub-Saharan Africa in textile production and trade was brought to a halt with the Chinese arrival.
CHINESE MIGRANTS IN KANO: A STORY OF TEXTILE INDUSTRY OCCUPATION

The arrival of the Chinese migrants to Kano was the result of intricate transformations in the 21st century (Muhammad, 2011). Moreover, in reality, it was the manifestation of the transition, which began in China from the late 1970s (Toyo, 1999). The Chinese came into Kano in droves at the beginning of the 21st century and dominated trade in textile, causing serious challenges to local production. The emergence of the new wave of transformation in the textile industry came to be referred to as the China factor - whose economic dimensions appeared to be driven by increasing cross-border flows of trade in textile items, which in turn provided additional impetus for further integration of Kano with China’s economy. From the 1960s up to the mid-1980s, the crux of the local trade policy was to avoid dumping of foreign goods. Perceived dependence on imports hence trade policies were generally restrictive providing for high tariffs. Dramatic negative transformation was experienced in the shift in mass imports in favour of China.

Smuggling, dumping, counterfeiting, faking, low quality and low cost textile items from China have fundamentally changed the face of the textile industry in Kano. These transformations have given China a clear shot at Kano market in everything made of cloth. The unrestricted access provided to China mostly came through the backdoor, which provided the impetus for multiple distasteful circumstances. China’s anti-capitalism credentials are now pro-capitalism. Certainly, China has supplanted the great textile trading powers in the global marketplace. In 2002, Adhama (Monday, June 1, 2015) stated, China’s share of goods imported by Kano more than tripled of what was imported two years earlier, while imports from the rest of the world dropped by 45 per cent. Kano textile commerce today is very active in China’s textile trade global ambition (Akinrinade & Ogen, 2008; Obeng-Odoom, 2015; Renne, 2015). The effect of its dominance and challenges to commercial activities form all-important factors of this dynamic relationship. For two decades, there was no significant presence of China in the textile trade engagement in Kano; but today there are many Chinese immigrants in the textile wholesale and retail sectors (Gadanya, 2015; M. T. Jakada, June 20, 2015; A. B. Yankatsari, May 3, 2015).

Chinese immigrants (see Fig. 1) have established many textile trade companies (see Appendix 1), which are involved in distribution, wholesale and retail and are actively encouraged by their home government to see Nigeria as an investment and trade terminal (Alden, 2007). Hundreds of trading and retailing shops, directly or indirectly owned by the Chinese, found place in the market. These shops trade in low cost and low quality textile products. The outcome of all these economic enterprises is a sharp discrepancy in textile activities between Kano and China. Total textile imports from China to Kano stood at $1.58 billion in 2006, rising to $3.89 billion in 2008 and exceeding $4.15 billion in 2011. This commercial painful transition made China the biggest textile exporter of textile items mostly smuggled into Kano. For China, Kano represents a lucrative export market. The effects of these unwholesome exports face growing discontent from stakeholders (S. Tijjani, May 2, 2015; B. Abdulaziz, June 10, 2015; G. Abdullahi, May 3, 2015). Kano’s little benefit, as far as textile trade with China, is a major concern (S. I. U. Tofa, June 6, 2015).
Kano is not only a famous commercial terminus in Nigeria, but also the second biggest non-oil and gas economy in the country with an estimated GDP of $15 - $19 billion. Now, it faces the threat of Chinese occupation of its market space (MAN, 2016). Kano’s economy has for centuries been driven largely by textile production and trade, with a large percentage of the population engaged directly or indirectly in it (Uba Adamu, 1998). The textile trade sector is strong and diverse with an estimated 1.6 million businesses and contributing approximately 30-35 percent of output and employment (MAN, 2016). Despite the dislocation during the colonial era and other challenges in the post colonial times, the importance of Kano as a textile centre has not been completely eroded. With the coming of the Chinese migrants though, Kano textile industry has been facing many challenges. Some of these challenges include, but not restricted to, smuggling and dumping, counterfeiting and faking, price manipulations, retail and wholesale inadequacies, poor quality and standard and the importation of huge low-cost items from China.

For instance, a textile item from a retailer at Kantin Kwari market in Kano, will have a “Made in China” label, on account of that China is now the world’s dominant textile label in Kano, accounting for over 90 percent of Kano textile merchandise (S. I. U. Tofa, June 6, 2015; M. T. Jakada, June 20, 2015). China has become significant due to its intense export trade. While its performance is remarkable, there is less understanding of fundamental issues regarding its export wonders, and the rampaging consequences to less developed textile economies. China’s advantages are the combination of its rapid economic growth, export expansions, and the country’s large size. Kano’s huge and prominent business environment which is a hub in textile production and trade has to contend with intractable challenge of unprecedented smuggling of textiles, auxiliaries and clothing including under invoicing and false declarations especially through neighbouring

**Figure 1: Number of Chinese Immigrants in Kano**

![Immigrants vs Year](chart)

Source: KASTU, 2015
countries such as Niger, Benin and Togo (Renne, 2015; Abdulaziz, June 10, 2015; M. Kura, May 3, 2015; A. Baba, May 4, 2015). Similarly, studies by Kano State Traders Association, in collaboration with Manufacturers Association of Nigeria show that Kano textile industry in terms of trade has suffered serious setback caused by the influx of imports, largely illegal and counterfeits, which has altered the nature of trade in the new millennium (see Fig. 2) (KASTU, 2015). Dumping of cheaper products causes serious issues to local wholesales and retails (H. NaAbba, May 12, 2015). It is worth to note that textile trade is one of the keys of Kano’s economic growth, wealth creation, sustained economic development and antidote for unemployment.

**Figure 2: Percentage of Counterfeit Textile Products from China to Kano Market**

Source: KASTU, 2015

Kano is proving to be uniquely important for China as the centre for huge collection and distribution of textile items for most of West Africa sub region which is of strategic significance as a market as the textile products are used far more than in any part of Africa. Aremu (2005); I. Aremu, 16 June, 2015; A. B. Nabegu, June 11, 2015) asserts that Kano, as the most populous state in Nigeria, use long meters of textile items far greater than most of Nigerian states. Chinese factories poured out clothing items at low prices that could not be matched locally in vast quantities to Kano through illegal means (see Fig. 3). According to Sunusi Ata (May 12, 2015) and Saidu Adhama (June 1, 2015) the total textile imports to Kano are estimated at more than $4 billion, most of which enter through porous borders and represent $1.8 billion in lost revenue and ₦900 million VAT.
Figure 3: Composition of Textile Demand
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Source: MAN, 2016

Results of massive textile import dumps in Kano market as at 2014 ran into $4.2 billion as reported by Saidu Adhama (Monday, June 1, 2015) and Sanusi Ata (May 12, 2015). NUTGWTN (2014) indicated that around N300 billion worth of textiles that were smuggled in were from China. Textile imports to Kano ran into billions of dollars mainly from China, India, Indonesia and the UK in the span of fifteen years (2000-2015). China’s imports, which were a meagre $800,000, rose to $4.1 billion, $3.2 billion, $3.8 billion, and $4.1 billion and dropped to $3.4 billion in 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015 respectively (Muhammad, Mukhtar, & Lola, 2017).

In summary, evidence shows that Chinese textiles smuggled through the Niger Republic Magarya border among several other Sahara routes into Nigeria occupy a large chunk of the share of the increasingly promising textile market in Kano. This engagement is mainly of benefit to the Chinese commercial interests with not much benefit to Kano. Generally, China is winning with sure and steady steps. Kano’s industry controls less than five per cent of the local market compared to China’s more than 90 per cent dominance (see Fig. 4).
Figure 4: Kano Textile Market Share in 2015

Source: KASTU, 2015

CONCLUSION

Textile production and trade is the leading sector of the Kano economy. This paper discusses how immigrants from Maghrib, North Africa, Middle East, South and Central Sudan and from nearby regions of Adamawa, Borno, Kwararafa, Nupe and Benue had transformed Kano textile economy. This paper also reviews the colonial intrusion coming along with middlemen in the Lebanese and Syrian immigrants drawing back the past successes. Post independence Kano also had a fair share of textile transformation only to be reversed by the influx of Chinese immigrants in the 21st century.

To further prove the impact made by immigrants to Kano textile sector, this paper reviews the Kano history from 15th to 21st centuries. It indicates that migratory patterns from other places towards Kano had enhanced the textile sector and the economy in general. Centuries before the colonial period, Kano appeared as a huge textile production and trade centre not only in the Sudan and the entire West and Central Africa, but also in North Africa. Colonial imperialism however had changed the pattern of textile trade from trans-Sahara to trans-Atlantic. For the first-time, authorities came to represent economic exploitation by the British Empire rather than the development of the textile industry. The arrival of the Chinese in the 21st century worsened the textile production and trade in Kano. Today, the volume of goods imported to Kano market far outstripped the demand, and this has caused serious issues to the business (H. NaAbba, May 12, 2015).

Overall, it would be said that immigrants who were attracted to Kano for centuries have helped to transform Kano textile industry and helped in its growth. The industry was however challenged by colonial policies that were originally meant to expatriate raw materials and brought in finished goods to Kano market. This paper notably has provided evidence on the most current salient challenges in Kano textile
industry, which include smuggling, dumping, counterfeiting and faking products. Other challenges are price instability and China’s dominance in local retail and wholesale businesses. Consequently, this has led to the sharp increase in volume and value of items and massive imports of low-cost items, which has destabilized the Kano market. Moreover, the standards and quality of textile items have also been neglected. These challenges have led to impacts on production capacity of the textile industry to shrink drastically in the past 15 years. The emergence of the new wave of globalization, otherwise known as the China factor, whose economic dimensions appear to be driven by increasing cross-border flows of trade in textile items provide additional impetus for further integration of Kano into the global market place.
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## Appendix 1: Some Kwari Market Registered Trade Companies

| S/N | Name of Company                        |
|-----|----------------------------------------|
| 1   | S. S. Textile Company                   |
| 2   | Opai Trading Company                    |
| 3   | Blue Sky Company Limited               |
| 4   | Guo Mio Textile                        |
| 5   | Young Gang Textile                     |
| 6   | Malli Textile                          |
| 7   | Naira Alkamfak                         |
| 8   | NBTX                                   |
| 9   | Huafie                                 |
| 10  | Nagashabandi                           |
| 11  | Asia, Imran                            |
| 12  | Peeky Impex                            |
| 13  | Chootani Textile Company               |
| 14  | M. Rayyan Textile Company              |
| 15  | Salman Munir                           |
| 16  | Janoo Textile                          |
| 17  | Ovais Textile                          |
| 18  | Mamoud Ahmad                           |
| 19  | Iqbal Enterprise, Company              |
| 20  | S. V. C. Enterprise                    |
| 21  | Yuemei Textile Company                 |
| 22  | A. A. International                    |
| 23  | Famouse International Company          |
| 24  | Inuwa Investment Company               |
| 25  | BAI International Company              |
| 26  | Tambari Zango                          |
| 27  | Afro Impexan                           |
| 28  | Dangang International Company          |
| 29  | Al-Rafeal                              |
| 30  | KingTex                                |
| 31  | Kasif Mashood                          |
| 32  | Jawell Life-Line                       |
| 33  | Sino Osno                              |
| 34  | Zein Textile                           |
| 35  | Mujada                                 |
| 36  | J. S. K.                               |
| 37  | David Strategic                        |
| 38  | Zigoul Vision                          |
| 39  | Tungda International                   |
| 40  | Lutex                                  |
| 41  | SAWA                                   |
| 42  | Xingli                                 |
| 43  | Musallo Nigeria Company                |
| Page | Company Name            |
|------|-------------------------|
| 44   | NBTX                    |
| 45   | Chitex                  |
| 46   | KFM                     |
| 47   | Bentex                  |
| 48   | Veira                   |
| 49   | Hotex                   |
| 50   | DT lace                 |
| 51   | Over One                |
| 52   | Sanfia                  |
| 53   | M. H.                   |
| 54   | RJY                     |
| 55   | Lucky                   |
| 56   | Pintex                  |
| 57   | Amsalco Nigeria         |
| 58   | BBY, Nigeria            |
| 59   | Madatai, Nigeria        |
| 60   | A. G. Karfe             |
| 61   | Thaiba General Enterprises |