



Nigeria and India bilateral relations: Contending realities and challenges

Ruqaiyah Saidu Abubakar¹ and Zasha Tersoo Zasha²

¹*Department of Political Science and International Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences,
University of Abuja*

²*Department of Political Science, Federal University, Dutsin-Ma, Katsina State
Email: ruqayyahsaidu@gmail.com*

Abstract

Many of the social, political and economic goals that States try to pursue in the International System cannot be achieved within the territorial confines of their nation, so States need the active cooperative and assistance of other States thereby encouraging interdependence in the international scene to achieve their national objectives. In the relation between these States which is referred to as foreign policy. foreign policy are designed to protect, promote and defend a nation's vital interests by preserving it National Sovereignty, the defense of territorial integrity, the promotion of economic, military, strategic and diplomatic interest, the increase and maintenance of power and prestige so as to influence international events, to communicate one's capabilities to both potential and actual allies and adversaries and defense of whatever state might define as its vital interests, thus the bilateral relation between Nigeria and India will be examine in this paper as to how the relate in terms of international and mutual benefits and how this relations affect their foreign policy making and its impact on the international scene though the process of maintaining this necessary relations can be difficult and frustrating at times especially when it comes to national and security interest. But the Nigeria-India bilateral relation has been very appreciative by both countries and on mutual agreement there by resulting in economic, political and social relations.

Keywords: Bilateral Relations, India, Nigeria and challenges

1.0 Introduction

The foreign policy of any country is the product of both internal and external environmental factors surrounding the country. The environment to foreign policy decisions is limitless theoretically, though in practice, the environment is circumscribed by the range of interest and the limitations of the power of every single state. Foreign policy policies are designed to promote, protect and defend a nation's vital interests such as the preservation of national sovereignty, the defense of territorial integrity; the promotion of economy,

military, strategic and diplomatic interests, the increase and maintenance of power and prestige so as to influence international events; to communicate ones' capabilities to both potential and actual allies and adversaries; and the defense of whatever a state might define as its vital interests. (Alkali, 2003).

What is Foreign policy? How do we make sense of all the phenomena that transcend National borders sending a diplomatic note, enunciating a doctrine, making an alliance or formulating a long-range but vague



objectives such as making the world safe for democracy. There are all foreign policy outputs: actors or Ideas designed by policy makers to solve a problem or promote some change in the environment that is, in the policies, attitudes or actions of another state or states.

Foreign policy consists of many actions and decisions that states make which is in their interest. Which is called national interest. National Interest is “When statesmen and bureaucrats are expected or are required to act in the National interest. What is meant is that they are being called upon to take action on issues that would improve the political situation, the economic and social well-being, the health and culture of the people as well as their political survival. They are being urged to take actions that will improve the lot of the people rather than pursue policies that will subject the people to domination by other countries. Policies which are likely to make them unable to stand among other nations. These national interests can be primary and secondary. The primary interest is that vital interest-which a country can never compromise like protection of the nation’s physical, political and cultural identity and survival against encroachment from the outside while the secondary interest are those falling outside of primary interest but contributing to it. These interests include protecting citizens abroad and maintaining power. These Interests are those a state can negotiate, bargain and trade off with other states (Ojo and Sesay 2002; Frankel 1997:1).

It’s important to understand how states make their foreign policy in regard to their power Morgenthau (1973) explains that the relative influence of the different factors upon national power must be determined with regard to all nations. One ought to know whether France is stronger than Italy and in

what respect. One ought to know what the assets and liabilities in terms of the different power factors of India or china are with respect to the Soviet Union, of japan with regard to the United States, of Argentina with regard to Chile. The national power of a state determine the influence of the state’s foreign policy which determine how strong it foreign policy can affect it relationship with other states. Powerful states have stronger foreign policy than weaker over because power determine the foreign policy of any state in the international arena

Methodology

The study made use of the secondary source of data to collate data through available document, books, articles, web sites, data collected from previous researches. Since secondary research is a systematic investigation which solely depend on existing data, the study involved collating, organizing and analyzing from already existing literatures.

Theoretical Framework

The paper adopts the neoliberal theory which emphasizes the free trade policy in order to enhance and develop the relations within nations. Neoliberalism is fundamentally a theory of wealth and how it is created. In explaining why some nations grow and prosper while other nations do not, it is the neo liberal perspective that the root of the problems lies in the state –in misguided public policies that derived from incorrect theories of political economy on one hand and from corrupt government on the other, either way the state in the problem and so the focus of neoliberal policies is to dismantle the state, at least in its ability to interfere unproductively in the market economy.

Thus, neoliberal policies advocate economic deregulation, privatization of government enterprises, low inflation, low government



debt and open domestic and international markets. This is the best environment, they believe for wealth creative, which is the key to material prosperity. Neoliberalism, at least as it is most often characterized uses the basis vocabulary of liberation to create a theory of wealth without concern for the implications this has for the distribution of power. It is thus easy for critics to characterized neoliberalism as taking power from the state and turning it over to business interests, just as it is easy for those who favour neoliberalism to paint it as the means to prosperity. Economic policy makers at the World Bank, the international monetary fund and the U.S treasury department in the early 1990s arrived at a consensus that neoliberal policies were needed in less developed and emerging market economies. Their shared policy prescriptions became known are the Washington consensus, although their term is more used by critics than supporters. (Balaam and Veseth, 2005). Neoliberalism is in the first instance a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets and free trade. The role of the state in to create and preserve to create and preserve an institutional framework appropriate to such practices.

The state has to guarantee, for example, the quality and integrity of money. It must also set up those military, defense, police and legal structures and functions required to secure private property rights and to guarantee, by force if need be, the proper functioning of markets. Furthermore, if markets do not exist (in areas such as land, water, education, health care, social security or environmental pollution) then they must

be created, by state action if necessary. But beyond these tasks the state should not venture. state interventions in markets (once created must be kept to a bare minimum because according to the theory, the state cannot possibly possess enough information to second guess market signals (prices) and because powerful interest groups will inevitably distort and bias state interventions (particularly in democracies) for their own benefit (Harvey 2005:2).

Foreign Policy: Towards A Conceptual Elucidation

According to Legg and Robinson, foreign policy is defined as a set of objectives with regards to the world beyond the borders of a given social unit and a set of strategic and tactics designed to achieve these objectives on the other hand, Joseph Frankel believes that foreign policy “consist of of decisions and actions which involve to some appreciable extent, relations between one state and others (Franklin, 1967; Alkali; 2003). To pursue these, states in the international system whether small or big, rich or poor, strong or weak, democracies or totalitarian systems, within or outside established alliances, use various methods and instruments of foreign policy to influence, sometimes even dictate, the role orientations, objectives and actions of other states. (Alkali, 2003).

Foreign policies are the strategies government use to guide their actions in the international arena, foreign policies spell out the objectives state leaders have decided to pursue in a given relationship or situation. States establish various organizational structures and functional relationship to create and carryout foreign policies. Officials and agencies collect information about a situation through various Channels; they write memoranda outlining possible options for action; they hold meetings to



discuss the matter; some of them meet privately outside these meetings to decide how to steer the meetings. IR Scholars are especially interested in exploring whether certain kinds of policy processes lead to certain kinds of decisions -whether certain processes produce better outcomes (for the states self-defined interests) than do others. (Goldstein and Pevehouse, 2008).

The study of foreign policy is fraught with a number of difficulties. The difficulty relates to the controversy over the definition of actors in international relations. Foreign policy is often seen purely as state action. For almost all intents and purpose, the state acts for the society internationally and internal matters relating to foreign affairs are a state prerogative. Foreign policies often involve a clear understanding and appreciation of the political role of non-governmental entities in the international system. (Ojo and Sesay, 2002:117-18).

Northedge Conceptualises foreign policy simply “an interplay between the outside and the inside. Charles Lerche and Abdul A. said that the foreign policy of a state usually refers to the general principles by which a state governs its reaction to the international environment. To T.B Millar. Foreign Policy is presumably something less than the sum of all policies which have an effect upon a national governments relations with other national governments.

Joseph Frankel sees foreign policy as “consisting of decisions and actions which involve to some appreciable extents relations between one state and another. In another major work, Frankel defines foreign policy as a dynamic process of interaction between the changing domestic demands and support and the changing external circumstances. Although there has been no universally satisfactory definition of the term; it is quite revealing from the few

meanings espoused above that foreign policy is a dynamic process involving interaction between the domestic and the external environment. This of course will be in accordance with the national interests of the states concerned. Hence, as J.C Plano and R. Olton submit foreign policy is the strategy or planned course of action developed by the decisions makers of a state vis-à-vis other states or international entities, aimed at achieving specific goals defined in terms of the national interest. R. Anderson and Christol also posit that foreign policy involves the formulation and implementation of a group of principles which shape the behavioral pattern of a state while negotiating with other states to protect or further its vital interest. Similarly William Wallace sees foreign policy in terms of high diplomacy as concerned primary with other states with international stability and the rules of the international system and with the promotion of the national interest through the cultivation of good relations with other government and the negotiation and maintenance of international agreements (Akinboye, 1999, 364-365).

Nigerian Foreign Policy and National Interest

Foreign policy is essentially the Instrumentality by which states influence or seek to influence the external world and to attain objectives that are in consonance with their perceived national interest. Hence, we can conceive of Nigerian’s foreign policy as the explicit objectives which Nigeria wants to pursue and achieve in her external relations. Essentially, it is the instrumentality by which Nigeria influences the global environment and through which she realizes objectives that are in conformity with her perceived national interest (Akinboye, 1999:365).



Nigerian's foreign policy will be understood and assessed in the context of its regional and continental ambitions largely designed by the presiding head of state or president. The pre-colonial time was the period when the entity Nigeria came into existence i.e. from 1914-1960 when the country was named and administered by the colonial masters. From 1914 to the later part of 1960, the interest of the British is the interest of the entity called Nigeria (Ogunsanwo, 1980; Njoku and Nwafor, 2005). The Nigerian Foreign policy and its external relations during the colonial rule were structured to improve the economies of the colonizing or metropolitan powers. In the scheme of things, what mattered was how the political economy of Nigeria could benefit the colonizers. It should be reiterated that, the interest of her majesty's government in England is the interest of the then dependent state of Nigeria. The post Independent period saw the formation of a truly indigenous foreign policy that was truly called a Nigerian's foreign policy with the coming of successive government, the policy has been mortified (Emakpor 2010; Emmanuel, 2010), (Omotoshi, 2012-408). Akinboye (1999:368) explained that since independent, ten different regimes have emerged in Nigerian, and in spite of their different orientations and leadership styles, the conduct of Nigeria's foreign policy has been publicly proclaimed by them to be guided by the same principles which are also in conformity with the well-established principles of traditional law as well as the charter of the organization of African unity (OAU).

They are

- Sovereign equality of all state
- Respect of territorial Integrity and independence of other states
- Non-interference in the internal affairs of other states
- Commitments to self-determination and independence of other states
- Commitments to functional approach as a means of promoting cooperation and peaceful co-existence in Africa, and
- Non-alignment to any geo-political power blocks.

Similarly Omotosho (2012:411) gave us the cardinal principles of Nigeria's foreign policy. From the administration of Sir Abubakar Tafawa on October 1st, 1960 through the various military administrations and under the presents civilian administration, they have all pursued the same national interest which include: The defense of our sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity; the promotion of equality and self-reliance in Africa and defense of human dignity, especially the dignity of the black men, and the defense and promotion of world peace and security. Successive Nigerian administration. (i.e from Balewa to Jonathan) have not had a single and common yet the trend of Nigerian's assistance to African countries and other outside the continent show a broad outline of solidarity and co-operative (Yusuf; 2004). In spite of their different orientations and leadership styles, the conduct of Nigerian's foreign policy has been publicly proclaimed by them to be guided by the same principles which are able in conformity with the well – established principles of traditional law as well as the charter of the organization of African unity (OAU) now African Union (AU).

Omotosho, (2012:411) continued, this in essence means that Nigerian's foreign policy like that of any other country ought to be fundamentally guided by its national



interests. It should be noted that the 1960s, 1979 and 1999 constitution, the question of promotion of international cooperation and solidarity among all nations, seem the most important objective of Nigerian's foreign policy. Section 19 of 1979 and 1999 constitutions of the federal republic had gone further to set out the cardinal principles of its foreign policy agenda. The basic principle of Nigerian's foreign policy anchored on the promotion of its National Interest and that of its citizens.

Certain basic factors Influence a state's foreign policy. As F.S Northledge has clearly demonstrated, the foreign policy of a country is a product of environmental factors-both internal and external to it. The factors include the political structure of the country, structure of the economy, geo-political structure of the country, structure of the economy, geo-political location of the country, character of political leadership, military factor, demographic factor and domestic political situation. The instruments for conducting foreign policy generally refer to the means or mechanisms used by states in conducting their relations with other states. They include diplomacy, propaganda, militarism, economic devices and cultural mechanisms. The significance of leadership role in the process of foreign policy making cannot be over-emphasized K.W Thompson and Roy Macridis underscore this when they posit that policies of states vis-a-vis the rest of the world are mere expressions of the prevailing political social and religious belief of the leaders. The onus of making Nigerians foreign policy lies mainly in the president or Head of state with the ministry of External or foreign affairs discharging the responsibility on his behalf. The manner of performing this onerous functions depends largely on the character and disposition of

the particular leader at the helm of affairs in the country (Akinboye, 1999).

Indian Foreign Policy and National Interest

Foreign policy is always determined by a number of historical and domestic factors. In the case of India also several of such factors have been responsible for the shaping of principles and objectives of its foreign policy. These factors include geographical position (location, size etc.) history, tradition, Ideology, personality of policy makers, international milieu and internal economic and military power. The objectives set out by the policy makers and the principles of which India's foreign relations are based are largely influenced by these factors. Every head of government and his foreign minister leave impact of their personality on the country's foreign policy. Nehru was not only prime minister but also foreign minister for over 17 years in the formative years of Independent India (Perkins, 1960:17).

Since India gained Independence from Great Britain in 1947, it has developed Institutions and processes to promote a strong foreign policy. However, core values and ideas from India's history continue to form India's foreign policy goals. Before 1947, India's position in International Sytem was characterized by two district eras. The first was its period of economic and cultural dominance before British Colonization and the second was its period of subjugation during British colonization (Ogden, 2014).

Quinn (2018) added that it is important to note that modern India has many simultaneous foreign policy goals. India's pre-colonial history as a dominant world power formed its self-conception of being a morapolitik, great power and foreign policy objective of being recognized by others as having great power status. Relying on the



Constructivist Idea of Co-constituted Identities. The pre-colonial period of Indian greatness led India to Conceive of its great power strategy as moralpolitik which means the aggressive use of morality to advance national interest. (Karnad, 2002:3). This approach can be seen as a combination of values and pragmatism. India's identity was constructed from history through discourse from sources, such as the mahabharata, regarding India's ancient history as a great power. Additionally, the mahatma Ghandi's interpretation of ancient constructed its present-day self-conception as a moralpolitik great power.

The pre-colonial period of Indian dominance is of its goal to be recognized as a contemporary great power in ancient times, India was a cultural and religious leader. Buddhism began with a Siddhartha Gautama's Birth in then-India, now Nepal, in the sixth century BCE. The predominance of Buddhism rose throughout central and south Asia until the eleventh century (Harvey, 2013:198). One factor influencing the decline of Buddhism was the rising power of Hinduism which is another Indian religion (Harvey, 2003:195). Throughout pre-colonial history, India's flourishing empires also made significant cultural and academic development. During the Mughal Empire, India functioned as a bridge between the Middle East and East Asia through which good and ideas could pass (Bose, 1998:44). This strategies location in the Indian ocean made India an economic power house for centuries as it was hub for agriculture and foreign trade (Ogden, 2014:53).

Horimoto,(2017) posit that India has self-evidently crossed the threshold of circumscribing its self-imposed external stance: from negation to affirmation of its aspiration to be a major power. This change

of stance might be attributable to Modi, the first non-Nehruvian prime minister of India because he was a perfect follower of Sardas Patel, the first home minister and later a prime minister (August 1947 to December 1950). Patel was thoroughly realistic and pragmatic unlike Nehru who was idealist, pragmatic and realistic.

Nigeria-India Bilateral Relations: Benefits and Contradictions

Beri (2013) comprehensively explained the bilateral relation between these two countries, Historical political connection: India's relation with Nigeria predate political independence. The migration of Indians to Nigeria under the system of indentured labour during the British rule marked the beginning of an informal relationship. At the same time the Nigerian nationalist were inspired by the Indian struggle for independence. In contrast to so many African States, Nigerians followed a non-violent method in their freedom struggle.

The deep influence of India on Nigeria was expounded by President Shehu Shagari during a visit to India in 1983 when he said we come to salute India, the largest democracy in the world. We also come to learn from India as we have been learning or we follow your example and your model. Diplomatic relations between India and Nigeria were established in 1958 two years prior to Nigerian independence. The visit of Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru in 1962 paved way for close relations between India and Nigeria. In the political realm, the open support of India's position by Nigeria during the Sino-India conflict of 1962.

Further strengthened relations at the same time India's active support for the anti-apartheid and liberation struggle in Africa from 1960's to 1998's, considered a foreign priority within Nigeria, was deeply



appreciated by successive Nigerian Government. However despite the potential, the India Nigeria relationship failed to thrive and it was only in the late 1990's that a change was discerned. In 1995, India awarded the Indira Gandhi prize for peace, disarmament and development to President General Olusegun Obasanjo who served as Nigeria's president twice from 1976-79 and 1999-2007 respectively.

Beri (2013) continued that significant socio-cultural cooperation: India and Nigeria have cooperated in socio-cultural areas too. Since independence a number of Indian teachers have been working in Nigerian schools and university. The numbers peaked in the 1970's but declined after Nigerian President General Buhari's in the 1980's introduced the policy to source Nigeria nationals for the public sectors jobs, particularly in health and education. India has offered scholarship to Nigerian student since the 1960's. While United States and Europe are the preferred destination of Nigerians for higher studies, the relatively lower cost have made India an attractive option-around 5,000 Nigerians are studying in India. While many Nigerians use their own funds, the government has provided assistance under the special Commonwealth African Assistance Plan and the Indian Technical and Economic cooperation Programme (ITEC). After the second Africa India forum summit held in May 2011, the number of the fellowship available to Nigerians for technical training in India, under the ITEC Programme was raised from 130-145. Apart from government sponsored training Indian companies in the information technology (IT) field such as infosys, NIIT and Apetech have trained close to 150,000 Nigerians. The presence of 35,000 people of India origin in Nigeria adds to the cultural linkage.

Beri (2013) further explained that Expanding Economic Tier: Economic cooperation is a critical component of India's relations with Nigeria. Currently, Nigeria is India's largest trading partner in Africa. Moreover India is the second largest trade partner of Nigeria and the largest investor with over a hundred Indian companies in the country. The current volume of trade between Nigeria and India is USD17.3 billion (2011-12). There is no doubt that the economic relationship between the two countries or dominated by the crude oil imports. It is to be noted that from 1960-1965, India imported mainly palm oil from Nigeria and subsequently palm oil was replaced by crude oil. The import of crude oil from Nigeria ceased during the 1970's which may have been due to the steep hike in the oil prices or the onset of military rule on the country. Oil imports were renewed from the mid 1990's and there was a significant spike at the turn of the century. No doubt, India's growing energy needs and its quest to diversity sources of oil supply from volatile West African region pushed India to develop closer tie with Nigeria. A number of Indian Oil Companies such as ONGC Videsh Ltd and Essar have invested in the Nigerian energy sector. On the other hand pharmaceutical form a major portion of India's exports to Nigeria. It appears India is Nigeria's leading source of pharmaceutical imports. Apart from pharmaceuticals rice, computer software, telecommunications and machinery. Several India companies have made investments in Nigeria. Way back in 1982, Hint Set Up Nigerian Machine Tools (NMT) with 15 percent equity participation – Indian companies like Mecon Ltd, RITES, Telecommunications consultants India Ltd (TCIL), National Small Industries Corporation (NSIC) have been involved in



consultancy and management Projects in steel, railways, telecom and small-scale industry sectors in Nigeria for several years. 8 Petroleum India International (PII) have been involved in the maintenance of Port Harcourt and the Warri oil refinery. Major Indian IT companies like Infosys, satyam, NIIT and Aptech have signed agreements with local companies to set up training institutions on Nigeria.

Beri (2013) went further to explain, Security Cooperation: India and Nigeria are both regional powers and share a similar world view with regards to global security challenges. They both support the idea of reform of global governance institutions such as the United Nations and the world Trade organization bilaterally, a bill of Defense Cooperation was signed during Prime Minister Manmohan Singh's visit to Nigeria on 2007. However military interactions can be traced back to the 1960s. India has helped set up various military institutions including the Nigerian Defense Academy (NDA) at Kaduna and the command and staff college (CSC) at Jaji in Nigeria. While India has deputed officers to train Nigerians, a number of Nigeria officers have been trained over the years in Indian military Institutions. These include former Nigerian President Olusegun Obasanjo, Ibrahim Banbangida and several other top military officers. The Indian government has communication equipment worth a million dollars to Nigerian armed forces. It has also set up IT labs in Nigeria Defense colleges. Capacity building has thus been the buzz word of India's security cooperation with Nigeria.

Similarly Vasudevan (2010) explained the bilateral relationship between Nigeria-India. India's relation with Nigeria as with the rest of Africa, were initially built upon industrial and political connections, but have gradually

come to be based more upon economic links. India opened a small Indian diplomatic office in Lagos in 1958, before Nigerian's independence in 1960. In his only visit to Sub-Saharan Country, India first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, visited Nigeria in September 1962, in recognition of Nigeria size, population, resources, then efficient civil service and well-functioning economy. Despite the potential for a close and mutually beneficial bilateral relationship, in the 1970s and 1980s, this failed to gain much momentum. Democratic India watched with concern the emergence of a predatory state in Nigeria and the failure Nigeria experience with democracy. Between 1962 and 2002, India's Ministry of external Affairs appeared to relegate Nigeria to the back burner despite warnings that in the process India was losing profile, influence and control of its image in the region. For a long time Nigeria has been regarded as African Giant with a population of 160 million and significant national resources. It is ambitious and sees itself as a region with the potential to replace South Africa and become the continents economic power house between 1995 and 2005, foreign direct investment (FDI) flows into Nigeria increased from \$1.27 billion to \$3.4 billion and spiked to nearly \$6 billion by 2006. In 2007, with the economic growth rate of 6.3%, Nigeria was rated in the top twelve of emerging market economies. It is Africa's top oil producer, with a reserve base estimated at 3 billion barrels of crude oil. Many Africa observers believe that despite the country's political unpredictability the economy is potentially capable of enjoying significant economic growth and is worth doing business with. It is now India's' largest trading partner Africa, supplying it with billion worth of oil.



Initially, India imported palm oil and exported goods and cotton textiles and enjoyed a trade surplus with Nigeria. However, things changed in 1973-74 when crude oil replaced Nigeria's other exports. Commonalities between the two countries both faced vast economic inequalities and the challenges of mainstreaming the multitude of ethnic, religious and linguistic groups should serve to enhance engagement. In both countries agriculture enjoyed primacy until the discovery of hydrocarbons changed Nigeria's course, while a strong and diversified manufacturing base and thriving services sector saw India take a different direction. It is economically strong enough to invest in Nigeria and promote Nigeria's growth. In the process, yet engagement has historically been business led rather government led. This has hampered the ability of Indian actors to make the most of the links. As a community in Nigeria, Indians have been best known for their substantial involvement in the textiles industry, predominantly in the Northern states of Kano and Kaduna between 1962 and the mid-1990s. Kaduna alone had around 21 textile industries while Kano had nearly twice as many, most owned by Indians and a few by Lebanese business people. The textile industry was the largest employer in Nigeria's manufacturing sector, accounting for about 25% of all manufacturing jobs. However, since Nigeria's return to democracy in 1999, the once vibrant, viable and booming textile industry has declined. by 2005 over 80%. Of Nigeria's textile manufacturing companies had shut down, leading to the loss of 250, 000 jobs (Vasudera, 2010).

By January 2009, Indo-Nigerian trade had surpassed the level of Nigeria's trade with all other countries in southern central and West Africa. India is the most fourth largest

non-oil export destination for Nigeria. Aside from Oil, it exports cashew nuts, wood, cotton pearls, rubber and gum Arabic to India. India's exports to Nigeria comprise paper and wood products, textile, Plastic, Chemical, Machinery and transport equipment, drugs and pharmaceutical. Overtime, India has widened the scope of its economic engagement with Nigeria and with the rest of Africa. Nigeria imports more Indian pharmaceuticals than any other country in Africa, but this is one trading sector that has been particularly controversial. India has been accused of exporting substandard or fake drugs. The chairperson of Nigeria's National Agency for food and Drug Administration and control met with authorities in India and was given reassurance by them that offenders are severely punished under Indian Law. The Indian automobile sector has made inroads into the Nigerians market, where there is widespread use of Tata vehicles, maruti cars, Bajaj-made three-wheelers vehicles and two wheelers made by TVS and Hero Honda, as well as Ashok Leyland vehicles and tractors manufactured by Mahindras (Vasudera, 2010).

The major findings of this study is that the Indian government acts as a promoter and coordinator of economic relations as seen in Nigeria's companies such as manufacturing, non-oil sector and energy sectors because Indian goods and services have dominated the Nigeria's market. The relation these two countries have established goes beyond political interest but has also led to stronger economic investment between this countries which has resulted in greater opportunities and investment between them.

Conclusion

Nigerian and India have had a strong and undeniable historical and political connections which has gradually move to



more economic aspects. Nigeria and India's relationship need to be repackaged and rebranded if their foreign policy in to significantly benefit both countries. Nigeria and India have a deep-rooted bilateral relations where both countries have had close ties in pharmaceuticals, power sector, solar energy, Agriculture, Automotive sector, Bilateral visits, Information and communication technology and economic and investment relations which have shaped their national interest. India has been flaunted as a global leader in medical tourism because of it highly qualified doctors and state of the art equipment and their treatment is approved by the world health organization (WHO) and the US food and drug administration and because medical and cheaper compared with the US and UK.

Recommendation

International economic relations have always been a critical important component of a country's international policies; foreign policy transactions as well as the economic well-being of a nation's citizens are ultimately the hallmark of a successful government policy (Olusanya, 1989). It is in this view that a greater attention should be given to economic initiatives in the context of a nations international activities. It is also in view of this that in practical terms, greater attention has been duly given to the economy in the context of bilateral co-operation between Nigeria and India (Kura, 2009)

References

- Akinboye, S.O (1999). "The concept of Foreign Policy" In Anifowose R and Enemuo F (ed) (1999). *Element of Politics*. Lagos: Malthouse Press Ltd.
- Alkali, R.A (2003). *International Relations and Nigeria Foreign Policy*. Kaduna: North Point Publishers.
- Balaam.D. N and Veseth, M (2005). *Introduction to International Political Economy*. Pearson Education International.
- Beri, R (2013). *India-Nigeria Relations: On the Upswing*. New Delhi: Institute for Defense Studies and Analysis.
- Bose, S and Jalal. A (1998). *Modern South Asia: History, Culture, Political Economy*. London and New York: Routledge Press.
- Charles O. Lerche Jr and Abdul. A. Said (1999). "Concept of International Politics in Global Perspective" In Anifowose R and Enemuo F(ed) (1999). *Element of Politics*. Lagos: Malthouse Press Ltd.
- Emakpor, O. (2012). "Evolution of Nigerian Foreign Policy" In Ogundiya I.S and Amzat.J (ed) (2012) *Foundations of the Social Sciences*. Lagos: Malthouse Press Ltd.
- Emmanuel,S (2012). "Nigeria's Foreign Policy" In Ogundiya I.S and Amzat.J (ed) (2012). *Foundations of the Social Sciences*. Lagos: Malthouse Press Ltd.
- Frankel, J (1999) "British Foreign Policy" In Anifowose R and Enemuo F (ed)(1999). *Element of Politics*. Lagos: Malthouse Press Ltd.
- Franklin, B. W (1967).*The Concept of a Commitment in International Relations*.
- Goldstein, J.S and Pavhouse, J. C (2010). *International Relations*
- Harvey, D (2015). "A brief History of Neoliberalism" In Ives, A (ed) (2015). *Neoliberalism and the Concepts of Governance: Renewing with an older Liberal Tradition to Legitimate the Power of Capital*.
- Harvey, P (2013). *An Introduction to Buddhism: Teachings, History and*



- Practices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holski, K.J (1988). *International Politics. A Framework for Analysis*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- Horimoto, T (2017). “Explaining India’s Foreign policy: From Dream to Realization of major Power”. In *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*. Vol. 17. Issues 3.
- Jam, M (1999). “India’s Foreign Policy. The Vision 2020”. In *Indian Journal of Asian Affairs*. Vol.12. No 1.
- Karnad, B (2002). *Nuclear Weapons and Indian Security*. New Delhi: Macmillan Press.
- Kura,S.B.(2009). Nigeria-India economic, political and socio-cultural relations: critical reflections for continuous mutual co-operation.IJAPS.Vol.5, No 1(January, 2009)
- Macridis, R (1962). “Foreign Policy in World Politics” In Anifowose R and Enemuo F (ed) (1999). *Element of Politics*. Lagos: Malt house Press Ltd.
- Millar, T.B (1999). “Writing about Foreign Policy in James N. Rosenau (ed) International Politics and Foreign Policy (1969) in Anifowose R and Enemuo F (ed) (1999) Element of politics. Lagos: Malt house Press Ltd.
- Morgenthau,H.J(1973). *Politics amongst Nations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Njoku, A.O and Nwafor P.I (2005). “Nigeria’s External In Ogundiya I.S and Amzat.J (ed) (2012) *Foundations of the Social Sciences*. Lagos: Malthouse Press Ltd.
- Ogden, C.(2014). *India Foreign Policy: Ambition and Transition Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ogunsawo,A(1980). *The Nigerian Military and Foreign Policy 1975-1979: Processes, Principles, Performance and Contradictions*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ojo, O and Sesay A. (2020). *Concept in International Relations*. Ile-Ife: Clear Print Publishers.
- Omotosho, M (2012). “Introduction to Nigerian Foreign” In Ogundiya I.S and Amzat.J (ed) (2012). *Foundations of the Social Sciences*. Lagos: Malt house Press Ltd.
- Olusanya,G.O and Akindele,P.A(1989). The Fundamentals of Nigeria’s Foreign Policy and External Economic Relations in Kura,S.B.(2009). Nigeria-India economic, political and socio-cultural relations: critical reflections for continuous mutual co-operation.IJAPS.Vol.5, No 1(January, 2009)
- Perkins, P (1960). *International Relations-Third Revised Edition*.
- Quinn. A (2018). *How History Shapes India’s Foreign Policy Goals*. London: University of St. Andrews Press.
- Rourke. J.T and Boyer, M.A (1996). *International Politics on the World Stage*. Dushkin/Mcgraw. Hill.
- Vasudevan, P (2010). *The Changing Nature of Nigeria-India Relation*. Programme Paper. Chaltham House.
- Vasudevan,P(2010).*The Changing Nature of Nigeria-India Relations*. Chatham House.